

# Submitted Performance Measures for the FY 2024 Budget

December 2022

# KLRD

*Providing objective research and fiscal  
analysis for the Kansas Legislature*

Kansas Legislative Research Department  
Room 68-W, Statehouse  
300 SW 10th Avenue  
Topeka, KS 66612  
Phone: (785) 296-3181  
[kslegresearch.org](http://kslegresearch.org)

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Foreward .....v

Agriculture and Natural Resources.....9

Education.....79

General Government.....124

Human Services .....507

Transportation .....746

Public Safety.....792

Appendix.....987

This page intentionally left blank.



**Kansas Legislative Research Department**

*Providing nonpartisan, objective research and fiscal  
analysis for the Kansas Legislature since 1934*

68-West–Statehouse | 300 SW 10th Ave. | Topeka, Kansas 66612-1504  
(785) 296-3181

[kslegres@klrd.ks.gov](mailto:kslegres@klrd.ks.gov)

[kslegislature.org/klrd](http://kslegislature.org/klrd)

December 21, 2022

This document is a compilation of information prepared by state agencies and submitted to the Kansas Legislative Research Department (KLRD) and the Kansas Division of the Budget in the KLRD template provided during the fall of 2022. All agencies submitted performance measures, or in the case of the Regents Institutions, performance agreements.

At the end of the 2021 Session, the House Appropriations Committee requested state agencies submit performance measures in a different reporting tool than previously utilized. Performance Based Budgeting (PBB), as outlined in KSA 75-3718(b), is an initiative to incorporate information on agency performance measures and program effectiveness into the budget process. Committee members expressed interest in further applying PBB throughout the budget process.

The PBB template includes information on:

- The consequences of not funding various agency programs;
- The authorizing authority for the program;
- Whether the program is mandatory or discretionary;
- Any federal funding for the program and whether that program has a maintenance of effort or match requirement;
- The agency's determination of the program priority level;
- Agency program goals; and
- Performance measures, including FY 2019 through FY 2022 actual and agency projections for the current and budget years.
  - Outcome Measures evaluate whether an agency is achieving its overall goals; and
  - Output measures evaluate the program activity. Output measures are typically used by agencies to manage agency personnel and expenditures.

This page intentionally left blank.

## Administrative Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Administrative Services program within KDA houses all of the support functions of the agency, as well as the Office of the Secretary. Without these integral functions, such as Fiscal, Human Resources, Information Technology (IT), Legal, and Communication, the agency would cease to function. Proper guidance and oversight for the entire agency is provided at this level and communicated to employees, stakeholders, and interested parties. Should this program not be funded, these duties would statutorily be required to be assumed by other state agencies or state employees. A large degree of synergism, education, and experience would be lost, as well as goodwill with the agricultural industry as a whole. The agency would jeopardize their ability to compete and receive top federal grant awards, causing further negative consequences to the agency.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt. No	Priority Level 1
Specific KSA Chapter 74 Article 5 KSA 74-569 - Organization of the Department of Agriculture KSA 74-576 - Powers and duties of the Secretary of Agriculture			

### Program Goals

- A. Provide timely, accurate, and efficient fiscal services (accounts payable and accounts receivable)
- B. Provide comprehensive Human Resources services to KDA employees and future KDA employees
- C. Assist programs in the modernization of legacy IT services and continue to improve existing services
- D. Provide timely, accurate, and efficient legal services (process administrative enforcement orders and settlement agreements)
- E. Provide open records to the public in a timely manner
- F. Advocate for agriculture and KDA programs through traditional and other media

### Program History

The Kansas Department of Agriculture (KDA) is the nation's first department of agriculture, devoted to the total support of agriculture in Kansas. Crafted from the roots of the Kansas Agriculture Society and Kansas State Agricultural Society, dating back to 1855 and 1862, respectively, the State Board of Agriculture was officially created by the Kansas Legislature in 1872. It was not until 1994 that the Board was officially renamed the Kansas Department of Agriculture. In 2014, a majority of the department was relocated from Topeka to the current headquarters' location in Manhattan.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of vouchers per staff member	A	1,132	1,035	1,097	1,125	1,313	1,250	1,250	1,148
2. Percent of full-time employees retained	B	90.84%	89.54%	81.85%	86.00%	83.05%	82.75%	83.25%	84.81%
3. Number of orders issued by Legal for all programs	D	1,054	908	409	700	451	500	550	589
4. Average number of processing days for orders in Legal	D	27	40	29	35	19	19	21	29.3
5. IT user satisfaction rating	C	N/A	95.4%	94.3%	95.0%	96.3%	95.5%	96.0%	95.3%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
6. Number of vouchers processed in SMART	A	5,095	4,659	4,388	4,500	5,253	5,000	5,000	4,767

Department of Agriculture

7. Number of IT Service Desk requests resolved	C	N/A	2,678	2,751	2,800	2,787	2,800	2,900	2,739
8. Number of news releases	F	85	89	78	80	60	70	70	75.67
9. Number of open record requests processed	E	706	1,019	1,092	950	981	1,000	1,000	1,031
10. Number of settlement conferences held	D	215	98	67	150	79	85	85	81.33

Funding

<i>Funding Source (In Millions)</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 889,750	\$ 1,046,445	\$ 1,048,746	\$ 649,207	\$ 857,235	\$ 1,086,387	\$ 743,020	\$ 984,142
Non-SGF State Funds	4,855,322	4,582,291	3,611,546	5,154,502	4,389,705	5,178,625	5,210,374	4,194,514
Federal Funds	449,626	305,562	165,665	169,161	496,496	1,528,519	1,365,969	322,574
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 6,194,698</b>	<b>\$ 5,934,298</b>	<b>\$ 4,825,957</b>	<b>\$ 5,972,870</b>	<b>\$ 5,743,436</b>	<b>\$ 7,793,531</b>	<b>\$ 7,319,363</b>	<b>\$ 5,501,230</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>35.5</b>	<b>36.0</b>	<b>36.0</b>	<b>35.0</b>	<b>35.0</b>	<b>36.0</b>	<b>36.0</b>	<b>35.7</b>

## Dairy & Feed Safety

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Inspections and sampling would not be performed, increasing risk of milk product and commercial feed contamination, and/or adulteration putting public health and animal health at risk. Illness and death could result. Kansas milk and dairy products could not be shipped or sold in interstate commerce. Kansas feed manufacturers would not comply with FSMA requirements and could not export feed stuffs.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	Dairy Law KSA 65-771 through 65-791 - licensing, inspection, and regulation of dairies and milk.  Commercial Feeding Stuffs (1923) KSA 2-1001 et. seq. - require regulation and analysis of feed stuffs.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Provide a fair-minded regulatory environment for the Kansas dairy and commercial feed industry which results in safe, clean, unadulterated milk, dairy, and commercial feed products for both animal and human feed consumers
- B. Achieve and maintain compliance with FDA guidelines and National standards
- C. Grain program efficiencies by continuing to automate and streamline inspection, sampling, and record-keeping processes

### Program History

The Dairy division within the old Board of Agriculture was established in 1925 within that same year the dairy law was transferred to the State Board of Agriculture. The Dairy Inspection program protects consumers in Kansas and other states. Inspectors regulate the dairy industry starting at the farm and continuing as the milk and milk products are transported, process, distributed and sold. The Feed Inspection program safeguards both human and animal health by inspecting feed manufacturers, transporters, distributors/retailers and animal production facilities to ensure compliance with state and federal regulations.

Department of Agriculture

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percentage of passing dairy farm raw milk samples compared to total amount of samples analyzed each fiscal year	A	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%
2. Percentage of passing feed samples vs. deficient samples each fiscal year	B	84%	84%	82%	84%	80%	84%	84%	82%
3. Percentage of FDA required dairy state surveys completed each fiscal year	C	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*Output Measures*

4. Total amount of state inspections (evaluations, tanker inspections, feed sample inspections, sampler evaluations) completed by both dairy and feed programs each fiscal year	A	1,762	1,927	1,856	1,850	2,111	2,100	2,100	1,965
5. Total FDA-related inspections completed, as specified in Goal B	B	205	198	203	200	177	175	175	193

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 18,200	\$ 18,328	\$ 18,416	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,248
Non-SGF State Funds	1,017,493	1,032,188	980,707	1,210,586	1,065,434	1,305,176	1,317,812	1,026,110
Federal Funds	220,590	246,731	325,726	388,940	341,447	363,190	363,189	304,635
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,256,283</b>	<b>\$ 1,297,247</b>	<b>\$ 1,324,849</b>	<b>\$ 1,599,526</b>	<b>\$ 1,406,881</b>	<b>\$ 1,668,366</b>	<b>\$ 1,681,001</b>	<b>\$ 1,342,992</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>16.2</b>

## Food Safety

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Providing uniform food safety inspections in food establishments and food processing plants ensures a safe food supply to Kansas consumers. Failure to provide these inspections and regulate these food and lodging facilities under standard federal guidelines would significantly increase the risk of the consuming public and be detrimental to public health including possible death due to unsanitary food preparation conditions.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	Transfer from KDHE to KDA (2004) KSA 74-581	Mandatory	No	1
	Transfer from KDHE to KDA (2008) 74-5, 104			
	Food (1927) KSA 65-643 et seq. - licensing and inspecting food establishments and food processing plants.			
	Lodging (1975) KSA 36-501 et seq. - licensing and inspection of lodging facilities ensuring minimum standards for safe and sanitary operation			

### Program Goals

- A. Provide uniform, effective, and efficient food safety inspections in order to protect public health and maintain the public's confidence in Kansas establishments
- B. Professional development of Food Safety & Lodging program staff
- C. Maintain outreach to customers through training and educational meetings

### Program History

Food inspection regulation dates back to the early 1900s and traditionally under KDHE. In 2003, the Legislative Division of Post Audit studied Kansas' food inspections and as a result, food inspection was moved to the Department of Agriculture in 2004 with lodging inspections following in 2008. This was done to place all food regulation under Department of Agriculture which was already doing meat, poultry, dairy, and egg inspections. A number of efficiencies were gained and continues to present.

Department of Agriculture

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percentage of inspections performed at interval required by statute	A	97.5%	98.0%	98.0%	98.0%	96.1%	97.0%	97.0%	97.4%
2. Number of individual employees completing training plans, yearly	B	64%	64%	64%	64%	64%	64%	64%	64%
3. Percentage of inspections where education and training is provided to food establishments	C	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*Output Measures*

4. Number of Food and Lodging inspections performed	A	21,232	15,836	18,058	20,500	20,530	20,500	20,500	18,141
5. Number of Focus on Food Safety classes given	C	66	93	39	55	90	95	100	74

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	3,584,650	3,696,047	3,612,775	4,044,756	3,594,010	4,250,376	4,286,300	3,634,277
Federal Funds	561,787	773,521	857,210	904,365	969,354	883,275	887,841	866,695
<b>Total</b>	\$ 4,146,437	\$ 4,469,568	\$ 4,469,985	\$ 4,949,121	\$ 4,563,364	\$ 5,133,651	\$ 5,174,141	\$ 4,500,972
<b>FTE</b>	60.0	64.0	64.0	64.0	64.0	64.0	64.0	64.0

## Grain Warehouse

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Defunding the Grain Warehouse program will have a significant negative effect on the Kansas economy by not ensuring that Kansas grain producers have safe, solvent warehouses where they may store their commodities as required by state statute.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	Public Warehouses (1907) KSA 31-101 et seq. - supervision and regulation of all public warehouses storing grain.	Mandatory	No	1
	Grain Warehouse Law (2007) KSA 21-3711, 21-3736, 21-3737 - criminal acts relating to grain warehouses.			

### Program Goals

- A. Protect grain depositors by performing subsequent exams of all licensed public grain warehouses once a year to ensure there are no losses due to fraud or mismanagement of records and grain quality is kept to the standards set forth by the State of Kansas.
- B. Provide a high level of customer service by completing special examinations when requested and measuring new facilities to add to licensed storage space or approve conditional storage space
- C. Accelerated examinations for noncompliance to maintain a system that ensures zero loss to depositors by identifying and deterring fraud in the grain warehouse industry
- D. Professional Development

### Program History

In 1907, Kansas enacted its first warehousing laws. The early farmers recognized the need for government to regulate the grain industry much in the same way it regulated banks. The primary goal for the program has not changed in more than 100 years. The Grain Warehouse Inspection program administers and enforces the Kansas Public Warehouse Law relating to grain storage. It requires that any entity that stores grain for the public be licensed by either the state or federal government. It ensures that Kansas grain producers have safe, solvent warehouses where they may store their commodities. To achieve this, the program examines state-licensed facilities at least once each year. More examinations are made on licensed facilities that meet only the minimum financial requirements. A licensed elevator, with the approval of the Grain Warehouse Inspection program, may move open stored grain to another licensed, bonded terminal elevator. This allows smaller facilities to free up bin space for the next harvest. Also, with approval from the program, licensed facilities may use emergency or conditional storage space during harvest when storage space is in short supply. This allows the elevator to better serve Kansas crop producers. Examinations help eliminate fraud in the grain industry, ensure the quantity of stored commodities in Kansas licensed warehouses, maintain the percentage of loss to producers at zero.

Department of Agriculture

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of grain warehouse failures	A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Number of licensee complaints	B	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0

  

<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Percent of annual examinations completed	A	99%	92%	78%	85%	85%	95%	100%	85%
4. Bushels of licensed storage	A	528,154,196	547,640,983	557,040,000	560,000,000	565,279,000	570,000,000	575,000,000	556,653,328
5. Number of accelerated examinations	C	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0.67

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 142,101	\$ 142,012	\$ 134,124	\$ 201,847	\$ 199,938	\$ 208,387	\$ 210,277	\$ 158,691
Non-SGF State Funds	328,135	368,446	264,563	253,070	165,411	375,392	376,499	266,140
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 470,236</b>	<b>\$ 510,458</b>	<b>\$ 398,687</b>	<b>\$ 454,917</b>	<b>\$ 365,349</b>	<b>\$ 583,779</b>	<b>\$ 586,776</b>	<b>\$ 424,831</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>5.2</b>

## Laboratory

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Agricultural products and commodities that pose a public health/safety hazard would likely result in foodborne or feedborne illness. Lack of fairness in commerce from inaccurate weighing and measuring devices or improperly labeled feeds, fertilizers, and pesticides.

	<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	Weights and Measures Law (1947) KSA 83-201-224 - metrology lab and services Commercial Feeding Stuffs (1923) KSA 2-1001 et seq. Fertilizer Law (1907) KSA 2-1201 et seq. Soil Amendment Act (1975) KSA 2-2801 et seq. Agriculture Liming Materials Act (1976) KSA 2-2901 et seq. Pesticide Law (1976) KSA 2-2438a et seq. Meat and Poultry Inspection Act (1969) KSA 65-6a18 et seq. Dairy Inspection KSA 65-771 through 791	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Protect consumer and animal health through multiple chemical and microbiological analyses of various food products sold in Kansas
- B. Evaluate ongoing technical competency of analysts through completion of proficiency testing
- C. Professional development of laboratory staff

### Program History

Started 1953 to ensure quality of fertilizers, seeds (former), animal feeds, dairy products, livestock remedies (former), pesticides; Metrology lab was established in 1971; Added: meat and poultry, metrology, industrial hemp; Relocated lab during pandemic from Topeka to Manhattan in March 2020.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Report test results within established times (percentage of quarters on track or completed)	A	90%	58%	89%	90%	79%	90%	90%	75%
2. Analysts complete proficiency testing for analytes on scope of accreditation (percentage of quarters on track or completed)	B	83%	94%	88%	90%	77%	85%	90%	86%
3. Attend conferences and complete trainings remain current with issues of regulatory testing (percentage of quarters on track or completed)	C	100%	78%	74%	90%	92%	90%	90%	81%

  

<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
4. Number of ISO-accredited and NIST-certified test methods	A	47	66	63	66	67	68	71	65
5. Lab trainings completed in Qualtrax	A	353	275	163	225	724	750	800	387

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 196,201	\$ 198,437	\$ 190,531	\$ 26,885	\$ 42,026	\$ 27,750	\$ 28,011	\$ 143,665
Non-SGF State Funds	1,215,155	1,637,056	1,276,169	1,726,109	1,804,434	1,518,438	1,407,685	1,572,553
Federal Funds	257,295	204,131	546,675	505,643	368,662	382,029	381,872	373,156
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,668,651</b>	<b>\$ 2,039,624</b>	<b>\$ 2,013,375</b>	<b>\$ 2,258,637</b>	<b>\$ 2,215,122</b>	<b>\$ 1,928,217</b>	<b>\$ 1,817,568</b>	<b>\$ 2,089,374</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>14.5</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>15.3</b>

## Meat and Poultry

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Kansas would be non-compliant with Federal law for meat inspection and we would lose federal funding. Either USDA would have to provide inspection services or meat processing could not continue. In the absence of inspection, meat and poultry products that pose a food safety hazard may enter the human food supply. Product adulteration and the incidence of economic fraud would have to be reported and investigated by another agency or not addressed.

	Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	Meat and Poultry Inspection Act (1969) KSA 65-6a18 et seq. - ante-mortem and post-mortem inspections, regulatory oversight of meat and poultry processing, individual slaughter allowance.  Food and Advertising Sales Practices (1984) KSA 50-901 et seq. - inspection, produce and price representation.	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

- A. Provide a fair-minded regulatory environment to the Kansas meat and poultry inspection industry to ensure our "equal to" status with FSIS
- B. Ensure that required sampling is done during the calendar year
- C. Facilitate growth and education to new and existing businesses

### Program History

Kansas Meat and Poultry Inspection Program started in 1969 under the Kansas Department of Agriculture when the Meat and Poultry Inspection Act was created.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Fairly regulate Kansas meat processing facilities (number of slaughter, processing and custom plants)	A	86	86	103	126	105	118	125	98
2. Regulatory sampling in accordance with Federal and State requirements	B	98%	99.4%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
3. Provide education materials and guidance to facilitate Industry growth (slaughter numbers)	C	48,961	51,991	62,371	76,230				57,181

*Output Measures*

4. Inspections performed (slaughter, compliance, patrols)	A	9,473	9,554	9,968	13,860	9,923	12,000	13,025	9,815
5. Required samples collected	B	889	796	766	1,122	827	1,000	1,050	796
6. Total businesses licensed by M&P including processing, slaughter, wholesalers, animal food, broker and warehouses.	C	397	404	526	600	580	610	620	503

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,519,683	\$ 1,513,493	\$ 1,347,316	\$ 1,476,434	\$ 1,354,350	\$ 1,866,816	\$ 1,880,098	\$ 1,405,053
Non-SGF State Funds	31,669	17,927	171,623	52,901	55,083	58,286	58,286	81,544
Federal Funds	1,369,159	1,325,159	1,318,123	1,394,480	1,543,892	1,663,244	1,663,253	1,395,725
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,920,511</b>	<b>\$ 2,856,579</b>	<b>\$ 2,837,062</b>	<b>\$ 2,923,815</b>	<b>\$ 2,953,325</b>	<b>\$ 3,588,346</b>	<b>\$ 3,601,637</b>	<b>\$ 2,882,322</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>38.5</b>	<b>37.5</b>	<b>37.5</b>	<b>37.5</b>	<b>37.5</b>	<b>43.5</b>	<b>43.5</b>	<b>37.5</b>

## Pesticide & Fertilizer

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Pesticide and Fertilizer Program needs funding to ensure it meets its statutory and regulatory duties. If the Pesticide and Fertilizer Program is not funded and the statutory and regulatory duties are not met, it is likely that pesticide misuse complaints would increase and such complaints would not be investigated; consumers would not know if a product was properly registered in Kansas; and there would be no oversight of chemigation process which may result in an increased likelihood of groundwater contamination. Additionally, not adequately funding the Pesticide and Fertilizer Program may result in Kansas losing primacy under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) which would likely increase the presence of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in the state, including additional federal enforcement actions being pursued against Kansas businesses.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	<p>Fertilizer Law (1907) KSA 2-1201 et seq., ensures that fertilizer products are properly labeled and safely stored; governs the storage and transport of anhydrous ammonia and licensure of individuals who blend fertilizer products.</p> <p>Agricultural Chemical Act (1947) KSA 2-2201 et seq., governs the registration of pesticide products that will be distributed, sold, delivered, and transported in the state.</p> <p>Soil Amendment Act (1975) KSA 2-2801 et seq., requires registration and proof of efficacy for any substance which is intended to improve physical, chemical or other characteristics of the soil, or improve crop production.</p> <p>Pesticide Law (1976) KSA 2-2438 et seq., governs pesticide use in Kansas, provides for licensure of pesticide businesses and dealers, and provides for training and certification of pesticide applicators in the state.</p> <p>Chemigation Safety Law (1985) KSA 2-3301 et seq., requires registration of all water points of diversion that will be used in the chemigation process.</p>	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Efficiently apply state resources to provide an equitable and balanced regulatory environment
- B. Maintain Kansas primacy under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to facilitate Kansas agriculture and restrict federal enforcement for noncompliance by Kansas pesticide business
- C. Grain program efficiencies by continuing to develop and streamline the Agriculture Information Management System (AIMS) to provide online opportunities for licensure and product registration

### Program History

The Pesticide and Fertilizer Program works to ensure compliance with Kansas statutes and regulations governing products that are used to control pests or to enhance plant growth. The Program strives to achieve its mission through compliance assistance and outreach education; complaint investigation; and monitoring inspections. The Kansas Department of Agriculture has been responsible for pesticide and fertilizer regulation since the implementation of the various statutes identified above. In approximately 1999, the Pesticide and Fertilizer Program was integrated after the fertilizer section was transferred from the Agricultural Commodity Assurance Program.

## Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Promptly investigate pesticide misuse complaints in an attempt to determine a single source of the misuse by completing 90% of the investigations within 30 days	A	97%	93%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98%
2. Provide opportunities for individuals to obtain and/or renew commercial applicator certification by proctoring at least 50 pesticide applicator certification examination sessions	B	59	52	70	50	64	50	50	62
3. Monitor at least 30% of the recertification training programs occurring in Kansas so EPA requirements are met and quality recertification training programs are provided to commercial applicators	B	36%	50%	71%	50%	73%	50%	50%	65%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Total number of pesticide misuse complaint investigations completed by the Pesticide and Fertilizer Program	A	118	99	85	100	80	80	80	88
5. Total number of certification exams taken in Kansas	B	3,325	5,152	2,502	2,500	3,068	2,500	2,500	3,574

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	1,268,294	1,321,441	1,113,930	1,113,930	951,470	1,227,726	1,236,614	1,128,947
Federal Funds	515,584	504,543	654,820	618,698	580,735	589,054	589,050	580,033
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,783,878</b>	<b>\$ 1,825,984</b>	<b>\$ 1,768,750</b>	<b>\$ 1,732,628</b>	<b>\$ 1,532,205</b>	<b>\$ 1,816,780</b>	<b>\$ 1,825,664</b>	<b>\$ 1,708,980</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>

## Plant Protection & Weed Control

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Defunding the Plant Protection and Weed Control program will have a significant negative effect on the Kansas economy. Important plant safeguarding, export certification, consumer protection, and industrial hemp licensing activities will not be completed as required by state statute.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	Seed (1925) KSA 2-1415 et seq. - ensure seeds are tested and labeled accurately.	Mandatory	Yes	1
	Plant Pest Act (1965) KSA 2-2112 et seq. - licensing and inspection of plant dealers, certification of Kansas commodities, plant pests and diseases, and quarantine authority			
	Barberry Eradication Act (1951) KSA 2-2712 et seq. - black stem rust and common barberry nuisances.			
	Noxious Weed Act (1943) KSA 2-1314 et seq. - control of noxious weeds.			
	Commercial Industrial Hemp Act (2019) KSA 2-3901 et seq. - cultivation of industrial hemp in a research and future commercial program.			

### Program Goals

- A. Safeguarding: Provide a system to safeguard Kansas' native and cultivated resources by excluding and/or early detection of high-profile exotic pests of regulatory significance which also allow the continued export of Kansas-produced plants and plant products.
- B. Export Commodity Assurance: Provide export commodity assurance for Kansas-produced commodities so that the pest freedom requirements by other states and foreign countries are maintained to allow expeditious movement of those commodities in foreign and domestic trade.
- C. Pest Management: Manage, control, or eradicate select pest of regulatory significance that are established in the state and provide technical expertise to program cooperators involved in pest control.
- D. Ensure that seed offered for sale meets label guarantees and contains no noxious weeds or restricted weed seed exceeding allowed quantities.
- E. Industrial Hemp Program: Enabling Kansans to take advantage of the new alternative crop in Kansas.
- F. Staff Training: Professional development and internal training

### Program History

The purpose of the Plant Protection and Weed Control program is to: protect the state's native and cultivated plants from the introduction and outbreak of harmful plant pests, including insects, plant diseases, weeds and other organisms; provide inspection and certification services to ensure compliance with statutes and quarantines and to facilitate movement of plants and plant products to other states and countries; manage pests of regulatory significance within the state; ensure that plants, plant products, and seed offered for sale in Kansas meet the requirements of the Plant Pest and Agricultural Commodity Act, the Kansas Seed Law, the Kansas Noxious Weed Law, and the Commercial Industrial Hemp Act.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of quarantines for harmful plant pests	A	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
2. Number of complaints from clients	B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Acres of compliant industrial hemp harvested (harvest occurs during the next FY after a license is issued)	E	0	1,831	761	400	260	482	450	951

<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Number of live plant and seed dealer inspections	A, D	1,137	575	702	900	580	700	700	619
5. Number of export certificates issued	B	9,615	8,082	7,788	8,000	9,282	8,000	8,000	8,384
6. Sites surveyed for harmful plant pests	A	7,251	2,890	3,179	6,000	4,607	5,000	5,000	3,559
7. Number of licensed industrial hemp producers	E	213	218	81	80	61	60	60	120

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 447,200	\$ 442,078	\$ 416,499	\$ 441,176	\$ 425,070	\$ 457,479	\$ 461,594	\$ 427,882
Non-SGF State Funds	686,527	832,065	658,912	884,371	770,097	921,878	931,660	753,691
Federal Funds	181,909	104,684	150,340	210,236	187,302	164,448	159,817	147,442
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,315,636</b>	<b>\$ 1,378,827</b>	<b>\$ 1,225,751</b>	<b>\$ 1,535,783</b>	<b>\$ 1,382,469</b>	<b>\$ 1,543,805</b>	<b>\$ 1,553,071</b>	<b>\$ 1,329,016</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>

## Weights & Measures

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Weights and Measures provides traceability for Kansas Weighing and Measuring Devices to the National System of Weights and Measures Standards and Performance Testing. This ensures equity in the marketplace for Kansans and facilitates trade locally, nationally and internationally. Failure to maintain accurate weighing and measuring devices harms Kansans, both purchasers and sellers. This harm is economic and results in many millions of dollars in lost revenue annually for Kansans. If trust in the weighing and measuring system is lost it could also result in lost trade and/or the requirement for traded items to be weighed elsewhere which would add additional cost for businesses. As an example there are some scales in Kansas over which several billion dollars of beef are traded annually. For a single scale trading 3 billion dollars of beef, a 0.1% error would result in 3 million dollars of lost revenue to either the beef producers selling beef or to the packing plant buying it. While we don't have the data to determine the value of all products sold annually in Kansas, it is easy to see how very small errors can have significant revenue impacts for Kansans irregardless of the product, beef, grain, oil, fuel, steel, gravel, cement, milk, chemicals, etc.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	Weights and Measures Law (1947) KSA 83-201-224 - metrology lab and services, monitoring and testing of scales, packages, and scanners.	Mandatory	No	1
	Device Inspection (1985) KSA 83-301-311 - annual testing of commercial weighing devices by licensed service companies.			
	Petroleum Products Inspection Law (1935) KSA 55-422-427, 55-429, 55-433-447 - inspection of fuel dispensers.			
	Liquefied Petroleum Gas (1952) KSA 83-143-149 - inspection of weighing and measuring devices, sale tickets.			

### Program Goals

- A. Utilize available resources efficiently
- B. Improve compliance education
- C. Improve program coverage

### Program History

KDA inspects all retail fuel devices every 18 months, these devices have a compliance rate around 90%. Other commercial devices such as scales, non-fuel meters, propane meters, moisture meters etc. are required to be inspected annually by a licensed service company, these devices have a compliance rate around 50%. KDA inspects a small portion of all non fuel devices on an annual basis. Do to the reliance on private service companies KDA no longer has the equipment or staffing to perform inspections of all device types and has not kept pace with new technology entering the market place such as Mass Flow Meters, Electric Vehicle Charging stations, Grain Moisture Meters, etc.

## Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percent of failed price verification (PV) inspections	A	58%	55%	51%	50%	46%	50%	50%	51%
2. Total number of complaints	A, B, C	115	89	97	100	103	100	100	96

<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Total number of fuel inspections	A	31,527	24,401	25,233	28,000	27,530	25,000	25,000	25,721
4. Total number of scale inspections	A	16,534	17,533	18,661	17,000	23,697	18,000	18,000	19,964
5. Number of educational events / price verification trainings	B	21	13	42	40	84	50	50	46
6. Total number of price verification (PV) inspections	A	920	361	588	588	1,610	700	700	853
7. Number of airport devices inspected	C	48	67	190	130	137	120	120	131

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 717,396	\$ 710,498	\$ 556,820	\$ 662,113	\$ 643,797	\$ 683,816	\$ 688,701	\$ 637,038
Non-SGF State Funds	944,286	686,643	795,150	1,006,859	865,626	1,133,758	1,140,270	782,473
Federal Funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,661,682	\$ 1,397,141	\$ 1,351,970	\$ 1,668,972	\$ 1,509,423	\$ 1,817,574	\$ 1,828,971	\$ 1,419,511
<b>FTE</b>	17.0	17.0	17.0	16.0	16.0	16.0	16.0	16.7

## Ag Marketing

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Consequences of not funding this program include: failure to meet statutory obligations as outlined below; loss of a voice for and support staff hired and trained to validate, promote and mentor/grow/expand Kansas agriculture (farmers, ranchers and agribusinesses/Ag Growth Strategy) domestically and internationally all while also serving a supply chain network associated with the direct, indirect and induced effects of the industry; loss of management oversight for the current KDA/Kansas Value Added Foods & Meat Laboratory partnerships designed to provide discounted services to Kansas food, beverage and meat processing/value add entities; dissolution of the state trademark program - From the Land of Kansas - and marketing initiatives/benefits (including eCommerce) offered through the program for farmers' markets and small/mid-sized food and agriculture entities; loss of securing and administering Federal funding associated with USDA AMS grants and USDA FAS market access/market development (International/federal cooperator partnerships); loss of agency economics and statistics validating the Kansas agriculture industry and data collection by statisticians contributing to feeder cattle indexes and hay/sunflower market pricing reports published by USDA AMS; loss of state/domestic agricultural advocacy initiatives including support for and engagement with secondary and post-secondary classrooms/audiences.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	ERO #40 (2011) KSA 74-5, 112-5, 118 - establishing agriculture marketing and promotions within KDA. Agriculture products (1996) KSA 74-50, 156-50, 163 - product development, value added center, trademark registration, contract fulfillment. Farmers' Market (2013) KSA 2-3801-3804 - farmers' market definition, registration, liability protection. Fostering Development and Economic Welfare of Agriculture Industry KSA 74-576 KSA 74-504	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Serve all Kansans through innovate programming and delivering solutions designed to create an environment that facilitates growth and expansion in agriculture while increasing pride in and awareness of the state's largest industry - agriculture
- B. Increase the awareness of making Kansas a potential state for the relocation or expansion of agriculture business
- C. Increase and enhance export opportunities for Kansas farmers, ranchers, and agribusinesses

### Program History

The Division of Agriculture Marketing, Advocacy and Outreach was originally created in the Board of Agriculture but was transferred to the Department of Commerce in 1995. In 2011, the division was transferred into the Department of Agriculture. The Division is organized into the following programs: Agriculture Workforce Development, Domestic Market Development, Compliance Education and Agency Outreach/Advocacy, Economist and Statistics, International Market Development and From the Land of Kansas/Affiliated Programs (local foods and farmers' markets). Additionally, the division has a 12-member Agriculture Marketing, Promotions and Advisory Board that meets quarterly and serves as a citizen sounding board for program activities.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
1. Implan / State & County Contributions, in billions of dollars	A	\$ 46.4	\$ 49.2	\$ 47.3	\$ 47.5	\$ 53.4	\$ 51.5	\$ 52.0	\$ 50.0
2. International Market Development / Total Agricultural Trade Value in billions of dollars	C	\$ 3.8	\$ 3.8	\$ 4.0	\$ 4.1	\$ 5.3	\$ 4.5	\$ 4.7	\$ 4.4
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. From the Land of Kansas Membership	A	301	349	333	350	340	350	375	341
4. Total Sales Generated from FLOK E-Commerce Member Marketing Initiatives	A	\$ 55,079	\$ 62,309	\$ 70,633	\$ 71,000	\$ 74,634	\$ 68,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 69,192
5. Strategic Growth Initiative (SGI) Community Facilitations	B	7	2	1	3	3	5	8	2

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 725,904	\$ 725,801	\$ 694,801	\$ 415,034	\$ 467,621	\$ 416,812	\$ 414,995	\$ 629,408
Non-SGF State Funds	1,468,180	1,250,749	1,433,410	1,574,248	1,449,848	1,463,993	1,467,177	1,378,002
Federal Funds	385,343	249,768	296,649	453,010	703,392	442,161	347,358	416,603
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,579,427</b>	<b>\$ 2,226,318</b>	<b>\$ 2,424,860</b>	<b>\$ 2,442,292</b>	<b>\$ 2,620,861</b>	<b>\$ 2,322,966</b>	<b>\$ 2,229,530</b>	<b>\$ 2,424,013</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>

## Animal Health

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Funding sources are a combination of SGF, license and registration fees, USDA APHIS cooperative agreements, NADPRP farm bill funding, special program grants. Both farm bill funds and special program grants are project specific and provide opportunities for additional initiatives.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific Animal Health KSA 47-104 through 47-2306 Stock running at large, strays, marks and brands, protection of domestic animals, registration of veterinarians, public livestock markets, deliveries in motor vehicles, disposal of dead animals, garbage restrictions, feedlots, pet animals, aquaculture, domesticated deer	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Support division responsibilities, including disease investigation and response and maintain interaction with regulated industries and stakeholders
- B. Enhance internal communication and professional development
- C. Enhance animal disease emergency response capabilities

### Program History

Kansas Department of Animal Health became a stand alone agency in 1969 by combining the Livestock Sanitary Commission and the State Brand Commission. Via a Governor's reorganization order, the Kansas Animal Health Department became a division of the Kansas Department of Agriculture in July 1, 2011. It is now known as the Kansas Division of Animal Health. Currently there are three programs that make up the Division - Animal Disease Control, Animal Facilities Inspection, Brands Program - all of which work to ensure the health and welfare of Kansas livestock and domestic animals.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Respond to Foreign Animal Disease (FAD) FAD investigation requests within a four-hour timeframe of report	A, C	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Department of Agriculture

2. Conduct routine inspections of licensed facilities as outlined in statutes, regulations and internal policies, as well as conduct pet animal complaint inspections within 3 days (72-hours)	A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
3. Conduct and develop at least one emergency management exercise and participate in one non-KDA sponsored exercise or tabletop event per year	C	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
4. Utilize all available funds that are provided from USDA and DHS in a responsible and effective manner, in line with approved workplan	A, C	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*Output Measures*

5. Number of Foreign Animal Disease (FAD) investigations	A, C	17	99	229	50	58	200	200	129
6. Number of Certificate of Veterinary Inspections (CVI)	A, C	50,653	51,614	51,110	52,000	62,432	62,000	62,000	55,052
7. Number of Official Calfhood vaccinations	A	166,000	169,000	175,000	170,000	162,524	160,000	160,000	168,841
8. Number of Avian Influenza tests by state staff	A	2,022	1,707	3,490	3,400	1,220	1,500	1,500	2,139
9. Number of facility inspections	A	1,588	1,531	1,610	1,600	679	700	700	1,273

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 703,301	\$ 696,426	\$ 699,055	\$ 697,776	\$ 689,892	\$1,130,118	\$ 1,135,932	\$ 695,124
Non-SGF State Funds	1,689,442	1,573,345	1,814,260	1,982,082	1,797,302	1,896,627	1,893,022	1,728,302
Federal Funds	422,330	501,934	485,947	613,662	663,025	924,009	906,229	550,302
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,815,073</b>	<b>\$2,771,705</b>	<b>\$2,999,262</b>	<b>\$3,293,520</b>	<b>\$3,150,219</b>	<b>\$3,950,754</b>	<b>\$3,935,183</b>	<b>\$2,973,729</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>23.0</b>	<b>23.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>

## Conservation

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Lack of funding for Division of Conservation programs would lead to greater soil erosion and loss of agricultural production which negatively impacts the Kansas economy, greater sediment and nutrient loading to streams and lakes which increases water treatment costs for municipalities and reduces water storage capacity, greater damage to crops, roads and structures caused by increased flooding, and the loss of 100+ full time positions with Conservation District staff across Kansas.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific Conservation Districts Law - 1937 KSA 2-1901 to 2-1918 Conservation of soil and water, prevention of soil erosion, flood control, preservation of wildlife, protection of public lands	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

A. Provide support for conservation districts  
 B. Increase in efficiency and effectiveness of State Water Plan program implementation / administration  
 C. Implement the State Water Plan and 50-Year Water Vision by addressing priority resource concerns through increase local technical assistance and targeted conservation practices with special initiatives and partnerships / cooperative grants / agreements

### Program History

The Division of Conservation, working with 105 local Conservation Districts, 75 organized Watershed Districts, other special-purpose districts, as well as state and federal entities administer programs to improve water quality, reduce soil erosion, conserve water, reduce flood potential and provide local water supply. The DOC has the responsibility to administer the Conservation Districts Law, the Watershed District Act and other statutes authorizing various programs.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Conserve and Extend the High Plains Aquifer by retiring water rights with CREP and WaterTAP Programs (irrigated acres retired)	C	345	0	275	1,288	420	1,500	500	232
2. Secure, Protect and Restore our Kansas Reservoirs by implementing Streambank Stabilization Projects to reduce Reservoir Sedimentation (tons of soil reduced)	B	N/A	35,969	50,539	45,000	40,233	30,015	30,000	42,247
3. Improve the State's Water Quality by targeting conservation efforts to high priority areas (acres protected in high priority areas)	C	32,339	43,156	33,313	35,000	40,154	45,000	50,000	38,874
4. Reduce our Vulnerability to Extreme Events by improving soil health through providing education and information (number of producers attending soil health workshops)	C	2,216	927	1,260	2,500	3,000	3,500	3,500	1,729

Department of Agriculture

5. Effectively provide technical assistance to implement conservation practices on private land by completing agreements to sponsor Conservation Technical Assistance contracts with Conservation Districts (number of contracts)	B								
		36	36	40	40	40	38	38	39
6. Effectively implement conservation practices on private lands by offering cost-share for agricultural best management practices statewide (tons of soil saved)	C								
		51,286	113,575	82,410	115,000	164,286	165,000	167,000	120,090

*Output Measures*

7. Conserve and Extend the High Plains Aquifer by retiring water rights (dollars spent on CREP and WaterTAP Programs)	A, C								
		\$ 36,927	\$ -	\$ 24,861	\$ 446,593	\$ 227,870	\$ 431,029	\$ 216,206	\$ 84,244
8. Secure, Protect and Restore our Kansas Reservoirs by implementing Streambank Stabilization Projects to reduce Reservoir Sedimentation (dollars spent on Streambank Stabilization)	B								
		N/A	\$ 521,841	\$ 1,112,829	\$ 794,264	\$ 1,531,826	\$ 1,084,589	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,055,499
9. Improve the State's Water Quality by targeting conservation efforts to high priority areas (dollars spent in high priority areas)	B								
		\$ 1,491,092	\$ 1,730,080	\$ 1,161,121	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 2,301,311	\$ 2,400,000	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 1,730,837
10. Reduce our Vulnerability to Extreme Events by improving soil health through providing education and information (dollars spent on soil health)	B								
		\$ 65,851	\$ 54,509	\$ 110,144	\$ 200,000	\$ 625,344	\$ 650,000	\$ 650,000	\$ 263,332
11. Effectively provide technical assistance to implement conservation practices on private land by completing agreements to sponsor Conservation Technical Assistance contracts with Conservation Districts (federal funding leveraged)	A								
		\$ 501,165	\$ 1,017,120	\$ 1,366,281	\$ 1,622,858	\$ 1,430,564	\$ 1,459,265	\$ 1,392,940	\$ 1,271,322
12. Effectively implement conservation practices on private lands by offering cost-share for agricultural best management practices statewide (dollars spent in Water Resources and Non-Point Source programs)	B								
		\$ 3,307,671	\$ 3,639,427	\$ 2,938,031	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 2,002,429	\$ 5,895,946	\$ 3,740,905	\$ 2,859,962

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 482,999	\$ 482,468	\$ 436,384	\$ 482,980	\$ 469,775	\$ 501,964	\$ 506,513	\$ 462,876
Non-SGF State Funds	7,163,356	8,361,468	10,598,937	10,679,975	6,148,350	14,210,185	9,875,605	8,369,585
Federal Funds	501,165	1,017,120	1,366,281	1,687,759	1,482,586	1,173,424	967,940	1,288,662
<b>Total</b>	\$8,147,520	\$9,861,056	\$12,401,602	\$12,850,714	\$8,100,711	\$15,885,573	\$11,350,058	\$10,121,123
<b>FTE</b>	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0

## Water Appropriations

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Certificates, permits, changes to water rights, would not be processed and issued. Water use reporting data would not be collected. Private property rights would not be protected. The state's economy would be hurt by not allowing water to be put to a beneficial use. Some water users would take advantage of their neighbors by using more water than authorized.

Specific	Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
	KSA 42-701-730 (irrigation districts)	Mandatory	No	1
	KSA 68-2201-2215 (junkyards and salvage control)			
	KSA 74-506a-506d, 74-510 - (Division of Water Resources)			
	KSA 74-509 (irrigation plants)			
	KSA 74-2610, 2622 (Kansas Water Authority and Kansas Water Office)			
	KSA 82a-601-647 (rural water)			
	KSA 82a-701-737, 740, 42-303, 313 (water appropriation)			
	KSA 82a-954 (water protection)			
	KSA 82a-1020-1040 (groundwater management districts)			
	KSA 82a-1301-1320 (water plan storage)			
	KSA 82a-1330-1348 (water assurance)			

### Program Goals

- A. Process applications to appropriate water and changes to existing water rights in Kansas  
 B. Ensure water rights and the resources are protected  
 C. Conduct field work, public outreach, and transparent rule development

### Program History

We administer the Water Appropriation Act which allocates water to our citizens with terms, conditions, and limitations that provides a framework of first in time is first in right to the water. This allocation method maximizes the use of water for the best economic benefit and protects private property rights.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percent of water use data received online	B	88.31%	90.01%	91.18%	95.00%	91.88%	93.00%	93.00%	91.02%
2. Amount of water conserved, in acre-feet	B, C	11,844	11,876	11,951	12,000	11,951	12,000	12,000	11,926
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Water use reports processed	B	12,053	12,121	12,153	12,110	13,067	13,000	13,000	12,447
4. Number of Water Conservation Areas (WCAs)	B, C	45	50	53	50	53	50	50	52

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 2,449,411	\$ 2,550,263	\$ 2,341,914	\$ 2,316,018	\$ 2,299,016	\$ 2,413,721	\$ 2,435,598	\$ 2,397,064
Non-SGF State Funds	1,006,388	1,298,525	1,234,915	1,865,843	1,230,923	2,203,256	1,710,830	1,254,788
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 3,455,799</b>	<b>\$ 3,848,788</b>	<b>\$ 3,576,829</b>	<b>\$ 4,181,861</b>	<b>\$ 3,529,939</b>	<b>\$ 4,616,977</b>	<b>\$ 4,146,428</b>	<b>\$ 3,651,852</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>43.0</b>	<b>46.5</b>	<b>46.5</b>	<b>43.5</b>	<b>43.5</b>	<b>43.5</b>	<b>43.5</b>	<b>45.5</b>

## Water Management

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Not funding this program would severely jeopardize Kansas's ability to secure its water supply from Colorado on the Arkansas River, and from Colorado and Nebraska on the Republican River. Not funding this program would also eliminate the agency's ability to use state of the art hydrologic modeling and analysis tools to develop, implement, and evaluate water management tools and strategies leading to poor management of water resources and economic harm to local and regional economies.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 2-1915, 1919, 1930 (conservation measures) KSA 12-635-638, 12-1616b, 12-766 (flood control/mapping) KSA 24-105, 126 (levees) KSA 24-656-668 (drainage districts) KSA 24-1201-1237 (watershed districts) KSA 42-701-730 (irrigation districts) KSA 68-2201-2215 (junkyards and salvage control) KSA 74-506a-506d, 74-510 - (Division of Water Resources) KSA 74-509 (irrigation plants) KSA 74-2610, 2622 (Kansas Water Authority and Kansas Water Office) KSA 79-201g, 82a-405-410 (water storage) KSA Chapter 82 (Waters and Watercourses)	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Protect Kansas water supplies through administering the KS-CO Arkansas River Compact  
B. Protect Kansas water supplies through administering the KS-CO-NE Republican River Compact  
C. Continue to encourage the development and use of sound science to inform water management decisions

### Program History

The water management services program is responsible to administer the state's four interstate river compacts, provide technical assistance to the water appropriation program, evaluate complex hydrologic scenarios to enhance water management, investigate groundwater impairment claims, and maintain and enhance the official water rights information database.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Protect Kansas entitlement under Ark River Compact (acre-feet of water)	A	166,592	147,189	98,174	150,000	62,149	150,000	150,000	102,504
2. Protect Kansas entitlement under Republican River Compact (acre-feet of water)	B	179,780	333,300	247,750	250,000	143,933	200,000	200,000	241,661
3. Provide technical support to facilitate Enhanced water management (requests filled)	C	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Acres of Colorado inspected for compact compliance	A	22,300	21,500	22,300	22,300	22,155	22,300	22,300	21,985
5. Meetings with CO & NE leadership on compact issues	B	24	18	21	22	19	20	20	19
6. Hydrologic evaluations to facilitate LEMAs, WCAs and management strategies (staff hours)	C	5,720	5,408	5,500	5,600	5,724	5,700	5,700	5,544

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 817,651	\$ 862,279	\$ 809,613	\$ 874,055	\$ 861,768	\$ 905,334	\$ 911,783	\$ 844,553
Non-SGF State Funds	257,415	603,155	629,602	1,032,220	642,104	1,198,034	818,064	624,954
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,075,066</b>	<b>\$ 1,465,434</b>	<b>\$ 1,439,215</b>	<b>\$ 1,906,275</b>	<b>\$ 1,503,872</b>	<b>\$ 2,103,368</b>	<b>\$ 1,729,847</b>	<b>\$ 1,469,507</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>13.5</b>	<b>13.5</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>13.2</b>

## Water Structures

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Severe private and public property damage or loss of life could occur due to failure of aging dams and other water structures, inappropriate floodplain development or poor construction of water structures. Private property rights could be infringed upon by neighbors constructing dams or other structures that are not properly designed. The citizens of Kansas would not be able to participate in the NFIP to help cover loss costs associated with disasters. Perspective property buyers and current owners would not have accurate data on flooding risks.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 82a-301-328 (stream obstruction) KSA 24-105, 126 (levees) KSA 12-635-638, 12-1616b, 12-766 (flood control/mapping) KSA 82a-325-327 (environmental coordination) KSA 24-1201-1237 (watershed districts) KSA-82a-1601-1609 (small lakes)	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

- A. Regulate dams, stream modifications, levee and floodplain fills for the protection of life, property, and public safety
- B. Ensure effective community engagement and risk communication
- C. Increase public awareness of floodplain management, stream obstructions, and channel changes

### Program History

The Water Structures Program reviews projects that involve dams, stream modifications, levees, floodplain fills and provides technical assistance and coordination for local communities participating in the National Flood Insurance Program for the protection of property and public safety. These duties were authorized starting in 1929 with the passage of the Obstructions in Streams Act and Levee Law.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. No loss of life and property damage due to water structure failures. Outcome based on number of lives lost.	A, C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Community interaction to produce accurate floodplain maps. Outcome based on number of effective maps per year.	B, C	3	1	5	5	10	7	5	5
3. Reduce NFIP claims through regulation, community engagement and public awareness (net total NFIP claims)	A, B, C	\$ 10,934,021	\$ 99,580	\$ 730,021	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 635,420	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 488,340
<b>Output Measures</b>									
4. Processing time for stream obstruction, channel change, floodplain fill and levee permits (days)	A, C	41	42	33	35	34	35	35	36
5. Processing times for dam permits (days)	A, C	85	112	221	120	224	180	180	186
6. Processing time for general permits (days)	A, C	15	14	11	14	8	14	14	11
7. Conduct RiskMAP public meetings (number of meetings)	B, C	61	84	92	75	80	75	65	85

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 746,301	\$ 713,810	\$ 739,395	\$ 750,582	\$ 680,329	\$ 1,319,079	\$ 1,178,487	\$ 711,178
Non-SGF State Funds	241,081	225,660	194,498	195,519	197,032	246,379	185,042	205,730
Federal Funds	9,478,614	8,956,325	5,771,413	6,796,954	6,117,966	5,869,660	5,478,188	6,948,568
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 10,465,996</b>	<b>\$ 9,895,795</b>	<b>\$ 6,705,306</b>	<b>\$ 7,743,055</b>	<b>\$ 6,995,327</b>	<b>\$ 7,435,118</b>	<b>\$ 6,841,717</b>	<b>\$ 7,865,476</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>15.5</b>	<b>15.5</b>	<b>14.5</b>	<b>14.5</b>	<b>17.5</b>	<b>17.5</b>	<b>15.2</b>

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

All accounting, Budget, purchasing, licensing, Legal, Public Affairs, and IT functions are accounted in this division

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General 32-801,32-802,32-805	Discretionary	No	2

### Program Goals

- A. To provide and accurate and dependable licensing and permit platform  
 B. To provide accurate and timely accounting for all budgets within the Agency  
 C. To provide accurate information in regards to all aspects of our agency to our constituents.

### Program History

The administration division has historically been split between the Pratt office and the Secretary's office in Topeka. This division contains the Licensing, Purchasing, accounting, budget, Legal, and IT sections of the Department. This is the division that makes the agency function.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2023	FY 2024
1. Number of Fishing Licenses Sold	A	251,349	218,895	196,931	222,392	200,000	200,000
2. Number of Hunting Licenses Sold	A	117,082	130,537	128,170	125,263	130,000	130,000
3. Wildlife Fee Fund Revenue (license and permit sales)	A	\$30,244,492	\$32,592,355	\$35,637,146	32,824,664	\$32,000,000	\$32,000,000
Output Measures							
4. Number of Combo hunting/fishing	A	41,490	42,390	40,455	41,445	41,000	41,000
5. Number of Lifetime Licenses Sold	A	958	1,352	1,123	1,144	1,200	1,200
Additional Measures as Necessary							
6. Number of Deer Permits sold	A	184,334	196,359	191,348	190,680	190,000	190,000
7. Number of Turkey Permits sold	A	37,042	48,883	42,446	42,790	40,000	40,000
8. Boating Fee Fund Revenue	A	\$1,272,922	\$1,917,760	\$1,448,471	1,546,384	\$1,200,000	1,200,000

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
EDIF	1,811,966	1,824,092	1,716,250	1,850,405	1,949,701	1,844,888
Wildlife Fee Fund	6,199,446	5,781,256	6,132,603	6,376,973	8,334,959	8,517,805
Park Fee Fund	94,570	352,995	120,100	50,157	410,146	752,241
All other Funds	1,896,542	1,550,804	1,447,698	1,550,280	1,101,980	1,161,451
<b>Total</b>	\$ 10,002,524	\$ 9,509,147	\$ 9,416,651	\$ 9,827,815	\$ 11,796,786	\$ 12,276,385

## Parks

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Management of the 25 state parks and the prairie spirit trail would be lost.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General    32-801, 32-802,32-805	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To effectively manage, protect, and administer the state's parks, its visitors, and associated wildlife efficiently, while providing a diversity
- B. To promote Kansas' quality outdoor recreation activities and quality of life experiences.
- C. To enhance the public's knowledge of the importance of outdoor recreation to the Kansas economy.

### Program History

In 1955, the Kansas Legislature adopted a public policy providing for state parks and facilities by creating the Kansas Parks and Resources Authority. In 1958, they appropriated funds for operations and created Kanopolis State Park. Additional parks were added legislatively by statute as years passed, and in 1987 Governor Mike Hayden merged the Kansas Parks and Resources Authority and the Kansas Fish and Game Commission into the Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks. Governor Sam Brownback added Tourism to the Department in 2011. The Parks Division is responsible management and operations of 28 designated state parks, including Little Jerusalem Badlands State Park and Flint Hills Trail State Park. These areas include 8,000 acres of maintained lawn grass, 32,200 acres of park-land resources, over 510 miles of trails, over 280 miles of roads, more than 10,000 campsites, 35,000 acres of recreational surface water, over 1,000 structures; complete sewer systems including 81 lagoons, over 160 lift stations with 2 pumps each and treatment plants; 24 potable water systems, and more than 3,000 miles of utility lines. The Division expects over 7 million visitors this year. On average, each employee is responsible for 74,000 visitors annually. A major effort is placed on public safety, law enforcement and providing a family atmosphere where children and adults can have an enjoyable, safe experience. Over 220 special events are provided annually that enhance quality-of-life experiences for our visitors and generate significant economic impact for surrounding communities and the state

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2023	FY 2024
1. Park Fee Fund Revenue	A, B, C	\$11,504,597	\$13,989,164	\$12,995,395	\$12,829,719	\$12,900,000	\$13,000,000
2. Cabin Fee Fund Revenue	A, B, C	\$1,337,057	\$1,777,908	\$1,530,077	\$1,548,347	\$1,530,000	\$1,600,000
3. Park vehicle permits sold	A, B, C	185,976	202,205	175,000	187,727	187,800	188,000

Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY2024</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000,000		\$ -	\$ -
EDIF	1,536,622	1,579,221	1,591,397	1,607,493	1,795,995	1,814,336
Park Fee Fund	9,163,043	9,573,959	9,950,485	13,212,958	11,522,417	10,446,367
All other funds	3,906,945	3,782,751	2,815,992	4,196,355	2,136,872	2,125,426
<b>Total</b>	\$ 14,606,610	\$ 14,935,931	\$ 16,357,874	\$ 19,016,806	\$ 15,455,284	\$ 14,386,129

## Fisheries

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

A dramatic reduction of fishing opportunity in Kansas. Jeopardize the fate of an estimated 400,000 anglers that spend approximately \$295 million dollars in Kansas each year. A predictable loss of sport fish that experience poor natural recruitment on their own due to degradation of habitat. Further degradation of habitat due to lack of manpower and funding to mitigate these issues. Loss of human respect and stewardship of our natural resources and heritage.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General      32-801,32-802,32-805	Mandatory	No	3

### Program Goals

- A. The Fisheries Division goals are to Conserve Kansas sport, non-sport, and threatened and endangered fishes, the water they rely on, and their habitats.
- B. Increase fishing opportunity. Increase fishing success.

### Program History

The Fisheries Division is responsible for maintaining and creating fishing opportunity and improving fishing quality across the state. It is also responsible for conserving and enhancing fisheries resources. Fisheries Division programs are tailored to meet the special needs of anglers. For example, the Urban Fishing Program provides fishing in areas where demand for fish exceeds supply by stocking catchable size fish throughout the fishing season. On the other end of the spectrum is the lack of public water in western counties. The Department's private water leasing program is designed to create new fishing opportunities in portions of the state that are under served. The fisheries program strives to respond to the needs of all anglers regardless of their location.

Kansas waters hosted an estimated 400,000 anglers for 4,694,000 fishing trips according to the 2011 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation (conducted every five years by the US Census Bureau). Because of its widespread popularity, recreational fishing is an important industry in Kansas. Anglers in Kansas spend over \$295 million each year.

The organizational sections of the fisheries Division are Management, Research, and Fish Culture. These sections work hand-in-hand to improve fishing in Kansas, protect the aquatic environment, and to educate the public on matters relating to aquatic life. The fisheries program is multifaceted, working with the fish habitat, the fish themselves, and the public who benefits from these precious natural resources

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2023	FY 2024
1. Number of core-panel gill nets deployed for monitoring trends in fish populations	A	900	933	889	907.3	700	700
2. Number of completed research projects	A	8	8	9	8.3	8	8
3. Number of bait traps reported	A	125	0	100	75.0	90	90
4. Number of city and county entities receiving Community Fisheries Assistance Program (CFAP) leases	B	124	123	123	123.3	124	124

Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks

5. Angler satisfaction derived from creel surveys (% rated their trip 2 or higher out of a scale of 1 to 5)	B	70%	NA	NA	0.7	70%	70%
---	---	-----	----	----	-----	-----	-----

*Output Measures*

6. Number of predacious fingerlings stocked from our hatcheries	A	1,471,846	1,099,849	1,828,228	1,466,641	1,500,000	2,100,000
7. Number of channel catfish intermediates stocked from our hatcheries	A	322,636	348,806	270,455	313,966	250,000	250,000

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
EDIF Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	4,327,111	4,301,378	5,547,860	5,179,996	4,470,819	4,584,489
Wildlife Fee Fund	3,831,177	3,670,840	4,486,076	4,066,150	5,732,425	5,156,031
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 8,158,288</b>	<b>\$ 7,972,218</b>	<b>\$ 10,033,936</b>	<b>\$ 9,246,146</b>	<b>\$ 10,203,244</b>	<b>\$ 9,740,520</b>

## Law Enforcement

### Program History

The Law Enforcement Division is responsible for the statewide enforcement of state and federal fish and wildlife laws, boating laws, and public lands regulations. These enforcement activities occur on private and publicly owned lands within the state. In addition to these primary law enforcement duties, these officers also assist federal, state and local law enforcement agencies in a support role when requested. Their assistance is provided for warrant service and arrest of wanted fugitives, enforcement of controlled substance laws, and response to emergency management. The Division also plays an active role in providing information and educational programs concerning hunter education, boating safety, and other natural resources related programs.

### Program Goals

A. Provide public health & safety for all public lands users through pro-active management and law enforcement

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>
1. Licensed Hunters Checked	A	6,430	6,904	9,795	7,710	7,500	8,000
2. Licensed Anglers Checked	A	14,262	13,208	11,607	13,026	12,500	12,500
3. Licensd Furharvesters	A	606	578	621	602	600	600
4. Sportsmen Contacts	A	23,763	19,087	19,666	20,839	24,000	24,000
5. Landowner Contacts	A	2,875	2,459	3,501	2,945	2,900	2,900
6. Boating Inspections	A	1,499	947	1,307	1,251	1,500	1,500
<i>Output Measures</i>							
7. Boating Violations	A	1,202	288	292	594	1,000	1,000
8. Wildlife Damage Complaints	A	366	371	312	350	375	375
9. Alcohol Related Contacts	A	218	192	120	177	200	200
10. Operation Game Thief	A	236	1,367	928	844	850	850
11. Drug Arrest	A	9	21	24	18	20	25

Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
EDIF	-	-	-	-	-	-
Boat Fee Fund	608,032	532,501	547,603	369,813	594,318	571,086
Wildlife Fee Fund	6,607,091	7,498,860	7,010,050	7,219,554	7,571,062	7,768,713
Federal Funds	660,724	545,418	1,160,943	1,071,854	683,553	714,069
<b>Total</b>	\$ 7,875,847	\$ 8,576,779	\$ 8,718,596	\$ 8,661,221	\$ 8,848,933	\$ 9,053,868

## Education

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The consequences of not funding this program include the loss of long standing and integral education programs such as hunter education and outdoor skills workshops, as well as the five nature and wildlife education centers in Kansas.

Statutory Basis		andatory vs. Discretion	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General	32-801,32-802,32-805	Mandatory	No	7
Specific	32-920 - 924, 32-912 - 914	Mandatory	No	7
Specific	32-1139 - 1143	Mandatory	No	7

### Program Goals

A. Connect people to the KDWP mission through strategies to engage with and support customers with broad experiences and backgrounds as they participate in and enjoy the outdoor opportunities of Kansas.

B. To produce safe, knowledgeable, responsible and legal hunters and furharvesters who will support wildlife management strategies that produce healthy populations of wildlife for the enjoyment of the people of Kansas, and to assist all individuals in developing awareness, knowledge, skills and commitment to result in safe, responsible behavior and actions concerning the use of Kansas' wildlife resources.

C. Inspire life-long learning through outdoor skills programs and outreach efforts designed to enhance the knowledge, understanding and appreciation of Kansas' natural resources.

### Program History

Nearing a 50 year anniversary and one of the most successful outdoor education programs delivered by the Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks, the Hunter Education program was created in 1973 and owes this success to the dedicated Kansas hunter education instructors that teach this program. The program funding is made possible through the excise taxes collected on hunting and shooting equipment (Pittman Robertson Act) which pays for classroom materials and training equipment. The Pratt Education Center was converted from the first fish culture school of Kansas University, built in 1913, into the agency's first nature center, established in 1966. Located in the Flint Hills, the Milford Nature Center was built adjacent to the Milford fish hatchery and opened its doors in 1991. The Great Plains Nature Center, the result of a partnership between KDWP, the friends of the Great Plains Nature Center, the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the City of Wichita, opened its doors in 1996. The Kansas Wetlands Education Center, a partnership between KDWP and Fort Hays State University, opened in 2009. In 2013, KDWP took over operations of the Southeast Kansas Nature Center through a lease agreement with the city of Galena.

Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>
1. Number of visitors at all Nature Centers	A	248,820	239,591	209,361	232,591	250,000	250,000
2. Number of Hunter Education Public Programs	B	300	230	265	265	300	300
3. Number of Boater Education Public Programs	C	120	50	7	59	100	100
4. Number of Schools teaching Outdoor Skills Programs (Hunter Ed, Student Air Rifle Program, National Archery in the Schools)	C	383	394	402	393	450	500
<i>Output Measures</i>							
5. Total Nature Center program Participants	A	87,087	15,117	23,030	41,745	85,000	85,000
6. Number of Hunter Education Students Certified	B	7,659	5,216	5,970	6,282	8,000	8,000
7. Number of Boater Education Students Certified	C	1,750	2,370	2,423	2,181	2,000	2,000
8. Number of Hunter Education in our Schools student participants	C	899	701	1,135	912	1,000	1,000
9. Number of Student Air Rifle Participants	C	-	38	132	57	250	500
10. Number of National Archery in the Schools student participants	C	11,593	10,383	7,294	9,757	12,000	12,000

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>
Wildlife Fee Fund	\$ 1,618,633	\$ 1,572,911	\$ 1,210,209	\$ 1,577,849	\$ 2,192,764	\$ 2,208,201
Federal Funds	392,622	386,369	360,654	281,403	445,734	453,665
All Other Funds	71,795	81,206	37,955	21,727	61,428	61,724
<b>Total</b>	\$ 2,083,050	\$ 2,040,486	\$ 1,608,818	\$ 1,880,979	\$ 2,699,926	\$ 2,723,590

## Wildlife Division

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Loss of habitat, loss of diversity, reduction in stable wildlife populations. Decline in outdoor recreation participation by public. Outdoor activities have been shown to have physical and mental health benefits and promote community interaction and resource appreciation. Negative socio-economic impact both at a local and statewide level due to low hunting/fishing participation, resource visitation, and reduced spending at associated industries.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.
General                      32-801,32-802,32-805	Mandatory	No                      6

### Program Goals

- A. To monitor wildlife populations and their habitats, and to assess public appreciation, demand and tolerance for wildlife resources and department programs.  
 B. Provide programs designed to conserve, protect and enhance wildlife habitat.  
 C. Provide wildlife related recreational opportunity.

### Program History

The Wildlife Division includes research and surveys, and management. Wildlife Division projects are funded from the wildlife fee fund. Most projects qualify for 75 percent reimbursement through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service federal aid to Wildlife Restoration Program. The research and survey program provides projects that measure trends in big game, upland game birds, migratory game birds, and furbearers. Harvest, hunter success and human dimensions information are obtained from hunter surveys. Information provides the basis for objective administration of seasons, permit quotas, regulations and management program planning. Research targeting specific wildlife management problems or environmental issues are accomplished within this section. Contracting for professional services is the primary means for accomplishing research objectives. The wildlife management program provides for a statewide initiative to improve upland game populations by improving upland game habitat. The walk-in-hunting-access program (WIHA) designed to lease private land for public hunting access is coordinated by management personnel. Other operations include assistance to public land management, agricultural liaison, animal damage control, species reintroduction, animal rehabilitation, and interaction with other governmental and private organizations concerning wildlife management.

### Performance Measures

#### Performance Measure for Wildlife Objective #1:

	<u>Goal</u>	<u>Actual FY2020</u>	<u>Actual FY2021</u>	<u>Actual FY2022</u>	<u>Current Year FY2023</u>	<u>Planned FY2024</u>	<u>Out Year FY2025</u>
1. Number of hunter and landowner surveys conducted	A	11	11	12	12	12	12
2. Number of wildlife population monitoring surveys conducted	A	16	16	15	16	16	16

**Performance Measures for Objective #2:**

		<u>Actual FY2020</u>	<u>Actual FY2021</u>	<u>Actual FY2022</u>	<u>Current Year FY2023</u>	<u>Planned FY2024</u>	<u>Out Year FY2025</u>
3. Acres of habitat impacted by upland game bird habitat program	B	245,000	302,789	308,450	309,000	310,000	310,000

\*Includes Habitat First, Habitat Specialists on Private Lands, and Equipment/Supplies Loaned

**Performance Measures for Objective #3:**

		<u>Actual FY2020</u>	<u>Actual FY2021</u>	<u>Actual FY2022</u>	<u>Current Year FY2023</u>	<u>Planned FY2024</u>	<u>Out Year FY2025</u>
4. Acres signed into walk-in-hunting-access program (WIHA)	C	1,195,366	1,181,461	1,158,997	1,117,382	1,175,000	1,175,000

\*Includes WIHA, HACH, VPA-HIP, iWIHA, and Special Hunts on Private Lands

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
EDIF	-	-	-	-
Wildlife Fee Fund	4,734,946	3,311,726	4,917,451	5,085,554
Federal Funds	8,316,862	6,054,838	9,940,846	9,074,700
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 13,051,808</b>	<b>\$ 9,366,564</b>	<b>\$ 14,858,297</b>	<b>\$ 14,160,254</b>

## Ecological Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Negative impacts to critical habitats for state listed threatened and endangered species could cause additional decline in population levels that could cause extirpation of the species from the state. Without the review and permitting process for impacts to wildlife additional species could be added to the Federal endangered species list and thus removing jurisdiction from state to federal authority. Part of this reviews includes reviews all KDWP grants for compliance and non-compliance with state and federal laws (Section 7 consultation and NEPA) which without this measure could result in the loss of federal funding for conservation programs agency wide. These reviews are completed in house to reduce cost for the agency that may be required to conduct environmental assessments for each grant funded project causing increased cost per project. Administration of the Section 6 Cooperative Agreement with US Fish and Wildlife Service is also within the sections duties and without this agreement being maintained each year the state wildlife agency would be in further non compliance with the Federal ESA.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General	32-801,32-802,32-805, 32-957 through 32-963, 32-1012, 32-1033, 82a-325 through 82a.327	Mandatory	Yes	8

### Program Goals

- A. Conduct project reviews for activities that impact fish and wildlife resources. Reviews are conducted on projects carried out by private individuals, industry, local, state and federal governments as allowed under statute and regulations.
- B. To help conserve sensitive or imperiled fish and wildlife species as determined by the State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP). This includes efforts to recover the most at risk species in the state.
- C. Develop and implement recovery plans for all species listed as in need of conservation, threatened, or endangered in the state of Kansas.

### Program History

The Ecological Services Section was established in 1987 during the reorganization of Fish and Game Commission and the Parks Resource Authority to one department. The section was developed to provide technical input to many agricultural and nonagricultural related projects. The addition of both federal and state environmental protection laws such as the National Environmental Policy Acts and federal Clean Water laws and regulations mandated that KDWP become more actively involved as the voice of the state's wildlife resources. The passing of the federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 and subsequent passing of the Kansas Nongame and Endangered Species Act in 1975 mandated additional KDWP involvement with project reviews and the development of the nongame, threatened and endangered species program in the state. Subsequent state laws (Water Project Environmental Coordination Act K.S.A. 82a-325 to 327) requires review of water projects in the state and their impacts to other natural resources including threatened and endangered species. In 2005, Ecological Services Section developed the first State Wildlife Action Plan, a plan developed to keep common species common by conserving wildlife and habitat before they become to rare and costly to restore. Through this process a list of species of greatest conservation need was developed and is the cornerstone to receiving federally funding from the State Wildlife Grants Program. The Ecological Services Section is responsible for programs related to non-game, threatened and endangered species, biodiversity, watchable wildlife, climate change (including alternative energy development), and private lands management. The section is responsible for administering State Wildlife Grants (both appropriated and competitive grant funds), Section 6 cooperative agreement and grants, Cooperative Service Agreements with the USFWS and the Chickadee Checkoff Program. The section is also responsible for upholding the threatened and endangered species project review program pursuant to the Kansas Nongame and Endangered Species Act of 1975. In addition, the section is responsible for addressing a diverse array of wildlife interest ranging from T&E to watchable wildlife. Programmatic objectives involve developing collaborative partnerships and committees (e.g. Kansas Nongame Advisory Council, T&E Task Force, Teaming With Wildlife) as well as the development and implementation of the State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP).

Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>
1. # of Projects Reviewed for KNESCA	A	2,093	2,464	2,399	2,319	2,200	2,200
2. # of Scientific Collection Permits	B	114	128	115	119	125	125
3. Annual average # of action permits required per projects reviewed	A	1.20%	0.77%	1%	0.890%	1%	1%
4. Average # days for response for review. 30 days mandated timeline	A	23.68	25.37	21.4	23.5	25.0	25.0

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF, Non WFF, State Funds	120,955	134,017	22,436	42,374	451,500	450,727
Wildlife Fee Fund	1,111,362	1,012,574	1,085,338	1,227,989	1,785,843	1,800,575
Federal Funds	1,083,870	1,857,087	1,173,176	636,747	1,605,682	1,638,965
<b>Total</b>	\$ 2,316,187	\$ 3,003,678	\$ 2,280,950	\$ 1,907,110	\$ 3,843,025	\$ 3,890,267

## Bureau of Air

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Air program would be implemented by the Environmental Protection Agency in Kansas.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
General    KSA 65-3005, 65-3024	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

- A. Meet all National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)  
 B. Conduct air quality compliance inspections  
 C. Maintain an air permitting program for the State of Kansas (Average cost per permit)

### Program History

In 1985, the Kansas Legislature created the Kansas Asbestos Act to protect citizens and asbestos workers from exposure to this hazardous air pollutant. The Federal Government implemented the Clean Air Act in 1993 and Kansas implemented the Kansas Air Quality Act in 1993.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of Counties in compliance with all NAAQS	A	104	105	105	105	105	105	105	105
2. Conduct air quality inspections	B	672	859	767	600	546	600	600	693
3. Average cost per air permit maintained (\$/# of permits)	C	\$ 5,236	\$ 5,097	\$ 5,079	\$ 7,374	\$ 6,873	\$ 10,644	\$ 7,862	\$ 6,106
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Percentage of Counties in compliance with all NAAQS	A	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
5. Compliance rate for facilities inspected	B	96.4	97.6	99.2	>95	99.8	>95	>95	98.9

Kansas Department of Health and Environment- Division of Environment

6. Percent of permits issued within required time constraints

C

97.4%	97.3%	98.4%	>95%	98.2%	>95%	>95%	98.0%
N/A	1,278	1,380	1,309	921	930	950	1,222

7. Number of permits

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 82,731	\$ 88,531	\$ 86,355	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 43,722
Non-SGF State Funds	4,663,033	4,602,555	4,264,216	7,704,965	3,992,690	7,503,861	5,201,512	\$ 5,141,107
Federal Funds	1,945,260	2,343,148	2,095,120	2,249,801	2,337,231	2,395,486	2,267,172	\$ 2,256,325
<b>Total</b>	\$ 6,691,024	\$ 7,034,234	\$ 6,445,691	\$ 9,954,766	\$ 6,329,921	\$ 9,899,347	\$ 7,468,684	\$ 7,441,153
<b>FTE</b>	38.7	39.0	44.1	43.1	43.1	43.2	43.2	42.3

## Bureau of Water

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Implementation of the Safe Drinking Water Act would revert to the Environmental Protection Agency. KDHE's technical assistance and training would be eliminated. Kansas would lose \$1.1m annually through the Public Water Supply Supervision Grant, and would lose \$8.3-\$16.6m annually from the Capitalization Grant which supports the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund. Public health and the environment could be jeopardized by improperly operated and maintained water supply and water pollution facilities. Implementation of the Clean Water Act would also return to the Environmental Protection Agency, including enforcement which would be a burden on our towns and industry. Most wastewater systems would suffer from lack of training and technical assistance. Approximately six millions dollars annually of federal funding would be lost. Program elimination also eliminates the state's ability to protect water supplies for municipalities, industries, livestock and irrigation and reduce pollutant loadings crossing statelines.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	K.S.A 65-163, et seq K.S.A 65-171d, et seq K.S.A. 65-171m, K.S.A. 55-1117, K.S.A. 82a- 1201, et seq	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

- A. Monitor water quality of Kansas waters to assist in development of water quality standards and total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) and to track environmental changes for water quality improvement.
- B. Provide subsidized financing (low interest loans) for municipal water infrastructure projects through the Kansas State Revolving Fund Programs to return and maintain municipal water and wastewater systems into compliance.
- C. Oversight of public water supply systems, wastewater and stormwater facilities, underground injection control (UIC) wells, and underground hydrocarbon storage (UHS) wells with regards to standards, regulations, and technical assistance (979 public water supply systems, 1853 wastewater facilities, and 3404 stormwater facilities, 73 UIC wells, and 368 UHS wells for a total of 6,677).

**Program History**

The origins of the Bureau of Water began in 1885 when the first rules and regulations pertaining to protecting water supplies were adopted by the Ks Board of Health (now KDHE). In 1907, the first statute prohibiting unpermitted sewage from entering waters of the state was approved and in 1927 the Kansas Board of Health was charged with preventing pollution found to be a public health or aquatic life threat. In 1933, the Legislature established laws pertaining to pollution prevention from livestock facilities. In 1972 the Federal Water Pollution Control Act was passed by Congress and in 1974 Congress approved the Safe Drinking Water Act. The Kansas Legislature responded in 1974 by creating the Kansas Department of Health and Environment as a cabinet-level agency to implement the two Federal laws as well as the accompanying state statutes.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of Water Bodies Restored	A	258	272	272	280	278	278	285	275.5
2. Percent of Water Systems in Compliance	B	92.7%	91.1%	92.4%	92.0%	93.0%	93.2%	93.5%	92.1%
3. Regulatory Cost per Permit Issued	C	\$ 1,249	\$ 1,476	\$ 1,397	\$ 1,705	\$ 1,627	\$ 1,701	\$ 1,740	\$ 1,551
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Number of Monitoring Sites	A	443	373	340	390	392	350	375	374
5. Number of New SRF Loans	B	25	25	32	28	34	30	32	30
6. Number of Wastewater Permits	C	283	398	208	300	257	300	325	291

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 139,620	\$ 162,514	\$ 148,683	\$ 106,570	\$ 106,396	\$ 109,919	\$ 111,004	\$ 131,041
Non-SGF State Funds	3,778,247	4,819,093	5,012,726	6,041,484	4,816,399	5,557,405	4,841,981	\$ 5,172,426
Federal Funds	4,422,612	4,871,920	4,164,493	5,233,946	5,940,043	5,690,555	6,664,759	\$ 5,052,601
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 8,340,479</b>	<b>\$ 9,853,527</b>	<b>\$ 9,325,902</b>	<b>\$ 11,382,000</b>	<b>\$ 10,862,838</b>	<b>\$ 11,357,879</b>	<b>\$ 11,617,744</b>	<b>\$ 10,356,067</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>56.0</b>	<b>64.0</b>	<b>63.8</b>	<b>66.8</b>	<b>66.8</b>	<b>68.8</b>	<b>68.8</b>	<b>65.4</b>

## Bureau of Environmental Remediation

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Contaminated sites or permitted facilities will have or potentially have uncontrolled release of petroleum or hazardous chemicals causing harm to human health and the environment. Increase of human exposure to hazardous materials, petroleum substances and other toxic materials. More involvement of the US Environmental Protection Agency in Kansas.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General Environmental assessment, response and cleanup: K.S.A. 65-161; 65-171; 65-3453 to 65-3457; 65-34,141 et seq.; 65-34,161 et seq.; 82a-901 et seq.; 42 U.S.C. Chapter 103.	Mandatory	Yes	1
Specific Petroleum Storage Tank: K.S.A. 65-34,100 to 65-34,139; 40 U.S.C. Chapter 1.	Mandatory	Yes	1
Specific Environmental Stewardship and Redevelopment: K.S.A. 65-1,221 et seq.; 65-34,176 et seq.; 65-34,177 et seq.; 75-5672. Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act - Public Law 107-118 which amends CERCLA.	Mandatory	Yes	1
Specific Surface Mining: K.S.A. 49-401 to 49-433; 30 U.S.C. Part 700 et seq.	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

- A. Promote redevelopment of contaminated properties to allow beneficial use of dilapidated or impacted properties
- B. Maximize pollution prevention measures to prevent release of stored chemicals
- C. Improve environmental health conditions for Kansans through contaminated site assessment, response and cleanup

**Program History**

Current configuration of the bureau was formed in response to the passage of the federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (Superfund).

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. # of acres available for new redevelopment and improvement of contaminated and potentially contaminated properties. (CELR, Brownfield, Storage Tanks)	A								
		1,013	957	619	460	460	500	500	624
2. # of regulated facilities where pollution prevention measures are in place to prevent future contamination and impacts to human health and the environment. (Storage Tank, Dry Cleaners and Coal)	B								
		15,093	14,849	14,843	14,842	14,951	1,490	1,490	14,871
3. Cost of oversight for contaminated sites where imminent and substantial threats to public health and the environment were removed or mitigated in a timely and adequate manner. (Cost/site)	C								
		\$ 16,167	\$ 18,546	\$ 15,582	\$ 13,910	\$ 30,994	\$ 14,804	\$ 14,876	\$ 19,758
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. # of CELR's issued per year	A								
		649	244	181	100	46	75	75	143
5. # of Brownfields Targeted Assessments completed for local government and non-profit organizations/ year	A								
		54	41	63	45	45	45	45	49
6. # of Facilities with Tank UST upgrades - single-wall to double-wall program	A								
		4	4	4	5	1	4	4	4

Kansas Department of Health and Environment- Division of Environment

7. # of Facilities with UST tank removals in the redevelopment program - abandoned tank removal	A							
		9	16	7	15	3	5	5
8. # of Aboveground storage tanks registered	B							
		9,500	9,267	9,274	9,280	9,380	9,400	9,420
9. # of Underground storage tanks permitted	B							
		5,524	5,518	5,505	5,500	5,300	5,490	5,470
10. # of Dry Cleaner Facilities registered	B							
		66	61	61	60	60	60	60
11. # of Coal mines permitted	B							
		3	3	3	2	1	1	1
12. # of sites with active environmental assessment/cleanup (used to calculate Outcome #3)	C							
		2,060	2,060	2,060	2,064	2,060	2,050	2,040

Funding

<i>Funding Source (In Millions)</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 525,755	\$ 530,218	\$ 537,010	\$ 381,339	\$ 378,831	\$ 396,876	\$ 398,728	\$ 456,849.5
Non-SGF State Funds	26,396,332	30,923,469	24,142,272	\$ 22,377,466	\$ 52,353,072	\$ 24,222,946	\$ 24,200,452	\$ 32,449,069.8
Federal Funds	6,382,169	6,751,589	7,418,989	\$ 5,952,344	\$ 11,116,716	\$ 5,727,546	\$ 5,747,021	\$ 7,809,909.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 33,304,256</b>	<b>\$ 38,205,276</b>	<b>\$ 32,098,271</b>	<b>\$ 28,711,149</b>	<b>\$ 63,848,619</b>	<b>\$ 30,347,368</b>	<b>\$ 30,346,201</b>	<b>\$ 40,715,829</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>86.0</b>	<b>92.6</b>	<b>94.0</b>	<b>94.0</b>	<b>94.0</b>	<b>95.0</b>	<b>95.0</b>	<b>93.7</b>

## Bureau of Waste Management

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Bureau of Waste Management implements all regulations for solid waste disposal areas and processing facilities, waste tire management, hazardous waste generators and transporters, and hazardous waste treatment, storage and disposal facilities in Kansas. Failure to fund the program would result in no regulatory oversight of solid and hazardous waste management activities in Kansas causing public health and environmental impacts including: illegal dumping; surface and groundwater contamination, and; public safety and nuisance conditions like fires, odors, litter and disease vectors. EPA would implement the hazardous waste programs in Kansas, and KDHE would forfeit about \$1.1 million annually in federal hazardous waste program funding.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>		<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
General	K.S.A. 65-3401 et seq.	Mandatory	No	1
General	K.S.A. 65-3430 et seq.	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

- A. Review active and closed solid waste landfill groundwater monitoring reports in a timely manner in order to coordinate response actions at landfills where off-site groundwater contamination is detected above the regulatory limit.
- B. Maintain a compliance rate of 90% or higher among permitted solid waste facilities and hazardous waste generators by conducting routine inspections and providing compliance assistance and operator training.
- C. Oversee the regulation of all hazardous and solid waste facilities in Kansas in accordance with the authorizing statutes. The unit cost was estimated by dividing the total number of facilities subject to regulations by the total program funding budgeted for each state fiscal year.

### Program History

The KDHE is the only state agency to implement the solid and hazardous waste programs authorized by the statutes referenced above. The Kansas Solid Waste Management Act was adopted in 1970. Key revisions occurred when KDHE sought approval from the United States Environmental Protection Agency to administer federal solid waste rules promulgated under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) in 1993, 1996 and 2009. The Solid Waste Program regulates solid waste disposal areas and processing facilities and waste tire handling; offers compliance assistance to regulated entities, and; provides financial support and grants to local entities. The Hazardous Waste Management Act was adopted in 1981. Key revisions occurred when KDHE sought approval to administer federal rules in 1985 and 2013. Under the hazardous waste program KDHE regulates generators of hazardous waste and permits facilities that treat, store and/or dispose hazardous waste to ensure proper cradle-to-grave management.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of landfills where offsite groundwater contaminant levels exceed the regulatory standard.	A	7	7	16	17	17	17	17	14
2. Percent (%) of facilities in compliance.	B	97%	95%	99%	97%	99%	97%	97%	98%
3. Cost of regulatory oversight per regulated facility.	C	\$ 2,341	\$ 2,598	\$ 2,536	\$ 2,454	\$ 2,438	\$ 2,831	\$ 2,846	2,507
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Landfill groundwater monitoring reports reviewed.	A	190	190	180	190	190	190	190	188
5. Inspection reports reviewed for potential enforcement due to non-compliance.	B	521	385	498	500	509	450	450	473
6. Total number of solid and hazardous waste facilities regulated.	C	2,502	2,396	2,437	2,655	2,598	2,477	2,477	2,522

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	5,069,531	5,368,879	5,326,782	5,677,460	5,340,088	6,090,030	6,121,975	\$ 5,428,302
Federal Funds	788,708	856,867	854,987	839,946	995,493	922,498	927,969	\$ 886,823
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 5,858,239</b>	<b>\$ 6,225,746</b>	<b>\$ 6,181,769</b>	<b>\$ 6,517,406</b>	<b>\$ 6,335,581</b>	<b>\$ 7,012,528</b>	<b>\$ 7,049,944</b>	<b>\$ 6,315,126</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>39.0</b>	<b>42.0</b>	<b>43.0</b>	<b>44.0</b>	<b>44.0</b>	<b>44.0</b>	<b>44.0</b>	<b>43.3</b>

## Environmental Field Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Implementation of all environmental programs would revert to the Environmental Protection Agency and funds for aid to locals would be curtailed.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General     Statutory mandates as required of the four other Division of Environment programs (Air, Water, Waste Management, Environmental Remediation).	Mandatory	Yes	1
General     K.S.A. 65-166a; K.S.A. 65-171d; K.S.A. 65-1,179-1,199;	Mandatory	Yes	1
General     K.S.A. 65-171g-h; 33 U.S.C. 319, 401, 404.	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

- A. Conduct compliance inspections/complaint investigations/spill responses
- B. Issue permits for confined animal feeding operations
- C. Reduce non-point source pollution

### Program History

In SFY 2018, the program was re-aligned to include the Livestock Waste Section and the Watershed Management Section, which allows field based programs to better work together. Total budget for this program includes significant amount of funding (state and federal) that is passed through as aid to locals.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. % of Compliance inspections/complaints/ spill	A	67%	59%	68%	67%	68%	68%	68%	66%

Kansas Department of Health and Environment- Division of Environment

2. % of current National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit coverage to Confined Animal Feeding Operations of 1,000 animal units or more  
3. Dollars per pound of nitrogen reduced from surface water

*Output Measures*

4. Compliance inspections/complaint investigation/spill response  
5. CAFO permits active  
6. # of Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategy projects established

B								
	88%	96%	95%	95%	95%	96%	96%	95%
C	\$ 11.05	\$ 10.69	\$ 9.72	\$ 8.68	\$ 6.81	\$ 8.90	\$ 8.90	\$ 8.98
A	5,047	4,574	4,141	4,375	4,745	4,800	4,800	4,459
B	3,138	3,145	3,179	3,185	3,192	3,195	3,195	3,175
C								
	31	31	31	32	31	31	31	31

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,506,847	\$ 1,512,047	\$ 1,613,969	\$ 1,587,555	\$ 1,570,545	\$ 1,663,480	\$ 1,666,456	\$ 1,571,029
Non-SGF State Funds	3,595,297	3,903,478	4,064,697	4,487,223	3,752,538	5,766,944	5,493,224	\$ 4,051,984
Federal Funds	4,025,002	6,696,102	5,530,845	5,999,603	4,578,390	6,172,371	6,198,267	\$ 5,701,235
<b>Total</b>	\$ 9,127,146	\$ 12,111,627	\$ 11,209,511	\$ 12,074,381	\$ 9,901,473	\$ 13,602,795	\$ 13,357,947	\$ 11,324,248
<b>FTE</b>	88.0	92.6	93.0	97.0	97.0	97.0	97.0	94.9

## Office of Laboratory Services (Kansas Health and Environment Laboratories)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Infants could go undiagnosed and experience permanent or life threatening disorders. The public would have greater exposure to viruses and diseases. Outbreaks could go undetected due to no investigative testing capacity. Increase risk and cost to Kansans due to poor water quality and decreased monitoring. Public Water Suppliers would have to find outside laboratories to perform testing and Kansas would have to contract with and designate a Primacy Laboratory or else have the program taken over by EPA. EPA would take over drinking water program, Clinical Testing Labs would not be evaluated for accurate performance, intoxicated drivers would remain on the highways.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General	KSA 75-5608	Mandatory	No	1
Specific	KSA 2000 Supp 65-153f; KSA 65-674; 65-677; KSA 2000 Supp 65-180	Mandatory	No	
Specific	KSA 65-157; KSA 48- 1601 et.seq, Safe Drinking Water Act Primacy Laboratory	Mandatory	No	1
Specific	KSA 65-101, 109a; KSA 65-1,109; KSA 65-1,,425	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Conduct clinical and environmental testing with a high degree of accuracy as measured by performance on proficiency tests.
- B. Maintain staff flexibility and continuity of operations by ensure that staff are cross trained in multiple methods and that each method has multiple staff that can perform it
- C. Process samples for both Clinical and Environmental purposes as measured by number of samples and average price per test. Noting that much of the budget provided in 2020,-2023 includes significant budgets that included pass through equipment, supplies and testing costs.

### Program History

History: The first biological and chemical analyses for Public Health and Protection were performed in 1886 at the Kansas Board of Health. In 1907, the Environmental Microbiology laboratory began analyzing water and wastewater for public health as a part of the Division of Sanitation. This was the first lab that would become what is now Kansas Health and Environmental Laboratories (KHEL). When the Kansas Department of Health and Environment was established by legislative action in 1974, the combined health and environmental laboratory was located in the Forbes Field complex. Named in statutes as the Office of Laboratory Services, the Division of Health and Environmental Laboratories became part of the Division of Environment in FY 2007. The total funding shown for the program in FY 2020 through FY 2023 represents COVID funding to support not only the laboratory operations but many supplies and equipment provided to partners throughout the state to fight the COVID 19 Pandemic.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. % Accuracy on performance samples	A	98.3%	99.0%	98.7%	99.0%	97.0%	99.0%	99.0%	98.4%
2. % of staff trained on multiple methods	B	100.0%	92.0%	100.0%	100.0%	86.0%	100.0%	100.0%	94.5%
3. Average cost per test	C	\$ 48.42	\$ 60.22	\$ 337.18	\$ 372.41	\$ 409.73	\$ 344.83	\$ 331.83	\$ 294.89
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Total Number of Proficiency tests performed	A	1,420	1,589	1,909	1,400	2,024	2,000	2,000	1,731
5. Total Number of Samples Processed (Clinical and Environmental)	C	178,070	205,343	440,325	258,000	381,458	250,000	250,000	321,282

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,892,539	\$ 1,980,376	\$ 1,946,037	\$ 1,975,008	\$ 2,234,349	\$ 34,625,545	\$ 1,908,784	\$ 2,033,943
Non-SGF State Funds	4,184,478	5,365,994	6,700,424	5,508,984	5,777,563	5,769,637	5,724,399	\$ 5,838,241
Federal Funds	2,544,912	5,019,656	139,820,817	88,372,863	148,283,751	45,812,549	75,324,837	\$ 95,374,272
<b>Total</b>	\$ 8,621,929	\$ 12,366,026	\$ 148,467,278	\$ 95,856,855	\$ 156,295,663	\$ 86,207,731	\$ 82,958,020	\$ 103,246,456
<b>FTE</b>	65.0	66.0	76.0	118.0	118.0	102.0	102.0	94.5

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Kansas State Fair is a Fee Funded organization that is reliant on dollars brought in to afford the programs that it supplies to the citizens of the State of Kansas. If these programs are not funded, there would be no way that we would be able to have a State Fair.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Mandatory	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 2-201 through 2-205		No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Support the Mission of the Kansas State Fair - To promote and showcase Kansas agriculture, industry, and culture; to create opportunity for commercial activity; and to provide an educational and entertaining experience that is the pride of all Kansans.
- B. To enhance the professional development and retention within the Kansas State Fair Team.
- C. Increase in efficiency and effectiveness of State Fair program implementation and administration

### Program History

In 1913, the Kansas Legislature declared the "Official" Kansas State Fair be located on 112 acres in Hutchinson that was donated by the citizens of Reno County and was authorized by K.S.A. #2 201 through 2-205. K.S.A. #74 520 through 74 525 designated the Kansas State Fair Board as the responsible body to organize and present the annual State Fair. These funds take care of the day to day operations of the Fair to include but not limited to staffing, office equipment, marketing and the like.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Increase Attendance at Fair	A	333,000	0	281,000	325,000	315,273	325,000	325,000	230,318
2. Total number of impressions views through our Social Media platforms - Facebook, Instagram, Google Ads, YouTube, Snapchat, and TikTok.	C	10,000,000	7,500,000	12,500,000	14,000,000	0	0	0	8,500,000
3. New reporting methods for Social (2022). More difficult to calculate total impressions - FB & Instagram - reports reach vs impressions - Paid Advertising (NEW)	C	0	0	0	0	4,900,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	1,225,000

Kansas State Fair

4. Facebook & Instagram Organic Ad Reach (NEW)	C	0	0	0	0	1,772,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	443,000
5. Number of full-time employees retained	B	26	15	21	26	26	26	26	22

*Output Measures*

6. Increase Grandstand Entertainment Lineup	A	738,334	0	450,000	675,000	675,000	800,000	900,000	450,000
7. Increase Sponsorships opportunities at Kansas State Fairgrounds	A	\$ 633,100	\$ 648,000	\$ 598,675	\$ 584,000	\$ 624,594	\$ 674,000	\$ 674,000	\$ 613,817
8. Number of Non-Fair Events per year	C	550	560	540	570	568	570	600	560

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ 200,000	\$ 310,205	\$ 1,149,995	\$ 1,176,167	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 709,092
Non-SGF State Funds	4,235,646	4,195,479	960,501	2,736,204	3,733,620	5,158,433	5,297,578	\$ 2,906,451
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ 4,235,646	\$ 4,395,479	\$ 1,270,706	\$ 3,886,199	\$ 4,909,787	\$ 5,158,433	\$ 5,297,578	\$ 3,615,543
<b>FTE</b>	15.0	15.0	15.0	14.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	14.8

## Capital Improvements

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Kansas State Fair is a Fee Funded organization that is reliant on dollars brought in to afford the programs that it supplies to the citizens of the State of Kansas. If these programs are not funded, there would be no way that we would be able to have a State Fair.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 2-201 through 2-205	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To provide the Kansas State Fairgrounds, which encompasses approximately 280 acres with 75 buildings and nearly 24 acres under roof, as a safe and secure facility for all Kansans and guests to the State.
- B. To ensure the safety and security to all patrons on the Kansas State Fair through continual improvements to facilities and grounds

### Program History

In 1913, the Kansas Legislature declared the "Official" Kansas State Fair be located on 112 acres in Hutchinson that was donated by the citizens of Reno County and was authorized by K.S.A. #2 201 through 2-205. K.S.A. #74 520 through 74 525 designated the Kansas State Fair Board as the responsible body to organize and present the annual State Fair. These funds take care of the day to day operations of the Fair to include but not limited to staffing, office equipment, marketing and the like.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Amount spent for Capital Improvements	A	\$ 670,422	\$ 386,464	\$ 449,290	\$ 628,167	\$ 469,008	\$ 13,973,883	\$ 2,023,882	\$ 483,232
2. Amount invested Building and Grounds Repairs from Kansas State Fair Fee Fund	A	\$ 532,155	\$ 499,635	\$ 209,771	\$ 225,000	\$ 249,151	\$ 586,500	\$ 586,500	\$ 295,889
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Turn around time for work orders to be completed (days)	B	3	5	5	3	3	3	3	4
4. Time spent (per month in hours) inspecting and repairing facilities and grounds based on two FTEs	B	87	65	50	100	75	75	75	73

Kansas State Fair

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -			\$ 13,200,000	\$ 1,250,000	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	574,522	652,836	131,057	594,500	620,806	586,500	586,500	\$ 499,800
Federal Funds	-	-	-					\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ 574,522	\$ 652,836	\$ 131,057	\$ 594,500	\$ 620,806	\$ 13,786,500	\$ -	\$ 499,800
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Facilities

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Kansas State Fair is a Fee Funded organization that is reliant on dollars brought in to afford the programs that it supplies to the citizens of the State of Kansas. If these programs are not funded, there would be no way that we would be able to have a State Fair.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 2-201 through 2-205	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. To provide the Kansas State Fairgrounds, which encompasses approximately 280 acres with 75 buildings and nearly 24 acres under roof, as a safe and secure facility for all Kansans and guests to the State.

B. The State Fair is the state's largest single event and typically attracts more than 300,000 people annually, plus an estimated 200,000 people to the more than 600 non-fair events held throughout the year.

### Program History

In 1913, the Kansas Legislature declared the "Official" Kansas State Fair be located on 112 acres in Hutchinson that was donated by the citizens of Reno County and was authorized by K.S.A. #2 201 through 2-205. K.S.A. #74 520 through 74 525 designated the Kansas State Fair Board as the responsible body to organize and present the annual State Fair. These funds take care of the day to day operations of the Fair to include but not limited to staffing, office equipment, marketing and the like.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. No loss of life, injury or property damage due to safety issues	A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Rentals from Fairgrounds Facilities - Fairtime and Non-Fairtime	A	\$ 1,071,797	\$ 777,445	\$ 448,342	\$ 1,037,065	\$ 506,792	\$ 516,928	\$ 553,113	\$ 692,411
<b>Output Measures</b>									
3. Conducting Risk Assessments for Facilities (Monthly)	A	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12

Kansas State Fair

4. Major Facility Upgrades or remodels	A,B								
		1	1	2	4	5	5	5	3

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 150,000	\$ 155,000	\$ 613,293	\$ 511,511	\$ 449,300	\$ 171,040	\$ 135,000	\$ 432,276
Non-SGF State Funds	1,524,945	1,441,887	781,299	240,926	96,098			\$ 640,053
Federal Funds	-	-	-	979,637	975,400	1,690,347	1,766,150	\$ 488,759
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,674,945	\$ 1,596,887	\$ 1,394,592	\$ 1,732,074	\$ 1,520,798	\$ 1,861,387	\$ 1,901,150	\$ 1,561,088
<b>FTE</b>	11.0	11.0	10.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	11.3

## Water Planning and Implementation

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Without KWO water planning and implementation efforts, Kansas will not be able to plan and meet current and future water supply demands now for the Ogallala Aquifer region as well as from areas served by reservoir water supply storage. Kansas would also not be able to fully coordinate on planning and implementation activities to address water quantity and quality issues impacting Kansas as identified in the Kansas Water Plan. At the current rate, with no changes during Vision implementation, the Ogallala Aquifer will be 70 percent depleted and our reservoirs will be 40 percent filled with sediment within the next 45 years.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>		<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rgt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific	74-2622; 82a-901 et seq.; 82a-1301 et seq.; 82a-1330 et seq.; 82a-1401 et seq.; 82a-2301 et seq.; 74-2613; 74-2608; 82a-220; 82a-733; 82a-901 et seq.; 82a-1101 et seq.; 82a-1401 et seq.; 82a-1501a; 82a-1801 et seq.; 82a-2101	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

- A. Develop and propose water policies that are long-term in scope.
- B. Identify and address priority water resource issues in Kansas.
- C. Support the Kansas Water Authority in its role of making policy recommendations to the Governor and Legislature.
- D. Measure the condition of the water resources of the state.
- E. Provide adequate technical analysis and background to support the development of policy and priority issues.
- F. Measure and assess the status and effectiveness of practices and projects implemented through the State Water Plan.
- G. Be an active participant in water resources policy formation and recommendations that result in legislation.
- H. Foster a trust in the planning process which is conducted in an open public forum and based on sound research.
- I. Involve the public and stakeholders in the development of proposed policy initiatives.
- J. Create electronic and written publications in a format and style that the public finds accessible.
- K. Annually host a Governor's Conference on the Future of Water in Kansas to disseminate information and encourage public engagement in water issues.

### Program History

The Water Planning and Implementation program covers the major agency responsibility for the development and coordination of implementation efforts of the Kansas Water Plan. These development and coordination of implementation efforts provide a collaborative framework to extend the life of the Ogallala-High Plains Aquifer; secure, protect and restore Kansas reservoir water supply; improve our state's water quality; reduce our state's vulnerability to extreme events (including flood and drought); as well as increase overall awareness of Kansas water resources. The administration of the Kansas Water Planning Act, Kansas Weather Modification Act, and portions of the Water Appropriations and Water Transfer acts are housed in this program. This program also houses the Kansas Water Authority, which is statutorily within the Kansas Water Office. The Authority is responsible for advising the Governor, Legislature, and the Director of the Kansas Water Office on water policy issues; approving the Kansas Water Plan; accounting for and making recommendations on the expenditures of State Water Plan Funds; and approving water storage sales, water marketing rate setting, federal contracts, administrative regulations, and legislation proposed by the Kansas Water Office. The Authority is composed of 24 members (13 voting, 11 ex-officio) that represent stakeholder groups and are informed of water-related issues representing water users, water interests, environmental interests, and the general public.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Vision/Kansas Water Plan Action Items underway or completed.	B	219	249	258	262	262	262	262	258
2. Number of people engaged in public meetings and conferences.	I	2,484	2,462	2,947	2,970	1,725	3,000	3,250	2,526
3. Number of digital interactions.	J	939,357	799,807	524,239	575,000	306,000	525,000	575,000	551,262
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. State of the Resource reports underway or completed.	D	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14
5. Research and technical studies underway and completed.	H	14	15	16	15	16	16	16	16

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 893,521	\$ 1,020,782	\$ 966,280	\$ 80,949,813	\$ 77,961,087	\$ 1,067,460	\$ 1,074,617	\$ 40,224,491
Non-SGF State Funds	3,515,913	3,404,693	3,149,114	7,078,851	3,562,436	12,136,238	6,592,972	\$ 4,298,774
Federal Funds	108,894	75,095	55,463	301,473	266,969	563,287	445,829	\$ 174,750
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 4,518,328</b>	<b>\$ 4,500,570</b>	<b>\$ 4,170,857</b>	<b>\$ 88,330,137</b>	<b>\$ 81,790,492</b>	<b>\$ 13,766,985</b>	<b>\$ 8,113,418</b>	<b>\$ 44,698,014</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>8.3</b>

## Public Water Supply Program

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The ability to meet water supply demands of all customers of the PWS programs in accordance with existing long-term contracts and operations agreements, ensuring that the state continues to meet its current and future obligations associated with state-owned water supply storage, and continued operations and analysis to effectively protect, maintain, and secure state-owned storage to support the needs of the citizens of Kansas will be limited.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific 82a-1301 et seq. 82a-1330 et seq. 82a-1604 et seq. 82a-2301 et seq. 82a-2401 et seq.	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

- A. Ensure that the water supply needs of the citizens of Kansas are met in an economical and efficient manner.
- B. Ensure that municipal, industrial and irrigation water rights on the major rivers have an adequate water supply during drought conditions.
- C. Effectively utilize storage to lengthen support during low flow conditions.

### Program History

The Kansas Water Office (KWO) operates the Kansas Water Marketing, Water Assurance and Access District programs as part of its overall Public Water Supply (PWS) Program. KWO has developed the Public Water Supply Program Comprehensive Capital Development Plan (CCDP) in order to account for all revenue and expenses related to the State's public water supply storage, and to provide for the long-term planning of future program needs, including acquisition of all the water supply storage under federal contracts, potential new storage development and protection and restoration of the storage owned by the State. Various funding sources contribute to KWO's overall PWS Program and are represented as part of the CCDP. These funding sources are the Water Marketing Fund, Water Assurance Fund, and Access District Fund.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of people directly served (Based on population estimates).	A	1,233,216	1,245,959	1,258,914	1,272,084	1,272,084	1,344,078	1,388,409	1,262,260
2. Number of industrial customers directly served.	B	15	15	15	15	15	16	17	15
3. Number of irrigation water rights directly served.	B	51	51	51	51	51	56	56	51

Kansas Water Office

<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. % of time demands are met - all PWS programs	C	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>		<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds		4,575,385	5,755,057	6,529,588	8,746,824	8,448,595	5,842,860	6,773,800	\$ 7,370,016
Federal Funds		-	-	-					\$ -
<b>Total</b>		\$ 4,575,385	\$ 5,755,057	\$ 6,529,588	\$ 8,746,824	\$ 8,448,595	\$ 5,842,860	\$ 6,773,800	\$ 7,370,016
<b>FTE</b>		10.0	10.0	10.0	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.8

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Decreased higher education coordination; inability to collect and analyze data; decreased higher education strategic vision for Kansas.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General The Kansas Board of Regents established in Article 6 of the Constitution of the State of Kansas. Kansas statutes establishes the powers, duties and administration of the Board of Regents in Chapter 74, Article 32.	Discretionary	Yes	3

### Program Goals

A. Provide effective and efficient staff support to the Board of Regents, Technical Education Authority, and the postsecondary education institutions they govern and coordinate.

### Program History

In addition to staff support for the Board of Regents and Technical Education Authority, this program provides office administration of academic programs, career technical education, regulation of private and out-of-state institutions, student financial aid, federal programs, data and planning, facilities planning, and financing/funding of the state's 32 public colleges and universities. The most recent change to the Board office administration occurred with the passage of SB 345 in 1999, creating the Kansas Higher Education Coordination Act (K.S.A. 74-3201a), bringing all public higher education institutions under the supervision of the Board.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percentage of agency administrative costs of total budget	A	3.1%	3.0%	2.1%	2.5%	2.6%	2.5%	2.5%	2.6%
2. Percent of Board goals completed	A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%
3. Systemwide data collection, tracking, analysis expenditures	A	\$ 1,296,059	\$ 1,368,325	\$ 1,382,109	\$ 1,395,000	\$ 1,492,104	\$ 1,525,000	\$ 1,525,000	\$ 1,414,179

Kansas Board of Regents

<i>Output Measures</i>								
4. Student financial assistance applications processed	A	4,468	4,818	5,357	6,000	5,922	7,000	5,366
5. Systemwide transfer courses in Kansas public higher education	A	84	91	100	108	108	114	100

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source (in thousands)</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 4,391	\$ 4,554	\$ 4,545	\$ 4,483	\$ 4,479	\$ 4,937	\$ 4,976	4,526
Non-SGF State Funds	1,362	1,296	1,128	1,142	1,621	1,338	1,219	1,348
Federal Funds	1,218	1,206	1,228	1,186	1,201	1,537	1,472	1,212
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 6,971</b>	<b>\$ 7,056</b>	<b>\$ 6,901</b>	<b>\$ 6,811</b>	<b>\$ 7,301</b>	<b>\$ 7,812</b>	<b>\$ 7,667</b>	<b>\$ 7,086</b>
<b>FTE</b>	62.5	62.5	62.5	62.5	62.5	62.5	62.5	63

## Postsecondary Education Institutions

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Kansas public postsecondary education institutions would not have the available state funds to meet goals of educating Kansans. The cost of attending a Kansas public postsecondary education institution would increase for families, which could decrease the number of citizens earning credentials to meet workforce demands across the state. Funding for the program also has a direct impact on the Board's Strategic Plan: Building a Future and the ability to reach the goals within the plan.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General	The Kansas Board of Regents established in Article 6 of the Constitution of the State of Kansas. Kansas statutes establishes the powers, duties and administration of the Board of Regents in Chapter 74, Article 32.	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

A.Helping Kansas Families: aims to ensure that higher education remains affordable and accessible to Kansans, while continuing to help graduates achieve success.

B. Supporting Kansas Businesses: focuses on the advantages higher education can provide to Kansas businesses in the development of a talent pipeline.

### Program History

This program comprises various appropriations and funding sources for the state's 32 public postsecondary institutions, including state universities, Washburn University, community colleges and technical colleges. The program was most significantly impacted with the passage of the Higher Education Coordination Act (K.S.A. 74-3201a).

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. First-to-second year retention rate	A	70.8%	71.1%	70.9%	71.0%	71.0%	72.0%	72.0%	71.0%

Kansas Board of Regents

2. Student Success Index rates	A	60.5	62.3	64.4	64.5	64.7	65.0	65.0	64
3. University Engineering Initiative expenditure per degree awarded	B	7,019	6,184	6,538	6,200	6,200	6,500	6,500	6,307
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Attainment: credentials awarded systemwide	A	45,008	43,939	42,936	43,000	42,801	43,000	43,000	43,225
5. Excel in CTE credit hours	B	105,084	109,226	98,681	105,000	105,510	106,000	106,000	104,472
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
6. Percent of students taking 30 credit hours per year	A	54.2%	54.1%	54.5%	54.0%	54.0%	54.5%	54.5%	54.2%
7. College going rate of Kansas high school graduates	A	49.3%	48.6%	44.8%	48.5%	48.5%	48.5%	48.5%	47.3%

Funding

<i>Funding Source (in thousands)</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 180,917	\$ 189,561	\$ 187,864	\$ 206,153	\$ 216,087	\$ 224,946	\$ 221,086	197,837
Non-SGF State Funds	4,760	4,734	4,695	4,509	4,711	4,573	4,560	4,713
Federal Funds	8,241	8,156	9,871	21,672	8,580	9,050	9,050	8,869
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 193,918</b>	<b>\$ 202,451</b>	<b>\$ 202,430</b>	<b>\$ 232,334</b>	<b>\$ 229,378</b>	<b>\$ 238,569</b>	<b>\$ 234,696</b>	<b>\$ 211,420</b>
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0

## Student Financial Assistance

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Decreased funding available for scholarships and grants awarded to students attending Kansas higher education institutions, which would increase the cost of attendance and decrease the number of students able to afford postsecondary education and attain a credential.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific Each scholarship has specific statutory language.	Discretionary	No	2

### Program Goals

A. Award scholarships to students in order to increase affordability of attending postsecondary education.

### Program History

This program includes all state sponsored student financial assistance programs available to Kansas residents attending both public and independent higher education institutions. It has developed and changed over the years as new scholarship programs are created and revised.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Applicant to Recipient Ratio	A	2.6	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.3
2. Applications processed	A	4,468	4,818	5,357	6,000	5,922	7,000	7,000	5,366
3. Average award per scholarship recipient	A	\$ 1,859	\$ 1,974	\$ 2,133	\$ 3,670	\$ 2,855	\$ 4,380	\$ 4,380	\$ 2,321
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Scholarship Recipients	A	12,021	12,365	11,303	15,000	12,944	15,000	15,000	12,204
5. Students in Repayment Status	A	231	238	236	235	220	220	220	231

### Funding

Funding Source (in thousands)	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 22,258	\$ 24,250	\$ 24,114	\$ 55,051	\$ 36,830	\$ 65,547	\$ 57,576	28,398

# Kansas Board of Regents

Non-SGF State Funds		84	154	-	150	122	150	150	92
Federal Funds		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>22,342</b>	<b>\$ 24,404</b>	<b>\$ 24,114</b>	<b>\$ 55,201</b>	<b>\$ 36,952</b>	<b>\$ 65,697</b>	<b>\$ 57,726</b>	<b>\$ 28,490</b>
<b>FTE</b>		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0

## 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 Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific –KSA 72-5170 (school district accreditation) –KSA 72-1250–2167 (teacher licensure)	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 aid)	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 reports)	Discretionary	No	8
Specific –National and Community Service Act of 1990 –Serve America Act of 2002	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-public entities.  
 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 KESA).  
 E. Continue the development and enhancement of web-based applications for seamless communication and exchange of information with customers and funding agencies.  
 F. Utilize federal SLDS grant to maximize standardization of data, increase interoperability of systems, and modernize overall P20W SLDS capabilities.

### 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 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Deployment of a statewide student information system or comparable platform	F	N/A	2%	5%	25%	10%	75%	100%	6%
2. Percent of assignments filled by fully licensed educators	C	90%	95%	95%	95%	93.2%	93%	94%	94%
3. Total amount of state aid savings generated by KSDE fiscal	B	\$ 17,760,541	\$ 18,645,980	\$ 22,562,435	\$ 17,000,000	\$ 30,113,406	\$ 18,820,000	\$ 18,820,000	\$ 23,773,940
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Number of state and federal aid payments distributed	A	507	432	450	440	487	490	490	456.3
5. Total number of licenses issued per year	C	20,323	20,570	24,551	22,000	26,976	27,000	27,000	24,032
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

Kansas State Department of Education

6. Number of accredited systems in Kansas under KESA (cumulative)	D	28	51	79	173	173	360	88	101
7. Percent of educator program standards that have completed the comprehensive revision process and have been approved by KSBE	C	76.0%	75.0%	77.5%	80.0%	80.0%	90%	100%	77.5%
8. Number of new teachers being supported by multi-year approved mentoring support	C	4,841	4,513	4,829	4,500	5,184	5,000	5,000	4,842
9. Number of web-enabled applications maintained by KSDE	E	90	93	95	97	109	109	109	99

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 9,334,290	\$ 9,553,581	\$ 9,601,123	\$ 9,305,274	\$ 9,460,678	\$ 9,474,642	\$ 9,684,748	\$ 9,538,461
Non-SGF State Funds	3,541,452	3,099,344	2,819,299	4,239,135	3,396,700	4,642,979	5,212,995	3,105,114
Federal Funds	3,502,336	3,205,477	3,762,513	5,835,795	3,877,099	4,134,653	1,807,343	3,615,030
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 16,378,078</b>	<b>\$ 15,858,402</b>	<b>\$ 16,182,935</b>	<b>\$ 19,380,204</b>	<b>\$ 16,734,477</b>	<b>\$ 18,252,274</b>	<b>\$ 16,705,086</b>	<b>\$ 16,258,605</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>145.5</b>	<b>145.4</b>	<b>141.3</b>	<b>144.3</b>	<b>144.3</b>	<b>130.2</b>	<b>130.2</b>	<b>143.7</b>

## Governance of Education

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The constitutionally proscribed State Board of Education would not be able to carry out its duties to provide general supervision of the State's K-12 educational interests.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific    KSA 72-243–72-263	Mandatory	No	7

### Program Goals

- A. Kansas leads the world in the success of each student.  
 B. Provide an effective educator in every classroom.  
 C. Develop active communication and partnerships with families, communities, business stakeholders, constituents, and policy partners.

### Program History

Article 6 of the Kansas Constitution provides for the Kansas State Board of Education. The State Board consists of 10 elected members, each representing a district comprised of four contiguous senatorial districts. Board members serve four-year terms with an overlapping schedule. Every other year, the State Board reorganizes to elect a chairman and vice-chairman. The State Board appoints a Commissioner of Education who serves as its executive director. The Kansas State Board of Education was created to replace the position of the Kansas State Superintendent of Public Instruction effective January 14, 1969.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Five-year postsecondary effectiveness rate	A	48.0%	48.3%	50.0%	50.0%	N/A	52%	53%	49.2%
2. Percent of assignments filled by fully licensed educators	B	90%	95%	95%	95%	93.2%	93%	94%	94%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Total number of licenses issued per year	B	20,323	20,570	24,551	22,000	26,976	27,000	27,000	24,032
5. Statewide dropout rate	A	1.4%	1.3%	1.7%	1.4%	N/A	1.6%	1.5%	1.5%
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
6. Percent of educator program standards that have completed the comprehensive revision process and have been approved by KSBE	B	76.0%	75.0%	77.5%	80.0%	80.0%	90%	100%	77.5%
7. Number of educator vacancies reported by USDs	A	540	648	839	700	1,381	1,500	1,400	956
8. HS graduation rate	A	87.5%	88.3%	88.1%	90.0%	N/A	90.0%	91.0%	88.2%
9. Percent of students scoring in levels 3 & 4 on the ELA assessment	A	36.6%	N/A	35.2%	37.0%	N/A	35.0%	38.0%	35.2%
10. Percent of students scoring in levels 3 & 4 on the math assessment	A	32.6%	N/A	27.9%	33.0%	N/A	33.5%	36.0%	27.9%
11. Percent of students scoring in levels 3 & 4 on the science assessment	A	35.6%	N/A	34.5%	36.0%	N/A	34.5%	37.0%	34.5%

Kansas State Department of Education

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 373,290	\$ 333,852	\$ 351,585	\$ 405,838	\$ 393,386	\$ 433,640	\$ 447,066	\$ 359,608
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 373,290</b>	<b>\$ 333,852</b>	<b>\$ 351,585</b>	<b>\$ 405,838</b>	<b>\$ 393,386</b>	<b>\$ 433,640</b>	<b>\$ 447,066</b>	<b>\$ 359,608</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>

## Child Nutrition and Wellness

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

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	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific    –42 USC 1751-1761, 1762a, 1765, 1766, 1772, 1773, 1776, 1779	Mandatory	Yes	5

### Program Goals

- A. Sponsors provide participants with nutritious, appealing meals.  
 B. Sponsors comply with federal and state requirements; operate efficient and effective programs; and receive reimbursement for meals and snacks served.  
 C. Sponsors increase participants' awareness of the benefits of choosing nutritious foods.

### Program History

The Child Nutrition and Wellness program administers several programs sponsored by the U.S. Department of Agriculture that provide health food to children including the National School Lunch Program, School Breakfast Program, Child and Adult Care Food Program, and several others. The National School Lunch Program was authorized in 1946 and the School Breakfast Program was made permanent in 1975, with other programs following. State law provides for state aid for school lunches, which is a match required under federal law.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Percent of programs that follow federal regulations and guidance	B	99.8%	99.6%	99.3%	99.0%	99.9%	99.0%	99.0%	99.6%
2. Number of meals/snacks served to participants in Child Nutrition Programs	A	102,065,303	87,060,622	83,177,067	103,184,608	96,987,146	95,000,000	95,000,000	89,074,945
3. Average reimbursement for each meal/snack served	B	\$ 1.87	\$ 2.16	\$ 3.11	\$ 2.62	\$ 3.82	\$ 3.16	\$ 2.11	\$ 3.03
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Percent of sponsors that had an administrative review and procurement review conducted by KSDE	B	50.3%	38.0%	31.3%	30.0%	37.5%	30.0%	30.0%	35.6%
5. Amount of reimbursement processed through KSDE's KN-CLAIM application	A	\$ 190,936,443	\$ 188,014,837	\$ 258,329,047	\$ 270,000,000	\$ 370,331,242	\$ 300,000,000	\$ 200,000,000	\$ 272,225,042
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
6. Percent of KS elementary students who participated in the Body Venture health education exhibit	C	8.5%	6.4%	0.0%	10.0%	2.0%	10.0%	10.0%	2.8%
7. Number of Body Venture site visits	C	78	52	0	100	0	75	75	17

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 323,526	\$ 328,760	\$ 333,870	\$ 321,218	\$ 375,660	\$ 330,743	\$ 293,671	\$ 346,097
Non-SGF State Funds	267,479	264,789	27,548	65,750	282,261	16,500	31,000	191,533
Federal Funds	3,129,992	3,170,794	3,005,672	3,247,087	2,881,200	2,806,800	2,960,602	3,019,222
<b>Total</b>	\$ 3,720,997	\$ 3,764,343	\$ 3,367,090	\$ 3,634,055	\$ 3,539,121	\$ 3,154,043	\$ 3,285,273	\$ 3,556,851
<b>FTE</b>	35.5	35.4	32.8	32.7	32.7	32.7	32.7	33.6

## Standards and Assessments

## 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 Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific –Every Student Succeeds Act –KSA 72-5170(b) –KSA 72-5170(c)	Mandatory	No	3

## 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 History

**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, reading, 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.

**Federal:** The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) was originally passed 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 consistently underperforming subgroups.

## Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Five-year postsecondary effectiveness rate	A	48.0%	48.3%	50.0%	50.0%	N/A	52%	53%	49.2%
2. Five-year postsecondary success rate	A	55.0%	55.9%	55.7%	58.0%	N/A	60%	61%	55.8%
3. SGF cost per assessment administered	A	\$ 1.20	N/A	\$ 1.39	\$ 1.17	N/A	\$ 1.07	\$ 1.03	\$ 1.39
4. Total cost per assessment administered	A	\$ 5.13	N/A	\$ 5.97	\$ 5.08	N/A	\$ 4.60	\$ 4.43	\$ 5.97
<i>Output Measures</i>									
5. Number of ELA, math, and science assessments administered	A	603,133	N/A	487,388	605,000	N/A	605,000	605,000	487,388
6. Total number of state interim assessments administered (regular	A	565,382	544,540	518,155	575,000	627,662	700,000	750,000	563,452
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
7. Percent of students scoring in levels 3 & 4 of the ELA assessment	A	36.6%	N/A	35.2%	37.0%	N/A	35.0%	38.0%	35.2%
8. Percent of students scoring in levels 3 & 4 of the math assessment	A	32.6%	N/A	27.9%	33.0%	N/A	33.5%	36.0%	27.9%
9. Percent of students scoring in levels 3 & 4 of the science assessment	A	35.6%	N/A	34.5%	36.0%	N/A	34.5%	37.0%	34.5%
10. HS graduation rate	A	87.5%	88.3%	88.1%	90.0%	N/A	90.0%	91.0%	88.2%

Kansas State Department of Education

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 2,609,381	\$ 2,657,697	\$ 2,626,987	\$ 2,864,142	\$ 2,741,207	\$ 3,212,818	\$ 3,181,969	\$ 2,675,297
Non-SGF State Funds	388,528	328,647	30,103	314,242	96,484	309,592	270,073	151,745
Federal Funds	7,255,704	6,949,124	6,707,998	6,525,429	6,906,813	8,365,947	9,849,834	6,854,645
<b>Total</b>	\$ 10,253,613	\$ 9,935,468	\$ 9,365,088	\$ 9,703,813	\$ 9,744,504	\$ 11,888,357	\$ 13,301,876	\$ 9,681,687
<b>FTE</b>	27.0	25.1	26.2	26.2	26.2	30.2	30.2	25.8

## 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 Disabilities 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

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percent of students with disabilities enrolled in higher education or some other postsecondary education or training program, or employed within one year	A	73.0%	75.0%	75.6%	73.4%	73.4%	76.6%	79.1%	74.7%
2. Percent of preschool-aged children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early literacy)	B	89.7%	89.1%	89.7%	86.5%	87.6%	88.9%	86.5%	88.8%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Number of technical assistance and training events sponsored by TASN to improve student performance and outcomes	A	439	438	591	600	839	864	891	623
4. Number of USDs with approved preschool-aged at-risk programs	B	215	226	244	255	255	262	265	242

Kansas State Department of Education

*Additional Measures as Necessary*

5. Percent of students with disabilities scoring in levels 3 & 4 on the reading assessment (by grade):

4th Grade

8th Grade

High School

6. Percent of students with disabilities scoring in levels 3 & 4 on the math assessment (by grade)

4th Grade

8th Grade

High School

7. Percent of students with disabilities graduating from high school

8. Number of positions fill through the use of the Kansas Education Employment Board

9. Total number of children enrolled in preschool in public school districts

10. Number of attendees participating in student performance technical assistance and training events sponsored by TASN

11. Number of agencies participating in students performance technical assistance and training events sponsored by TASN

A	20.5%	N/A	22.8%	20.5%	N/A	22.0%	23.5%	22.8%
A	7.3%	N/A	7.6%	7.5%	N/A	7.5%	10.5%	7.6%
A	7.0%	N/A	6.7%	7.0%	N/A	8.5%	10.0%	6.7%
A	14.5%	N/A	13.5%	14.5%	N/A	17.5%	20.0%	13.5%
A	5.7%	N/A	5.1%	6.5%	N/A	7.5%	9.0%	5.1%
A	4.5%	N/A	4.0%	5.5%	N/A	6.0%	7.5%	4.0%
A	77.5%	78.4%	80.0%	80.5%	78.4%	84.5%	81.0%	78.9%
C	257	215	144	280	120	130	140	160
B	22,588	23,421	20,148	22,900	22,579	23,600	24,600	22,049
A	9,968	7,917	14,429	15,100	19,362	19,942	20,541	13,903
A	335	317	348	355	421	434	447	362

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 508,062	\$ 601,749	\$ 547,422	\$ 577,425	\$ 513,702	\$ 614,942	\$ 588,116	\$ 554,291
Non-SGF State Funds	24,337	11,704	4,246	15,574	7,466	32,458	31,476	7,805
Federal Funds	13,872,165	17,155,328	17,509,406	12,056,019	17,272,010	16,684,605	17,459,340	17,312,248
<b>Total</b>	\$ 14,404,564	\$ 17,768,781	\$ 18,061,074	\$ 12,649,018	\$ 17,793,178	\$ 17,332,005	\$ 18,078,932	\$ 17,874,344
<b>FTE</b>	25.5	25.3	26.3	26.6	26.6	25.5	25.5	26.1

## 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	Yes	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 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percent of economically disadvantaged students scoring in levels 3 & 4 on state assessments:									
English language arts	A	22.9%	N/A	21.1%	23.0%	N/A	21.0%	23.0%	21.1%
Math	A	19.3%	N/A	14.8%	19.5%	N/A	19.0%	21.0%	14.8%
2. Percent of English-language learner students scoring in levels 3 & 4 on state assessments:									
English language arts	A	7.5%	N/A	6.0%	7.5%	N/A	7.0%	9.0%	6.0%
Math	A	9.4%	N/A	6.1%	9.5%	N/A	10.0%	12.0%	6.1%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Number of technical assistance resources for teachers made available through TASN	A	1,829	2,146	2,353	2,400	2,562	2,638	2,718	2,354
4. Number of contacts made by TASN staff to local agencies and school districts with the purpose of assisting in improving student academic performance	A	1,632	1,570	1,779	1,800	3,380	3,481	3,585	2,243
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
5. Percent of migrant students scoring in levels 3 & 4 on state assessments:									
English language arts	A	13.2%	N/A	13.6%	13.5%	N/A	15.0%	16.5%	13.6%
Math	A	11.5%	N/A	9.1%	12.0%	N/A	13.0%	14.5%	9.1%
6. Percent of homeless students scoring in levels 3 & 4 on state assessments:									
English language arts	A	17.4%	N/A	18.4%	17.5%	N/A	19.0%	20.5%	18.4%
Math	A	13.8%	N/A	11.0%	14.0%	N/A	15.5%	17.0%	11.0%

Kansas State Department of Education

7. Percent of students who graduate from high school:

7. Percent of students who graduate from high school:									
English learners	A	82.6%	83.7%	82.6%	85.5%	N/A	84.0%	86.5%	83.2%
Economically disadvantaged	A	80.2%	81.2%	81.0%	82.5%	N/A	83.0%	83.5%	81.1%
Migrant	A	79.4%	78.3%	81.4%	83.5%	N/A	84.0%	84.5%	79.9%
Homeless	A	67.1%	68.3%	68.8%	71.5%	N/A	72.0%	72.5%	68.6%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 45,915	\$ 48,769	\$ 43,825	\$ 48,634	\$ 36,624	\$ 52,226	\$ 41,932	\$ 43,073
Non-SGF State Funds	4,301	4,875	850	3,665	2,396	897	2,041	2,707
Federal Funds	4,050,808	8,960,749	4,154,985	4,158,496	4,242,123	9,373,548	4,250,809	5,785,952
<b>Total</b>	\$ 4,101,024	\$ 9,014,393	\$ 4,199,660	\$ 4,210,795	\$ 4,281,143	\$ 9,426,671	\$ 4,294,782	\$ 5,831,732
<b>FTE</b>	15.0	15.0	14.5	14.8	14.8	14.3	14.3	14.8

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

### 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 vocational training in agriculture, home economics, and trade and industry. The 1985 Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act aimed to expand, 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 evenly between KBOR and KSDE.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Number of CTE career clusters/pathway programs meeting standards and implemented at the local level	A	2,988	3,245	3,415	3,491	3,493	3,482	3,490	3,384
2. Number of high school students enrolled in tuition-free college, career, and technical education courses	A	13,675	13,934	12,529	14,000	13,000	13,500	14,000	13,154
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Number of students participating in CTE organizations	A	23,555	23,441	23,441	23,000	23,657	23,800	24,000	23,513
4. Number of CTE students who have earned at least two credits in an approved CTE career cluster/pathway course sequence	A	24,502	29,920	26,187	25,000	26,250	26,500	27,000	27,452
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
5. Percent of middle and high school students that have developed IPS	A	96.8%	97.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.0%

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 1,058,605	\$ 1,122,668	\$ 1,113,986	\$ 718,913	\$ 652,493	\$ 697,806	\$ 688,110	\$ 963,049
Non-SGF State Funds	13,782	10,183	2,800	11,403	4,010	11,624	-	5,664
Federal Funds	945,527	629,189	595,627	801,774	734,535	852,231	917,471	653,117
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,017,914</b>	<b>\$ 1,762,040</b>	<b>\$ 1,712,413</b>	<b>\$ 1,532,090</b>	<b>\$ 1,391,038</b>	<b>\$ 1,561,661</b>	<b>\$ 1,605,581</b>	<b>\$ 1,621,830</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>12.9</b>	<b>13.4</b>	<b>13.4</b>	<b>12.4</b>	<b>12.4</b>	<b>13.4</b>

## Financial Aid

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

School districts would not have the funding to effectively operate and educate Kansas students.

Specific	Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
	–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

### Program Goals

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. Significant 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 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
		Performance measures for the Financial Aid Program are those identified for the other seven programs: Administration, Governance of Education, Child Nutrition and Wellness, Standards and Assessment Services, Special Education Services, Title Programs and Services, and Career and Technical Education. Accurately implementing the Financial Aid Program assists these seven programs in meeting their performance measures.							

### Funding

Funding Source (in Thousands)	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 3,480,745	\$ 3,962,795	\$ 3,916,185	\$ 4,111,185	\$ 4,104,279	\$ 4,467,803	\$ 4,400,871	\$ 3,994,420
Non-SGF State Funds	1,051,170	1,039,399	1,053,113	1,079,972	1,080,274	1,116,980	1,137,283	1,057,595
Federal Funds	454,502	397,120	481,399	463,998	643,660	590,161	634,190	507,393
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 4,986,417</b>	<b>\$ 5,399,314</b>	<b>\$ 5,450,697</b>	<b>\$ 5,655,155</b>	<b>\$ 5,828,214</b>	<b>\$ 6,174,944</b>	<b>\$ 6,172,343</b>	<b>\$ 5,559,408</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## 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 behavioral health screening, training for parents and health care providers, and access to healthcare.

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

### Program Goals

A. The Children's Cabinet will develop and implement a coordinated, comprehensive delivery system to improve the health and well-being 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.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percent of classrooms funded by the Early Childhood Block Grant meeting high quality standards for classroom instruction:					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 professional development and quality improvement.				
Toddler Classrooms	A	74%	59%	75%		78%			71%
Pre-K Classrooms	A	74%	62%	72%		76%			70%
2. Percent of classrooms funded by Communities Aligned in Early Development and Education meeting high quality standards for classroom instruction:									
Toddler classrooms	A	44%	55%	44%		47%			49%
Pre-K Classrooms	A	20%	35%	14%		N/A			25%
Output Measures									
3. Number of children served through ECGB programs	A	7,457	7,163	6,074		6,719			6,652
4. Number of children served through CAEDE programs	A	343	653	511		937			700
Additional Measures as Necessary									
5. Percent of providers funded by the Child Care Quality Initiative meeting high-quality standards at initial assessment	A	N/A	42%	45%		65%			51%
6. Number of children receiving services through the Child Care Quality Initiative	A	372	527	484		443			485
7. Number of professionals receiving professional development through the Autism Diagnosis Program	A	153	91	62		95			83

Kansas State Department of Education

Funding Source	Funding								
	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.	
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Non-SGF State Funds	20,234,400	20,131,307	20,281,709	21,212,516	20,229,292	23,698,350	27,264,800	20,214,103	
Federal Funds	822,652	790,697	16,610,314	10,040,463	11,532,162	10,357,175	4,875,735	9,644,391	
Total	\$ 21,057,052	\$ 20,922,004	\$ 36,892,023	\$ 31,252,979	\$ 31,761,454	\$ 34,055,525	\$ 32,140,535	\$ 29,858,494	
FTE	3.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.7	

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Inability to maintain services to students, violation of Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) and Individuals with Disabilities Education

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General K.S.A. 76-1101b	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Increase school enrollment  
 B. Improve school climate  
 C. Improve operational efficiencies and maximize resources allocated to student services

### Program History

KSSB was established in 1867 and is a trusted source of information and expertise related to vision services for school districts and blind students across the state. The administration provides leadership to ensure that the agency's resources are aligned with its vision and goals.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Student access to intensive services	A	N/A	N/A	40	48	40	45	50	45
2. Teacher-Staff retention rate	B	N/A	N/A	90.0%	95.0%	95.0%	90.0%	90.0%	91.7%
3. Percent budget for Instructional Services	C	N/A	70.0%	75.0%	80.0%	77.0%	74.0%	76.0%	75.6%

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 249,182	\$ 297,116	\$ 292,192		\$ 175,249	\$ 178,673	\$ 167,936	\$ 173,953
Non-SGF State Funds	6,295	4,414	10,418		4,225	-	-	4,225
Federal Funds	565	484	15,490		1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 256,042</b>	<b>\$ 302,014</b>	<b>\$ 318,100</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 180,474</b>	<b>\$ 179,673</b>	<b>\$ 168,936</b>	<b>\$ 176,361</b>
<b>FTE</b>		0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

## Instructional Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Student Individual Education Plan (IEP) services disrupted, violation of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General      K.S.A. 76-1101b	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Increase outreach services to infants and young children who are Blind/VI across Kansas.
- B. Increase students 0-21 who are Blind/VI across Kansas receiving direct instructional contact from KSSB.

### Program History

KSSB promotes equal access for all children who are blind, low vision or deaf-blind in Kansas' schools. The campus program serves elementary through high school and transition students. Field Services works with local districts to maximize resources and personnel to serve students with qualified staff throughout the state.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Students 0-5 receiving direct services		N/A	35	35	40	40	45	50	45
2. Number of Low Vision Examinations		N/A	N/A	150	200	83	95	100	93
3. Total students served					240	123	140	150	138

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 249,182	\$ 3,831,442	\$ 4,194,409		\$ 4,339,816	\$ 4,484,272	\$ 4,935,612	\$ 4,586,567
Non-SGF State Funds	109,340	633,049	457,575		664,692	412,196	424,899	500,596
Federal Funds	536,604	516,107	490,841		546,387	686,952	496,879	576,739
<b>Total</b>	\$ 895,126	\$ 4,980,598	\$ 5,142,825	\$ -	\$ 5,550,895	\$ 5,583,420	\$ -	\$ 5,224,773
<b>FTE</b>		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	57.5	57.5	57.5

## Support Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Student Individual Education Plan (IEP) services disrupted, violation of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General K.S.A. 76-1101b	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Safe and secure environment for students and professionals that provide specialized education.  
 B. Provide and support technology on campus for specialized educational needs of students.  
 C. Maintain safe vehicle fleet to transport students to off-campus academic classes, extracurricular activities.

### Program History

Focus of Support Services is to make sure students have safe and secure facilities for delivery of high-quality educational services. In 2012 the closure commission recommended combining Administration/Support Services with KSSD to achieve efficiencies. All departments within Support Services share supervisory employees with KSSD. Additional staff members provide support on either campus as needed to further promote savings.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Security services meet standards		90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%
2. IT resources for direct classroom		70%	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%
3. Average mileage per vehicle in fleet		21,121	85,000	75,000	85,000	33,211	36,000	39,000	36,070

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 249,182	\$ 1,565,348	\$ 1,250,530		\$ 1,326,152	\$ 1,826,292	\$ 1,199,713	\$ 1,450,719
Non-SGF State Funds	19,927	29,018	157,910		120,678	316,720	377,200	271,533
Federal Funds	72,950	28,905	44,791		74,358	172,261	100,356	173,852
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 342,059</b>	<b>\$ 1,623,271</b>	<b>\$ 1,453,231</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,521,188</b>	<b>\$ 2,315,273</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,532,563</b>
<b>FTE</b>		<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>23.0</b>	<b>23.0</b>	<b>23.0</b>	<b>23.0</b>

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Inability to maintain services to students, violation of Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) and violation of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General K.S.A. 76-1001b	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Advance agency's mission, vision and core values by assuring quality services are provided to internal and external community
- B. Promote safe, healthy environment for employees to gain satisfaction from their contributions to agency mission

### Program History

KSSD is an accredited school established in 1861 and committed to educating Deaf/Hard of Hearing students. It serves as a center-based educational option to provide a free and appropriate education in the least restrictive environment (most accessible). KSSD also has an Outreach department to serve as a statewide resource center for families and students served in their local school districts.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Increase job satisfaction to 90%	B	85%	89%	84%	90%	81%	85%	85%	84%
2. Increase dual endorsement staff	A	75	76	83	85	74	75	76	75

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 287,407	\$ 352,743	\$ 352,902	\$ 252,754	\$ 252,754	\$ 279,689	\$ 286,638	\$ 273,027
Non-SGF State Funds	-	20,884	4,114	7,812	7,812	4,999	-	\$ 4,270
Federal Funds	-	-	-	5,000	5,000	4,997	5,027	\$ 5,008
<b>Total</b>	\$ 287,407	\$ 373,627	\$ 357,016	\$ 265,566	\$ 265,566	\$ 289,685	\$ 291,665	\$ 282,305
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0

## Instructional Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Student Individual Education Plan (IEP) services disrupted, violation of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, (IDEA).

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General	K.S.A. 1001b Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Increase student enrollment at campus-based program  
 B. Increase direct and indirect support for students and families  
 C. Administer language assessment assessments to at least 50 students each year through LAP

### Program History

Instructional Services operates both a campus-centered program and outreach services which serve children aged birth through 21 years old. It includes a Student Life program for those who live too far from KSSD to attend as a day student. Student Life includes language immersion, social emotional development, homework and tutoring support and access to extracurricular activities.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Increase enrollment on campus	A	146	148	154	159	150	155	160	155
2. Increase students served	B	250	453	537	569	658	671	684	671
3. Students receiving LAP services under K.S.A. 75-5397e	C	20	45	62	56	56	68	80	68
4. Increase students age 3-8 receiving LAP service	C		19	40	73	73	85	97	85
<i>Output Measures</i>									
5. Extended School Year Enrollment		84	92	100	100	100	105	110	105

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 6,761,253	\$ 6,954,712	\$ 7,225,874	\$ 7,222,725	\$ 7,222,725	\$ 7,653,011	8,734,433	\$ 7,870,056
Non-SGF State Funds	1,131,455	504,874	356,869	685,750	685,750	693,237	762,511	713,833
Federal Funds	266,826	373,898	221,831	554,256	554,256	466,662	518,229	513,049
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 8,159,534</b>	<b>\$ 7,833,484</b>	<b>\$ 7,804,574</b>	<b>\$ 8,462,731</b>	<b>\$ 8,462,731</b>	<b>\$ 8,812,910</b>	<b>\$ 10,015,173</b>	<b>\$ 9,096,938</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>103.5</b>	<b>108.5</b>	<b>108.5</b>	<b>101.0</b>	<b>103.5</b>	<b>104.3</b>

## Support Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Student Individual Education Plan (IEP) services disrupted, violation of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, (IDEA).

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General K.S.A. 1001b	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Safe and secure environment for students and professionals that provide specialized education  
 B. Provide and support technology on campus for specialized educational needs of students  
 C. Maintain safe vehicle fleet to transport students to off-campus academic classes, extracurricular activities

### Program History

Focus of Support Services is to make sure students have safe and secure facilities for delivery of high-quality educational services. In 2012 the closure commission recommended combining Administration/Support Services with KSSB to achieve efficiencies. All departments within Support Services share supervisory employees with KSSB. Additional staff members provide support on either campus as needed to further promote savings.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Security services meet standards	A	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%
2. IT resources for direct classroom	B	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%
3. Average mileage per vehicle in fleet	C	N/A	70,800	88,000	121,000	121,567	130,000	138,000	129,856

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 1,968,232	\$ 2,036,585	\$ 1,844,088	\$ 2,117,203	\$ 2,117,203	\$ 2,307,758	\$ 2,395,231	\$ 2,273,397
Non-SGF State Funds	257,766	166,213	249,455	183,034	183,034	415,988	512,764	210,881
Federal Funds	71,817	30,663	72,185	103,373	138,522	83,571		222,029
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,297,815</b>	<b>\$ 2,233,461</b>	<b>\$ 2,165,728</b>	<b>\$ 2,403,610</b>	<b>\$ 2,438,759</b>	<b>\$ 2,807,317</b>	<b>\$ 2,907,995</b>	<b>\$ 2,706,307</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>35.0</b>	<b>33.0</b>	<b>33.0</b>	<b>38.0</b>	<b>38.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Without the Administration program the Kansas Historical Society programs mandated by statute could not function as Administration provides centralized support for all other programs ensuring the agency uses state resources in a responsible and productive way. Without this program there would be no security, no human resources, no business office, no working physical plant, or IT services. There would be no security or maintenance and preservation of the state's 57 buildings under the care of the agency. Communication to the public would also collapse in terms of the agency's website and public response. Administration covers all indirect costs.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 75-2701 through 75-2705 establishes the Kansas Historical Society as a state K.S.A. 75-3148 gives the executive director the authority to hire staff. The enabling legislation also outlines specific duties such as collecting. K.S.A. 76-2056 allows for the Kansas Historical Society to rent space to outside groups for events and meetings and charge for the use of the space. The executive director is assigned by statute to sit on a variety of committees including the Capitol Preservation Committee (K.S.A. 75-2268 through 75-2269), Council on Travel and Tourism (K.S.A. 32-1410 through 1411), and the Governor's Residency Advisory Commission (K.S.A. 75-129 through 131).	Discretionary	No	2

### Program Goals

- A. Ensure the agency uses public resources wisely by taking regular public feedback, updating agency priorities annually, and practicing fiscal
- B. Providing management of the agency's buildings and structures, as well as the agency's IT infrastructure.
- C. Ensure all staff and visitors are safe and that all agency communications are transparent and easily accessed.

State Historical Society

**Program History**

The administrative functions have been part of the Kansas Historical Society since it was formed in 1875. In 1990 the agency obtained legislation to operate a third-party rental program for agency facilities.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of page views on kshs.org	B,C	3,639,835	3,496,887	3,762,955	3,700,000	3,479,927	3,600,000	3,600,000	3,579,923
2. Number of formal complaints about the facilities received	B,C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Annual cost per visit for total agency program usage	A	\$0.53	\$0.29	\$0.29	\$0.37	\$0.38	\$0.38	\$0.38	\$0.32

*Output Measures*

4. How many social media post told Kansas historical stories	C	2,160	2,263	2,142	2,200	2,872	2,500	2,500	2,426
5. How many fiscal transactions processed	A	4,499	4,448	4,445	4,230	3,618	4,000	4,000	4,170

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 2,186,700	\$2,535,259	\$ 2,614,329	\$ 2,258,790	\$2,542,218	\$2,595,403	\$2,551,773	\$2,563,935
Non-SGF State Funds	554,958	188,139	140,738	836,141	152,312	195,121	158,007	160,396
Federal Funds	80,613	101,497	30,567	24,691	131,707	147,881	40,580	87,924
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,822,271</b>	<b>\$ 2,824,895</b>	<b>\$ 2,785,634</b>	<b>\$ 3,119,622</b>	<b>\$2,826,237</b>	<b>\$2,938,405</b>	<b>\$2,750,360</b>	<b>\$2,812,255</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>22.5</b>

## Archives

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

If administration is not funded, the agency would not be able to maintain a Director, Chief Fiscal Officer or Director of Human Resources. Not funding these positions and other requisite expenditures, the agency would not maintain central oversight of all other agency programs.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific K.S.A. 45-401 through 45-414 creates the official state archives K.S.A. 64-106 through 64-107 allows the agency to certify records for counties in the case of lost records. K.S.A. 75-3501 through 75-3520 establishes and defines the state's records board. K.S.A. 45-215 through 45-223 encompasses the open records act. K.S.A. 58-2005 through 58-2011 establishes the handling of land survey records. K.S.A. 75-2250 through 75-2251 authorizes the law enforcement memorial on the Capitol grounds is the responsibility of the Kansas Historical Society as the keeper of the records of fallen officers. K.S.A. 75-104 relates to the transfer of Governor's records to the Kansas Historical Society. K.A.R. 118-3 procedures and fees for land survey program. K.A.R. 118-1 procedures for deaccessioning of collections.	Mandatory	No	1

**Program Goals**

- A. Collaborate with Kansas state and local government officials to draft and submit to the State Records Board new and revised records retention and disposition schedules that accurately reflect contemporary government business practices and provide records management training to Kansas state and local government officials.
- B. Collect, preserve, and make available to the public Kansas state government records with enduring, or permanent, value housed in the State Archives with access provided in-person and/or digitally.
- C. Process current land survey reference report filings and providing land surveyors with access to historical land survey records housed in the State Archives.

**Program History**

Functions of the State Archives have been part of the Kansas Historical Society since it was founded in 1875. The Land Survey Program and the Law Enforcement Memorial were transferred to the agency in the 1980s. All functions are mandated by statutes.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Records Retention Schedules created or revised	A	29	224	148	140	97	100	100	156
2. Number of reference visits in-person and digitally	B	263,166	2,091,027	2,019,381	2,000,000	1,691,066	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,933,825
3. Cost per research request performed by staff	B	\$14.79	\$13.07	\$14.21	\$14.50	\$14.22	\$14.25	\$14.25	\$13.83
4. Number of land survey requests filled annually	C	1,110	471	751	800	607	650	650	610

*Output Measures*

5. Number of items digitized to allow public to view online	B	28,583	128,183	3,816	50,000	92,832	100,000	100,000	74,944
6. Amount of cubic feet of state records processed into the State Archives	A	591	259	17	280	1,634	450	450	637

State Historical Society

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 960,526	\$ 907,722	\$ 784,036	\$ 831,521	\$ 692,560	\$ 853,124	\$ 924,401	\$ 794,773
Non-SGF State Funds	98,448	68,131	67,986	18,625	56,126	102,008	102,334	64,081
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,058,974	\$ 975,853	\$ 852,022	\$ 850,146	\$ 748,686	\$ 955,132	\$ 1,026,735	\$ 858,854
<b>FTE</b>	18.0	18.0	18.0	18.0	18.0	16.0	16.0	18.0

## Cultural Resources

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Without the Cultural Resources program there would be no state recognition and protection for historic structures and sites. Several state and federal economic development programs would be discontinued, and the state would no longer financially assist businesses and historic property owners, seriously impacting the economies of communities across Kansas. This could lead to a decline in business districts and neighborhoods in some small towns. There would be no protection of antiquities and unmarked burials in the state as prescribed by state and federal legislation. Since this program acts as a liaison to tribal governments historically affiliated with the state, not funding this program could affect tribal relations. Federal law requires a review of all federally funded activities in the state to ensure that important cultural resources are not lost or at least mitigated. Without this program many other state and private projects could be shut down or delayed without qualified reviews (i.e., road development, cell tower construction, utility repairs). The state owns 15 State Historic Sites that would not be cared for or open to the public and

	<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	<p>Federal National Historic Preservation Act, P.L. 89-665 directs the state to survey and recognize the state's cultural resources, support Certified Local Governments, review federal projects in the state to ensure the protection of significant cultural resources.</p> <p>K.S.A. 75-2715 through 75-2725 makes historic preservation an official policy of the state.</p> <p>K.S.A. 75-2729 and 79-3107b establishes the Heritage Trust fund directing the agency to provide grants to owners of historic properties.</p> <p>K.S.A. 79-32,211 creates the state preservation tax credit program.</p> <p>K.S.A. 74-5401 through 74-5408 establishes the Kansas Antiquities Act which prohibits the gathering of antiquities without a permit.</p> <p>K.S.A. 75-2741 through 75-2754 regulates the excavation, study, and display of human remains and goods from unmarked burial sites.</p> <p>K.S.A. 75-2711 establishes Pawnee Indian Museum State Historic Site.</p>	Mandatory	<p>Yes</p> <p>60 / 40</p>	1

K.S.A. 76-2001 through 76-2002  
establishes John Brown Museum  
State Historic Site.

K.S.A. 76-2005 established Pawnee  
Rock State Historic Site.

K.S.A. 76-2006 through 76-2007  
establishes Fort Hays State Historic  
Site.

K.S.A. 76-2002 through 76-2012  
establishes Shawnee Indian Mission  
State Historic Site.

K.S.A. 76-2017 establishes  
Hollenberg Pony Express Station  
State Historic Site.

K.S.A. 76-2021 through 76-2022  
establishes Marais des Cygnes  
Massacre State Historic Site.

K.S.A. 76-2023 through 76-2024  
establishes Kaw Mission State Historic  
Site.

K.S.A. 76-2030 through 76-2031  
establishes Grinter Place State  
Historic Site.

K.S.A. 76-2034 through 76-2035  
establishes Goodnow State Historic  
Site.

K.S.A. 76-2040 through 76-2043  
establishes Mine Creek Civil War  
Battlefield State Historic Site.

K.S.A. 76-2052 through 76-2054  
establishes Constitution Hall State  
Historic Site.

K.S.A. 2057 established Red Rocks  
State Historic Site.

Cottonwood Ranch State Historic Site,  
First Territorial Capitol State Historic  
Site, and the Last Chance Store State  
Historic Site were brought to the

K.A.R. 118-1 procedures for  
deaccessioning of collections.

K.A.R. 118-2 procedures for  
deaccessioning of human remains.

### Program Goals

- A. Administer the nomination procedures of the Register of Historic Kansas Places and the National Register of Historic Places and facilitate identification of historic resources in the state, while providing incentives such as state and federal tax credits and Heritage Trust Fund grants for the rehabilitation of such properties.
- B. Meet all state and federal requirements in evaluating potential effects on the state's historic and cultural resources, providing mitigation opportunities when necessary, and cooperating with tribal, city, and county governments.
- C. Preserve and operate the state-owned historic sites, opening to the public at least six months of the year.

### Program History

State and federal laws enacted beginning in the 1960s were established to protect the state's cultural resources. The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 was amended in 1970 and 1980 and is the basis of some of these program activities. Federal money allocated to Kansas for these activities are matched by the state (60% federal and 40% state). The Heritage Trust Fund (1990) and the Historic Preservation Tax Credits (2001) were established by state statute. The State Historic Sites were acquired by the state between 1899 and 2015, by statute or through budget appropriations.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Economic impact of the state and federal historic preservation tax credits	A	596 jobs and grew the Kansas economy by \$24,713,700	466 jobs and grew the Kansas economy by \$19,262,900	1,132 jobs and grew the Kansas economy by \$57,530,026	600 jobs and grow the Kansas economy by \$20,000,000	1,706 jobs and grow the Kansas economy by \$69,300,200	1,000 jobs and grow the Kansas economy by \$50,000,000	1,000 jobs and grow the Kansas economy by \$50,000,000	1,101 jobs and grew the Kansas economy by \$48,697,708
2. Archeology sites cleared	B	205	270	240	245	225	250	250	245.0
3. Cost per visitor at the State Historic Sites*	C	\$10.00	\$21.00	\$25.00	\$12.00	\$23.53	\$24.00	\$24.00	\$23.18

\* Visitors limited due to the COVID-19 pandemic in FY 2020 and FY 2021

### *Output Measures*

4. Staff reviews of state and federal projects potentially impacting cultural	B	4,851	4,307	5,634	4,800	3,777	4,000	4,000	4,573
5. Total financial incentives distributed	A	\$36,666,948	\$28,974,638	\$16,509,542	\$27,000,000	\$6,532,056	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$17,338,745

State Historical Society

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 431,173	\$ 391,153	\$ 438,508	\$ 526,923	\$ 433,457	\$ 540,362	\$ 604,457	\$ 421,039
Non-SGF State Funds	1,007,695	1,923,807	1,788,997	1,574,712	1,934,557	1,715,800	1,776,638	1,882,454
Federal Funds	826,166	751,377	715,619	1,172,904	1,352,936	710,808	1,505,667	939,977
<b>Total</b>	\$ 2,265,034	\$ 3,066,337	\$ 2,943,124	\$ 3,274,539	\$ 3,720,950	\$ 2,966,970	\$ 3,886,762	\$ 3,243,470
<b>FTE</b>	27.0	27.0	27.0	27.0	27.0	22.0	24.5	27.0

## Education

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

If administration is not funded, the agency would not be able to maintain a Director, Chief Fiscal Officer or Director of Human Resources. Not funding these positions and other requisite expenditures, the agency would not maintain central oversight of all other agency programs.

	<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
General	<p>K.S.A. 72-1117 requires a course in Kansas history and government in all public schools.</p> <p>State curricular standards mandated by the State Board of Education require the teaching of State history.</p> <p>K.S.A. 58-4001 through 58-4013 govern the museum collections.</p> <p>K.S.A. 75-2728 allows the museum to maintain insurance for loss or damage to the collections.</p> <p>The building of the Kansas Museum of History and the operations at the Capitol Visitor Center were designated through the appropriations process.</p> <p>K.A.R. 118-1 procedures for deaccessioning of collections.</p>	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Ensure excellence in teaching by producing curriculum materials that explores the stories of Kansas, while educating students on research skills that are practical and applicable to everyday life.
- B. Provide information to the public at the Capitol Visitor Center and interpret Kansas government to K-12 students and the public through tours, programs, and exhibits, emphasizing civic engagement.
- C. Operate the Kansas Museum of History to tell the stories of Kansas by maintaining exhibits based on the state's artifact collections and developing specialized school tours aligned to state curriculum standards.

### Program History

The functions of the Education program have been part of the Kansas Historical Society since it was formed in 1875. The state history museum began originally in the Capitol and in 1914 moved to the Memorial Building. The current Kansas Museum of History opened its doors to the public in 1984. In 1988 when the state began requiring a course in Kansas history and government for all students there was an outcry from the schools asking for curriculum materials to satisfy this requirement. With the knowledge and support of the State Department of Education, the Kansas Historical Society agreed to take on this role. Kansas history, government, economics, and geography are included in state curricular standards.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Participation in curriculum activities	A	74,433	44,030	65,751	65,000	101,101	100,000	100,000	70,294
2. Number of K-12 school tour participants*	A, C	12,485	6,095	0	1,500	7,074	5,000	5,000	4,390
3. Capitol Tour Participants	B	55,427	28,312	1,220	10,000	28,071	40,000	50,000	19,201
4. Annual cost to serve visitors to the Kansas Museum of History and Capitol Visitor Center combined	B, C	\$9.00	\$16.00	\$13.00	\$15.00	\$15.86	\$17.50	\$15.00	\$14.95

\* Visitors limited due to the COVID-19 pandemic in FY 2020 and FY 2021

### *Output Measures*

5. Traveling Resource Trunks loaned to schools	A	173	133	21	110	112	115	115	89
6. E-newsletter distributed to Kansas educators	A	6,460	6,160	5,056	5,000	4,907	5,000	5,000	5,374

State Historical Society

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 730,254	\$701,004	\$ 675,093	\$ 665,214	\$570,643	\$780,967	\$830,846	\$ 648,913
Non-SGF State Funds	37,113	68,658	6,528	25,906	28,726	76,968	76,990	34,637
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 767,367</b>	<b>\$769,662</b>	<b>\$ 681,621</b>	<b>\$ 691,120</b>	<b>\$599,369</b>	<b>\$857,935</b>	<b>\$907,836</b>	<b>\$ 683,551</b>
<b>FTE</b>	18.0	18.0	18.0	18.0	18.0	13.0	13.0	18.0

## Reference Division

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Legislative constituents would not be able to ask an accurate and trusted source for information about legislation, legislative procedure, or who their legislators are and how to contact them. One-of-a-kind documents produced by state agencies would be inaccessible to Kansas taxpayers and decision makers and most likely lost for future use.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 46-1212 "One of the functions of the state library shall be to provide library services to the legislative branch of state government." KSA 75-2534 "The state library shall provide library and informational services to the judicial, legislative and executive branches of the state government...." KSA 75-2541 requires each book to be cataloged. KSA 75-2566 through 2568 requires the library to "establish, operate and maintain a publication collection and depository system" and is authorized to adopt regulations to implement and administer the act.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Provide library resources and research support to members of the Kansas Legislature and state agencies.
- B. Assisting Kansans in identifying legislation and understanding legislative procedure.
- C. Preserve and provide access to the publications of state government.

### Program History

The Reference Division is composed of a reference program that provides direct assistance to inquiries from and about all branches of Kansas government. The other program within the Reference division is state documents and cataloging. This program organizes information produced by Kansas government to assist current and future research needs regarding Kansas government. The Organic Act of 1855 specified a library "to be kept at the seat of government for the use of the governor, legislative assembly, judges of the supreme court, secretary, marshal, and attorney of said territory ..."  
Organic Act: An Act to Organize the Territory of Kansas (1855) Sec. 33. This requirement is still the goal of the Reference Division at the State Library but utilizing modern resources. L. 1862 ch. 187, Sec. 35 through 41 provided for the management of the State Library, requiring a catalog and books to be loaned and returned. L. 1883, ch. 26 appropriated funds "for page and messenger in the state library during legislative session." L.1909, ch. 16, Sec. 19 required the State Library to "establish and maintain a legislative reference department of such [state] library". From about 1909 until 1929 legislative reference work and bill drafting were performed by a member of the State Library staff known as the "Legislative Reference Clerk." The Legislative Reference Department was moved to the Revisor of Statutes when that office was created in 1929. Library staff still performed research and worked "in close cooperation with the Revisor of Statutes in accumulating and filing for quick reference material on legislation." Book of the States, 1935, Chapter III. L. 1963, ch. 422 created the State Library as it is now. That law provided for "library and informational services to the judicial, legislative and executive branches..." L. 1971, ch. 184, Sec. 12 provided "one of the functions of the state library shall be to provide legislative reference services." Sec. 34 required the state librarian to employ personnel "to perform legislative reference services and functions." January 14, 1974, the Legislative Hotline began at the State Library, taking messages for legislators, giving hearing dates and times, and status of bills. This service was added at the request of the legislature. L. 1976, ch. 358 established a publication collection and depository system that would avoid costly duplication of library materials and facilitate easy retrieval of state documents. This was the result of an interim study to the 1971 legislature (Prop. No. 39). In 2008 library staff began using instant messaging to answer legislative reference questions.

State Library

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of materials loaned	A	3,462	2,476	1,592	2,000	2,050	2,250	2,500	2,039
2. Number of information requests responded to	B	4,209	3,490	3,114	4,000	2,608	3,000	3,500	3,071
3. Number of requests from known state employees	A	417	482	280	300	386	400	450	383
4. Number of contacts supplied for legislators	B	794	689	661	700	398	500	600	583
5. Number of searches using databases available only to agencies and legislative staff	A	91,257	110,109	118,998	125,000				119,001
						127,897	130,000	135,000	
6. Number of views to the KS Government Information Library blog	C	4,812	5,480	8,434	7,000				5,335
						2,090	2,250	2,500	
7. Number of page views annually to KGI Library	C	42,630	70,841	100,131	125,000	89,965	90,000	93,000	86,979
8. Average cost per search using databases available only to agencies and legislative staff.	A	\$ 0.60	\$ 0.58	\$ 0.53	\$ 0.53	\$ 0.51	\$ 0.52	\$ 0.51	\$ 0.54
9. Cost of content management system per page viewed in KGI	C	\$ 0.17	\$ 0.11	\$ 0.08	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.09	\$ 0.10	\$ 0.11	\$ 0.09
<i>Output Measures</i>									
10. Total cost for online databases for legislative and state agency use	A	\$ 56,466	\$ 58,139	\$ 64,300	\$ 66,229	\$ 65,734	\$ 67,536	\$ 69,386	\$ 62,724
11. Average annual cost for online databases available only to state agencies	A	\$ 7,056	\$ 7,267	\$ 8,037	\$ 8,278	\$ 9,390	\$ 9,648	\$ 9,912	\$ 8,231
12. Number of items added to KGI	C	3,218	6,934	4,453	5,000	4,134	4,500	5,000	5,174
13. Number of blogs submitted promoting KGI	C	42	44	50	45	34	40	45	43

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 3,743,255	\$ 3,334,468	\$ 3,743,255	\$ 3,985,306	\$ 3,867,437	\$ 4,024,123	\$ 4,036,215	\$ 3,648,387
Non-SGF State Funds	--	--	--	--	\$ 450	\$ 12,435	\$ 1,499	\$ 450
Federal Funds	2,005,936	2,245,211	2,005,936	4,530,576	3,976,826	1,921,848	1,934,170	2,742,658
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 5,749,191</b>	<b>\$ 5,579,679</b>	<b>\$ 5,749,191</b>	<b>\$ 8,515,882</b>	<b>\$ 7,844,713</b>	<b>\$ 5,958,406</b>	<b>\$ 5,971,884</b>	<b>\$ 6,391,494</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>30.0</b>	<b>28.0</b>	<b>23.5</b>	<b>29.5</b>	<b>26.0</b>	<b>29.5</b>	<b>29.5</b>	<b>25.8</b>

## Statewide Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

1. More than 400,000 books in digital format become unavailable or inaccessible. Library circulation statewide decreases by nearly over 715,000 transactions.

2. Teachers, students, instructors, parents, researchers, business and industry, along with the general public will lose access to resources searched over 135 million times in FY 2022. Most local libraries will be unable to provide a fraction of the lost information due to the much lower price of statewide purchase (cost avoidance estimate \$83,515,399.00).

3. Kansans are severely limited in access to library materials other than those held locally. 733,000 requests to borrow titles from cooperating libraries would go unfilled. Timely delivery of materials will suffer should the library courier service not be maintained at current levels.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific Act of March 4, 1899, ch. 163, 1899 Kan. Sess. Laws 327 (creating Kansas traveling libraries commission). Empowered the State Library to proactively support the reading and informational needs of the public statewide. K.S.A. 75-2575 through 75-2586, directs the State Library to encourage interlibrary cooperation.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Make reading materials available to all Kansans.  
B. Provide reliable and relevant e-content.

### Program History

This program carries out the statutory and mission-based obligation to enhance and expand the quality of library service across the state, for all potential library users, and through both direct-to-user services and materials/services shared with local libraries.

It is considered to be authorized by the Act of March 4, 1899, and expanded to include partnership with libraries of all types by K.S.A. 75-2575 through 75-2686, both cited above.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Digital book collections - total circulation	A	654,395	712,620	755,809	864,000	714,158	735,583	757,650	727,529
2. Cost per search, statewide research databases	B	\$ 0.006	\$ 0.010	\$ 0.010	\$ 0.008	\$ 0.010	\$ 0.009	\$ 0.009	0.010
3. Total interlibrary items loaned by Kansas libraries annually	A	870,772	772,663	577,293	801,000	716,335	774,000	820,000	688,764
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Total searches, statewide research databases	B	136,087,581	134,726,678	134,389,300	149,650,000	136,333,752	151,330,000	167,980,000	135,149,910
5. Total sessions, learning modules	B	81,567	113,459	118,249	150,000	91,530	105,000	121,000	107,746
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
6. Digital book collections - patron accounts	A	73,701	76,507	22,392	22,980	50,349	53,400	56,850	49,749

State Library

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 3,743,255	\$ 3,334,468	\$ 3,743,255	\$ 3,985,306	\$ 3,867,437	\$ 4,024,123	\$ 4,036,215	\$ 3,648,387
Non-SGF State Funds	--	--	--	--	\$ 450	\$ 12,435	\$ 1,499	\$ 450
Federal Funds	2,005,936	2,245,211	2,005,936	\$ 4,530,576	\$ 3,976,826	\$ 1,921,848	\$ 1,934,170	\$ 2,742,658
<b>Total</b>	\$ 5,749,191	\$ 5,579,679	\$ 5,749,191	\$ 8,515,882	\$ 7,844,713	\$ 5,958,406	\$ 5,971,884	\$ 6,391,494
<b>FTE</b>	30.0	28.0	23.5	29.5	26.0	29.5	29.5	25.8

## Talking Books

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Kansans with print disabilities (blindness, visual impairment, physical impairment, reading disabilities) will lose access to an accessible library of over 120,000 audio and braille materials that support lifelong learning, cultural engagement, and entertainment.

	<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific	75-2534 9(c) For the benefit of blind readers of Kansas, the state library may make available books and other reading matter in Braille, talking books or any other medium of reading used by the blind. To this end, the state library is authorized to provide library services for the blind and other handicapped persons through contract, agreement or otherwise with the library of congress or any regional library thereof.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Provide reading materials in an accessible format to eligible Kansas residents.
- B. Provides personalized library support to eligible Kansas residents.
- C. Produce specialized reading material by Kansas authors or about Kansas for users of the Talking Books Program.

### Program History

Kansas Talking Books (KTB) provides personalized library support and materials in an accessible format to eligible Kansas residents to ensure that all may read. This library service features audio books, audio magazines, braille books, braille magazines, and playback equipment mailed directly to patrons and returned postage free. The division staff also provide personalized reference and reader advisory support. Patrons have access to the NLS Braille and Audio Reading Download (BARD) service through the web or via mobile app at no-cost. Starting in 1940, the State Department of Social Welfare Division of Services for the Blind contracted braille and talking book services for eligible Kansans through the Wolfner Library in Missouri. The Funding for Talking Books as a division of the State Library of Kansas was approved in the Governor's Budget for FY 1970. KTB was established as a regional network library of the Library of Congress's National Library Service for the Blind and Print Disabled in July 1970. Subregional libraries were established in Manhattan, Hays, Hutchinson, Dodge City, Kansas City, & Wichita, providing direct service to Talking Book patrons in their service areas with administrative and material support provided by the regional library in Topeka. Over the years, subregionals were also located in Great Bend, Topeka, & Norton. The regional library moved from Topeka to Emporia in July 1983. In 2009, Kansas Talking Books began circulating materials on digital talking book cartridges with digital talking book machines to replace the cassette collection. By 2012, all subregional libraries were closed and statewide circulation operations were consolidated to the regional library in Emporia. Contracts for outreach services with NWKLS, SWKLS, CKLS, and SEKLS were establish and remain in place. In 2020, KTB began shifting to a Download on Demand circulation model, providing access to every title in the NLS collection to patrons on demand.

State Library

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of titles circulated by staff	A	160,734	145,443	138,723	150,000	248,922	190,000	192,000	177,696
2. Number of talking book machine and accessories circulated	A	1,551	1,376	1,239	1,300	1,320	1,300	1,300	1,312
3. Patron downloads	A	47,317	55,891	55,319	60,000	65,381	66,000	69,000	58,864
4. Cost Per Item Circulated	A	\$ 1.56	\$ 2.08	\$ 2.20	\$ 2.05	\$1.71	\$2.24	\$2.19	\$ 2.00
5. Total Active Talking Book Users Served	A	4,714	5,015	4,870	4,970	4,857	4,900	4,950	4,914
6. Number of BARD users	A	627	643	635	675	645	670	700	641
7. Phone/email contacts (Emporia, Norton, Great Bend, Dodge City, Iola)	B	17,755	27,351	25,290	29,000	22,413	24,000	26,000	25,018
<i>Output Measures</i>									
8. Locally Produced Kansas Titles in the collection	C	868	903	910	925	927	950	975	913
9. Digital books produced	C	76	35	15	15	23	23	25	24
10. DTB titles available	A	93,547	101,605	108,260	112,000	116,940	124,000	132,000	108,935
11. Presentations/Contacts (Emporia, Norton, Great Bend, Dodge City, Iola)	B	242	2,419	478	1,500	967	1,200	1,700	1,288
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
12. Children served during FY	A	42	38	26	30	24	29	34	29
13. Schools served during FY	A	164	162	161	165	164	167	170	162
14. Children's material circulated	A	5,405	5,959	5,668	6,000	12,640	8,000	9,000	8,089
15. Children's material available	A	16,585	17,372	18,229	19,000	19,312	20,500	22,000	18,304

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 3,743,255	\$ 3,334,468	\$ 3,743,255	\$ 3,985,306	\$ 3,867,437	\$ 4,024,123	\$ 4,036,215	\$ 3,648,387
Non-SGF State Funds	--	--	--	--	\$ 450	\$ 12,435	\$ 1,499	\$ 450
Federal Funds	2,005,936	2,245,211	2,005,936	\$ 4,530,576	\$ 3,976,826	\$ 1,921,848	\$ 1,934,170	\$ 2,742,658
<b>Total</b>	\$ 5,749,191	\$ 5,579,679	\$ 5,749,191	\$ 8,515,882	\$ 7,844,713	\$ 5,958,406	\$ 5,971,884	\$ 6,391,494
<b>FTE</b>	30.0	28.0	23.5	29.5	26.0	29.5	29.5	25.8

**Administration****Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

Consequences of not funding this program would be that there would be no regulation of or licensing of abstracters in Kansas, nor examinations for abstracters in Kansas.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific KSA 58-2801 <i>et seq.</i>	Mandatory	No	1
Specific KSA 74-3901 <i>et seq.</i>	Mandatory	No	1

**Program Goals**

- A. To continue to keep the active businesses licensed.  
 B. To promote getting new individuals licensed as Abstracters in Kansas.  
 C. To improve awareness of the value of an Abstract.

**Program History**

The Abstracters' Board of Examiners was created by the 1941 Legislature (KSA 74-3901 *et seq.*) to administer the Kansas Abstracters' Act (KSA 58-2801 *et seq.*). The Act provides for regulation of individuals and firms that compile and sell abstracts of Kansas real estate.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of Employee Licenses Issued	<b>B</b>	208	192	196	196	181	185	185	190
2. Number of Business Licenses Issued	<b>A</b>	178	178	172	170	172	172	172	174
3. Cost per License	<b>A, B</b>	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 75
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Employee License Revenue	<b>B</b>	\$ 15,600	\$ 14,400	\$ 14,700	\$ 14,700	\$ 13,575	\$ 13,875	\$ 13,875	\$ 14,225

Abstracters's Board of Examiners

5. Business License Revenue	<b>A</b>	\$ 13,350	\$ 13,350	\$ 12,900	\$ 12,750	\$ 12,900	\$ 12,900	\$ 12,900	\$ 13,050
-----------------------------	----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	25,702	25,704	25,703	25,716	25,716	25,717	25,711	25,708
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 25,702</b>	<b>\$ 25,704</b>	<b>\$ 25,703</b>	<b>\$ 25,716</b>	<b>\$ 25,716</b>	<b>\$ 25,717</b>	<b>\$ 25,711</b>	<b>\$ 25,708</b>
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Investigation and Discipline

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Citizens receiving services from practitioners who violate the statutes and regulations would not have a way to report misconduct. Practitioners who violate rules would be able to continue to practice.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific      KSA 74-7508	Mandatory	No	2

### Program Goals

A. All complaints/Report of Alleged Violations (RAVs) from licensees and members of the public will be reviewed in a timely manner, a determination will be made whether the agency has jurisdiction to investigate the RAVs, and the agency will begin investigations in a timely manner.

B. Investigative staff will attempt to maintain a short length of time from receipt of RAV to completion of investigation, when it is appropriate to end the investigation.

C. Spend agency funding responsibly in the Investigation and Discipline program to effectively investigate RAVs, while avoiding unnecessary expenditures.

### Program History

The BSRB was created by Kansas Legislature in 1980 by combining the previous Board of Psychology Examiners and the Board of Social Work Examiners. At the time of creation, one of the charges to the agency was to investigate complaints against practitioners.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percent of investigations commencing within 10 days of receipt of complaint	A	80%	78%	89%	90%	90%	90%	90%	86%
2. Percent of investigations commencing within 30 days of receipt of complaint	A	95%	90%	98%	98%	100%	98%	98%	96%
3. Percent of investigative reports finalized and submitted to Complaint Review Committee within 90 days of receipt of complaint/RAV	B	35%	30%	23%	38%	40%	35%	35%	31%

Behavioral Sciences Regulatory Board

4. Percent of investigative reports finalized and submitted to Complaint Review Committee within 180 days of receipt of complaint/RAV	B	94%	86%	72%	95%	92%	90%	90%	83%
5. Program cost of RAV reviewed using RAV per dollar spent by program	C	Data Not Available	\$331	\$645	\$790	\$564	\$731	\$726	\$513

*Output Measures*

6. Number of Report of Alleged Violations reviewed and evaluated by investigators	A	201	199	132	178	205	210	215	179
---	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	65,832	85,094	136,920	115,562	153,606	156,080	88,829
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ 65,832	\$ 85,094	\$ 136,920	\$ 115,562	\$ 153,606	\$ 156,080	\$ 88,829
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Not funding this program would result in the inability for persons to become certified public accountants in Kansas; further resulting in no oversight with compliance of the laws and regulations; and the public's inability to rely on financial reports issued solely by CPAs.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific <b>Licensing:</b> K.S.A.1-201; 1-202; 1-204; 1-205; K.S.A. 1-302; 1-302a; 1-307; 1-308; 1-310; 1-315; 1-316; K.S.A. 1-501	Mandatory	N/A	1
Specific <b>Enforcement:</b> K.S.A. 1-205; 1-206; K.S.A. 1-311; 1-312; 1-316; 1-318; 1-319; K.S.A. 1-401	Mandatory	N/A	1

### Program Goals

- A.** To approve applications for certificates by exam and reciprocity to those who meet minimum qualifying requirements.
- B.** To approve applications for permits to practice who meet an experience requirement and to reinstate permits to those who meet certain CE requirements.
- C.** To register in-state and out-of-state CPA firms practicing in the state of Kansas.
- D.** Enforcement: Regulate CPAs and the services provided relating to the practice of certified public accountancy.

### Program History

The Board was initially created in 1915 with a "Board of Examiners" as a part of the Business Administration Department of the University of Kansas. Only three CPA certificates were issued that year. In its present form, the "Board of Accountancy" was created in 1952. In 1970, the Board became autonomous from the University and its offices moved to Topeka. A full-time Executive was hired to replace the part-time faculty CPA who had served as the official "Board Secretary" and the school of business clerical personnel who performed the duties of the Board. The new Executive was also designated as the official Board Secretary, as well as being the Executive Agency Head. In 1973, a Baccalaureate degree was a "concentration in accounting" defined by the Board, became the minimum requirement to take the national CPA exam to become a CPA. The Board was authorized to require continuing professional education as a requirement to renew or reinstate a permit to practice. In 2009, legislation was passed to allow out of state CPAs, without a physical presence in this State, to practice under mobility, without the need to obtain a certificate and permit.

Kansas Board of Accountancy

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Total number of Certificates	<b>A</b>	12,817	12,934	13,059	13,172	13,205	13,331	13,451	13,066
2. Total number of Permit Holders	<b>B</b>	3,824	3,813	3,841	3,747	3,812	3,741	3,611	3,822
3. Total number of CPA Firms	<b>C</b>	819	845	828	855	836	842	843	836
4. Total number of Complaints Filed	<b>D</b>	111	97	95	92	95	95	95	96

*Output Measures*

5. Total number of New Certification Holders	<b>A</b>	141	116	141	120	146	126	120	134
6. Total number of New Permits	<b>B</b>	143	125	126	120	150	126	120	134
7. Total number of New CPA Firms	<b>C</b>	59	56	47	56	49	47	45	51
8. Total number of Hearings Held	<b>D</b>	59	66	64	62	48	65	65	59

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	465,884	511,763	504,155	440,976	433,311	396,612	395,595	483,076
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 465,884</b>	<b>\$ 511,763</b>	<b>\$ 504,155</b>	<b>\$ 440,976</b>	<b>\$ 433,311</b>	<b>\$ 396,612</b>	<b>\$ 395,595</b>	<b>\$ 483,076</b>
<b>FTE</b>	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0

## Kansas Board of Barbering

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Kansas Board of Barbering is a Fee Funded Agency. We do not use tax dollars or State funds, but we do pay 10% of all revenue to the State General Fund. Consequences of not funding this program would be there wouldn't be any oversight or licensing of barbers in Kansas.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific 65-1801 et seq. and 74-1801 et seq.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Protect the public health and safety by ensuring that all barbers, shop owners, barber colleges and barber students meet the sanitation standards established by the Kansas Department of Health and Environment.
- B. Continue the number of licenses renewed on-time above 80% per year.
- C. Continue computer-based-testing (CBT) with contracted provider to facilitate personalized scheduling for candidates' written examination. The Kansas Board of Barbering conducts practical examinations for candidates after the candidates' successful completion of CBT examination.

### Program History

**AGENCY MISSION** - The mission of the Kansas Board of Barbering is to protect the health and welfare of the consuming public through the enforcement of existing barber statutes and sanitary regulations established for the barbering profession; to ensure that only qualified and well trained barbers and barber instructors are licensed; to ensure that all shops and barber colleges are properly licensed for operation; and to provide information to barbers concerning all technical, medical, and scientific data which may enhance the protection of the public. In addition, the mission of this agency includes updating electronic files with academic test scores and updating the Kansas Board of Barbering Website and improving the online payment portal. This includes an electronic tablet for in-office website access to make online payments.

**AGENCY PHILOSOPHY** - The Kansas Board of Barbering has and will continue to act in accordance with the highest standards of ethics, accountability, efficiency, and openness. Members of the Board and staff continue to affirm their interests in the barbering profession. They approach their activities with a sense of purpose and responsibility. The general public and the regulated community, i.e., barbers, barber instructors, barber shops, and barber colleges and their students, may be assured of a fair, balanced, and sensible approach to regulation.

**AGENCY HISTORY** - The Kansas Board of Barbering as it is known today, was created by the Legislature on February 27, 1913. The original board consisted of three members appointed by the governor, which has since been increased to five members. The board gives bond and normally holds examinations at least four times per year. In 1939, Kansas Statute Annotated (K. S. A.) 74-1805 set forth the Board's authority to adopt sanitary rules and regulations as deemed necessary in order to prevent the spreading of infectious or contagious diseases.

Kansas Board of Barbering

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percent of Licenses Renewed On Time	B	82%	78%	84%	84%	79%	82%	84%	81%
2. Percentage of Candidates Successfully Completing CBT	C	N/A	N/A	29%	85%	45%	50%	52%	53%

*Output Measures*

4. Total Number of Licenses Renewed/Restored	B	1,800	1,713	2,132	2,150	1,921	2,050	2,100	1,979
5. Number of Candidates Successfully Completing CBT	C	N/A	N/A	25	39	67	80	90	43.67

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	154,366	163,018	172,739	198,073	190,818	193,596	196,836	\$ 181,162
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ 154,366	\$ 163,018	\$ 172,739	\$ 198,073	\$ 190,818	\$ 193,596	\$ 196,836	\$ 181,162
<b>FTE</b>	2.3	2.2	2.4	3.1	2.3	1.9	1.9	2.5

## Board of Cosmetology

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Prevention of the board to protect the health and safety of the consuming public by licensing qualified individuals and enforcing standards of practice.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>		<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
General	Cosmetology, Tanning and Body Art Act	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Safeguard the general public's health and safety through administration of policies and regulations.
- B. Regulate the cosmetology, tanning facility, and body art industries appropriately as required by law.
- C. Provide support to the regulated industries with informational tools necessary to meet the health and sanitation requirements determined by statute, rules, and regulations.

### Program History

The Board of Cosmetology was established by the 1927 Legislature to regulate the cosmetology industry. KBOC operates under the authority of K.S.A. 65-1901 et seq. and K.S.A. 74-2701 et seq. KSA 74-2701 established the creation, composition, and duties of the Board. KSA 74-2704 established the Cosmetology Fee Fund. The 1992 Legislature passed legislation (KSA 65-1920) to authorize the Board of Cosmetology to license and inspect tanning facilities. The 1996 Legislature passed HB 2916 (KSA 65-1940, et seq.), requiring the Board to develop and implement regulations for the tattooing and body piercing professionals in the State of Kansas.

# Board of Cosmetology

## Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percentage of facilities inspected for compliance with health, sanitation and infection control regulations (FY19 and FY20 reflect routine inspections + Compliance Inspections Vs. total # of facilities. Per House Budget Committee Chair request, data has been updated to reflect completed annual routine inspections starting FY21, which is the 2020 calendar year.) *UPDATE - FY2020 actuals were recalculated for total routine inspections completed vs. total # of inspections assigned.	B	78%	73%	70%	100%	69%	69%	100%	78%
2. Percentage of disciplinary actions implemented to enforce health, sanitation and infection control regulations (H&S Discipline vs. all discipline by fiscal year)	B	56%	48%	62%	50%	56%	50%	50%	54%
3. Percentage of practitioners maintaining current license (total renewable licenses vs. renewals)	A	89%	92%	94%	95%	91%	95%	95%	93%

### *Output Measures*

4. # of annual routine inspections assigned	B	4,718	4,852	4,978	5,000	4,893	5,000	5,000	4,931
5. # of disciplinary actions issued	B	348	268	423	350	288	300	300	332
6. # of renewable licenses	A	17,543	17,299	17,159	17,350	17,395	17,500	17,500	17,301
7. # of statutes and regulations	A	144	142	142	142	142	142	142	142
8. Percentage of statutes and regulations reviewed to ensure industry standards are reflected in Kansas.	A	43%	47%	48%	50%	33%	50%	50%	45%

Board of Cosmetology

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source (In Millions)</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.2	\$ 1.1
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1.0	\$ 1.1	\$ 1.1	\$ 1.2	\$ 1.1	\$ 1.2	\$ -	\$ 1.1
<b>FTE</b>	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0	15.0	14.0

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Optometrists are the primary eye care providers for the citizens of Kansas. In addition to providing for the eye health of Kansans, optometric examinations detect underlying health conditions that may not be previously diagnosed, particularly heart disease, hypertension, and diabetes. Especially in more rural settings, optometrists are commonly the only option for eye care. Without licensing and enforcement of the statutes, rules and regulations of the Kansas Optometry Act, the citizens of Kansas would suffer from a lack of quality care necessary to protect both vision and systemic health.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General    KSA 65-1501-65-1526	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To license qualified optometrists
- B. To investigate reports of infractions of the law and administer appropriate resolutions

### Program History

The Board of Optometry was created in 1909. Three members constituted the Board. In 1909, approximately 70 licenses were held. The Board now has 5 Board members, 4 of which are licensed optometrists and one public member. 1977, qualified optometrists were allowed to utilize pharmaceutical agents for diagnosis. In 1987, qualified optometrists were permitted to treat certain eye diseases with topical (i.e., drops or ointments) pharmaceutical agents and remove embedded foreign bodies that do not penetrate into the eyeball. In 1996, qualified optometrists were permitted to treat Adult Open Angle Glaucoma. Other changes which this law effected include a requirement for minimum of \$1,000,000 in professional liability insurance coverage. In 1999, therapeutic licensees were allowed to prescribe oral drugs for ocular conditions, some in consultation with an ophthalmologist. In 2005, licensees were required to obtain a therapeutic license by 2008 and a glaucoma license by 2010. In 2012, one level of licensure, require FBI background checks, require new graduates of optometry to have 24 hours of CE their first year, and established a litigation fund.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Passing Exam (%)	A	94%	91%	95%	90%	94%	90%	90%	93%
2. License Renewals	A	378	330	382	352	\$331	\$390	\$340	347.7
3. Average Time to complaint	B	4	20	139	10	37	90	90	65.3
4. Total License fees received		\$ 170,100	\$ 148,500	\$ 171,900	\$ 158,400	\$ 148,950	\$ 175,500	\$187,000	\$ 156,450

Board of Examiners in Optometry

<i>Output Measures</i>									
5. Cost of biennial license	A	\$ 450	\$ 450	\$ 450	\$ 450	450	450	550	450.0
6. Cost of salaries and OE Tracker	A	\$ 92.65	\$ 95.37	\$ 95.29	\$ 95.48	117.2	119.26	121.8	102.6

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	149,234	130,705	136,539	168,999	138,898	166,860	176,940	135,381
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 149,234</b>	<b>\$ 130,705</b>	<b>\$ 136,539</b>	<b>\$ 168,999</b>	<b>\$ 138,898</b>	<b>\$ 166,860</b>	<b>\$ 176,940</b>	<b>\$ 135,381</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Failure to fund this program will render it impossible for the State of Kansas, through the Board of Indigents' Defense Services, to comply with its Sixth Amendment obligation to provide criminal defense services to all indigent Kansans who qualify for appointed felony counsel. The administrative office helps the Board accomplish this mission by providing support services for 17 public defender offices across the state, and administering the assigned counsel program with over 350 individual private counsel across all 31 judicial districts. Specifically, the administrative program accomplishes this by handling accounts payable and receivable, purchasing, contract negotiations, information technology services, data collection and review, human resources services, training, budgeting, and through advocacy and responses to Legislative and public inquiries.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General 6th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution; Sec. 5 & 10 KS Const Bill of Rts; K.S.A. 22-4519 through K.S.A. 22-4523	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Maintain statewide costs per case while maintaining quality service to clients.
- B. To monitor caseload and performance of public defenders in all divisions.
- C. To minimize increase in cost of expert services.

### Program History

The State Board of Indigents' Defense Services was created by the 1982 Legislature (1982 Session Laws, Ch. 142) for the purpose of providing indigent felony defense services as required by the Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

The present Board succeeds the Board of Supervisors of Panels to Aid Indigent Defendants (1969 Legislature - K.S.A. 22-4501 et seq.) which was abolished on the effective date of the 1982 legislation. The Board of Indigents' Defense Services' (BIDS) statutory purpose is to "Provide, supervise and coordinate, in the most efficient and economical manner possible, the constitutionally and statutorily required counsel and related services for each indigent person accused of a felony and for such other indigent persons as prescribed by statute."

This statutory mission is firmly rooted in the combination of the constitutional requirements of the Sixth Amendment of the United States Constitution, as held in *Gideon v. Wainwright*, 372 U.S. 335 (1963); Sections 5 and 10 of the Kansas Constitution Bill of Rights; and K.S.A. 22-4503(a). The Board traditionally fulfills this core mission of providing the Sixth Amendment right to counsel to indigent Kansans accused of felonies through two different types of delivery systems: public defenders and assigned private counsel. The Administrative office program has been in effect since the beginning of the Board and its predecessor in order to administer all of the Board's programs and to provide support to its direct employees and its system of private appointed counsel.

Board of Indigents' Defense Services

Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Maintain level of dollars saved by audit proceedings.	A	\$235,654	\$234,185	\$291,488	\$291,488	\$404,353	\$505,441	\$631,802	\$310,009
2. Maintain increase in average cost per case for private attorney services to 5% or less.	A	\$941	\$993	\$898	\$898	\$1,062	\$1,115	\$1,171	984.3
3. Prevent ineffective assistance of counsel due to case overload.	B	All Offices	All Offices	All Offices	All Offices	All Offices	All Offices	All Offices	
4. Maintain standard of excellence in public defender legal services with a zero tolerance for ethics violations on case work.	B	No Violations	No Violations	No Violations	No Violations	No Violations	No Violations	No Violations	
5. Number of experts agreeing to work at reduced rates.	C	64	64	65	65	67	68	70	65.3

Output Measures

6. Number of Judicial Districts reviewed for cost effective delivery of defense services.	A	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31
7. Number of counties covered by assigned counsel contracts/agreements.	A	39	19	19	19	17	18	20	18
8. Number of agency CLE programs offered to appointed panel attorneys.	A	2	2	2	2	10	12	15	5
9. Number of agency CLE programs offered to public defenders.	B	2	2	3	2	24	25	30	10
10. Number of contacts with Chief Defenders regarding caseloads.	B	20	35	33	33	48	50	45	39
11. Number of cotacts with Court regarding assignment of public defenders to other jurisdictions.	A	7	20	18	18	10	12	14	16
12. Estimated Number of contacts/communications with assigned counsel/court regarding expert services approval and clarifications.	C	1,000	1,010	1,300	1,300	1500	1700	2000	1,270

Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 800,949	\$ 926,154	\$ 1,064,106	\$ 1,798,746	\$ 1,338,921	\$ 5,115,008	\$ 17,369,799	\$ 1,109,727
Non-SGF State Funds	1,639	1,435	625	2,000	2,140	9,852	6,000	1,400
Federal Funds	-	243,771	131,144	-	-	-	-	124,972
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 802,588</b>	<b>\$ 1,171,360</b>	<b>\$ 1,195,875</b>	<b>\$ 1,800,746</b>	<b>\$ 1,341,061</b>	<b>\$ 5,124,860</b>	<b>\$ 17,375,799</b>	<b>\$ 1,236,099</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>18.8</b>	<b>18.8</b>	<b>19.2</b>	<b>150.2</b>	<b>13.9</b>

## Trial Public Defender Program

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Failure to fund this program will render it impossible for the State of Kansas, through the Board of Indigents' Defense Services, to comply with its Sixth Amendment obligation to provide criminal defense services to all indigent Kansans who qualify for appointed felony counsel. The trial level public defender program helps the Board accomplish this mission by providing quality efficient trial level defense services to indigent Kansans charged with felonies in areas where the number of felony cases are numerous enough to justify maintaining a public defender office or in areas where there are an insufficient number of private attorneys to handle the number of criminal cases in their jurisdiction.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	6th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution; Sec. 5 & 10 KS Const Bill of Rts; K.S.A. 22-4522b	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Maintain statewide costs per case while maintaining quality service to clients.
- B. To monitor caseloads and performance of our public defenders for quality services.

### Program History

The first two public defender offices (3rd Judicial District - Topeka, and 8th Judicial District - Junction City) were authorized and organized in FY 1972, and the third (28th Judicial District - Salina) was set up in FY 1973. The 18th Judicial District Public Defender Office (Wichita) was created in FY 1985, although it began its phase-in during the latter part of FY 1984. On July 3, 1989, the 10th Judicial District Public Defender Office (Johnson County) began accepting indigent felony appointments. The 25th Judicial District Office (Garden City) began accepting cases in January 1994. The 27th Judicial District Public Defender Office (Hutchinson) opened in June of 1996. The Johnson County Office opened a satellite office in Miami County in June of 1996. In August of 1996, the Garden City Office began accepting cases at a satellite office in Liberal, Kansas. The Northeast Kansas Conflict Office began accepting cases in July of 1997 and the Southeast Kansas Public Defender Office (Chanute) began accepting cases in August of 1997 and a satellite office was opened in 2005 in Independence. The satellite office in Miami County was closed that same year in favor of a contract to allow attorney FTE to devote full time to Johnson County. On July 1, 2008, the Sedgwick County Conflicts Office was opened in Wichita. Effective September 1, 2009, the Southwest Public Defender Office in Liberal was closed as a result of continuing staff turnover. In August 2021, the Board voted to request funding for FY 2023 to open a new public defender office in the 7th Judicial District, Douglas County.

Board of Indigents' Defense Services

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Prevent ineffective assistance of counsel due to case overload.	B	All Offices	All Offices	All Offices	All Offices	All Offices	All Offices	All Offices	
2. Maintain increase in average cost per case for public defender services to 5% or less.	A	\$659	\$818	\$1,032	\$1,032	\$1,120	\$1,120	\$1,120	990
3. Maintain standard of excellence in legal services with a zero tolerance	B	No Violations	No Violations	No Violations	No Violations	No Violations	No Violations	No Violations	

*Output Measures*

4. Number of in-house attorney training CLEs for public defenders.	A	2	2	3	2	24	25	30	10
5. Number of Judicial Districts reviewed for cost effective delivery of defense services.	A	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31
6. Number of contacts with Chief Defenders regarding caseloads.	B	20	35	33	33	48	50	45	39
7. Number of cotacts with Court regarding assignment of public defenders to other jurisdictions.	A	7	20	18	18	10	12	14	16

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 9,762,455	\$ 10,138,750	\$ 10,260,120	\$ 14,167,753	\$ 10,642,919	\$ 17,103,417	\$ 16,786,000	\$ 10,347,263
Non-SGF State Funds	185,670	243,924	260,322	109,749	224,226	102,391	100,000	242,824
Federal Funds	-	-	159	-	-	-	-	53
<b>Total</b>	\$ 9,948,125	\$ 10,382,674	\$ 10,520,601	\$ 14,277,502	\$ 10,867,145	\$ 17,205,808	\$ 16,886,000	\$ 10,590,140
<b>FTE</b>	140.5	139.5	139.5	174.5	174.5	165.0	165.0	151.2

## Appellate Defender Program

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Failure to fund this program will render it impossible for the State of Kansas, through the Board of Indigents' Defense Services, to comply with its Sixth Amendment obligation to provide criminal defense services to all indigent Kansans who qualify for appointed felony counsel. The appellate public defender program helps the Board accomplish this mission by providing quality efficient defense services at the Kansas Court of Appeals, Kansas Supreme Court, and the United States Supreme Court to indigent Kansans convicted of felonies who are appealing their convictions.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific 6th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution; Sec. 5 & 10 KS Const Bill of Rts; K.S.A. 22-4522b; K.S.A. 22-4505b	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To provide high quality and economically efficient constitutionally required defense services at the appellate level to our clients.
- B. To monitor caseloads of our public defenders to ensure compliance with professional ethical rules.

### Program History

In June 1985, the Board approved the development and implementation of the Appellate Defender Office as a statewide office to represent indigent felony defendants on appeal.

In FY1994, an appellate defense program was established in partnership with the University of Kansas, School of Law whereby law students prepare direct appeal briefs under the supervision of an appellate defender. In FY2005, a similar program was established in partnership with the Washburn University School of Law. The universities provide office space, equipment and student labor.

In FY2002, the Capital Appeals and Conflicts Office and the Capital Appeals Office were established through reassignment of appellate defenders to provide appellate defense on capital murder convictions where the death penalty was issued and on other capital and capital eligible cases. Capital defense is the priority of these offices. However, both offices handle conflict cases and overflow cases from the appellate defender office when their workloads allow.

The Appellate Defender Office is currently staffed with eighteen appellate defenders, including one chief, and two deputies, two legal assistants and three support staff. The caseload of this office fluctuates depending on whether the Kansas Supreme Court decides a case that sets new precedent for current cases and future case filings.

Board of Indigents' Defense Services

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Prevent ineffective assistance of counsel due to case overload.	A	All Offices	All Offices	All Offices	All Offices	All Offices	All Offices	All Offices	
2. Monitor average case units per attorney to avoid caseload overload.	B	39	41	29	29	25	25	25	31.7
3. Maintain standard of excellence in legal services with a zero tolerance	B	No Violations	No Violations	No Violations	No Violations	No Violations	No Violations	No Violations	

*Output Measures*

4. Number of in-house attorney training CLEs for public defenders.	A	2	2	3	2	24	25	30	10
5. Number of Appeals Docketed	B	954	750	704	704	731	760	850	728
6. Number of Appeals Completed	B	1,120	981	981	981	843	900	950	935

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 2,215,769	\$ 2,287,109	\$ 2,113,380	\$ 2,116,521	\$ 2,113,925	\$ 2,782,446	\$ 2,834,507	\$ 2,171,471
Non-SGF State Funds	284,934	241,588	215,981	250,000	170,505	250,000	250,000	209,358
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 2,500,703	\$ 2,528,697	\$ 2,329,361	\$ 2,366,521	\$ 2,284,430	\$ 3,032,446	\$ 3,084,507	\$ 2,380,829
<b>FTE</b>	23.0	23.0	23.0	24.0	24.0	25.0	25.0	23.3

## Capital Defender Program

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Failure to fund this program will render it impossible for the State of Kansas, through the Board of Indigents' Defense Services, to comply with its Sixth Amendment obligation to provide criminal defense services to all indigent Kansans who qualify for appointed felony counsel. The capital defender program helps the Board accomplish this mission by providing quality efficient capital defense services at the trial, appellate, and habeas level to indigent Kansans charged with capital crimes.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific 6th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution; Sec. 5 & 10 KS Const Bill of Rts; K.S.A. 22-4522b; K.S.A. 22-4506d	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To provide high quality and economically efficient constitutionally required defense services to our capital clients.
- B. To monitor caseloads of our public defenders to ensure compliance with professional ethical rules.

### Program History

The Board of Indigents' Defense Services established the Capital Defense Coordinator Office in FY1995 in response to the enactment of the death penalty. The Board transferred its most experienced attorney to the office and authorized a temporary Office Assistant I to assist. In FY1996 the office expanded and its name was changed to the Death Penalty Defense Unit to more accurately reflect its mission to defend potential death penalty cases statewide. The purpose of the office is to establish and administer procedures and to provide services that result in the highest quality defense of person's accused of murder when the potential penalty is death. To accomplish this purpose, the Death Penalty Defense Unit will (1) represent all individuals, except those with which the office has a conflict of interest, charged with potentially capital cases wherever charged in the state; (2) establish and administer a system by which courts may appoint qualified attorneys; (3) plan and execute training programs for staff, public defenders, private counsel, investigators, mitigation specialists and ancillary staff including continuing legal education programs, manuals and newsletters; (4) establish and maintain a resource library and consultation service for attorneys assigned to capital or potentially capital cases; (5) collect and maintain statistical records regarding the use of capital punishment; and (6) establish through contract and/or negotiation a system for providing trial counsel with competent and cost-effective expert and investigative services needed to defend potential capital cases. In FY2020, this office employed five trial attorneys, one investigator, two mitigators, two legal assistants and one clerical staff. Additional attorneys from trial offices are called upon to handle conflict cases on occasion.

In FY2016 the Kansas death penalty was upheld by both the United States Supreme Court and the Kansas Supreme Court which necessitated the establishment of the capital habeas unit and the hiring of private attorneys with experience defending capital habeas cases.

Board of Indigents' Defense Services

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Prevent ineffective assistance of counsel due to case overload.	A	All Offices	All Offices	All Offices	All Offices	All Offices	All Offices	All Offices	
2. Maintain standard of excellence in legal services with a zero tolerance for ethics violations on case work.	B	No Violations	No Violations	No Violations	No Violations	No Violations	No Violations	No Violations	

*Output Measures*

3. Number of new cases filed with a potential sentence of death.	B	6	6	3	6	2	4	6	4
4. Number of cases tried or pled during the fiscal year.	B	12	2	1	5	4	2	3	2
5. Number of in-house attorney training CLEs available for capital public defenders.	A	3	3	3	3	24	25	30	10

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 2,954,446	\$ 2,902,584	\$ 2,917,894	\$ 3,255,160	\$ 3,512,716	\$ 4,053,237	\$ 7,562,693	\$ 3,111,065
Non-SGF State Funds	12,228	19,535	5,175	2,000	5,131	-	-	9,947
Federal Funds	-	-	201	-	-	-	-	101
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,966,674</b>	<b>\$ 2,922,119</b>	<b>\$ 2,923,270</b>	<b>\$ 3,257,160</b>	<b>\$ 3,517,847</b>	<b>\$ 4,053,237</b>	<b>\$ 7,562,693</b>	<b>\$ 3,121,079</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>26.0</b>	<b>27.0</b>	<b>27.0</b>	<b>27.0</b>	<b>27.0</b>	<b>34.0</b>	<b>64.0</b>	<b>27.0</b>

## Assigned Counsel

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Failure to fund this program will render it impossible for the State of Kansas, through the Board of Indigents' Defense Services, to comply with its Sixth Amendment obligation to provide criminal defense services to all indigent Kansans who qualify for appointed felony counsel. The assigned counsel program helps the Board accomplish this by providing constitutionally required defense services in geographic areas where public defender offices do not yet exist or where the establishment of public defender offices is not cost efficient.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific 6th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution; Sec. 5 & 10 KS Const Bill of Rts; K.S.A. 22-4501; K.S.A. 22-4503c.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Manage the average annual cost of assigned counsel expenditures while maintaining quality defense services.

### Program History

The State Board of Indigents' Defense Services was created by the 1982 Legislature (1982 Session Laws, Ch. 142) for the purpose of providing indigent felony defense services as required by the Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

The present Board succeeds the Board of Supervisors of Panels to Aid Indigent Defendants (1969 Legislature - K.S.A. 22-4501 et seq.) which was abolished on the effective date of the 1982 legislation. The Board of Indigents' Defense Services' (BIDS) statutory purpose is to "Provide, supervise and coordinate, in the most efficient and economical manner possible, the constitutionally and statutorily required counsel and related services for each indigent person accused of a felony and for such other indigent persons as prescribed by statute."

This statutory mission is firmly rooted in the combination of the constitutional requirements of the Sixth Amendment of the United States Constitution, as held in *Gideon v. Wainwright*, 372 U.S. 335 (1963); Sections 5 and 10 of the Kansas Constitution Bill of Rights; and K.S.A. 22-4503(a). The Board traditionally fulfills this core mission of providing the Sixth Amendment right to counsel to indigent Kansans accused of felonies through two different types of delivery systems: public defenders and assigned private counsel. The Assigned counsel program has been in effect since the beginning of the Board and its predecessor in order to provide for the constitutionally required assistance of counsel to all indigent Kansans charged with felonies.

## Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Maintain level of dollars saved by audit procedures on assigned counsel vouchers.	A	\$235,654.00	\$234,185.00	\$291,488.00	\$291,488.00	\$404,353.00	\$505,441.00	\$631,802.00	\$310,008.67
2. Maintain increase in average cost per case for private attorney services to 5% or less.	B	\$941	\$993	\$898	\$898	\$1,062	\$1,115	\$1,171	\$984

<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Number of Judicial Districts reviewed for cost effective delivery of defense services.	A	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31
4. Number of counties covered by assigned counsel contracts/agreements.	A	39	19	19	19	17	18	20	18
5. Number of agency CLE programs offered to appointed panel attorneys.	A	2	2	2	2	10	12	15	5

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 14,733,020	\$ 14,656,847	\$ 13,063,084	\$ 21,200,692	\$ 16,903,546	\$ 20,710,816	\$ 23,998,328	\$ 14,874,492
Non-SGF State Funds	371,147	402,174	391,935	250,000	586,374	250,000	250,000	460,161
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 15,104,167	\$ 15,059,021	\$ 13,455,019	\$ 21,450,692	\$ 17,489,920	\$ 20,960,816	\$ 24,248,328	\$ 15,334,653
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Legal Services for Prisoners (BIDS Passthrough)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Legal Services for Prisoners, Inc. is a non-profit corporation organized under the laws of the State of Kansas for the purpose of providing legal assistance to indigent incarcerated residents of Kansas correctional institutions. Failure to fund this program would prevent the State of Kansas from meeting its constitutional obligation to provide indigent incarcerated residents of KDOC with meaningful access to the courts to pursue non-frivolous legal claims.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific    K.S.A. 22-4514a	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To provide individuals incarcerated in the Kansas Department of Corrections with constitutionally required meaningful access to the courts.
- B. To identify and assist those incarcerated residents with real legal problems concerning the validity of convictions and sentences, civil rights, and conditions of confinement.
- C. To discourage frivolous and unsubstantial litigation.
- D. To assist state courts and the Board of Indigents' Defense Services meet their program goals.
- E. To assist incarcerated residents in successfully completing their sentences, parole, and post release supervision. Those whose legal problems are taken care of prior to their release are more apt to successfully complete their term of parole or post release supervision.

### Program History

Legal Services for Prisoners, Inc. is a non-profit corporation organized under the laws of the State of Kansas for the purpose of providing legal assistance to indigent incarcerated residents of Kansas correctional institutions. K.S.A. 22-4514(a) authorizes the corporation to submit its annual operating budget to the State Board of Indigents' Defense Services. BIDS has no administrative authority over LSP, rather LSP's budget is a passthrough and submitted as part of BIDS budget.

Board of Indigents' Defense Services

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Cases administratively resolved	B	1,220	1,042	1,058	1,058	1,039	1,039	1,039	1,046
2. Cases judicially resolved	A	4	6	1	1	2	2	2	3
3. Cases rejected by LSP	C	387	376	467	467	522	522	522	455
4. Cases still open at the end of the fiscal year.	A, E	11	0	4	4	0	0	0	1

*Output Measures*

1. Total Cases Handled by LSP	A, D, E	1,636	1,463	1,530	1,530	1,582	1,582	1,582	1,525
2. Total Hours spent on cases	B	1,894	1,759	2,013	2,013	1,943	1,943	1,943	1,905

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 289,592	\$ 289,592	\$ 289,592	\$ 289,592	\$ 289,592	\$ 289,592	\$ 289,592	\$ 289,592
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 289,592</b>	<b>\$ 289,592</b>	<b>\$ 289,592</b>	<b>\$ 289,592</b>	<b>\$ 289,592</b>	<b>\$ 289,592</b>	<b>\$ 289,592</b>	<b>\$ 289,592</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## Licensure

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Public protection would be jeopardized if there were not licensure qualifications that all applicants must meet before a license was issued. The Board of Nursing checks applications to determine if the licensure qualifications have been met. Licensure is one component that helps establish competency of the nurse and mental health technician.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. <u>Discretionary</u>	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A 65-1115, 65-1116, 65-1130, 65-1152, 65-4203	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Provide licenses and license renewals to eligible practical nurses, registered nurses, advanced practice registered nurses, registered nurse anesthetists, and mental health technicians.
- B. Issue a license to practice or authorization to practice within 3 business days after receipt of all required information 95% of the time.
- C. Enter information into the licensing software with 95% accuracy.

### Program History

Licensure is required for all nurses (LPN, RN, APRN) and licensed mental health technicians to practice in Kansas. Authorization to practice is required for registered nurse anesthetists to practice in Kansas. The licensure of professional nurses (RNs) is required by K.S.A. 65-1115 (authorized in 1949). The licensure of practical nurses (LPNs) is required by K.S.A. 65-1116 (authorized in 1949). The licensure of advanced practice registered nurses is required by K.S.A. 65-1130 (authorized in 1983). The authorization for practice as a registered nurse anesthetist is required by K.S.A. 65-1152 (authorized in 1986). The authorization for licensure of mental health technicians is K.S.A. 65-4203 (authorized in 1973). This licensure program has always been with the Board of Nursing. Two major legislative changes have impacted the licensure program, the requirement of fingerprints for a criminal background report before licensure and the implementation of the Nurse Licensure Compact (NLC). K.S.A. 74-1112 authorizes the Board of Nursing to require an applicant to be fingerprinted and submit to a state and national criminal history record check before being licensed to practice in Kansas. This was authorized in 2008. We performed the fingerprints in our agency until March 2020 at which time we stopped because of the COVID-19 pandemic as we were unable to social distance and obtain fingerprints. Since that time, the equipment outdated and would require the purchase of new, costly equipment. The applicants can obtain fingerprints at the KBI or most law enforcement agencies and then submit the fingerprints to us. This change also assisted to increase the efficiency of our licensing division in processing applications and responding to applicants. The Board of Nursing receives the fingerprint cards and waives the applicants submit, processes them, and sends them to the KBI. We receive the criminal background report that is generated by the KBI and we process that report. The other major change for licensing was the implementation of the NLC on July 1, 2019. This change allowed LPN and RN applicants the option of another license type, a multistate license. This multistate license would allow the LPN or RN to work on this multistate license in another other jurisdiction that is part of the NLC (presently 37 other states and one U.S. territory). This change was authorized in 2018 and implemented on July 1, 2019. This multistate license increases the mobility of the nurses with a multistate license. This license has proven to be very beneficial during the pandemic.

Board of Nursing

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percentage of renewal licensure applications processed within 3 business days after receipt of required information	B	97.0%	98.8%	100.0%	98.0%	100%	95%	95%	99%
2. Percentage of initial through examination licensure applications processed within 3 business days after receipt of required information	B	100.0%	100.0%	99.8%	98.0%	99/8%	95%	95%	100%
3. Percentage of reinstatement licensure applications processed within 3 business days after receipt of required information	B	100.0%	88.9%	100.0%	98.0%	100%	95%	95%	94%
4. Percentage of endorsement licensure applications processed within 3 business days after receipt of required information	B	98.0%	100.0%	100.0%	98.0%	99.8%	95%	95%	100%
5. Percentage of advanced practice licensure applications processed within 3 business days after receipt of required information	B	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	98.0%	100%	95%	95%	100%
6. Percentage of licensure application information entered accurately into the licensing software	C	99.0%	93.1%	99.9%	96.0%	99.9%	99%	99%	97%
7. Cost per license	A	\$7.72	\$9.00	\$8.55	\$10.03	\$6.90	\$6.07	\$7.28	\$8.15

*Output Measures*

8. Number of licensees	A	75,683	75,142	79,617	70,702	70,716	72,000	72,000	75,158
------------------------	---	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	583,963	674,647	680,930	488,204	480,204	437,642	524,273	611,927
Federal Funds	-	1,752	-	-	-	-	-	584
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 583,963</b>	<b>\$ 676,399</b>	<b>\$ 680,930</b>	<b>\$ 488,204</b>	<b>\$ 480,204</b>	<b>\$437,642</b>	<b>\$524,273</b>	<b>\$ 612,511</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.3</b>

## Education

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Public protection would be jeopardized if there were not licensure qualifications that all applicants must meet before a license was issued. The Board of Nursing checks applications to determine if the licensure qualifications have been met. Licensure is one component that helps establish competency of the nurse and mental health technician.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 65-1117, 65-1119, 65-1136	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Review and approve continuing education providers and programs that meet the Board's rules and regulations
- B. Oversee the nursing programs, which includes surveying each nursing program once every 5 - 10 years
- C. Receive an annual report from each nursing program by June 30, 2021 (as per regulation)
- D. Receive an annual report from each continuing education provider by July 31, 2021 (as per regulation)
- E. Ensure continuing nursing providers submit five-year renewals as per schedule
- F. Review single nursing continuing education provider applications within 2 weeks of date received in agency

### Program History

The authority to oversee the nursing programs in Kansas is in K.S.A. 65-1119 (authorized in 1945). The authority to oversee the mental health technician programs is in K.S.A. 65-4206 (authorized in 1973). Overseeing the programs includes reviewing faculty, curriculum and annual reports submitted by the program. Each program is surveyed every 5 - 10 years to verify the program is in compliance with our regulations for approval of the programs. The first-time licensure examination pass rates are monitored by the Board of Nursing and communicated to the Board and the programs. The Board of Nursing administers the mental health technician licensure examination. Education is provided to the program administrators. The authority to require continuing nursing education for our licensees is in K.S.A. 65-1117 (authorized in 1949) and 65-4205 (authorized in 1973). Annual reports and five-year renewal applications are received from the approved continuing nursing education providers. In the event a continuing nursing education provider wants to provide only one offering multiple times in a two year period, they apply for a single program provider. The authority for IV Therapy providers is in K.S.A. 65-1136 (authorized in 1994). They must submit course rosters, faculty and annual reports that must be reviewed. COVID travel restrictions have impacted the ability to do all the nursing program surveys per schedule and we were able to work with the nursing programs and change most to a virtual survey.

Board of Nursing

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percentage of programs surveyed per schedule	B	100.0%	75.0%	87.5%	100.0%	94%	95%	95%	81.3%
2. Percentage of nursing programs submitting an annual report as per regulation	C	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	97%	100%	100%	100.0%
3. Percentage of continuing-nursing education providers submitting an annual report as per regulation	D	75.0%	76.4%	92.0%	85.0%	79.5%	85%	90%	84.2%
4. Percentage of continuing nursing education providers submitting a five-year renewal application as per schedule (started with this measure in FY 20)	E	-	64.7%	100.0%	85.0%	85%	85%	90%	82.4%
5. Percentage of applications for single continuing education provider reviewed within 2 weeks of receiving (started with this measure in FY 19)	F	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%
6. Cost per approved programs (nursing, IV Therapy and CNE programs)	A	\$2,732	\$3,341	\$2,795	\$3,175	\$2,351	\$2,016	\$2,412	\$3,068
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of approved nursing & mental health technicians programs	A	60	60	60	59	71	72	72	60
2. Number of approved continuing education providers	A	120	114	151	140	111	115	115	132.5
3. Number of approved IV therapy providers	A	22	23	24	24	25	25	25	23.5

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	551,935	656,479	656,724	486,853	486,853	427,531	511,490	600,019
Federal Funds	-	1,752	-	-	-	-	-	584
<b>Total</b>	\$ 551,935	\$ 658,231	\$ 656,724	\$ 486,853	\$ 486,853	\$ 427,531	\$ 522,490	\$ 600,603
<b>FTE</b>	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0

## Investigations of Possible Violations of the Nurse Practice Act and Legal History on Applications

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Public protection would be jeopardized if complaints received in the agency were not investigated and licensees who violated the Nurse Practice Act were not disciplined. All complaints received in the office must be reviewed and a priority assigned. Anyone submitting a complaint to the Board of Nursing has the expectation that a thorough investigation will occur and the licensee will be disciplined if a violation occurred. Applicants with a legal history on their criminal background report must be reviewed to determine if it is safe to issue a license to the applicant.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	K.S.A. 74-1112, 65-1120, 65-1122	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Review complaints received in the agency for possible violations of the Nurse Practice Act and assign a priority within 2 weeks of date received.
- B. Review applications with legal history before license is granted
- C. Investigate possible violations of the nurse practice act in a timely manner and present to the Board

### Program History

K.S.A. 65-1120 contains the grounds for disciplinary action against licensees that have a license with the Board of Nursing (authorized in 1949). It contains a provision that states the board may designate and authorize an employee or employees of the board to conduct an investigation on complaints filed with the board. The board has authorized the RN Practice Specialist, RN Investigators and Special Investigator to conduct the investigations. After the investigation is completed, a summary of the findings are presented to the Investigative Committee, a sub committee of the board, that consists of three Board members. The Investigative Committee determines if there has been a violation of the Nurse Practice Act by the licensee based on the findings of the investigation.

Board of Nursing

Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percentage of complaints received in the agency and reviewed by Professional Staff within 2 weeks of date received. (new for FY 2020 - this process was changed in July 2021 and the percentage through the first two months of FY 22 is up to 86%)	A	-	36%	7%	75%	92%	90%	90%	22%
2. Percentage of investigations completed within 9 months of opening the case (this timeline is being researched for national benchmarks and will be discussed with our Board)	C	65%	66%	29%	35%	48%	55%	60%	48%
3. Cost per investigation (investigations opened and applications with legal history reviewed)	C	\$504	\$268	\$472	\$496	\$402	\$388	\$421	\$370
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of complaints received in the agency and reviewed by Professional Staff (new for FY 20)	C	-	685	419	500	513	550	575	552
2.. Number of applications with legal history reviewed	B	-	3,192	1,908	2,000	1,902	2,000	2,000	2,550
3. Number of investigations opened	C	2,198	1,197	597	550	715	700	700	897
4. Number of nurses practicing without a current nursing license (typically lapsed licenses)	C	86	91	44	45	121	40	40	68
5. Number of individuals presenting themselves as a nurse but no nursing license (imposter)	C	0	3	1	1	5	5	5	2

Board of Nursing

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	1,107,880	1,176,076	1,183,210	1,051,960	1,051,960	1,047,852	1,137,159	1,137,082
Federal Funds	-	1,752	-	-	-	-	-	584
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,107,880	\$ 1,177,828	\$ 1,183,210	\$ 1,051,960	\$ 1,051,960	\$ 1,047,852	\$ 1,137,159	\$ 1,137,666
<b>FTE</b>	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	\$ 10.0

## Discipline

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Public protection would be jeopardized if licensees who violated the Nurse Practice Act were not disciplined. All complaints received in the office must be reviewed and a priority assigned. Anyone submitting a complaint to the Board of Nursing has the expectation that a thorough investigation will occur and the licensee will be disciplined if a violation occurred. Applicants with a legal history on their criminal background report must be reviewed to determine if it is safe to issue a license to the applicant. If the Investigative Committee (a sub committee of the Board) determines a violation has occurred, the case may be transferred to Disciplinary Counsel (an AAG assigned to the Board of Nursing) for further review and action.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>		<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific	K.S.A. 65-1120	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Discipline licensees who violate the Nurse Practice Act via initial orders, consent orders, evidentiary hearings, denied licenses, revoked licenses, limited and/or suspended licenses or diversion agreements

### Program History

K.S.A. 65-1120 contains the grounds for disciplinary action against licensees that have a license with the Board of Nursing (authorized in 1949). It contains a provision that states the board may designate and authorize an employee or employees of the board to conduct an investigation on complains filed with the board. The board has authorized the RN Practice Specialist, RN Investigators and Special Investigator to conduct the investigations. After the investigation is completed, a summary of the findings are presented to the Investigative Committee, a sub committee of the board, that consists of three Board members. The Investigative Committee determines if there has been a violation of the Nurse Practice Act by the licensee based on the findings of the investigation. If the Investigative Committee (a sub committee of the Board) determines a violation has occurred, the case may be transferred to Disciplinary Counsel (an AAG assigned to the Board of Nursing) for further review and action.

Board of Nursing

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of initial orders, consent orders and evidentiary hearings ( <i>new for FY 20</i> )	A		168	29	30	18	30	30	72
2. Number of denied licenses	A	21	12	6	10	10	10	10	9
3. Number of revoked licenses	A	14	21	8	10	7	10	10	12
4. Number of limited and/or suspended licenses	A	72	80	27	30	31	30	30	46
5. Number of Diversion agreements	A	61	52	20	30	13	25	25	28
6. Cost per discipline (includes #1 through 5 above)	A	\$3,203	\$1,928	\$7,268	\$6,663	\$6,477	\$4,482	\$5,305	\$5,224

*Output Measures*

7. Total fines deposited in state general fund for violations of the Nurse Practice Act	A	\$54,390	\$33,384	\$17,546	\$40,000	\$2,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$17,643
---	---	----------	----------	----------	----------	---------	----------	----------	----------

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	538,099	640,370	654,145	511,754	511,754	470,681	557,028	602,090
Federal Funds	-	1,752	-	-	-	-	-	584
<b>Total</b>	\$ 538,099	\$ 642,122	\$ 654,145	\$ 511,754	\$ 511,754	\$470,681	\$557,028	\$ 602,674
<b>FTE</b>	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	\$ 3.0

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Administrative Division oversees the administration of the agency. The Administrative division ensures the financial stability of the agency and identifies resources necessary for the agency to function and obtains those resources. The Administrator of the agency is the liason with the 11 member Board. The Administrative Division ensures the quarterly committee and board meetings occur seamlessly for the committee and board members. The Administrator is responsible for legislative initiatives requested by the Board and submitting various required reports to the Legislature. If it was not funded, there would be no oversight of the entire agency.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>		<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	K.S.A. 74-1106	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Provide a transparency report regarding the performance and activities of the Board and agency each fiscal year via an annual report that is posted on our website.
- B. Annual review with the Board regarding the agency performance regarding outcomes identified on the strategic plan developed by the Board
- C. Update of the Nurse Practice Act when legislation is enacted that impacts nursing practice in Kansas or information updated

### Program History

The Kansas Board of Nursing was developed via the legislature in 1915 and has statutory authority to license nurses and licensed mental health technicians. The Board has statutory authority to approve the nursing education programs in Kansas. They also have statutory authority to investigate complaints received and present the investigative findings to the Board to determine if a violation of the Nurse Practice Act has occurred. If a violation has occurred the Board can determine the discipline that should occur. K.S.A. 74-1106 includes statutory authority for an eleven member board that constitutes a board of nursing, with the duties, power and authority set forth in the Nurse Practice Act. The Board has the authority to adopt rules and regulations consistent with the Nurse Practice Act. The Board has the authority to employ and executive administration and this staff member shall employ such other employees to carry on the work of the Board. The Board develops a strategic plan for a three year period that also helps to direct staff as to the priorities of the Board. Transparency regarding the activities and performance of the agency staff is important.

Board of Nursing

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Annual report is developed and available on our website for each fiscal year	A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
2. Performance assessment on outcomes measures identified on strategic plan is reported to the Board annually	B	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
3. Five year review completed on rules and regulations in Nurse Practice Act	C	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*Output Measures*

1. Annual Report is published	A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2. Strategic plan is reviewed by the Board annually and contains updated performance assessment on outcomes measures	B	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3. Number of rules and regulations reviewed as per the scheduled five year review	C	14	20	30	30	33	28	14	28
4. Number of rules and regulations revised (due to changes in legislation or updated information)	C	1	5	0	0	17	10	0	7

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	574,707	574,707	538,889	623,527	191,569
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 574,707</b>	<b>\$ 574,707</b>	<b>\$ 538,889</b>	<b>\$ 623,527</b>	<b>\$ 191,569</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>0.8</b>

## Operations / IT

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Operations/IT Division oversees the administration of the agency's technology systems and eGovernment services, the agency's information security program, KSBN human resources, all agency procurements and the KSBN office facilities. Not funding these critical areas of operations would severely impact all divisions within the agency and public protection would be jeopardized due to the unavailability of the 24 X 7 eGovernment service offerings.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 75-7240	Mandatory	None	1

### Program Goals

- A. Maintain a superior and secure information technology infrastructure.
- B. Sustain electronic storage of records in the agency per agency record retention schedule.
- C. Annual review with the Board regarding the agency information security program posture and Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) identified in the strategic plan developed by the Board.
- D. Recruit, develop and retain qualified staff and develop succession plans for key agency leadership positions.

### Program History

The Operations/IT Division oversees the administration of the agency's 24 X 7 technology systems and eGovernment services, the agency's information security program, KSBN human resources, all agency procurements and the KSBN office facilities. The Board of Nursing is a highly automated agency that provides services to the KSBN Board and committee members, all internal staff and the 71,000+ licensed nurses of Kansas. KSBN was an early adopter of online technologies and was the first Kansas regulatory agency to fully automate online government services and verification technologies since the inception of eGovernment in the early 2000's. These systems interface with various educational and national entities. Over the past fifteen years, KSBN has processed over 500,000 applications, renewals, and reinstatements via our automated systems and increased the volume of licensed nurses, all while continuing to maintain near the same level of staffing within the agency. Our board has accomplished many of these goals by investing in advanced technologies and aggressively pushing towards further automation. These goals can only be accomplished by having updated technology offerings within our portfolio and maintaining competent and qualified staff within the board of nursing to produce these streamlined operations. The department's primary vision is to be "Citizen and Customer Focused - Technology Driven." The Operations/IT division ensures the operational stability of the agency technology resources, information security and human resources for the board of nursing.

Board of Nursing

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Information Technology strategy and architecture plans align with business strategy.	A	100%	100%	100%	N/A	100%	100%	100%	100.0%
2. Information security program is reviewed and update per state guidelines.	C	Untracked	Untracked	60%	N/A	80%	100%	100%	70.0%
3. Image licensing files and maintain per agency record retention schedule.	B	80%	80%	80%	N/A	80%	100%	100%	80.0%
4. Image investigative and discipline case files and maintain per agency record retention schedule.	B	0%	0%	0%	0%	20%	50%	80%	6.7%
5. Include funds allocated for staff development in each budget year, based on feedback from the departmental Supervisors and/or to support an agency strategic initiatives.	D	Untracked	Untracked	Untracked	0%	50%	75%	100%	50.0%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Submitted KSBN 3 Year Information Technology Plan to CITO for publication.	A	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2. Review and Update Annual Cybersecurity Self-Assessment (CSA)	C	Untracked	Untracked	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3. Critical machines are backed up daily and patched monthly.	A & C	100%	100%	100%	N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%
4. Number of licensing files indexed in the imaging system.	B	Untracked	Untracked	Untracked	N/A	294,127	310,000	325,000	294,127
5. Number of investigative and discipline records indexed in the imaging system.	B	0	0	0	N/A	7858	9000	10,000	2,619
6. Review and update the agency Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP)	C	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
7. Review the salary & staff structures and pay bands of other fee funded and state governmental agencies, and explore how to incorporate a competitive and sustainable program within the board of nursing	D	Untracked	Untracked	Untracked	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
8. Identify key agency leadership positions that require succession plans	D	No	No	No	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	Yes

Board of Nursing

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	551,578	551,578	567,298	653,030	183,859
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 551,578	\$ 551,578	\$ 567,298	\$ 653,030	\$ 183,859
<b>FTE</b>	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.5	3.5	4.5	4.5	2.8

## Kansas Corporation Commission Rate Cases

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

CURB's sole program responsibility and statutory authority centers on representation of residential and small commercial ratepayers before the KCC and the Kansas Legislature. These metrics indicate the key aspects of CURB's work; there are no separate and distinct programs that CURB offers its consumer citizens. The consequences of not funding CURB's program would be a void of representation of residential and small commercial ratepayers in important utility matters. CURB's representation of its constituents has obtained millions of dollars of utility rate savings as well as enjoined business practices sponsored by utilities that are adverse to consumer interests. For example, in Docket 18-WSEE-328-RTS, CURB opposed a minimum bill tariff and grid access charge for solar and other customers and prevailed before the KCC. This result benefited residential customers and may have been lost had CURB not intervened and sponsored testimony in the 2021 proceeding. CURB also attempts to add value to the legislative process through testimony before House and Senate utility committees. CURB also plays an integral role in advising consumers about their rights in utility complaint cases, both KCC-jurisdictional and otherwise. These benefits would be impaired if this program were not funded.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	K.S.A. 66-1223(b)	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Represents CURB constituents in KCC rate cases.
- B. Intervenes in KCC cases where necessary to protect CURB constituents from unreasonable utility business practices.
- C. Represents CURB constituents before the Kansas legislature.
- D. Represents CURB constituents in complaint cases filed by with the KCC.

### Program History

CURB was funded by the Kansas legislature in 1991. The program/role of CURB as an advocate for residential and small commercial utility ratepayers has remained with the agency since that time. Since the enactment in 1991, there have been no legislative amendments to CURB's authority.

Citizens' Utility Ratepayer Board

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percentage of total filed rate cases in which CURB intervened on an annual basis	A	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
2. Percent of rate reduction proposed by CURB on annual basis in utility rate cases	A	104.0%	99.0%	0.0%	75.0%	116.0%	75.0%	75.0%	72.5%
3. Rate Savings less Rate Expenses (In Millions)	A	\$ 170.0	\$ 100.0	\$ -	\$ 15.0	\$ 24.1	\$ 35.0	\$ 35.0	\$ 34.8

*Output Measures*

4. Total number of filed rate cases in which CURB intervened annually	A	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	871,604	877,814	669,123	985,000	1,004,212	1,372,074	1,238,441	\$ 884,037
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 871,604</b>	<b>\$ 877,814</b>	<b>\$ 669,123</b>	<b>\$ 985,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,004,212</b>	<b>\$ 1,372,074</b>	<b>\$ 1,238,441</b>	<b>\$ 884,037</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>

## Other KCC Cases

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

See KCC RATE CASES for Consequences of Not Funding this Program.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	K.S.A. 66-1223(a)	Discretionary	No	2

### Program Goals

A. Intervenes in KCC cases where necessary to protect CURB constituents from unreasonable utility business practices.

### Program History

CURB was funded by the Kansas legislature in 1991. The program/role of CURB as an advocate for residential and small commercial utility ratepayers has remained with the agency since that time. Since the enactment in 1991, there have been no legislative amendments to CURB's authority.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percentage of total filed utility practices/programs cases which CURB analyzed and/or intervened in on an annual basis	A	81.0%	97.0%	100.0%	95.0%	100.0%	95.0%	95.0%	98.0%
2. Percent of utility practices/programs cases in which CURB posited a recommendation on behalf of residential and small commercial ratepayers	A	32.0%	26.0%	25.0%	25.0%	38.3%	30%	30%	28.6%
3. Annual savings achieved from CURB analysis and involvement in utility practices/programs cases versus the cost of outsourcing representation	A	N/A	\$ 142,000	\$ 531,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 493,250

Citizens' Utility Ratepayer Board

<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Number of utility practice/program cases in which CURB intervened	A								
		36	31	54	40	29	35	35	38.5

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	871,604	877,814	669,123	985,000	1,004,212	1,372,074	1,238,441	\$ 884,037
Federal Funds	-	-	-					\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ 871,604	\$ 877,814	\$ 669,123	\$ 985,000	\$ 1,004,212	\$ 1,372,074	\$ 1,238,441	\$ 884,037
<b>FTE</b>	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	9.0	9.0	7.0

## Legislative Work

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

See KCC RATE CASES for Consequences of Not Funding this Program.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	K.S.A. 66-1223(a)	Discretionary	No	3

### Program Goals

A. Represents CURB constituents before the Kansas legislature.

### Program History

CURB was funded by the Kansas legislature in 1991. The program/role of CURB as an advocate for residential and small commercial utility ratepayers has remained with the agency since that time. Since the enactment in 1991, there have been no legislative amendments to CURB's authority.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percent of total legislative bills which were modified due to comments/proposals made by CURB on an annual basis	A	40.0%	40.0%	62.5%	45.0%	13.3%	35.0%	35.0%	40.2%
2. Annual savings achieved through CURB analysis and input in Kansas legislation versus the cost of outsourcing representation	A	N/A	\$ 38,700	\$ 26,500	\$ 35,000	\$38,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 34,550

#### Output Measures

3. Total number of utility-related legislative bills analyzed and/or presented testimony before Kansas legislature on an annual basis	A	12	8	16	10	15	10	10	12.3
---	---	----	---	----	----	----	----	----	------

Citizens' Utility Ratepayer Board

4. Total number of proposals made by CURB to legislative bills on an annual basis	A								
		5	5	8	5	4	5	5	5.5

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	871,604	877,814	669,123	985,000	1,004,212	1,372,074	1,238,441	\$ 884,037
Federal Funds	-	-	-					\$ -
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 871,604</b>	<b>\$ 877,814</b>	<b>\$ 669,123</b>	<b>\$ 985,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,004,212</b>	<b>\$ 1,372,074</b>	<b>\$ 1,238,441</b>	<b>\$ 884,037</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>

## Outreach Work

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

See KCC RATE CASES for Consequences of Not Funding this Program.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	K.S.A. 66-1223(a)	Discretionary	No	4

### Program Goals

A. Represents CURB constituents in complaint cases filed by with the KCC.

### Program History

CURB was funded by the Kansas legislature in 1991. The program/role of CURB as an advocate for residential and small commercial utility ratepayers has remained with the agency since that time. Since the enactment in 1991, there have been no legislative amendments to CURB's authority.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percentage of the annual potential complainants who contacted CURB and to whom CURB provided advice and/or assistance	A	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
2. Annual savings achieved by CURB outreach and representative/advisory work with ratepayers and other stakeholders versus the cost of outsourcing representation	A	N/A	\$ 55,600	\$ 77,500	\$ 62,500	\$ 126,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 80,400
<u>Output Measures</u>									
3. Number of CURB constituents who contacted CURB with a question or complaint with whom CURB interacted on an annual basis	A	24	38	57	45	33	40	40	43.3

Citizens' Utility Ratepayer Board

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	871,604	877,814	669,123	985,000	1,004,212	1,372,074	1,238,441	\$ 884,037
Federal Funds	-	-	-					\$ -
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 871,604</b>	<b>\$ 877,814</b>	<b>\$ 669,123</b>	<b>\$ 985,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,004,212</b>	<b>\$ 1,372,074</b>	<b>\$ 1,238,441</b>	<b>\$ 884,037</b>
<b>FTE</b>	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	9.0	9.0	7.0

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Administration program provides for the means for other programs to be successful, such as paying rent, IT bills, paying the monumental building surcharge, and providing office supplies.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General K.S.A. 25-4119a et seq.	Discretionary	No	3

### Program Goals

- A. To ensure that all reports receive a review of compliance with the law.
- B. To provide the necessary mandatory tools required to support other programs.

### Program History

The Administration program ensures that fundamental operating costs of running an office (e.g., paying building rent) are adequately addressed.

This requirement is fundamental to the agency and originated with the agency in 1974.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percentage of campaign finance report reviews completed	AB	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Percentage of lobbying report reviews completed	AB	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
3. Percentage of statement of substantial interest report reviews	AB	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Number of campaign finance reports filed	AB	2,556	1,512	3,360	1,235	1,462	2,538	1,479	2,111

Governmental Ethics Commission

5. Number of lobbying reports filed	AB	7,114	7,505	7,441	7,500	7,810	7,530	7,900	7,585
6. Number of statement of substantial interest reports filed	AB	5,620	5,561	5,744	5,852	5,772	5,765	5,788	5,692

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 126,048	\$ 123,376	\$ 1,503,133	\$ 160,314	\$ 159,095	\$ 201,739	\$ 209,974	\$ 595,201
Non-SGF State Funds	59,106	62,109	74,408	86,435	78,988	44,352	56,362	\$ 71,835
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 185,154</b>	<b>\$ 185,485</b>	<b>\$ 1,577,541</b>	<b>\$ 246,749</b>	<b>\$ 238,082</b>	<b>\$ 246,091</b>	<b>\$ 266,336</b>	<b>\$ 667,036</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.9</b>

## Education, Awareness, and Compliance

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This program focuses on preventing violations of the Campaign Finance Act, lobbying, and ethics law, and correcting unintentional violations when they do occur. Not funding this program would result in only using the enforcement arm of the Commission to encourage compliance with the laws, which is neither cost-efficient nor effective at obtaining voluntary legal compliance. Additionally, unintentional violations would proliferate as trainings would be eliminated. The consequences of not funding this program extend from allowing incorrect filings to fundamentally undermine the public's ability to trust government decision-making.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General	K.S.A. 25-4142 et seq. K.S.A. 46-215 et seq.	Mandatory	No	1
Specific	K.S.A. 25-4148; 46-268; 46-248			

### Program Goals

- A. To reduce the severity and number of unintentional violations of the Campaign Finance Act, lobbying, and ethics laws.
- B. To rapidly correct unintentional and non-severe violations of the Campaign Finance Act, lobbying, and ethics laws.

### Program History

Education, awareness, and compliance focuses on preventing violations and correcting unintentional violations as rapidly as possible to ensure the public is able to have confidence in governmental decision-making. This program includes training and efforts to correct errors in reports. The goals of education, awareness, and compliance are fundamental to the Ethics Commission and therefore originated with the agency in 1974.

The most significant legislation in recent years that affected this program was the extension of lobbying laws to include lobbying the executive

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percent of campaign finance entities receiving Error and Omission Notices	AB	18.30%	17.20%	17.90%	18.40%	17.6%	22.0%	17.8%	17.57%
2. Percent of lobbyists receiving Error and Omission Notices	AB	0.00%	0.05%	0.00%	0.10%	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%	0.18%
3. Percent of Statement of Substantial Interest filers receiving Error and Omission Notices	AB	0.10%	0.00%	0.00%	0.10%	0.10%	0.10%	0.10%	0.03%

Governmental Ethics Commission

*Output Measures*

4. Number of Error and Omission Notices sent to campaign finance entities	AB	437	260	602	227	198	387	221	353.3
5. Number of Error and Omission Notices sent to lobbyists	AB	0	1	0	2	0	2	2	0.3
6. Number of Error and Omission Notices sent to Statement of Substantial Interest filers	AB	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0.0
7. Number of trainings performed	AB	11	13	11	12	16	16	16	13.3

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 196,170	\$ 204,274	\$ 232,872	\$ 211,672	\$ 215,374	\$ 284,663	\$294,781	\$ 217,507
Non-SGF State Funds	151,571	151,268	142,055	114,125	106,929	62,583	79,126	\$ 133,417
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 347,741</b>	<b>\$ 355,542</b>	<b>\$ 374,927</b>	<b>\$ 325,798</b>	<b>\$ 322,302</b>	<b>\$ 347,246</b>	<b>\$373,906</b>	<b>\$ 350,924</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.9</b>

## Enforcement

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Not funding this program would eliminate consequences of violations of the campaign finance act, ethics laws, and lobbying laws. Violations would occur without investigation or penalty. While the Ethics Commission works to avoid the necessity of enforcement whenever reasonable and possible, the fact that the enforcement arm of the Commission is the only reason why some abide by the laws.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>		<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
General	K.S.A. 25-4142 et seq. K.S.A. 46-215 et seq.	Discretionary	No	2
Specific	Many; Examples: 25-4152; 4158; 4161- 4164; 4181. 46-255-263; 280; 288			

### Program Goals

- A. To provide consequences for violations of the campaign finance, ethics, and lobbying laws in order to deter other violations.
- B. To adequately resolve violations of the campaign finance, ethics, and lobbying laws.
- C. To identify when violations have occurred of the campaign finance, ethics, and lobbying laws, as well as clearing referrals that are not violations.

### Program History

Enforcement focuses on identifying investigating, and providing consequences for violations when they occur. Severe and intentional violations merit immediate referral to the enforcement arm of the Commission. Additionally, more minor violations that are not adequately resolved in other ways require intervention by the determination of probable cause, public hearing, a determination, and a possible fine. The goals of enforcement are fundamental to the Ethics Commission and are believed to have originated with the agency in the 1970s. The last significant alteration to statutory authority of the enforcement program is the authority to issue subpoenas, which was added in 1998.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of hearings finding a violation	ABC	8	6	7	9	10	8	11	\$ 8

Governmental Ethics Commission

*Output Measures*

2. Number of investigations	ABC	33	30	27	26	18	16	16	25
3. Number of complaints	ABC	28	15	25	22	26	26	23	22
4. Number of audits	ABC	7	1	6	8	8	8	12	5

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 55,941	\$ 62,845	\$ 62,032	\$ 98,246	\$ 95,764	\$ 129,752	\$ 132,443	\$ 73,547
Non-SGF State Funds	32,895	35,185	36,445	52,971	47,545	28,526	35,551	\$ 39,725
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ 88,836	\$ 98,030	\$ 98,477	\$ 151,217	\$ 143,308	\$ 158,278	\$ 167,994	\$ 113,272
<b>FTE</b>	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.4

## Adjudication

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Health Care Providers would not be properly represented, patients would not receive appropriate compensation, and the Board of Governors would likely be held in contempt of court.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific      K.S.A.40-3403	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To assure appropriate representation and advocacy in the event of a claim against a health care provider.
- B. In the event the courts determine that an injured patient should be compensated, to assure the appropriate compensation is provided in a timely manner.

### Program History

The Health Care Provider Insurance Availability Act, KSA 40-3401 et seq was enacted July 1, 1976. The Act was specifically cited by the KS Supreme Court in October 2012 in the case of Miller v. Johnson supporting the Legislature's authority to enact tort reforms.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of claims closed	A	549	524	421	-	542	500	500	496
2. Expenditures (claim payments for settlements and awards) (in millions)	B	\$28.9	\$27.7	\$21.5	\$28.7	\$31.6	\$30.1	\$31.0	\$ 26.9

### Funding

Funding Source (in millions)	Actuals	Actuals	Actuals	Approved	Actuals	Est.	Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	28.9	27.7	21.5	28.7	31.6	30.1	31.0	26.9
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 28.9	\$ 27.7	\$ 21.5	\$ 28.7	\$ 31.6	\$ 30.1	\$ 31.0	\$ 26.9

* Expenditures directly reimbursed by SGF pursuant to K.S.A. 40-3403(j) (3) (in millions)	\$ 2.6	\$ 1.0	\$ 1.3	\$ -	\$ 2.0	\$ 2.1	\$ 2.0	\$ 1.4
<b>FTE</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>

## Medical Professional Liability

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Practitioners would not be able to be licensed to practice, which could result in individuals practicing without a violation or not practicing, leading to a sharp decrease in crucial services to the citizens of Kansas.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific      K.S.A. 40-3402	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. To assure that all health care providers as defined in K.S.A. 40-3401 and maintain adequate professional liability coverage as required by K.S.A. 40-3402.

### Program History

The Health Care Provider Insurance Availability Act, KSA 40-3401 et seq was enacted July 1, 1976. The Act was specifically cited by the KS Supreme Court in October 2012 in the case of Miller v. Johnson supporting the Legislature's authority to enact tort reforms.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of Insurance Companies offering PLI to KS health care providers.	A	31	32	32	35	35	35	35	33
2. Number of health care providers as of July 1 of fiscal year	A	15,992	14,741	15,474	17,013	17,013	16,983	16,998	15,743
3. Net surcharge revenue collected (in millions)	A	\$ 27.7	\$28.7	\$ 35.0	\$0	\$24.4	\$ 28.5	\$29.0	\$29.4

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	33.1	37.8	55.6	30.8	27.2	30.8	29.4	40.2
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 33.1	\$ 37.8	\$ 55.6	\$ 30.8	\$ 27.2	\$ 30.8	\$ 29.4	\$ 40.2
<b>FTE</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>

## Judicial Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Constitutional Requirement			
Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
Article III, § 1	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. To implement the rules and policies of the Supreme Court as they apply to the operation and administration of the Judicial Branch
--

### Program History

Administrative authority ratified in the Kansas Constitution in 1859; last amended in 1972.
---

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	3- yr. Avg.
		Actuals	Actuals	Actuals	Previous Est.	Actuals	Est.	Est.	
1. Number of employees and judges receiving payroll services	A	1,868	1,914	1,930	2,000	1,941	2,003	2,025	\$ 1,928
2. Number of employees and judges participating in SEHP	A	1,467	1,683	1,542	1,592	1,583	1,645	1,667	\$ 1,603
3. Number of vouchers processed	A	5,600	4,490	2,818	2,825	3,211	3,300	3,300	\$ 3,506
<b>Output Measures</b>									
4. Number of judicial districts supported	A	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31
5. Number of employees and judges positions	A	1,868	1,914	1,930	2,000	1,941	2,003	2,025	1,928
6. Number of standing committees supported	A	11	10	14	14	18	18	18	14

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	3-yr. Avg.
	Actuals	Actuals	Actuals	Approved	Actuals	Est.	Est.	
State General Fund	\$2,077,178	\$2,306,214	\$2,259,124	\$ 2,878,910	\$2,883,858	\$ 6,939,537	\$ 8,185,596	\$ 2,483,065
Non-SGF State Funds	3,267,961	3,561,854	3,306,659	2,942,411	4,303,544	318,763	304,975	3,724,019
Federal Funds	-	-	-	145,920	154,421	109,558	160,000	-
	\$5,345,139	\$5,868,068	\$5,565,783	\$ 5,967,241	\$7,341,823	\$ 7,367,858	\$ 8,650,571	\$ 6,207,084
<b>FTE</b>	39.0	41.8	43.8	48.8	48.8	51.8	56.8	44.8

## Appellate Courts

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

All sub-programs are constitutionally or statutorily required: Supreme Court (Article III § 2), Court of Appeals (20-3001), Appellate Clerk (Article III § 4), Appellate Reporter (Article III § 4), Supreme Court Law Library (20-155), eCourt (20-1a20), Municipal Court Training and Judicial Recertification (12-4114) and Alternative Dispute Resolution (5-501).

**Statutory Basis**

See above

**Mandatory vs.  
Discretionary**

Mandatory

**MOE/Match  
Requirement**

No

**Priority  
Level**

1

### Program Goals

A. Provide Kansas residents with their fundamental right of access to justice

### Program History

Judicial authority ratified in the Kansas Constitution in 1859; last amended in 1972

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of law library volumes and online resources managed	A	132,996	137,790	139,399	141,699	139,404	144,004	147,004	138,864
2. Number of opinions reviewed and filed	A	1,319	1,131	1,012	1,071	952	1,100	1,200	1,032
3. Number of cases docketed	A	1,797	1,516	1,097	1,300	1,152	1,300	1,450	1,255
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Number of dispute resolution providers receiving support/education/training	A	297	266	229	250	262	260	270	252
5. Number of municipal judges certified during year	A	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	1
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
6. Number of municipal judges and clerks served by support/education/training	A	390	375	360	360	240	360	360	325

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 9,146,501	\$ 9,285,622	\$ 8,854,427	\$10,747,334	\$10,582,832	\$15,678,905	\$17,455,662	\$ 9,574,294
Non-SGF State Funds	9,147,274	8,971,318	11,302,435	9,258,177	8,676,812	4,451,317	4,589,847	9,650,188
Federal Funds	-	-	-	110,357	-	-	-	-
	\$18,293,775	\$18,256,940	\$20,156,862	\$20,115,868	\$19,259,644	\$20,130,222	\$22,045,509	\$19,224,482
<b>FTE</b>	129.5	125.5	124.0	123.0	123.0	122.0	122.0	124.2

## District Courts

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Sub-programs include: District Court Judges (constitutionally required - Article III § 6), District Court Employees (statutorily required - 20-361), CASA and CRB Programs (Kansas children remaining in court system), Court Improvement Federal Grants (noncompliance resulting in federal penalties), Correctional Supervision (statutorily required - 21-6607) and Child Support Enforcement (federally mandated).

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
See above	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

A. Provide Kansas residents with their fundamental right of access to justice.

### Program History

Judicial authority ratified in the Kansas Constitution in 1859; last amended in 1972.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of certified CASA and CRB programs	A	31	31	24	23	22	21	21	26
2. Number of cases involving Title IV-D child support	A	139,900	126,683	129,748	129,748	131,538	131,600	131,700	129,323
3. Number of offenders supervised	A	22,200	16,066	17,001	18,021	17,501	18,021	19,102	16,856
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Number of court improvement trainings	A	11	1	12	12	13	18	18	9
5. Number of people trained (GAL, CASA, CRB, social workers, judges, parent's attorneys, agency attorneys, prosecutors and other child welfare stakeholders)	A	828	440	1,094	1,026	1,147	1,300	1,500	894

Judicial Branch

*Additional Measures as Necessary*

6. Number of correctional supervision trainings	A	24	23	116	75	50	50	50	63
7. Number of LSI-R's administered	A	4,213	8,740	9,868	10,000	8,942	5,188	5,300	9,183
8. Number of YLS's administered	A	2,402	2,005	1,730	1,900	1,443	1,500	1,550	1,726
9. Number of LSCMI's administered	A	0	0	0	0	715	3,458	3,600	238
10. Number of WRNA's administered	A	0	0	0	0	306	1,317	1,500	102
11. Number of Supreme Court appointments	A	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	1
12. Number of bar exam/attorney applicants	A	373	352	534	540	535	550	550	474
13. Number of bar exam sittings held	A	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2
14. Number of court reporters certified during year	A	4	298	291	295	284	290	295	291
15. Number of court reporters within the Judicial Branch receiving support/training	A	115	123	123	125	97	100	103	114

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 94,966,404	\$ 99,111,198	\$ 98,216,360	\$ 122,501,627	\$ 122,567,349	\$ 143,044,015	\$ 161,650,475	\$ 106,631,636
Non-SGF State Funds	20,501,858	20,358,677	17,192,556	9,587,076	7,321,769	4,672,572	4,260,383	14,957,667
Federal Funds	1,197,538	1,110,380	1,270,613	1,412,285	1,185,420	1,621,854	1,578,348	1,188,804
	\$ 116,665,800	\$ 120,580,255	\$ 116,679,529	\$ 133,500,988	\$ 131,074,538	\$ 149,338,441	\$ 167,489,206	\$ 122,778,107
<b>FTE</b>	1,681.5	1,680.7	1,672.2	1,737.2	1,737.2	1,776.2	1,776.2	1,696.7

## Information Services Support

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Entire court system could not operate.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Using information technology to improve efficiency and productivity through use of new and existing technology.

### Program History

Information Services (Data Processing) became a separate program in the Judicial Branch budget in 1985.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of employees and judges served by information services support/training	A	1,868	1,914	1,930	2,000	1,941	2,003	2,025	1,928
<i>Output Measures</i>									
2. Number and size of courts served	A					43	39	1	43
3. Number of support calls	A					8,673	9,500	9,500	8,673
4. Number of site visits	A					49	130	74	49
5. Number of trainings	A					168	331	92	168

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 896,746	\$ 949,744	\$1,120,098	\$ 1,871,479	\$ 1,961,461	\$ 6,525,868	\$ 6,888,783	\$1,343,768
Non-SGF State Funds	1,683,891	2,692,366	3,796,823	3,142,870	2,806,478	-	-	3,098,556
Federal Funds	-	-	-		8,525	522,894	629,411	2,842
	\$ 2,580,637	\$ 3,642,110	\$4,916,921	\$ 5,014,349	\$ 4,776,464	\$ 7,048,762	\$ 7,518,194	\$4,445,165
<b>FTE</b>	16.0	18.0	26.0	27.0	27.0	49.0	49.0	23.7

## Education Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Statutorily Required
----------------------

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
KSA 20-1a11	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Providing quality training for judges and staff.
---

### Program History

The Judicial Branch education fund was established by the Kansas Legislature in 1992.
---

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of trainings	A	15	15	18	20	18	20	20	17
2. Number of employees and judges served by education/training services	A	1,868	1,914	1,930	2,000	1,941	2,003	2,025	1,928
3. Number of nonlawyer district magistrate judges certified	A	1	3	2	10	2	10	10	2

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 317,011	\$ 381,379	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	\$ 286,719	\$ 384,493	\$ 17,876	\$ 202,120	\$ 183,028	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 195,132
Federal Funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 63,245	\$ -	\$ 40,000	\$ -	\$ -
	\$ 286,719	\$ 384,493	\$ 17,876	\$ 265,365	\$ 183,028	\$ 357,011	\$ 381,379	\$ 195,132
<b>FTE</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Judicial and Professional Review

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Sub-programs include: Judicial Qualifications (constitutionally required - Article III § 15), Nominating Commission (constitutionally and statutorily required - Article III § 5; 20-119 through 20-138), Law Examiners (statutorily required - 20-1a03) and Court Reporters (statutorily required - 20-912).

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
See above	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Provide professional oversight for judges, attorneys and court reporters in Kansas.

### Program History

Commissions established constitutionally and statutorily from ratification in 1859 through 1973.

### Performance Measures

		FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	
Outcome Measures	Goal	Actuals	Actuals	Actuals	Previous Est.	Actuals	Est.	Est.	3- yr. Avg.
The Agency Has No Performance Measures For This Program									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 2,875	\$ 3,921	\$ 4,522	\$ -	\$ 3,417	\$ 30,584	\$ 48,677	\$ 3,953
Non-SGF State Funds	657,449	400,938	529,385	601,629	413,245	499,746	510,294	447,856
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
	\$ 660,324	\$ 404,859	\$ 533,907	\$ 601,629	\$ 416,662	\$ 530,330	\$ 558,971	\$ 451,809
FTE	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	--

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Kansas Judicial Council operates under one program to improve the administration of justice in Kansas. The consequences of not funding the Judicial Council would be (1) loss of an efficient and expert forum used by the Legislative and Judicial Branches to assemble stakeholders and reach consensus on complex bills and issues; (2) major statutory codes becoming outdated causing inefficiencies in the court process as well as an increase in workload for the Kansas legislative branch; (3) loss of access for Kansas citizens to free legal forms for use in Kansas courts; and (4) an inability to continue publication of the Judicial Council's five copyrighted books including the criminal jury instructions relied heavily on by judges, attorneys and law enforcement.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
KSA 20-2201 et seq.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To monitor major areas of law and corresponding statutory codes to identify needed updates or improvements.  
 B. To publish and distribute legal materials for use in the Kansas court system.  
 C. To create and post legal forms for use in the Kansas court system.

### Program History

The Judicial Council was created by the Legislature in 1927 to improve the administration of justice in Kansas. With a small staff and through the use of advisory committees, the Judicial Council executes its statutory mission by recommending statutory enactments and amendments, conducting studies requested by the Legislature and Supreme Court, publishing important legal materials including the jury instructions used in all civil and criminal jury trials, and drafting and posting on the Judicial Council's website, legal forms for use by Kansas citizens. Beginning in fiscal year 2004, the Judicial Council became fully fee-funded.

### Performance Measures\*

		<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
<i>Outcome Measures</i>		<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>
1. Number of Comm. Mtgs. Held	A		54	64	67	64	66	60	55
2. Number. of Publications Authored	B		4	2	3	3	3	4	2
3. Number of Website Visitors	C		147,804	152,995	164,078	169,000	183,840	198,500	214,300
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Number of Reports	A		8	10	6	6	8	6	7
5. Number of Publications Sold	B		2,413	938	2,179	1,562	1,486	1,797	1,031
6. Number of legal forms posted	C		546	566	566	566	550	550	550

Judicial Council

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	567,052	585,106	551,493	618,036	589,600	645,673	694,098	567,884
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$ 567,052	\$ 585,106	\$ 551,493	\$ 618,036	\$ 589,600	\$ 645,673	\$ 694,098	\$ 567,884
<b>FTE</b>	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

No licensing of Hearing Aid Examiners.

	<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
General	K.S.A. 74-5801 establishes the Board of Hearing Aid Examiners for the purpose of regulating the practice of hearing aid dispensing in the State of Kansas.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Work to establish online renewals and update continuing education requirements in rules and regulations.
- B. Establish servicing renewal system to make annual license renewals more efficient.

### Program History

The mission of the Board of Hearing Aid Examiners is to establish and enforce standards to ensure that the people of Kansas receive competent and ethical hearing aid care. The Board of Hearing Aid Examiners will act in accordance with a standard of conduct that will ensure efficient, productive, ethical and accountable actions. It is our obligation to approach this responsibility in a fair and logical manner. K.S.A. 74-5801 establishes the Board of Hearing Aid Examiners for the purpose of regulating the practice of hearing aid dispensing in the State of Kansas.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Renewals	B	456	113	451	400	334	300	315	299.3
2. Applications	B	30	40	41	39	37	33	35	39.3
3. Temporary Licenses	B	11	13	9	9	13	12	13	11.7
4. Temporary Renewals	B	6	10	6	6	5	5	5	7.0

Kansas Board of Hearing Aid Examiners

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	25,377	23,029	39,156	34,072	28,332	34,010	37,695	30,172
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 25,377	\$ 23,029	\$ 39,156	\$ 34,072	\$ 28,332	\$ 34,010	\$ 37,695	\$ 30,172
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Kansas Board of Pharmacy

### Regulatory Program

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Potential for harm to the public resulting from: 1) No oversight of pharmacies and other drug facilities (registrants) administering, dispensing, or shipping drugs in Kansas, or pharmacy personnel (licensees). 2) Lack of compliance with pharmacy practice standards including sterile compounding.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	KSA 65-1625 et seq	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

- A. Licensing – Ensure that the practice of pharmacy protects the health, safety, and welfare of Kansas citizens and provide transparency to members of the public.
- B. Compliance – Facilitate compliance with, foster respect and appreciation for, and educate on Kansas statutes, rules, and regulation regarding the practice of pharmacy and proper manufacturing, distribution, and dispensing/sale of prescription and non-prescription drugs and devices for businesses and individuals doing business in the state of Kansas.

## Kansas Board of Pharmacy

### Program History

Regulation of the manufacture, sale, and distribution of drugs and poisons began in Kansas with the passage of enabling legislation in 1885. In the 1930s, sensational drug abuse cases contributed to the enactment of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act by Congress. The dispensing of certain drugs was restricted by the Act to the pharmacist and only pursuant to a prescription. The Durham-Humphrey Amendment to the Act was enacted in 1951 distinguishing, at the federal level, those drugs requiring a prescription from nonprescription drugs or over-the-counter drugs. In addition to requiring a prescription for specific drugs, the Durham-Humphrey Amendment also provided provisions for the receipt of oral prescriptions as well as for the refilling of prescriptions.

Until the middle of the twentieth century, pharmacists in small, independently-owned, retail outlets dispensed most drugs. The post-World War II hospital construction boom, however, increased the number and capability of hospitals, leading to increased drug dispensing from hospital pharmacies.

By 1970, several other major developments precipitated a half-century of change in the profession. These included the growth of corporately owned “chain” stores; the sudden growth of long-term care facilities; the development of new drugs; and, in 1970, the passage of the Controlled Substance Act. The Controlled Substance Act is the principal federal law regulating the manufacture, distribution, dispensing and delivery of drugs or substances which are subject to, or known to have the potential for, abuse or physical or psychological dependence. Pharmacists are subject to federal drug control laws as well as drug control laws of the state in which they are licensed and practicing – unless such practice is exclusively in a federal facility such as the Veteran’s Administration Hospital. Most states have enacted their own version of the controlled substance act based on the federal provisions. These developments required many changes in the law and increases in the number of regulations.

By 1970, the Kansas Pharmacy Practice Act had been amended several times to reflect changes occurring in the industry. As the roles of pharmacists and other health care professionals expanded and the market has become increasingly global, laws and regulations have adapted and changed in coordination with other regulatory bodies. All states now allow dispensing of naloxone (emergency opioid antagonist) by pharmacists in accordance with a set protocol. The FDA’s recent approval of drugs like Shingrix, a vaccine to prevent shingles, and Epidiolex, the first FDA-approved medication with cannabidiol as the active ingredient, as well as new devices like the Proteus ingestible event sensor have required adjustments to state regulatory frameworks and controlled substance acts. In addition, the global economy of pharmaceuticals has necessitated the Federal Drug Supply Chain Security Act, which creates a gradual roll-out of national track and trace laws for the manufacture, distribution, and sale of all drugs and devices.

Emerging topics include increased consumer access to pharmacy services in the form of telepharmacy or secure vending machines, increase in the prevalence and oversight of sterile and nonsterile compounding, specialty pharmacy white-bagging, shifting the roll of boards of pharmacy to a standard of care instead of a prescriptive model, and increased scope of practice for pharmacists as a result of increased needs during and after the COVID-19 pandemic.

## Kansas Board of Pharmacy

The Board recently has adopted regulations to address the increased compounding of pharmaceuticals, reporting of theft/loss of controlled substances, increasing the pharmacist to pharmacy technician ratio, and requirements for pharmacy closure to protect patient records and continuity of care. The Board is currently working on amendments to regulations concerning K-TRACS, requirements for pharmacists-in-charge (PIC), pharmacy electronic records retention, drug packaging, labeling, prescription transfers, and controlled substances. The Board will continue its efforts to achieve its mission to protect Kansas consumers and promote quality health care in the field of pharmacy using the least restrictive means available. services in the form of telepharmacy or secure vending machines, increase in the prevalence and oversight of sterile and nonsterile compounding, specialty pharmacy white-bagging, shifting the role of boards of pharmacy to a standard of care instead of a prescriptive model, and increased scope of practice for pharmacists as a result of increased needs during and after the COVID-19 pandemic.

The Board recently has adopted regulations to address the increased compounding of pharmaceuticals, reporting of theft/loss of controlled substances, increasing the pharmacist to pharmacy technician ratio, and requirements for pharmacy closure to protect patient records and continuity of care. The Board is currently working on amendments to regulations concerning K-TRACS, requirements for pharmacists-in-charge (PIC), pharmacy electronic records retention, drug packaging, labeling, prescription transfers, and controlled substances. The Board will continue its efforts to achieve its mission to protect Kansas consumers and promote quality health care in the field of pharmacy using the least restrictive means available.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percentage of initial applications processed within 30 days of receipt during the previous fiscal year	A	78.70%	79.96%	64.21%	75.00%	77.95%	75%	75%	74.04%
2. Percentage of initial applications processed within 30 days of completion during previous fiscal year	A	100.00%	95.37%	74.21%	85.00%	97.20%	87%	87%	88.93%
3. Percentage of initial applications for military service members or spouses processed within 15 days of completion during the previous fiscal year	A				90.00%	100.00%	95%	95%	100%
4. Percentage of online renewals for previous fiscal year	A	97.80%	89.40%	98.80%	98.90%	99.20%	99%	99%	95.80%

# Kansas Board of Pharmacy

5. Number of CE courses approved for previous fiscal year	A	81	60	54	60	62	60	60	59
<i>Output Measures</i>									
6. Number of complaints received during calendar year	B	41	109	165	100	70	125	125	115
7. Number of compliance investigations conducted during calendar year	B	581	532	541	350	335	500	500	469
8. Number of applications or renewals referred to compliance division during calendar year	B	278	236	318	250	232	250	250	262
9. Number of denied applications during calendar year	B	86	40	110	50	61	50	50	70
10. Number of revoked licensees/registrants during calendar year	B	106	54	38	75	19	35	35	37
11. Number of other disciplinary actions during calendar year	B	248	215	118	250	146	175	175	160
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
12. Percentage of resident pharmacy inspections conducted within past 24 months	B	98.1%	92.8%	80.5%	93.5%	99.1%	94.0%	94.0%	90.8%
13. Percentage of other facility resident inspections conducted within past 36 months	B	78.7%	73.3%	82.5%	80.5%	86.0%	85.0%	85.0%	80.6%
14. Percentage of investigations completed within nine months during calendar year	B	97.2%	98.5%	97.8%	95.0%	100.0%	95.0%	95.0%	98.8%

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	1,318,556	1,393,000	1,348,845	2,223,372	1,538,844	2,412,768	2,482,235	1,426,896
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,318,556</b>	<b>\$ 1,393,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,348,845</b>	<b>\$ 2,223,372</b>	<b>\$ 1,538,844</b>	<b>\$ 2,412,768</b>	<b>\$ 2,482,235</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>

## Kansas Board of Pharmacy

### Drug Monitoring Program

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Misuse abuse and diversion of controlled substances and drugs of concern

<b>Statutory Basis</b>		<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rgt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific	KSA 65-1625 et seq	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

- A. Track prescriber, dispenser, and patient information for all scheduled substances and drugs of concern dispensed in Kansas or to an address in Kansas
- B. Prevent abuse, misuse, and diversion of controlled substances and drugs of concern, while ensuring continued access for legitimate medical use.

#### Program History

In 2008, the legislature created the Prescription Drug Monitoring Act to establish and maintain a PDMP for Schedule II through IV controlled substances and other drugs of concern. Law enforcement and health agencies recognized the abuse and diversion of controlled substances as an increasing threat. The PDMP is a potent tool in aiding in the identification of patients with drug-seeking behaviors, providing treatment, and educating the public. Each dispenser (pharmacy) is required to electronically submit information to the Board's central data collection system, known as K-TRACS, for each controlled substance prescription or drug of concern dispensed in an outpatient setting. Kansas has now joined 54 other states and U.S. districts/territories in using a PDMP in an effort to reduce the diversion and improper use of controlled substances and drugs of concern, while ensuring continued availability of these medications for legitimate use. K-TRACS includes all retail and outpatient dispensing records for any controlled substance or drug of concern dispensed in or into Kansas. The only exception is for quantities dispensed in the emergency room for 48 hours or less. If a prescriber or a pharmacist has a concern about a patient, he/she can look up the patient's prescription history in K-TRACS. Because K-TRACS is a real-time, web-based system, patient information can be obtained instantly from any location at any time with the proper login credentials. Prescribers and pharmacists must register for K-TRACS through the Board prior to utilizing the system. Each dispensing pharmacy is required to post a notice to patients about the availability and reporting of this information. Law enforcement and other state agencies have limited access to the program, but may request records with proper legal authority. In 2012, medical examiners were permitted access to the PDMP so they could investigate and determine cause of death. In addition, de-identified or aggregate data may be provided to requestors for educational or research purposes. The Board collaborates with KDHE to transmit such de-identified data and cooperatively employs a grant-funded epidemiologist to analyze K-TRACS data and identify trends.

# Kansas Board of Pharmacy

## Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of registered K-TRACS Prescribers	A	10,481	10,829	9,438	9,500	10,572	10,600	10,700	10,280
2. Number of registered K-TRACS pharmacists	A	4,367	3,395	3,809	3,820	3,629	3,650	3,700	3,611
3. Number of Active Integrations	A	144	179	179		282	290	295	213
4. Annual program costs per K-TRACS user	A	\$12.37	\$31.84	\$14.66	\$15.89	\$16.89	\$17.24	\$72.93	\$21.13
5. Annual program costs per K-TRACS patient	A	\$0.22	\$0.55	\$0.26	\$0.27	\$0.29	\$0.21	\$0.87	0.37
6. Annual Program costs per K-TRACS prescription	A	\$0.03	\$0.08	\$0.04	\$0.04	\$0.04	\$0.04	\$0.16	0.05
<i>Output Measures</i>									
7. Number of K-TRACS queries	A	2,105,100	2,407,981	2,855,531	21,000,000	5,295,053	5,300,000	5,350,000	3,519,522
8. Percentage of Registered Users	A	50%	50%	52%		55%	55%	55%	52%
9. Percentage of Registered Users	A	61%	53%	48%		46%	50%	50%	49%
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
10. Number of connected states	B	32	37	37	37	37	38	38	37
11. Number of Threshold Patients	B	167	97	88	85	30	25	25	72
12. Number of Clinical Alerts	B	-	191,484	188,984	188,000	186,239	184,376	182,532	188,902

## Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	183,737	452,870	217,604	210,454	223,719	244,836	1,035,660	298,064
Federal Funds	856,480	899,396	1,277,940	1,703,940	1,427,483	1,372,640	730,070	1,201,606
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,040,217</b>	<b>\$ 1,352,266</b>	<b>\$ 1,495,544</b>	<b>\$ 1,914,394</b>	<b>\$ 1,651,202</b>	<b>\$ 1,617,476</b>	<b>\$ 1,765,730</b>	<b>\$ 1,499,671</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>

## Regular Division - Valuation Appeals

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Board would be in non-compliance with Kansas Statutes. In addition, taxpayers would not have an avenue to appeal their taxes in front of a neutral body.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific    K.S.A.74-2433	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Resolve disputes between taxpayers and taxing authorities promptly and impartially
- B. Maintain public confidence in the state and local tax systems by providing sound leadership to enhance independent, efficient, professional decision-making, and certainty in state tax law.
- C. Continue to strive to meet the changing needs of our stakeholders

### Program History

The Board of Tax Appeals, or its equivalent, has been in existence since the late 1800s. Prior to 1929, the jurisdiction now conferred on the Board was placed in the Public Service Commission, the Inheritance Tax Commission, and other part-time bodies. In 1929, the Kansas Legislature created the State Tax Commission, consisting of three members. In 1939, the State Tax Commission was replaced by the State Commission of Revenue and Taxation. In 1957, the Director of Revenue and the Director of Property Valuation offices were severed from the Commission, and the Commission was replaced by a three-member Board of Tax Appeals. In 1969, the Board was increased to five members. In the 1975 legislative session, the Board of Tax Appeals was transferred out of the Department of Revenue and made an independent agency in the executive branch of state government. During the 1998 session, the Legislature created a Small Claims Division within the Board of Tax Appeals. In 2003, the Board was reduced from five members to three members. 2003 Kan. Sess. Laws, ch. 147 § 35.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Valuation Cases Filed	N/A	2,133	2,284	2,589	2,675	2,152	2,675	2,675	2,341.7
2. Valuation Cases Closed	N/A	1,576	1,373	1,655	2,980	1,292	2,675	2,675	1,440.0
3. Clearance Rate	100 %	74%	60%	64%	111%	60%	100%	100%	61.3%
4. Outcome measure comparing outcomes to dollars									
	\$650	\$661	\$762	\$499	\$374	\$798	\$600	\$600	\$ 686.3
Output Measures									

# Board of Tax Appeals

5. Number of Cases Heard - K.S.A. 74-2426(a)	600	715	309	522	600	637	600	600	489.3
6. Number of Cases w/ 14-Day Summary Decision - K.S.A. 74-2426(a)	450	661	166	458	500	415	450	450	346.3
7. Number of 14-Day Summary Decisions Issued Timely - K.S.A. 74-2426(a)	450	660	166	458	500	377	450	450	333.7
8. Percent of 14-Day Summary Decisions Issued Timely - K.S.A. 74-2426(a)	100%	100%	100%	93%	100%	91%	100%	100%	94.7%
9. Number of Cases w/ Full Opinions Issued - K.S.A. 74-2426(a)	200	85	183	2	250	124	200	200	103.0
10. Number of Full Opinions Issued Timely - K.S.A. 74-2426(a)	200	83	180	2	250	124	200	200	102.0
11. Percent of Full Opinions Issued Timely - K.S.A. 74-2426(a)	100%	98%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99.33%
12. Number of Days to Close a Residential Appeal	200	158	178	285	180	265	200	200	242.7
13. Number of Days to Close a Commerical Appeal	450	364	353	384	365	483	450	450	406.7

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 478,912	\$ 481,532	\$ 330,652	\$ -	\$ 412,258	\$ 642,000	\$ 642,000	\$ 408,147
Non-SGF State Funds	562,201	565,276	495,978	-	618,388	963,000	963,000	\$ 559,881
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,041,113</b>	<b>\$ 1,046,808</b>	<b>\$ 826,630</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,030,646</b>	<b>\$ 1,605,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,605,000</b>	<b>\$ 968,028</b>

**FTE** The Board consist of 16 staff. The duties are the processes of all aspects. No indivudal is assigned to one case type.

## Regular Division - Exemption Filings

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Board would be in non-compliance with Kansas Statutes. In addition, taxpayers would not have an avenue to appeal their taxes in front of a neutral body.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A.79-213	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Resolve disputes between taxpayers and taxing authorities promptly and impartially
- B. Maintain public confidence in the state and local tax systems by providing sound leadership to enhance independent, efficient, professional decision-making, and certainty in state tax law.
- C. Continue to strive to meet the changing needs of our stakeholders

### Program History

EDX exemption is allowed pursuant to Kan. Const. art. XI, § 13.

IRBX exemption is allowed pursuant to K.S.A. 79-201a Second.

PVX and TX exemptions are both allowed pursuant to all applicable exemption statutes ( 79-201, 79-201a Second, 79-201j, etc.)

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Exemptions/Grievances/Other Filed	2100	2,162	2,147	1,960	2,221	2,060	2,100	2,100	2,069.0
2. Exemptions/Grievances/Other Closed	2100	2,279	1,311	2,102	2,236	2,162	2,100	2,100	1,858.3
3. Clearance rate	100%	105%	61%	107%	101%	105%	100%	100%	91.0%
4. Outcome measure comparing outcomes to dollars	\$240	\$189	\$331	\$163	\$207	\$235	\$240	\$240	\$ 243.0
<b>Output Measures</b>									
5. Number of to close an Exemption Application	<90	58	78	151	<90	153	<90	<90	127.3
6. Number of Days to Close a Tax Grievance Appeal	<90	94	171	140	<90	224	<90	<90	178.3

Board of Tax Appeals

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 198,406	\$ 199,491	\$ 136,984	\$ -	\$ 203,244	\$ 201,600	\$ 201,600	\$ 179,906
Non-SGF State Funds	232,912	234,186	205,477	-	304,866	302,400	302,400	\$ 248,176
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-			\$ -
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 431,318</b>	<b>\$ 433,677</b>	<b>\$ 342,461</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 508,110</b>	<b>\$ 504,000</b>	<b>\$ 504,000</b>	<b>\$ 428,083</b>

## Regular Division - Exemption Filings

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Board would be in non-compliance with Kansas Statutes. In addition, taxpayers would not have an avenue to appeal their taxes in front of a neutral body.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A.79-213	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Resolve disputes between taxpayers and taxing authorities promptly and impartially
- B. Maintain public confidence in the state and local tax systems by providing sound leadership to enhance independent, efficient, professional decision-making, and certainty in state tax law.
- C. Continue to strive to meet the changing needs of our stakeholders

### Program History

PVs are filed with BOTA pursuant to K.S.A. 74-2438. L. 1957, ch. 429, § 11. DTs are filed with BOTA pursuant to K.S.A. 74-2438. L. 1957, ch. 429, § 11. NFWs are with BOTA pursuant to K.S.A. 79-2938 (shortages in revenue). L. 1941, ch. 377, § 11 and filed with BOTA pursuant to K.S.A. 79-2939 (unforeseen emergencies). L. 1941, ch. 377, § 12

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Other-KDOR,IRB,MRP,NFW Filed	105	91	121	84	100	96	105	105	100
2. Other-KDOR,IRB,MRP,NFW Closed	105	91	113	66	110	103	105	105	94
3. Clearance Rate	100	100%	93%	76%	110%	107%	100%	100%	92%
4. Outcome measure comparing outcomes to dollars	\$145	\$163	\$132	\$179	\$145	\$143	\$145	\$145	\$ 151

#### Output Measures

5. Number of days to close KDOR Matters	<240	316	134	233	<240	464	<240	<240	277
6. Number of Days to Close IRBs	<20	19	21	14	<20	18	<20	<20	18
7. Number of Days to Close NFWs	<40	0	38	37	<40	35	<40	<40	37
8. Number of Days to Close MRPs		11	5	No Longer Receives MRPs	No Longer Receives MRPs	No Longer Receives MRPs	No Longer Receives MRPs	No Longer Receives MRPs	5

# Board of Tax Appeals

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 6,612	\$ 6,879	\$ 4,724	\$ -	\$ 5,891	\$ 6,090	\$ 6,090	\$ 5,831
Non-SGF State Funds	7,761	8,075	7,085	-	8,837	9,135	9,135	\$ 7,999
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ 14,373	\$ 14,954	\$ 11,809	\$ -	\$ 14,728	\$ 15,225	\$ 15,225	\$ 13,830

**FTE** The Board consist of 16 staff. The duties are the processes of all aspects. No indivudal is assigned to one case type.

## Small Claims and Expedited Hearings Division

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Board would be in non-compliance with Kansas Statutes. In addition, taxpayers would not have an avenue to appeal their taxes in front of a neutral body.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific K.S.A. 74-2433f	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Resolve disputes between taxpayers and taxing authorities promptly and impartially
- B. Maintain public confidence in the state and local tax systems by providing sound leadership to enhance independent, efficient, professional decision-making, and certainty in state tax law.
- C. Continue to strive to meet the changing needs of our stakeholders

### Program History

EDX exemption is allowed pursuant to Kan. Const. art. XI, § 13.  
 IRBX exemption is allowed pursuant to K.S.A. 79-201a Second.  
 PVX and TX exemptions are both allowed pursuant to all applicable exemption statutes ( 79-201, 79-201a Second, 79-201j, etc.)

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of Cases Filed	100	2,989	3,146	2,541	3,501	2,049	2,500	2,500	2,579
2. Number of Cases Closed	100	2,406	2,431	3,067	3,501	1,942	2,500	2,500	2,480
3. Clearance Rate	100	80%	77%	121%	100%	95%	100%	100%	97.7%
4. Outcome measure comparing outcomes to dollars	\$125	\$105	\$108	\$85	\$104	\$116	\$125	\$125	\$104

# Board of Tax Appeals

## Output Measures

5. Average days between filing and hearing. (The Small Claims hearing shall be conducted within 60 days from the date of the filing. K.S.A. 74-2433(f))	<60	40	54	60	75	53	<60	<60	63
6. Average number of days between hearing and decision. (The Small Claim hearing decision must be rendered within 30 day of the hearing. K.S.A. 74-2433(f))	<30	19	28	27	25	22	<30	<30	25
7. Number of cases where decision was certified more than 30 days after hearing. K.S.A. 74-2433(f))	<30	6	42	26	0	115	<30	<30	47

The Board consist of 16 staff. The duties are the processes of all aspects. No indivudal is assigned to one case type.

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 116,617	\$ 121,101	\$ 104,517	\$ -	\$ 95,327	\$ 128,654	\$ 128,654	\$ 118,091
Non-SGF State Funds	136,898	142,161	156,775	-	142,991	192,981	192,981	\$ 163,972
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 253,515</b>	<b>\$ 263,262</b>	<b>\$ 261,292</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 238,318</b>	<b>\$ 321,635</b>	<b>\$ 321,635</b>	<b>\$ 282,063</b>

**FTE** The Board consist of 16 staff. The duties are the processes of all aspects. No indivudal is assigned to one case type.

## Licensure, Registration, and Renewals

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

A lack of uniformity in setting standards and not assuring the public that a veterinarian or registered veterinary technician possesses the qualifications, skills, and ability to practice their profession.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>		<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	K.S.A. 47-814, 47-816, 47-829, 47-856	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To assure the public consumer that each licensed veterinarian and each registered veterinary technician is qualified, properly trained, and performing in accordance with the Kansas Veterinary Practice Act.
- B. To assure that all Kansas veterinary premises meet or exceed minimum premise standard to assure adequate facilities for providing veterinary services to the public in a sanitary and safe manner.
- C. To assure that licensees practice in a manner that prevents and controls animal diseases communicable to humans.
- D. To assure that licensees practice in a manner that protects the safety of animal products entering the public food chain.
- E. To protect public welfare against negligent and fraudulent practices, including unlicensed practice.
- F. To respond efficiently and effectively in the investigation of all allegations of violations reported to the agency.
- G. Insure that a mobile premise is a registered premise that has met certain standards and had a virtual inspection.

### Program History

Licensing of veterinarians started in 1907 with provisions in the Veterinary Practice Act (KSA 47-815 et seq.) Registration of veterinary technicians was implemented in 1993.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Licensure of new qualified veterinarians per year	A	129	158	158	148	167	165	165	148.3
2. Registration of new qualified veterinary technicians per year	A	48	62	60	55	62	60	60	57

Kansas Board of Veterinary Examiners

<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Registration of new veterinary premises	B	15	12	15	15	35	20	20	14.0
5. Registration of mobile premises	G	0	0	40	6	63	68	73	13.3

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	333,189	347,000	330,086	349,001	348,453	363,270	368,512	\$ 348,502
Federal Funds	-	-	3,304					\$ 1,101
<b>Total</b>	\$ 333,189	\$ 347,000	\$ 333,390	\$ 349,001	\$ 348,453	\$363,270	\$ 368,512	\$ 337,860
<b>FTE</b>	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8

## Premise Inspections

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Premises and mobile premises would not meet minimum standards to assure adequate facilities for providing services to the public in a sanitary and safe manner.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General	KSA 47-821 & 840	Mandatory	No	1
Specific	KSA 47-834 (b)	Mandatory	No	1
Specific	KAR 70-6; 70-7	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To have all Kansas veterinary premises in compliance with minimum standard regulations and registered with the Board
- B. To register all "new" premises
- C. To register all premises that change ownership

### Program History

Regulations for minimum standards for Veterinary Premises Sanitary Conditions and Physical Plant was implemented in 1994 and amended in 2017. While mobile premises were being identified in FY20, the first ones were registered in FY21.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Reduce the percent of premises that are not registered	A	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	2.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
2. Reduce the percent of premises that do not meet the minimum standards	A	3.0%	0.8%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.6%
3. Percent of all premises that have a change of ownership that are issued new registrations	C	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
4. Percent of new premises registered	B	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Kansas Board of Veterinary Examiners

5. Percent of mobile veterinary premises registered	A	N/A	N/A	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
---	---	-----	-----	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

<i>Output Measures</i>									
6. Number of non-registered premises that became registered	A	2	3	3	3	12	3	2	2.7
7. Number of non-complying premises that are brought into compliance	A	13	4	1	2	4	8	8	6.0
8. Number of new premises registered	B	15	12	15	15	35	20	20	14.0
9. Number of premises that have a change of ownership that are issued new registrations.	C	12	9	9	11	29	30	30	10.0
10. Number of mobile practices registered	A	N/A	N/A	49	5	63	68	73	49.0

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	333,189	347,000	330,086	349,001	348,453	363,270	368,512	\$ 348,502
Federal Funds	-	-	3,304					\$ 1,101
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 333,189</b>	<b>\$ 347,000</b>	<b>\$ 333,390</b>	<b>\$ 349,001</b>	<b>\$ 348,453</b>	<b>\$ 363,270</b>	<b>\$ 368,512</b>	<b>\$ 337,860</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.8</b>

## Investigation of Complaints

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

No oversight over reports of diseases communicable to humans, unsafe animal products entering the food chain, violations of certificates of veterinary inspection, negligent and fraudulent practices including unlicensed practice of veterinarians and practice by registered veterinary technicians, and practice of impaired veterinarians and veterinary technicians.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	KSA 47-816, 834, 847	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Assure licensees practice in a manner which prevents and controls animal diseases communicable to humans, such as rabies.
- B. Assure licensees practice in a manner that protects the safety of animal products entering the food chain.
- C. Protection of the public welfare against negligent and fraudulent practices including unlicensed practice.
- D. Investigate all allegations of a licensed veterinarian's or registered veterinary technician's impairment.

### Program History

The statute for practicing without a license was added in 1969. The statute relating to impaired veterinarians was added in 1989.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percent of alleged violations relating to disease communicable to humans investigated	A	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
2. Percent of allegations of violations of misuse of drugs investigated	C	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
3. Percent of alleged veterinarians' impairment investigated	D	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
4. Percent of alleged complaints of negligence investigated	C	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

### Output Measures

Kansas Board of Veterinary Examiners

5. Number of allegations of violations relating to diseases communicable to humans investigated	A	1	2	3	1	2	2	2	2.0
6. Number of allegations of violations of misuse of drugs investigated	C	2	2	0	1	5	2	2	1.3
7. Actual number of verified instances of negligence and fraudulent veterinary practices	C	10	12	25	6	22	15	15	15.7
8. Actual number of veterinarians assessed to have impairment	D	3	1	3	3	0	2	2	2.3

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	333,189	347,000	330,086	349,001	348,453	363,270	368,512	\$ 348,502
Federal Funds	-	-	3,304					\$ 1,101
<b>Total</b>	\$ 333,189	\$ 347,000	\$ 333,390	\$ 349,001	\$ 348,453	\$ 363,270	\$ 368,512	\$ 337,860
<b>FTE</b>	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8

## Revision of Statutes and Regulations

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Outdated Statutes and Regulations as standards of practice.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General KSA 47-821 (14)	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Development of Standards of Practice, Rules, and Regulation for approval by the board.

### Program History

The powers of the Board for KSA 47-821 (14) was passed in 1969.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percent of rules and regulations approved by the Board.	A	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	333,189	347,000	330,086	349,001	348,453	363,270	368,512	\$ 348,502
Federal Funds	-	-	3,304					\$ 1,101
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 333,189</b>	<b>\$ 347,000</b>	<b>\$ 333,390</b>	<b>\$ 349,001</b>	<b>\$ 348,453</b>	<b>\$ 363,270</b>	<b>\$ 368,512</b>	<b>\$ 337,860</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.8</b>

## Conservation Division

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The KCC's Conservation Division regulates, enforces laws, and supervises activities associated with the exploration and production of oil and natural gas. Conservation staff works to prevent degradation of land and water resources, prevent waste in the production of crude oil and natural gas resources, and protect correlative rights of mineral owners and royalty interest holders.

Without funding, most aspects of the oil and gas industry would be unregulated or cease to function in Kansas. Licenses to operate oil and gas wells could not be obtained, and current licensees would not be able to transfer and operate wells, or obtain permits to drill wells, plug wells, obtain injection authority to dispose of wastewater, to vent or flare current wells, or engage in compressed air energy storage operations. There would be no state oversight of on-lease spills of oil or brine water, wasteful oil and gas practices, the casing integrity of current oil, gas, and class II injection wells to ensure protection of fresh and usable water, or certain safety aspects of intra-state gas storage facilities. For Class II injection wells the Commission exercises delegated regulatory primacy over such wells, in conformity with the requirements mandated by federal regulations, without this delegated authority oversight would revert to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Operators would be unable to obtain various severance tax exemptions. Abandoned wells with no responsible party would remain unplugged. Certain oil-and-gas related disputes would be unresolvable, as parties would be unable to exhaust administrative remedies before seeking court review. Fees and fines would not be collected or accrue to various funds, including the state general fund. Oil-and-gas related tax revenue would decline because the industry would be unable to fully function.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
74-606	Mandatory	No	1
74-623 to 74-628	Mandatory	No	1
Chapter 55	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Regulate, enforce laws, and supervises activities associated with the exploration and production of oil and gas to prevent degradation of land and water resources, prevent the waste in the production of crude oil and natural gas resources, and protect correlative rights of mineral owners and royalty interest holders.

B. Timely reclaim and remediate land and water sources using allocated funds.

**Program History**

The Commission has regulated the petroleum industry since 1933. General agency jurisdiction over oil and gas practices has remained stable for many decades; the agency shared some overlapping jurisdiction with KDHE during the 1970s through 1990s. Recent legislation impacting the division includes this session's merging of the well plugging assurance fund into the abandoned oil and gas well fund. K.S.A. 74-606 requires the conservation division office to be located in Wichita. The Conservation Division is primarily funded by assessments and fees on the petroleum industry. The Division's main office is located in Wichita, with district offices in Chanute, Dodge City, Hays, and Wichita. Day-to-day Division activities include: permitting associated with wells and operator licenses; inspection and investigation of oil and gas leases, including wells, tank batteries, pits, and spills; enforcement of Commission regulations, and management of the abandoned well plugging program.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Median response time in days to single well project priority 1A abandoned wells	B	126.0	2.5	44.5	30.0	1.0	30.0	30.0	16.0
2. % of MIT failures (wells) remediated within 90 days (UIC program measure based on federal fiscal year, FY2022 is based on data through June 1, 2022)	A	91%	90%	84%	90%	91%	90%	90%	88%

*Output Measures*

3. Number of Priority 1A wells plugged (1A wells are prioritized to be plugged within the fiscal year they are identified.)	A, B	6	47	25	N/A	3	N/A	N/A	25
4. MIT failures (UIC program measures are tracked on federal fiscal year so FY2022 is through June 1, 2022)	A, B	235	324	174	250	374	250	250	291

*Additional Measures as Necessary*

5. Number of oil and gas facility inspections performed	A	4,158	3,983	4,540	4,000	4,652	4,000	4,000	4,392
6. Wells plugged in the course of regulatory enforcement	A	674	716	727	600	903	600	600	782

Kansas Corporation Commission

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	8,349,860	8,119,374	10,040,410	10,407,910	10,299,594	11,559,364	12,306,938	9,486,459
Federal Funds	-	-	-			5,000,000	12,000,000	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 8,349,860	\$ 8,119,374	\$ 10,040,410	\$ 10,407,910	\$ 10,299,594	\$ 16,559,364	\$ 24,306,938	\$ 9,486,459
<b>FTE</b>	75.5	70.0	88.0	87.5	87.5	87.50	88.50	81.8

## Utilities Division

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Failure to fund would violate the KCC's Chapter 66 mandates to ensure utilities provide efficient and sufficient service at just and reasonable rates. Failure to fund would essentially leave the KCC'S current jurisdictional utilities unregulated, which would have profound impacts on rates as the agency would lack the resources to audit the utilities' rate increase requests and deprive the Commission of an evidentiary basis to establish rates. There is a high probability and risk that both residential and commercial rates could increase significantly, placing Kansas at an economic development disadvantage. Conversely, underfunding or not funding this program would allow a utility to have one class of customer, such as residential, subsidize another class, such as commercial or industrial, in order to create an economic incentive through lower rates to large customers, thereby increasing the utilities revenues. In addition, the KCC would be unable to evaluate and correct any deficiencies a utility might have in providing reliable service. Failure to fund the Energy Operations and Pipeline Safety could have dire effects on the environment and safety. Underfunding this section would hinder its ability to ensure safe operation of all gas utilities through enforcement of federal and state pipeline safety regulations. Failure to fund the Telecommunications section could dramatically impact the Kansas Universal Service Fund, customer service protections, and availability of telecommunication service.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>		<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
General	74-601 to 74-631	Mandatory	No	1
Specific	74-633	Mandatory	No	1
Specific	Chapter 66	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Ensure the laws and regulations applicable to jurisdictional electric, natural gas, telecommunications and water utilities are adhered to.
- B. Provide recommendations and advice to the Commission to promote and assure sufficient, efficient, and safe utility services at reasonable and non-discriminatory rates to consumers.
- C. Minimize the safety risk of natural gas pipeline operations throughout the State by assuring safe operation through compliance with regulations. Initiate action to educate operators to lower safety risk of natural gas system
- D. Lower the risk to public safety by reducing excavator damages to pipelines
- E. Protect the public interest through impartial, efficient, and transparent resolution of all jurisdictional issues through regulation and oversight of rates, services, and quality of service of jurisdictional telecommunications public utilities.

**Program History**

The KCC was originally established in 1883 to regulate railroad activity. Kansas was one of the first states to establish a regulatory agency and in 1911 the Legislature created a three member Public Utilities Commission (Commission). Over the years the Commission has regulated telegraph and telephone, pipeline, common carriers, water, electric, gas and other power companies with the exception of municipal owned utilities. The Utilities Division has four sections: Accounting and Financial Analysis responsible for investigating, analyzing and making recommendations to the Commission on accounting and financial issues relating to the electric, natural gas, telecommunication and water industries. The Economic Policy and Rates section is responsible for investigating and making recommendations on economic issues relating to the above industries. The Energy Operations and Pipeline Safety section provides technical expertise relating to electric utility operations, reliability, safety, electric transmission siting, and electric and gas consumer services. They also responsible to ensure safe operation of all gas utilities through enforcement of federal and state regulations. The Telecommunications section is responsible for researching, investigating, analyzing, and making recommendations on courses of action for all telecommunications matters that come before the Commission.

\* Because the KCC is required by statute to balance the public need for adequate, efficient, and affordable service with a public utility's need for sufficient revenue, it is difficult to derive relevant outcome measures for Staff's performance based budgeting purpose since outcomes have to be determined on a case-by-case basis. Staff have to be able to review the data, facts, evidence and conduct investigations without a predetermined outcome. Staff's actions must be determined based on the merits of the issue.

More details are provided in the agency budget which provides more context around the goals, outcome and output measures. Taking this information out of context may create inaccurate assumptions.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percentage of applications granted by Commission	A, B	84%	90%	86%	85%	94%	90%	90%	90%
2. Percentage of applications denied by Commission	A, B	16%	10%	14%	15%	6%	10%	10%	10%
3. Highest number of hours for rate case(s) during fiscal year	A, B	3,644	3,750	5,786	3,750	3,048	3,750	3,750	4,195
4. Highest cost for a rate case during the Fiscal year (see note below)	A, B	231,043	200,000	69,974	350,000	268,329	350,000	350,000	179,434

*Output Measures*

5. Number of applications filed and reviewed	A, B	225	250	196	250	163	200	200	203
--	------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Kansas Corporation Commission

6. Percentage of applications completed within statutory deadline	A, B	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
7. Average number of days to complete applications	A, B	109	100	85	100	69	75	75	85
8. Number of applications completed in less than 180 days	A, B	173	200	169	200	145	175	175	171
9. % of applications completed in less than 180 days	A, B	81%	80%	86%	90%	89%	90%	90%	85%
10. Complete 520 person-days of field inspections throughout the state	C	659	549	691	549	652	549	549	631
11. Number of leaks per 100 miles of pipe	C	16	16	17	16	16	16	16	16
12. Number of inspection units inspected	C	98	120	91	120	135	120	120	115
13. Average Number of field person-days per inspector	C	139	125	108	125	107	125	125	113
14. % of field inspection cases closed per calendar year	C	97%	95%	95%	95%	96%	95%	95%	95%
15. Kansas share of programs cost per operator inspected	C	2,047	2,000	3,023	3,000	3,316	3,000	3,000	2,780
16. Number of compliance actions taken from damage investigations	D	202	180	356	250	327	250	250	288
17. Number of gas damages per 1,000 locate tickets	D	2.2	2.0	2.3	2.0	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.1
18. Compliance action taken per number of incidents of utility damage that are investigated by staff	D	66%	75%	61%	75%	74%	75%	75%	70%
19. Number of applications filed and reviewed	E	126	150	173	150	137	135	135	153.3333333
20. % of filed applications reviewed within statutory deadline	E	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

#4 above FY2021 consisted of four rate cases. Three of the rate cases were solely related to the Tax Cut and Jobs Act, which resulted in rate reductions for all three. The fourth rate case was a revenue neutral rate design case that resulted in a small rate reduction. Because all of the rate cases resulted in rate reductions and none were litigated, the metrics for the test year are inconsistent with typical years.

Kansas Corporation Commission

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	3,933,497	4,639,346	3,967,029	5,843,290	4,462,475	6,730,651	7,978,200	4,356,283
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 3,933,497	\$ 4,639,346	\$ 3,967,029	\$ 5,843,290	\$ 4,462,475	\$ 6,730,651	\$ 7,978,200	\$ 4,356,283
<b>FTE</b>	37.0	38.5	38.5	39.5	39.5	39.5	39.5	38.8

## Transportation Division

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This is an industry fee funded. To end the program funding would result in a much higher injury and fatality accident rate for the Kansas based motor carriers (MCs). This equates to a higher mortality rate for the motoring public. This would allow operators that are only concerned with their bottom line to operate with disregard for the safety of their employees and the general public. Additionally, Kansas would lose millions of dollars in interstate registration fees. Further, failing to fund this program would have a negative chain reaction in that funds currently transferred to the Kansas Highway Patrol to Kansas Department of Transportation, and all fines and penalties are transferred to the State General Fund would end.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. <u>Discretionary</u>	MOE/Match <u>Rgt.</u>	Priority <u>Level</u>
General	66-1a, a, 108b	Mandatory	No	1
Specific	66-1, 112g - Private reg	Mandatory	No	1
Specific	66-1, 114 - For hire reg	Mandatory	No	1
Specific	66-1, 139(a)- UCR	Mandatory	No	1
Specific	66-1, 129- Safety	Mandatory	No	1
General	Chapter 66 - throughout has numerous references to motor carriers and the authority of the Commission, the statutes specifically listed herein are a fraction of what the Division operates within.			

### Program Goals

- A. Reduce the number of accidents involving Kansas based carriers in comparison to carriers based in Midwest States
- B. Reduce the number of conditional and unsatisfactory rated Kansas based carriers.
- C. Maintain high rate of compliance of Kansas based carriers with Unified Carrier Registration (UCR) requirements.

**Program History**

The transportation division regulates motor carriers (MCs) and businesses that operate commercial motor vehicles in the state of Kansas. The Division is responsible for establishing the regulations that apply to motor carriers through both state statutes and administrative regulations, ensuring that businesses, drivers, and vehicles meet the appropriate economic and safety regulations to ensure the safety of the motoring public. This includes collaborations with other state and federal agencies with a close working relationship with the Kansas Highway Patrol. Although state regulation of public utilities existed in Kansas as far back as 1883, the Public Service Commission was not established until 1925. In 1933, the Kansas legislature replaced the Public Service Commission with the State Corporation Commission expanding its jurisdiction to include transportation. Transportation regulation was largely focused on enforcement of territories, rates and tariffs until deregulation occurred due to the Motor Carrier Act of 1980. The Transportation Division continues to regulate motor carriers today for issues related to safety and economic issues related to licensing and permitting, insurance and vehicle registration, among other things.

The KCC is required by statute to balance the safety of the motoring public with the economic impact to motor carriers and ensure compliance with federal regulations, it is virtually impossible to derive relevant, meaningful, and realistic outcome measures for Staff's performance based budgeting purposes. Transportation staff have at the core of their mission the safety of the motoring public, it is hard to measure the number of accidents averted or lives saved by the work they do every day.

More details are provided in the agency budget which provides more context around the goals, outcome and output measures contained herein. Taking this information out of context may create inaccurate assumptions.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>CY 2018</i>	<i>CY 2019</i>	<i>CY 2020</i>	<i>CY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>CY 2022 as of August 1st</i>	<i>CY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>CY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. KS based MCs involved in fewer accidents compared to the 10 Midwest region states.	A	Kansas has the 2nd lowest accident total out of the 10 Midwest States	Kansas has the 2nd lowest accident total out of the 10 Midwest States	Kansas has the 4th lowest accident total out of the 10 Midwest States	Lowest accident total out of the 10 Midwest States	Kansas has the 2nd Lowest accident total out of the 10 midwest states	Lowest accident total out of the 10 Midwest States	Lowest accident total out of the 10 Midwest States	3rd lowest accident total compared to the 10 Midwest States

Kansas Corporation Commission

2. KS based MCs receiving fewer Conditional and Unsatisfactory rated Compliance Reviews.	B	Out of 211 compliance reviews, KS issued a total of 24 Conditional and Unsatisfactory rated reviews which was the lowest of the 10 Midwest States	Out of 201 compliance reviews, KS issued a total of 23 Conditional and Unsatisfactory rated reviews which was the lowest of the 10 Midwest States	Out of 113 compliance reviews, KS issued a total of 10 Conditional and Unsatisfactory rated reviews which was the lowest of the 10 Midwest States	Register 98% of the interstate motor carriers	Out of the 86 Compliance reviews, KS issues a total of 21 Conditional and Unsatisfactory rated reviews which was the lowest among the 10 midwest states.	Lowest number of Conditional and Unsatisfactory rated reviews out of the 10 Midwest States	Lowest number of Conditional and Unsatisfactory rated reviews out of the 10 Midwest States	Kansas has the lowest Conditional and Unsatisfactory rated Compliance Reviews average compared to the 10 Midwest States
3. KS based MCs in compliance with UCR registration	C	Kansas registered 94.53.% of the interstate MCs, this is the highest registration percentage in the nation.	Kansas registered 94.53.% of the interstate MCs, this is the highest registration percentage in the nation.	Kansas registered 97.47.% of the interstate MCs, this is the highest registration percentage in the nation.	Register 98% of the interstate motor carriers	Kansas registered 96% of the interstate MCs, this is the highest registration percentage in the nation.	Register 99.50% of the interstate motor carriers	Register 99.50% of the interstate motor carriers	Kansas 3 year average of 97.90% is the highest registration rate in the nation

*Output Measures*

4. Conducted Compliance Reviews		211	201	113	225	86	170	170	133
5. Conducted Training Seminars		78	87	47	90	42	90	90	59

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	1,426,880	1,478,369	1,492,908	1,684,015	1,710,687	2,076,064	2,495,936	1,560,655
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,426,880</b>	<b>\$ 1,478,369</b>	<b>\$ 1,492,908</b>	<b>\$ 1,684,015</b>	<b>\$ 1,710,687</b>	<b>\$ 2,076,064</b>	<b>\$ 2,495,936</b>	<b>\$ 1,560,655</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>17.0</b>

## Administration Division

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Failure to fund the administrative functions of the agency would leave the agency without leadership or the ability to maintain the day-to-day operations. The agency would in essence be unable to regulate the industries charged with regulating, would lack staff to respond to the public and could not process and resolve legal issues, address budget, information technology or human resource issues.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
74-601 to 74-631 - establishes the KCC and provides the agency consists of three members appointed by and confirmed by the Senate	Mandatory	No	1
74-605 and 74-606 - authorization to hire staff, main office to be located in Topeka; Conservation Division to be located in Wichita	Mandatory	No	1
Chapter 66	Mandatory	No	1
Chapter 55	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Protect the public interest by impartially, effectively, and efficiently regulating the rates, terms of service, and safety of public utilities and commercial trucking, by regulating the production of crude oil and natural gas, and by promoting energy programs that improve energy efficiency in Kansas.

B. Ensure due process in Commission proceedings and ensure compliance with applicable statutes, and regulations.

C. To protect the public interest through fair, impartial, efficient and transparent legal resolution of all jurisdictional matters.

D. Maintain all dockets for the agency and ensure timely filing of all documents within the dockets

E. Serve as resource for the legislative process by providing technical information to legislators, their staff, legislative committees in regard to subject matters under the agency's regulatory authority

F. Provide a streamlined process for public participation, education, and protection for the general public regarding regulatory issues.

G. Implement programs and services to ensure a comprehensive and effective human resource effort for the KCC.

H. Provide responsive, cost effective and efficient information technology services to the agency.

I. Process all fiscal related transactions for the agency and provide support to the Divisions for purchases, travel and other fiscal related matters. Maintain financial integrity of the KCC

### Program History

The Administrative Division consists of the Commissioners, its attorneys, front office support staff, public affairs, docket room, fiscal, human resources, and information technology staff. In 1883, the Board of Railroad Commissions was established by the Legislature, the Commissioners worked to ensure safe and reliable service for the public on the developing railroads. The Commission was charged with balancing the needs of Kansans and industry in reaching reasonable rates. At the time the Commission's role was primarily investigatory and advisory. As electricity and telephones became part of daily life, the 1911 Public Utilities Commission replaced the Railroad Commission. the role expanded to include the regulation of telephone service, water, light, heat and pipeline, and power companies. In 1920, the Court of Industrial Relations was created to combine regulatory duties with the arbitration of wages, hours, and industry and labor disputes. In 1925, it became the Public Service Commission. In 1933, the present regulatory State Corporation Commission was established. Today the Commission regulates the ever changing electric, natural gas, telecommunications, oil and gas, and transportation industries. K.S.A. 74-606 requires the Commission main office to be located in Topeka and the conservation division in Wichita.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of orders issued*	A, B, C	3,146	2,756	711	2,300	3,413	2,300	2,300	2,293
2. Number of hours litigation attorneys spent on rate cases	A, B, C	872.75	786.50	684.75	1,200	1104.75	1200.00	1200.00	858.67
3. Number of hours litigation attorneys spent on FERC and SPP (*new metric in 2020)	A, B, C	N/A	454.75	638.25	700.00	761.75	700.00	700.00	618.25
4. Number of dockets opened	D	910	959	1,075	1,300	1,138	1,300	1,300	1,057

\*2021 number of orders issued by the Commissioner were down due to COVID 19 restrictions.

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	5,521,499	5,301,487	5,125,587	7,269,951	6,142,554	8,835,481	10,583,373	5,523,209
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 5,521,499</b>	<b>\$ 5,301,487</b>	<b>\$ 5,125,587</b>	<b>\$ 7,269,951</b>	<b>\$ 6,142,554</b>	<b>\$ 8,835,481</b>	<b>\$ 10,583,373</b>	<b>\$ 5,523,209</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>58.5</b>	<b>60.75</b>	<b>59.75</b>	<b>58.00</b>	<b>58.00</b>	<b>58.0</b>	<b>58.0</b>	<b>59.50</b>

## Energy Division

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This is a federal funded program through a U.S. Department of Energy formula grant, failure to continue to fund the program would reduce energy efficiency education and resources for K-12 teachers. Additionally, it would prevent the KCC from meeting the statutory requirements for the Energy Division.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. <u>Discretionary</u>	MOE/Match <u>Rgt.</u>	Priority <u>Level</u>
Specific	74-616	Mandatory	No	1
Specific	74-617	Mandatory	No	1
Specific	74-622	Mandatory	No	1
Specific	75-37,125	Mandatory	No	1
Specific	75-37,129	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Increase energy conservation in small rural businesses and public buildings.
- B. Increase the number of schools participating in K-12 energy benchmarking activities.
- C. Expand energy efficiency education outreach (K-12, small business, and residential). This includes KidWind challenge participants.

### Program History

The Kansas Energy Office (KEO) was created by statute in 1975, attached to the Governor's office. In 1978 the KEO was reorganized and given independent status as a separate state agency. The Kansas Energy Office was then abolished in 1983 and its duties and responsibilities transferred to the Kansas Corporation Commission. (K.S.A. 74-622) Pursuant to KSA 74-617 the KCC is authorized to receive federal funds. The KCC is specifically prohibited from adopting or enforcing energy efficiency standards for residential, commercial or industrial structures (KSA 66-1227). In 2000 the Kansas Legislature passed the Facility Conservation Improvement Program (FCIP) within the Department of Administration. The FCIP was moved to the KCC in 2007. The Division is completely funded by U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) federal funds and an annual grant application has to be approved by DOE to receive federal funds. All programs, goals and performance measures are established in compliance with the DOE grant requirements. DOE changed program metrics in 2019 and again in 2021.

The Congressional Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act if passed will have a direct effect on the Energy Division and may require modifications to programs, outcome measures and other DOE required metrics. The Division will be closely monitoring actions by Congress and will have to respond accordingly to all mandatory requirements.

Kansas Corporation Commission

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of presentations about FCIP	A	3	5	3	5	3	2	3	4
2. Number of public entities supported through energy performance contracting	A	6	4	3	2	3	2	2	3
3. kWh energy savings identified through small business energy assessments	A	2,267,304.00	1,518,925.00	1,995,081.00	550,000.00	867,225.00	500,000.00	500,000.00	1,460,410.33
4. Number of energy assessments/audits completed for small rural businesses	A	21	23	20	21	21	20	20	21
5. Number of energy efficiency presentations	A, B, C	31	31	38	15	65	35	40	45
6. Number of K-12 school districts participating in energy benchmarking	B	N/A	N/A	7	12	7	7	7	7
7. K-12 building square footage being tracked in Energy Star Portfolio Manager	B	N/A	N/A	2,172,617	2,600,000	2,587,066	2,600,000	2,600,000	2379841.5
8. Number of students participating in KidWind Challenge	C	*150	*208	91	400	196	200	200	143.5

Notes: K-12 benchmarking was added FY2022, the program started in FY2020, but because of COVID 19 we were prevented from working with schools. The KidWind Challenges had to be held virtually in FY2021 and because most schools were remote learning, we had a reduction in the number of participants. There were still some travel restrictions in FY2022. A correction was made to the FY2019 and FY2020 actuals for number of students.

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	256,071	195,538	98,319	(35,669)				146,929
Federal Funds	515,790	480,084	496,607	815,127	927,681	921,300	921,300	634,791
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 771,861</b>	<b>\$ 675,622</b>	<b>\$ 594,926</b>	<b>\$ 779,458</b>	<b>\$ 927,681</b>	<b>\$ 921,300</b>	<b>\$ 921,300</b>	<b>\$ 732,743</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>1.75</b>	<b>1.75</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.17</b>

\*the actuals for fy2022 is higher than approved because of the three year grant cycle reporting for expenditures.

## Kansas Dental Board

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

1. Licensing. Nonlicensed persons will practice dentistry and dental hygiene. Insurance companies and public safety net programs require licensure for reimbursement.
2. Legal. Ongoing practice of dentists and dental hygienists by unqualified or dangerous individuals.
3. Inspections. No capability to ensure sterilization and infection control standards are being met despite statewide, universal rules.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 74-1404	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. License qualified candidates desiring to practice dentistry or dental hygiene in Kansas.
- B. Monitor compliance with sanitary and other regulations through routine sanitation inspections.
- C. Ensure safe dental practices by investigating complaints of incompetence, negligence, and illegal practice and revoking or suspending the licenses of practitioners engaging in negligent or illegal practice.

### Program History

In 1943, the Kansas Legislature passed the Dental Practices Act, K.S.A. 65-1421 et seq. The Kansas Dental Board was established to enforce the Act, K.S.A. 74-1404 et seq. The Board is composed of six dentists, two dental hygienists, and one public member, all of whom are appointed to four-year terms by the Governor.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	CY 2019 Actuals*	CY 2020 Actuals	CY 2021 Actuals	CY 2022 Previous Est.	CY 2022 Estimates	CY 2023 Est.	CY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of Sanitation Inspections for DDS (360 per year at \$100 through CY 19 and \$110 starting in CY 20)	B	360	303	303	360	360	360	360	322
2. Cost per sanitation inspection	B	\$ 100	\$ 105	\$ 110	\$ 110	110	110	110	\$ 108
3. Average cost per license	A	\$ 53	\$ 53	\$ 53	\$ 54	\$ 53	\$ 52	\$ 52	\$ 53
4. Average cost of board sanitation corrections	C	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$ 2,000
5. Average cost of board investigations for complaints of incompetence, negligence, and illegal practice	C	\$ 46,000	\$ 47,575	\$ 70,325	\$ 88,250	88,250	88,250	88,250	\$ 68,717
<i>Output Measures</i>									
6. Total number of dentists licensed	A	2,257	2,289	2,298	2,275	2,275	2,300	2,300	2,287
7. Total number of hygienists licensed	A	3,114	3,144	3,162	3,150	3,150	3,200	3,200	3,152
8. Number of complaints	C	93	80	86	100	100	100	100	89

\*Calendar year 2019 data was used as agency tracks data by CY and did not have CY 2018 data readily available to estimate FY 2019

Kansas Dental Board

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	380,511	418,211	381,181	418,500	412,339	425,688	560,000	403,910
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 380,511	\$ 418,211	\$ 381,181	\$ 418,500	\$ 412,339	\$ 425,688	\$ 560,000	\$ 403,910
<b>FTE</b>	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0

## Program: Business Development

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The division plays a critical role connecting companies, both new and expanding, with the resources needed to stay and grow in the state. Without funding, there will be limited interaction between companies and the state thereby limiting the opportunities to help companies capitalize on potential new projects. The states we often compete with for jobs and capital investment have well-funded public or public-private partnerships to aggressively recruit new business. Loss of funding would make it difficult for the state of Kansas to compete for this new business.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Increase new business to Kansas
- B. Retain businesses in Kansas

### Program History

The Business Development Division grows the Kansas Economy through the creation and retention of jobs and increased capital investment. This Division is charged with recruiting new business and assisting existing Kansas companies interested in opportunities to grow and expand in the state. In 2020, Governor Kelly announced that Kansas broke the record for new capital investment in the state—over \$2.5 billion was invested by private businesses, the highest total in the 35-year history of the Department of Commerce. In 2021, Kansas again broke the capital investment record with more than \$3.8 billion invested by private businesses. Calendar year 2022 is expected to result in a third year of record-breaking capital investment.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of jobs created or retained through business development efforts*	A, B	25,458	14,458	17,241	18,965	8,521	10,850	10,850	13,407
2. Private capital investment (in billions) in Kansas through Commerce programs	A, B	\$1.42	\$1.50	\$4.31	\$4.74	\$2.60	\$5.00	\$4.00	\$2.80
3. Number of jobs created or retained through business recruitment efforts	A, B	8,573	2,887	7,397	8,137	3,336	4,620	4,620	4,540
4. Number of jobs created or retained through retention/expansion efforts	A, B	16,460	11,126	9,844	10,828	5,185	6,230	6,230	8,718

<i>Output Measures</i>									
5. Number of projects opened by business development staff	A, B	165	324	519	571	403	423	444	415
6. Number of business recruitment projects opened	A	128	140	149	164	126	160	175	138
7. Percent of business recruitment projects won	A	36%	15%	15%	17%	19%	20%	20%	16%
8. Number of business development projects in "new" status at fiscal year end	A					103	115	130	103.0
9. Number of projects with proposal's sent out at fiscal year end	A					88	90	100	88.0
10. Number of projects in the "Competitive Stage" at fiscal year end	A					10	20	30	10.0
11. Number of projects being finalized at fiscal year end	A					21	25	25	21.0

\*International project data is included in the International Division section

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund								\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds								\$ -
Federal Funds								\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	26.0	26.0	8.3

\*\*Unable to provide a total funding amount since many of the subprograms listed in this spreadsheet make up this Division. Therefore funding numbers would be repeated on this particular sheet and would have already been reported under a specific sub-program.

## Program: Workforce Services Division

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Workforce Services Division is responsible for the links to businesses (employers), education institutions and jobseekers to ensure the placement of qualified and skilled workers. The division and its partners are dependent upon federal funding to ensure Kansans are receiving proper core and intensive services via training opportunities, job referrals and placements. The impact of not funding this division would result in loss of employment opportunities for Kansas job seekers and matching of qualified candidates to opportunities with employers within the state. Funding is vital to maintain an integrated, demand-driven statewide network.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act (WIOA) 20 CFR Part IV	Mandatory	No	2

### Program Goals

- A. Customer Service
- B. Performance Accountability and Transparency
- C. System Messaging and Awareness
- D. Technology Integration

### Program History

Federal workforce development legislation is said to have originated with President Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal legislation (1933-1938). During the Great Depression, employment across the nation fell to an all-time low. In 1962, President John F. Kennedy recognized that unemployment was again on the rise, and the worker skills gap was increasing rapidly with a changing economy. The Manpower Development and Training Act (1962-1973) was designed to provide training to unemployed adults and a small percentage of youth workers whose skills needed to be upgraded to enter or re-enter the workforce. The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA), implemented in 1973 (1973-1982), resulted from many revisions to the Manpower Development and Training Act. CETA was designed to create jobs for unemployed adults and provide summer job opportunities for high school students. A primary focus of CETA was apprenticeships for unemployed or underemployed individuals to help them gain experience and on-the-job training. The Job Training and Partnership Act (JTPA) (1982-1998) further consolidated education and job training programs by setting up regional Service Delivery Areas (SDAs) in each state, but still placed a heavy responsibility on the federal government. These SDAs evolved into today's Workforce Investment Areas. Fourteen years after the Job Training Partnership Act, President William J. Clinton spearheaded the passage of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) (1998-2014). Enacted during a period of full employment, WIA focused on the delivery of workforce development programs and related services through a nationwide network of community-based, one-stop career centers. On July 22, 2014, President Barack Obama signed the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act of 2014 (WIOA), which reauthorizes the workforce investment system and replaces the Workforce Investment Act of 1998. WIOA took effect on July 1, 2015. The Workforce Services Division links businesses, job candidates and educational institutions to ensure that employers can find skilled workers.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of customer service survey responses	A	7,206	12,612	5,037	6,000	2,414	2,462	2,512	6,688
2. Number of jobs created or retained	B	15,238	12,349	10,941	13,742	17,535	17,886	18,243	13,608
3. Number of participants trained	B	13,545	7,909	3,765	8,995	1,668	1,701	1,735	4,447
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Number of job seeker users on KansasWorks.com	D	N/A	313,029	446,319	406,251	922,689	941,143	959,966	560,679
5. Number of employer contacts on KansasWorks.com	D	11,250	6,796	10,656	10,237	11,045	11,266	11,491	9,499
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
6. Number of participants served with core services*	B	63,397	42,722	19,143	44,677	21,318	21,744	22,179	27,728
7. Percentage entered employment (Adult) 2nd quarter after exit	B	78.4%	75.5%	72.4%	76.0%	75.2%	76.7%	78.2%	74.4%

## Workforce Services

## Kansas Department of Commerce

8. Number of job orders	B	206,826	170,288	318,342	248,046	71,215	72,639	74,092	186,615
9. Number of job seeker resumes	B	8,328	6,796	35,630	18,102	8,691	8,865	9,042	17,039

\*Core Services includes, but is not limited to: Job Search Counseling, Resume Writing, Career Guidance, Workforce Information Services and more.

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund								\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds								\$ -
Federal Funds								\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	164.0	165.0	165.0	54.7

\*\*Unable to provide a total funding amount since many of the subprograms listed in this spreadsheet make up this Division. Therefore funding numbers would be repeated on this particular sheet and would have already been reported under a specific sub-program.

## Sub\_Program: Job Creation Fund (JCF)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Job Creation Fund Program was created for the purposes of promoting job creation and economic development projects. If JCF is not funded, Kansas will not be able to compete for projects, leading to a loss in new job creation and capital investment.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific      74-50,224	Mandatory	No	3

### Program Goals

A. Promoting job creation and economic development activity.

### Program History

The Job Creation Fund Program was created in 2011 for the purposes of promoting job creation and economic development projects. The fund was created by combining the former Investments in Major Projects and Comprehensive Training (IMPACT) and Kansas Economic Opportunities Initiative Fund (KEOIF).

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Jobs created	A.	2,280	2,822	3,837	4,000	842	3000	3000	2500
2. Total ROI for program dollars invested	A.	\$80,190,000	\$348,876,000	\$379,960,099	\$396,000,000	\$49,302,000	\$792,000,000	\$792,000,000	\$259,379,366
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Number of JCF applications received	A.	10	12	16	16	7	12	12	12
4. Percent of JCF applications approved	A.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
5. Total dollar amount of JCF application fees	A.	\$6,750	\$7,600	\$11,250	\$12,000	\$6,750	\$9,000	\$9,000	\$8,533

## Kansas Department of Commerce

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,701,013	\$6,500,000	\$1,830,000	\$4,703,107		\$ 1,843,671
Non-SGF State Funds	1,576,688	575,457	391,906	2,774,542	400,810	25,032,571	8,748,224	456,058
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,576,688</b>	<b>\$ 575,457</b>	<b>\$ 4,092,919</b>	<b>\$ 9,274,542</b>	<b>\$ 2,230,810</b>	<b>\$ 29,735,678</b>	<b>\$8,748,224</b>	<b>\$ 2,299,729</b>
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.2	1.2	0.4

## Sub\_Program: Promoting Employment Across Kansas Program (PEAK)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

PEAK is an economic development tool used to encourage economic development and job creation in Kansas by incenting companies to locate, relocate, expand, or retain their business facilities/operations and related jobs. Lack of funding would result in the loss of job and economic growth in Kansas.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	KSA 74-50,210 - 74-50,219	Mandatory	No	4

### Program Goals

- A. To foster economic development and the creation of new jobs and opportunities for the citizens of Kansas.
- B. To incentivize the location of business facilities, other operations and jobs in Kansas.

### Program History

PEAK was created by the 2009 Legislature. The 2010, 2011 and 2014 Legislative Sessions passed subsequent changes to the Act effectively broadening the eligibility criteria resulting in increased program scope. The Legislature enacted PEAK to encourage economic development and job creation in Kansas by incenting companies to locate, relocate, expand or retain (retain incentives are no longer available via PEAK) their business facilities/operations and related jobs.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of direct jobs created or retained	A,B	19,616	22,218	18,502	21,000	TBD	20,000	21,000	20,360
2. Total state withholding taxes retained by all participant companies (in millions)	B	\$46.9	\$49.2	\$ 43.10	\$49.5	TBD	\$44.0	\$45.0	\$46.2
3. Number of indirect jobs created	A,B	11,500	14,500	17,724	13,500	TBD	19,159	20,116	16,112
4. State and local tax revenue estimates (in millions)	A,B	\$206.3	\$216.4	\$189.60	\$217.8	TBD	\$193.6	\$198.0	\$203.0

PEAK

Kansas Department of Commerce

5. Total ROI estimates on the state withholding taxes retained by all PEAK participant companies (in billions)	A,B	\$2.6	\$2.8	\$2.40	\$2.8	TBD	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$2.6
6. Kansas economic growth estimates (in billions)	A,B	\$45.0	\$47.2	\$41.30	\$47.5	TBD	\$42.2	\$43.2	\$44.3
<i>Output Measures</i>									
7. Number of PEAK applications received	A,B	69	71	59	67	45	50	55	58
8. Number of executed PEAK agreements	A,B	27	62	43	45	43	45	60	49
9. Total dollar amount of PEAK application fees	A,B	\$51,750	\$53,250	\$44,250	\$50,250	\$40,250	\$44,750	\$49,250	\$45,917

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund								\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds								\$ -
Federal Funds								\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.2

\*\*Program/overhead expenses not currently tracked

## Sub\_Program: High Performance Incentive Program (HPIP)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

High Performance Incentive Program (HPIP) is an incentive program that can provide generous tax benefits to businesses that in return are willing to expand the scope of their capital investments, pay a higher than average wage and make a significant investment in employee training. A lack of funding would result in the loss of jobs and new capital investment by eligible companies in Kansas.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	79-32,160a	Mandatory	No	5

### Program Goals

- A. To increase wages and economic development
- B. To encourage eligible companies to increase capital investment

### Program History

The Kansas High Performance Incentive Program (HPIP), signed into law by Governor Finney in 1993, offers significant and comprehensive business incentives to encourage the construction and expansion of Kansas businesses and industries. Specifically, the High Performance Incentive Program (HPIP) offers business incentives to companies that make new capital investment in their companies and pay above-average wages for their industry. During the 2020 legislative session, Senate Bill 65 was signed into law by Governor Kelly. This bill decoupled the Kansas Industrial Training and Kansas Industrial Retraining grants from the program and added the ability for an HPIP qualified company to transfer tax credits to another entity or individual.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Total amount of projects' estimated capital expenditures (in billions)	B	\$2.24	\$2.10	\$4.51	\$3.50	\$4.89	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$3.83
2. HPIP certifications issued	A, B	302	304	280	300	343	350	357	309
3. Total dollar amount of HPIP applications fees received	A, B	\$115,000	\$115,000	\$94,250	\$100,750	\$134,000	\$136,750	\$139,000	\$114,417

## Kansas Department of Commerce

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund								\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds								\$ -
Federal Funds								\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.2

## Program: International Division

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

A lack of funding for the International Division would have detrimental effects on the Kansas businesses that export goods and services. Without support from the Department of Commerce, fewer Kansas companies will export and the exports that do happen will result in fewer sales. international business recruitment efforts will also be negatively impacted. With more international attending on Kansas and international companies interested in foreign direct investment in the state, our economic development efforts in these areas will greatly suffer without funding.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General	Discretionary	No	6

### Program Goals

- A. Increase the number of Kansas exporters and Kansas exporter market diversification
- B. Recruit international businesses to establish facilities and create jobs in Kansas

### Program History

The International Division works with Kansas companies to help them sell their products and services in international markets. The Division also works to recruit international businesses to establish facilities and create jobs in Kansas. The International Division became a standalone division within the Department in FY21, after having been eliminated as a separate business unit in FY13. During those eight years these functions were managed by a much smaller staff operating out of the Business Development Division.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Successful projects	B				3	4	4	6	4.0
2. Capital investment (Million \$)	B				\$40	\$144	\$65	\$80	\$144
3. Jobs created	B				150	300	200	325	300
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Number of webinars	A				10	7	10	10	7
5. Number of webinar attendees	A				350	385	350	400	385
6. Number of trade missions	A				3	1	3	4	1

## International Division

## Kansas Department of Commerce

7. Number of investment projects opened	B				6	32	30	40	32
8. Number of business visits	B				85	120	175	225	120
9. Percent of investment projects approved	B				40%	12.50%	25%	25%	12.5%

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund			\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds			200,061	207,480	202,732	216,714	212,030	201,397
Federal Funds			-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200,061	\$ 207,480	\$ 202,732	\$ 216,714	\$ 212,030	\$ 134,264
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	2.0

\*\* Funding includes only amounts under Budget Unit designated for International Division.

### Tourism Division

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The mission of the Kansas Tourism Division is to inspire travel to and throughout Kansas, and to maximize the positive impacts that tourism has on the state and local communities. A lack of funding would result in decreased visitation to and throughout Kansas resulting in a loss of jobs, lower transient guest tax and sales tax collections, and decreased overall economic impact for the state and local communities. The Pandemic highly affected the tourism industry, and sufficient marketing of Kansas Tourism assets are vital for a full economic recovery.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific 32-1403	Discretionary	No	7

#### Program Goals

- A. Increase number of visitors to Kansas
- B. Increase statewide Transient Guest Tax collections
- C. Increase visitor spending
- D. Increase number of registered Agritourism businesses

#### Program History

Kansas Tourism has the mission to inspire travel to and throughout Kansas to maximize the positive impacts that travel has on the state and local communities. In 2011, Kansas Tourism was moved by ERO from the Kansas Dept of Commerce to Kansas Dept of Wildlife, Parks and Tourism. In 2021, Kansas Tourism was moved back to the Kansas Dept of Commerce by ERO 48. The specific duties of Kansas Tourism are to market Kansas to visitors; produce visitor publications including an annual travel guide; TravelKS.com; increase visitation to the state; increase Kansans awareness and pride for the state; conduct appropriate tourism research; and to provide support to members of the Kansas tourism industry across the state. Other programs that Kansas Tourism oversees include the Kansas Agritourism Program, Kansas Byways Program, KANSAS! magazine, Attraction Development Grants, Marketing Grants, and initial approval of brown and blue signage.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of visitors to Kansas	A	35,600,000	36,500,000	31,400,000	32,500,000	33,700,000	34,000,000	35,500,000	33,866,667
2. Amount of statewide Transient Guest Tax collections	B	\$48,276,241	\$40,865,673	\$32,662,414	\$35,000,000	\$51,430,093	\$57,000,000	\$60,000,000	\$41,652,726
3. Visitor spending in the state	C	\$7,100,000,000	\$7,300,000,000	\$5,400,000,000	\$6,000,000,000	\$7,000,000,000.00	\$7,500,000,000.00	\$7,500,000,000.00	\$6,566,666,667
Output Measures									
4. Number of registered Agritourism businesses in Kansas	D	285	344	395	425	428	435	440	389

# Kansas Department of Commerce

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,701,576	\$ 10,000	\$ 73,500	\$ -	\$ 3,333
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	2,922,638	3,729,340	5,870,000	5,024,061	1,243,113
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	400,000	3,100,000	-	133,333
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 4,624,214</b>	<b>\$ 4,139,340</b>	<b>\$ 9,043,500</b>	<b>\$ 5,024,061</b>	<b>\$ 1,379,780</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>5.3</b>

\*Commerce does not have any funding prior to FY22, which is when the ERO went into effect.

## Sub\_Program: KS Industrial Training and Ks Industrial Retraining Programs (KIT & KIR)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Kansas Industrial Training (KIT) and Kansas Industrial Retraining (KIR) programs assist eligible employers in training workers for new jobs and retraining existing workers who would otherwise be displaced because of obsolete job skills or knowledge. Lack of funding would result in the loss of a necessary tool used to create jobs, retrain/retain existing workers, and grow the economy.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific      KSA 74-5066	Mandatory	Yes	8

### Program Goals

- A. Provide training awards for net new job creation
- B. Provide training awards for existing Kansas workers

### Program History

The Kansas Industrial Training (KIT) program started in 1978 to promote private sector training projects. In 1989, the Legislature created the Kansas Industrial Retraining (KIR) program for Kansas companies to train existing employees and at this time, both the KIT and KIR programs were established and placed into law. During the 2020 legislative session, Senate Bill 65, decoupling KIT and KIR from the High Performance Incentive Program, was signed into law by Governor Kelly.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Total net new job trainees	A	1,514	2,746	1,772	1,949	2141	2355	2590	2220
2. Total existing job trainees	B	3,807	3,414	1,381	1,519	1,186	1,304	1,434	1,994
2. Total ROI for program dollars	A,B	\$ 73,813,000	\$ 53,520,000	\$ 40,140,000	\$ 40,140,000	\$43,612,110	\$89,200,000	\$89,200,000	\$45,757,370
3. ROI of state and local tax revenue for program dollars invested	A,B	\$ 6,454,500	\$ 4,680,000	\$ 3,510,000	\$ 3,510,000	\$3,813,615	\$7,800,000	\$7,800,000	\$ 4,001,205
4. Total award amount	A,B	\$ 1,655,000	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 900,000	\$977,850	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$ 1,025,950
<i>Output Measures</i>									
5. Number of new KIT KIR projects	A,B	75	90	78	85	31	34	37	66
6. Total dollar amount in application fees	A,B	\$ 38,500.00	\$ 46,000.00	\$ 39,500.00	\$ 42,500.00	\$15,500	\$17,000	\$18,500	\$33,667

## Kansas Department of Commerce

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	1,008,406	592,054	768,780	918,715	525,769	2,000,000	2,000,000	628,868
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,008,406	\$ 592,054	\$ 768,780	\$ 918,715	\$ 525,769	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 628,868
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1

**Program: Office of Broadband Development****Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

Without funding for this program the state will not have a sustainable approach to expanding robust broadband connectivity throughout the state and many rural communities will go without reliable internet access. New federal funding opportunities will be at risk as they are increasingly linked to being a part of the state's coordinating broadband office.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	IKE Transportation SB 173; Executive Order 20.67	Mandatory	No	9

**Program Goals**

- A. Award infrastructure grants to expand broadband availability to premises where needed
- B. Provide local and regional communities with technical assistance and support to identify priority needs and increase adoption of broadband services to enhance overall economic growth
- C. Facilitate federal broadband funding investments in Kansas

**Program History**

KDC was designated as the lead state agency for broadband development in 2010 as part of the NTIA's 5 year broadband mapping and capacity building grant program. Since then, KDC has continued to accelerate economic growth in Kansas by harnessing broadband internet access for all citizens and communities. In 2020, as part of the KDOT IKE Transportation bill, KDC received \$85 million over 10 years to establish and implement an infrastructure grant program to accelerate deployments where there is demonstrated need. Subsequently, KDC established and implemented the state's broadband pandemic response plan and Governor Kelly formally established the Office of Broadband Development within KDC to serve as the primary coordinating agency for the state. KDC is currently administering the second year of the 10-year Broadband Acceleration Grant program funded by the IKE Transportation Plan. OBD continues to work with local communities, ISPs and federal funding partners to carry out it's mission to ensure all Kansans have access to robust broadband services.

**Performance Measures**

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of KOBD programs	A			3	4	4	6	7	5
2. Number of infrastructure programs	A, B,C			2	3	3	4	5	3
3. Number of digital adoption programs	B, C			1	1	1	2	2	1
4. Number of premises with access to high speed broadband	A,B, C			47,579.00	7,500.00	1,580.00	12,500.00	25,000.00	24,579.50
Output Measures									
5. Number of grant applications received*	A, C			160	200	36	400	300	98

## Kansas Department of Commerce

6. Number of grant applications approved\*

A, B, C

		105	125	11	135	150	58
				98	14	65	98.0

7. Number of grant projects closed\*

A, C

\*FY2021 actuals includes data associated with Covid funding from CARES Act.

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund (Ike Transportation Funding)								\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds					249,680	1,018,304	1,018,304	249,680
Federal Funds			65,000,000	144,000,000				65,000,000
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 65,000,000	\$ 144,000,000	\$ 249,680	\$ 1,018,304	\$ 1,018,304	\$ 21,749,893
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	0.7

\*FY2021 actuals includes data associated with Covid funding from CARES Act. Estimates for FY22 & 23 include anticipated funding from ARPA

## Program: Community Development

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Kansas communities will lose direct technical assistance for community development programs and incentives including CDBG, Community Service Tax Credits, Individual Development Accounts, RHID, MIH, tax credits, Housing Assessment Tool, asset mapping, creative and cultural resources, placemaking, public art and Kansas Main Street. Building and bridging of community assets in housing, childcare, and youth development would be lacking. Economic development in Kansas would lack a focus for community development opportunities, resulting in less livable communities through a variety of indicators. Community Development also provides indirect match for federal funding sources including CDBG and National Endowment for the Arts.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General		No	10

### Program Goals

- A. Provide direct technical assistance in planning, development, housing resources, and funding preparation for Community Development programs.
- B. Provide program support and community assistance for Community Development programs.

### Program History

In fiscal year 2020, the Community Development Division was re-established at the Department of Commerce. The existing Community Development programs and personnel were separated from Business Development to form the new Community Development Division. With the restoration of the division, Kansas Main Street was re-established as a program within the division; a division director was hired to provide oversight and coordination among the programs and services for maximum effectiveness; and additional staff were added. The Community Development Division includes programs and professional staff that provide grants, tax credits, technical assistance, and support for Kansas communities to help find solutions for various infrastructure and quality of life investments. The Community Development Division is focused on the needs of Kansas communities to enhance their current assets and improve their ability to attract residents and businesses.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of grant applications received by Community Development programs	A, B			296	350	582	320	330	439
2. Number of dollars awarded by Community Development programs*	A, B			\$ 19,582,509.00	\$ 20,628,370.00	\$25,462,097	\$21,878,662	\$21,175,000	\$22,522,303
3. Total amount of community leverage through Community Development programs	A			\$ 63,496,000	\$ 40,000,000	\$ 38,035,037.00	\$34,906,177.00	\$ 34,372,650.00	\$ 50,765,519
4. Number of communities served	A						350	450	
*Includes grants and tax credits									
<i>Output Measures</i>									

5. Number of housing units rehabilitated*	A				70	80	120	130	80
	B				65	229	275	300	229
6. Number of community development projects/activities completed									

\*Includes CDBG, SHOVL, and direct housing grants

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund			\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds			366,257	921,865	786,641	660,545	660,219	576,449
Federal Funds			-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 366,257	\$ 921,865	\$ 786,641	\$ 660,545	\$ 660,219	\$ 384,299
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.0	17.0	17.0	5.7

## Sub\_Program: Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

CDBG grant awards provide vital infrastructure, building blocks that stimulate economic development, and key improvements to the quality of life across Kansas. This program benefits low to moderate income individuals and communities would not have access to sanitary water and sewer systems, decent housing to live in or community services without the CDBG funding. This would also affect communities that have had natural disasters that do not get FEMA dollars or not enough FEMA support to complete the project to restore services. Our program in the last year benefitted over 100,000 people, of which a minimum of 51% are low income.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific    CFDA 14-228; 24 CFR 570; Title 1 CD Act of 1974 as Amended	Mandatory	Yes	11

### Program Goals

- A. Leverage compared to CDBG dollars is 60% or greater each year.
- B. Number of applications received each year to be 60 or higher
- C. Increase number of persons benefitting with a better quality of life
- D. To increase the number of standard housing units through rehabilitation of substandard units through rehabilitation

### Program History

The CDBG program was offered to states back in 1982 instead of HUD allocating the money to localities within a state. The Department of Commerce took over the program from HUD in 1984. The program has allocated \$303,029,921 in CDBG funds with local matching dollars of \$450,859,160 since 2004. It has benefitted 1,123,611 individuals of which 637,660 (56%) were low to moderate income. These individuals would be paying higher service rates or not have quality services without the CDBG grant program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Total number of person benefitting from CDBG funds*	C	68,086	266,862	107,165	110,000	81,143	80,000	80,000	151,723
2. Total number of housing units rehabbed from CDBG	D	19	45	27	50	80	50	50	51
3. Local match dollars	A	\$38,099,248	\$38,571,635	\$26,928,852	\$30,000,000	\$27,783,499	\$25,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$31,094,662
4. Percentage of local match dollars to CDBG dollars invested in projects. (ROI)	A	64%	68%	65%	60%	61%	60%	60%	65%

<i>Output Measures</i>									
5. Number of CDBG applications received*	B	66	224	43	55	43	48	48	103
6. Percent of CDBG applications approved	B	53%	79%	86%	70%	93%	83%	83%	86%
7. Total dollar amount of CDBG applications*	B	\$33,634,354	\$45,004,317	\$16,309,446	\$35,000,000	\$17,756,356	\$15,000,000	\$15,000,000	\$15,918,785
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
8. Total dollar amount of approved CDBG agreements*	C	\$21,846,017	\$37,600,661	\$14,453,830	\$15,500,000	\$17,640,932	\$15,050,000	\$15,000,000	\$23,231,808
9. Total project costs	C	\$59,945,265	\$56,807,738	\$41,382,682	\$50,000,000	\$45,424,431	\$40,050,000	\$40,000,000	\$47,871,617

\*FY2020 actual includes data associated with Covid funding

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	11,709,116	30,795,401	30,864,624	16,512,731	19,234,591	17,089,949	16,078,811	26,964,872
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 11,709,116</b>	<b>\$ 30,795,401</b>	<b>\$ 30,864,624</b>	<b>\$ 16,512,731</b>	<b>\$ 19,234,591</b>	<b>\$ 17,089,949</b>	<b>\$ 16,078,811</b>	<b>\$ 26,964,872</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>2.7</b>

## Sub\_Program: Community Service Tax Program (CSP)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Community Service Tax Credit Program has been a popular program among non-profits since 1994. Most recently, CSP has earmarked \$1 million dollars to help address the lack of childcare in Kansas. Since doing so, there have been 8 childcare projects that have received tax credits. If CSP is not funded, many non-profits and hospitals will not be able to proceed with projects or they will be delayed as they search for alternative solutions for funding. In addition to that, nonprofit childcare facilities will lose one of the few funding options they can utilize to expand/build their facility in their community. CSP is a statutory program, not funding the program will result in non-compliance.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	KSA 79-32,194	Mandatory	No	12

### Program Goals

A. Encourages cash and non-cash contributions to nonprofit organizations for certain community service activities.

### Program History

The Community Service Tax Credit Program (CSP) was established in 1994 and provides an opportunity for private, non-profit organizations and public health care entities to improve their ability to undertake major capital campaigns for projects involving children and family services, non-governmental crime prevention, youth apprenticeship and youth technical training and health care. Under this program, the state authorizes selected non-profit organizations to offer tax credits to donors making contributions to the approved projects. Applicants may request up to \$250,000 in tax credits. Applicant organizations in rural areas (< 15,000 population) are eligible for a 70 percent credit. Applicant organizations in non-rural areas are eligible for a 50 percent credit. In 2019, Commerce began to earmark \$1 million in tax credits to help address childcare and early childhood development needs for those providing services to those under the age of five. Eligible projects for childcare facilities consist of building renovations, equipment and educational materials and tools.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Contributions received from those with a Kansas Tax Liability	A	\$ 5,503,295.46	\$ 5,311,847.50	\$ 7,053,361.59	\$ 7,077,658.14	\$ 7,293,359.83	\$ 7,079,669.29	\$ 7,166,250.00	\$ 6,552,856.31
2. Contributions received compared to amount of tax credits awarded. *	A	170%	160%	172%	173%	178%	175%	175%	170%

\*ROI=(Gain from investment-Cost of investment) / Cost of investment

Output Measures									
3. Number of CSP applications received	A	50	53	56	55	55	55	58	55
4. Percent of CSP applications approved	A	32%	32%	45%	47%	47%	53%	54%	41%
5. Total dollar amount of CSP application fees	A	\$ 12,500.00	\$ 13,250.00	\$ 14,000.00	\$ 13,750.00	\$ 13,750.00	\$ 13,750.00	\$ 14,500.00	\$ 13,666.67

## Kansas Department of Commerce

<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
6. Total dollar amount of approved CSP agreements	A	\$ 3,235,978.41	\$ 3,314,293.25	\$ 4,097,883.71	\$ 4,093,370.50	\$ 4,093,370.50	\$ 4,084,455.75	\$ 4,095,000.00	\$ 3,835,182.49

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund								\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds								\$ -
Federal Funds								\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.0

\*\*Program/overhead expenses not currently tracked

## Program: Office of Innovation

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Office of Innovation provides critical programs and ecosystem building functions in support of innovation based business creation, expansion and attraction. Innovation is the driver of an economy and failure to fund this program will result in loss of future economic growth and a decline of career opportunities for Kansas high school and college graduates.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	KSA 74-8131- 74-8137	Mandatory	No	13

### Program Goals

- A. Increase number of Kansas innovations reaching market through Proof of Concept program and the Small Business R&D Acceleration Grants program.
- B. Accelerate the growth of Kanas scalable businesses through the Angel Investor Tax Credit program (see sub program)
- C. Increase sources of capital, dilutive and non-dilutive, for scalable Kansas businesses

### Program History

The Office of Innovation was created in July 2021 in response to findings of the Framework for Growth which identified Kansas near the bottom for innovation commercialization. Kansas' competitive position was in decline causing loss of talent and new business growth opportunities, both key to future growth and stability in the Kansas economy. Upon creation of the Office of Innovation a new program was launched, Proof of Concept, and reorganization occurred in the Department of Commerce by moving the Angel Investor Tax Credit program from the Community Development Division to the Office of Innovation. As of July 2022 the Office of Innovation manages three programs: Proof of Concept, Angel Investor Tax Credits, and Small Business R&D Acceleration Grants. The Office of Innovation provides oversight and direction to the SSBCI programs administered by Network KS.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
<i>Output Measures</i>								
1. Number of Proof of Concept awards	A	N/A	N/A	N/A	18	18	22	18.0
2. Number of Small Business R&D Acceleration Grants awarded	A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	30	30	0.0

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund					\$ 125,000	\$ 126,616	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds			\$ -	152,701	2,039,034	1,941,766	76,351
Federal Funds							
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 152,701	\$ 2,164,034	\$ 2,068,382	\$ 50,900
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.0

## Sub\_Program: Angel Investor Tax Credit Program

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

KAITC is the only program the state offers that focuses on Kansas start up companies having a hard time funding their innovative businesses. Without this program the state will miss out on grassroots growth of new companies that create jobs and economic benefits in Kansas. Businesses that start in Kansas leave the state when they cannot find funding sources. Not funding the program puts a higher risk of outward migration of home grown Kansas companies.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific    KSA 74-8131- 74-8137	Mandatory	No	14

### Program Goals

- A. Assist in the creation and expansion of Kansas businesses, which are job and wealth-creating enterprises
- B. Facilitate the availability of equity investment in businesses in the early stages of commercial development

### Program History

The Legislature created the program in 2004. In 2011 the program was moved from KTEC to KDC. In 2021 the program was extended for 5 years and granted additional tax credit for qualified companies.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	CY 2018	CY 2019	CY 2020	CY 2021 Previous Est.	CY 2021 Actuals	CY 2022 Est.	CY 2023 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Total capital raised	B	\$ 17,799,710	\$ 36,295,928	\$ 34,990,678	\$10,000,000	\$43,060,075	\$38,000,000.00	\$ 38,683,584	\$ 38,115,560
2. Total annual payroll	A	\$ 6,465,733	\$ 14,018,589	\$ 10,440,955	\$ 5,000,000	\$12,056,933	\$13,000,000	\$ 11,832,629	\$ 12,172,159
3. (ROI) Company economic output/ tax credits utilized that year		\$4.49	\$9.13	\$9.11		\$13.97			11
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Number of investors	B	300	385	293	200	209	250	251	296
5. Annual revenue	A	\$ 2,548,461	\$ 10,316,860	\$ 4,567,660	\$ 3,000,000	\$10,069,059	\$ 8,317,860	\$ 7,651,526	\$ 8,317,860
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
6. Tax credits issued	B	\$ 5,972,215	\$ 7,069,201	\$ 5,489,088	\$ 6,000,000	\$4,664,630	\$5,600,000.00	\$ 5,251,239	\$ 5,740,973

## Kansas Department of Commerce

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>CY 2018 Actuals</i>	<i>CY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>CY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>CY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>CY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>CY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>CY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -				\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-				-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-				-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.3

\*\*Program/overhead expenses not currently tracked

## Sub\_Program: Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This is a federally funded program by US DOL, required to be administered by each State. Not funding this program is not an option under federal statute and regulations. *Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act (WIOA) 20 CFR Part IV*

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act of 2014	Mandatory	No	15

### Program Goals

- A. Assist Kansans', including youth and those with significant barriers to employment, into high-quality jobs and careers and help employers retain skilled workers
- B. Increase the number of Kansans' served (Adult, Dislocated Worker, Youth)

### Program History

On July 22, 2014, President Barack Obama signed the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act of 2014 (WIOA), which reauthorizes the workforce investment system and replaces the Workforce Investment Act of 1998. WIOA took effect on July 1, 2015. Title I of WIOA authorizes programs to provide job search, education, and training activities for individuals seeking to gain or improve their employment prospects, and which establishes the One-Stop delivery system. In addition, Title I of WIOA establishes the governing structure and the performance accountability for all programs authorized under WIOA. Workforce services in WIOA, administered by Commerce, are funded through four separate programs: Adult Program, Dislocated Worker Program, Youth Program and Wagner-Peyser Labor Exchange. Nearly all the Adult, Dislocated Worker and Youth funds are allocated by statutory formula to the Local Workforce Development Boards for direct service delivery to eligible individuals per the requirements of the Act. Kansas is divided into five Local Workforce Development Areas, each overseen by a separate Local Board.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Adult - employment rate 2nd quarter after exit(percent)	A	78.4%	75.5%	72.4%	73.0%	75.2%	76.0%	76.0%	74.4%
2. Adult - employment rate 4th quarter after exit(percent)	A	76.6%	74.7%	69.7%	71.0%	72.2%	71.9%	71.9%	72.2%
3. Adult - median earnings 2nd quarter after exit(dollars)	A	\$ 5,551	\$ 6,244	\$ 6,870	\$ 7,000	\$ 7,118	\$ 6,784	\$ 6,784	\$ 6,744
4. Adult - credential attainment(percent)	A	74.7%	71.9%	79.7%	80.0%	80.8%	76.5%	76.5%	77.5%

## Kansas Department of Commerce

5. Adult - measurable skills gain(percent)	A			65.6%	66.0%	75.1%	64.1%	64.1%	70.3%
6. Dislocated Worker - employment rate 2nd quarter after exit(percent)	A	85.8%	87.0%	75.1%	75.0%	80.2%	77.0%	77.0%	80.8%
7. Dislocated Worker - employment rate 4th quarter after exit(percent)	A	83.1%	83.1%	78.1%	79.0%	77.7%	78.0%	78.0%	79.6%
8. Dislocated Worker - median earnings 2nd quarter after exit(dollars)	A	10,118	9,762	9,528	9,600	9,965	9,653	9,653	9,752
9. Dislocated Worker - credential attainment(percent)	A	85.8%	87.0%	91.4%	88.0%	75.1%	86.9%	86.9%	84.5%
10. Dislocated Worker - measurable skills gain(percent)	A			78.4%	79.0%	76.1%	58.1%	58.1%	77.3%
11. Youth - employment rate 2nd quarter after exit(percent)	A	76.1%	76.1%	73.9%	74.0%	76.1%	72.3%	72.3%	75.4%
12. Youth - employment rate 4th quarter after exit(percent)	A	76.6%	75.9%	67.3%	65.0%	71.8%	69.4%	69.4%	71.7%
13. Youth - median earnings 2nd quarter after exit(dollars)	A			\$ 2,900	\$ 3,250	\$ 3,421	\$ 3,050	\$ 3,050	\$ 3,161
14. Youth - credential attainment(percent)	A	58.2%	62.8%	66.5%	66.0%	60.4%	66.3%	66.3%	63.2%
15. Youth - measurable skills gain(percent)	A			47.2%	49.0%	64.0%	49.2%	49.2%	55.6%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
16. Adults served	B	3,795	2,751	2,063	2,250	888	906	924	1901
17. Dislocated Workers served	B	458	592	1,233	1,000	152	155	158	659
18. Youth served	B	884	637	472	600	108	110	112	406

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	14,391,571	12,615,682	11,117,932	11,345,644	13,345,374	13,365,711	13,371,771	12,359,663
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 14,391,571</b>	<b>\$ 12,615,682</b>	<b>\$ 11,117,932</b>	<b>\$ 11,345,644</b>	<b>\$ 13,345,374</b>	<b>\$ 13,365,711</b>	<b>\$ 13,371,771</b>	<b>\$ 12,359,663</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>21.1</b>	<b>9.9</b>	<b>9.9</b>	<b>7.0</b>

## Sub\_Program: Office of Minority and Women Business Development

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Without funding for the Office of Minority and Women Business Development, there would be a lack of business development opportunities to serve minority and/or women-owned businesses which would lead to decreased readiness on the part of these businesses to perform effectively and be sustainable. There would also be decreased opportunities for federal agencies and private industry to meet their diversity goals by contracting with minority-and women-owned businesses. Recognizing that small, minority and women owned businesses are critical to the growth and development of the Kansas economy it is vital that these services are continued.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General	N/A	Discretionary	No	16

### Program Goals

- A. Increase number of certifications by 10% overall to include outreach to Western Kansas.
- B. Collaborate with the Office of Contracts and Procurement to increase state contracting opportunities.
- C. Continue to provide business development services to women and minority businesses.

### Program History

The Office of Minority and Women Business exists to assist small minority and women businesses in their business development activities by providing resources to include technical, financial, business management, certification and procurement information. The Office of Minority and Women Business Development was created in 1975 by Statute 74-5010a. On August 11, 1994, Governor Finney signed Executive Order 94-169 creating a single source Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) certification program in Kansas. A partnership between the Kansas Department of Transportation and the Kansas Department of Commerce was created related to certain processes of the certification program. In June 24, 2008 Governor Sebelius issued Executive Order 08-08 to expand the certification program to include additional designations for Women Business Enterprises (WBEs) and Minority Business Enterprise (MBEs).

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of certified companies	A, B	134	148	116	142	180	225	250	148
2. Number of workshops conducted	A, B	8	13	13	15	11	15	20	12

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	204,819	194,139	169,235	189,657	198,744	206,477	226,425	187,373
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 204,819	\$ 194,139	\$ 169,235	\$ 189,657	\$ 198,744	\$ 206,477	\$ -	\$ 187,373
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	0.7

## America's Job Link Alliance (AJLA)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

AJLA–Technical Services (AJLA-TS) is an asset to the State of Kansas as a provider of workforce services to states across the nation. Nine states utilize America’s JobLink (AJL), our web-based, all-in-one labor exchange and case management solution for user-centered workforce development organizations. AJLA–TS staff are fully versed in the AJL system functions needed to support workforce development activities including job seeker services, employer services, partner services, fiscal management services, and federal reporting services, including reporting and data validation requirements. The JobLink Mobile app complements AJL as a free, user-friendly app for job seekers. Job seekers can view, save, and share jobs from across the state.

The Work Opportunity Tax Credit (WOTC) is a federal tax credit available to employers who hire individuals from eligible target groups with significant barriers to employment. The AJLA CertLink online system allows employers and employer consultants to apply for and manage WOTC applications and certifications and allows state workforce agencies and other participating agencies to administer the WOTC program. Four states utilize CertLink.

VOCAL, or vocational portal, is an online service delivery hub. It provides a “no wrong door” approach for customers to explore a variety of re-employment and training resources, as well as connect with front-line staff and career counselors through email, chat, and calendar features. It also provides light-weight case management for staff, including referrals and other features that support partner collaboration for enhanced service delivery. Two states utilize VOCAL. VOCAL will sunset within the next year and its functionality incorporated into America's JobLink.

Without AJLA–TS, the state would be unable to meet contractual obligations in place for nine states across four different applications. Failure to provide these duties could result in states and their local workforce investment areas being sanctioned both monetarily and operationally for non-compliance with federally mandated data collection and reporting requirements.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. <u>Discretionary</u>	MOE/Match <u>Rqt.</u>	Priority Level
Specific	KSA 74-5002y	Discretionary	No	17

### Program Goals

- A. Increase revenue by 10%.
- B. Improve website user experience.

**Program History**

America's Job Link Alliance–Technical Support (AJLA–TS) is now in its 53rd year of providing data processing systems, training, and technical support to workforce development agencies. AJLA–TS was first organized as the Manpower and Computer Systems Institute (MACSI) in 1969 through federal grants. AJLA–TS has also operated under the name Employment Security Systems Institute (ESSI) and America's Workforce Technology Solutions (AWTS). AJLA–TS has been a producer of web-based systems since 1999.

America's Job Link Alliance–Technical Support (AJLA–TS) has served as the national information systems development and support center for AJLA since 2001. AJLA–TS helps state and local workforce agencies meet the needs of today's customers by providing intuitive, integrated information technology solutions and exceptional technical support.

AJLA–TS is a division of the Kansas Department of Commerce. AJLA–TS operates with statutory authority established in 1987 through Kansas Statutes Annotated 74-5002y:

*Authorization to contract for data processing services and training. Subject to approval of the governor, the secretary of commerce is authorized to contract with federal government agencies, governmental agencies of any state, and private not-for-profit corporations for the performance of data processing services and training.*

*History: L.2005, ch. 132, 11; Apr.21.*

In 2005, AJLA–TS was transferred to the Kansas Department of Commerce from the Kansas Department of Human Resources.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Average page views (thousands)	B				9.5	18.8	18.8	18.8	18.8
2. Average load times (seconds)	B				3.5	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Number of states using JobLink software	A	10	9	9	9	9	9	9	9.0
4. Number of states using CertLink software	A	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	4.0
5. Number of states using VOCAL software	A	1	2	2	2	2	0	0	2.0
6. Number of states using Mobile App	A	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	2.0

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	5,504,009	5,631,455	5,578,976	5,554,980	5,826,634	6,903,974	6,913,208	5,679,022
Federal Funds	542,768	580,419	826,861	1,123,510	512,593	725,801	729,877	639,958
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 6,046,777</b>	<b>\$ 6,211,874</b>	<b>\$ 6,405,837</b>	<b>\$ 6,678,490</b>	<b>\$ 6,339,227</b>	<b>\$ 7,629,775</b>	<b>\$ 7,643,085</b>	<b>\$ 6,318,979</b>
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	42.0	42.0	42.0	14.0

## Athletic Commission

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Athletic Commission promotes and regulates the state's combat sports industry in line with accepted industry standards. The Commission works to facilitate high quality combative sporting events, while striving to protect the health and welfare of all participants and spectators. If the Commission was not funded and fights continued, the state would be exposed to litigation if a fighter were to be seriously hurt without the most current regulations in place. In addition, the great athletes of Kansas would not have an opportunity to compete in front of friends and family and bring much needed revenue to the state.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	K.S.A. 74-50, 183	Mandatory	No	18

### Program Goals

- A. Regulate and facilitate high quality competitive sporting events, while striving to protect the health and welfare of all participants and spectators
- B. Increase number of licenses issued to participants and officials by expanding the industry across Kansas
- C. Ensure the Kansas judges and referees are certified by the Association of Boxing Commissions (ABC) in order to enhance the integrity and safety of all regulated sports in the state

### Program History

The Athletic Commission was created by the 2004 Legislature to promote and regulate the state's combat sports industry. In recent years, the combat sports industry in Kansas has seen an increase in the interest and number of mixed martial arts and professional wrestling contests.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of events sanctioned	A	94	57	39	70	51	65	70	49.0
2. Overall revenue	B	\$113,885	\$59,404	\$42,449	\$70,000	\$62,660	\$70,000	\$80,000	\$54,837.80
3. Combat sports shows sanctioned	A	27	25	26	30	16	25	30	22.3
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Number of fines issued	A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. Number of fighters, promoters, referees, judges and doctors certified	C	511	486	324	400	530	560	580	446.7

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	125,604	117,222	128,478	209,463	172,085	267,012	268,273	139,262
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 125,604	\$ 117,222	\$ 128,478	\$ 209,463	\$ 172,085	\$ 267,012	\$ 268,273	\$ 139,262
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	6.7

## Program: Office of Rural Prosperity

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Office of Rural Prosperity provides dedicated support for rural communities across Kansas in the areas of Housing, Childcare, Workforce, Healthcare, Arts & Culture, Community and Economic Development, and Broadband/Infrastructure. The consequences for not funding ORP would be to slow progress in these areas for rural Kansas, which would only intensify these challenges facing rural communities and likely contributing to further population loss for rural parts of Kansas.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General	Discretionary	No	19

### Program Goals

- A. Collaborate with other state and local partners to increase or improve housing program opportunities, and provide support for communities in developing or redeveloping housing.
- B. Partner with state, regional, and local agencies to improve childcare opportunities, training programs, and entrepreneurial programs to support the growth of childcare facilities in rural Kansas.
- C. Improve rural community growth through grassroots economic development trainings and tools, workforce recruitment, infrastructure improvements, and community resources that help foster entrepreneurship, innovation, community revitalization, building preservation/development, beautification, business development, technology, and quality job creation.
- D. Support efforts to improve and stabilize healthcare and wellness access in rural Kansas communities.
- E. Collaborate with other state and private industry partners to improve access to high speed internet in all areas of rural Kansas, as well as other key infrastructure needed to help communities prosper.

### Program History

The Office of Rural Prosperity was established in 2019 under Lt. Governor Lynn Rogers. In 2021, this office was moved into the Kansas Department of Commerce, as a stand alone department under Lt. Governor and Secretary of Commerce, David Toland. Trisha Purdon was hired in late May 2021 to lead the Office of Rural Prosperity. There are 4 ORP team members including one ROZ specialist as of June 2022.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Participants trained in rural communities	A, B, C, D, E	226	558	24	40	437	600	700	340
2. Funding leveraged to support projects	A, B, C, D, E	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$121,750	\$360,000	\$25,000
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Funding allocated to rural communities	A, B, C, D, E	\$0	\$0	\$ 75,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 345,000	\$ 790,000	\$ 75,000.00

4. ORP trainings offered	A, B, C, D, E	53	7	5	7	17	20	25	10
5. Counties receiving ORP assistance	C	23	92	28	25	30	25	35	50

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund		\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds		491,230	496,487	597,282	519,296	445,166	432,168	502,338
Federal Funds		-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ 491,230	\$ 496,487	\$ 597,282	\$ 519,296	\$ 445,166	\$ 432,168	\$ 502,338
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	1.3

## Sub\_Program: Work Opportunity Tax Credit Program (WOTC)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Loss of funding for the Work Opportunity Tax Credit Program would detrimentally impact the State of Kansas' business growth and economic development. Employers utilize this tax credit when hiring individuals that have a significant barrier to employment which helps stimulate the growth and sustainability of their business. This program also assists the employee by assisting them to gain lasting and gainful employment. Federally funded by US DOL.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	The Work Opportunity Tax Credit (WOTC) is authorized until December 31, 2025 (Section 113 of Division EE of P.L. 116-260 -- Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021)	Mandatory	No	20

### Program Goals

A. Assist Kansas Employers in utilizing the WOTC Program and increase the number of qualified certification requests for approval.

### Program History

The Work Opportunity Tax Credit (WOTC) is a federal tax credit available to employers hiring individuals from certain target groups who have consistently faced significant barriers to employment. The Work Opportunity Tax Credit (WOTC) is authorized until December 31, 2025 (Section 113 of Division EE of P.L. 116-260 -- Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021). WOTC targeted groups include: 1) Qualified IV-A recipient; 2) Qualified Veteran; 3) Qualified Ex-Felon; 4) Designated Community Resident; 5) Vocational Rehabilitation Referral; 6) Summer Youth Employee; 7) Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) recipient; 8) Supplemental Security Income (SSI) recipient; 9) Long-term Family Assistance recipient; and 10) Qualified Long-term Unemployment recipient.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. New certification requests	A	46,124	36,555	47,295	45,000	66,890	68,228	69,592	50,247
2. Approved certifications	A	7,931	4,673	2,106	8,000	33,893	34,571	35,262	13,557
3. Total tax credit awarded	A	22,296,600	12,862,800	5,657,400	12,000,000	\$89,835,000	\$ 91,631,700	\$ 93,464,334	\$ 36,118,400

### Funding

## Kansas Department of Commerce

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	186,285	209,180	373,060	373,060	289,994	213,350	213,410	290,745
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 186,285</b>	<b>\$ 209,180</b>	<b>\$ 373,060</b>	<b>\$ 373,060</b>	<b>\$ 289,994</b>	<b>\$ 213,350</b>	<b>\$ 213,410</b>	<b>\$ 290,745</b>
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	0.4

## Sub\_Program: Registered Apprenticeship

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Registered Apprenticeship program is federally funded through U.S. Dept. of Labor Employment and Training Administration Grant Awards and the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act funding. If this program is not funded the program will not meet federal grant requirements.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	National Apprenticeship Act (50 Stat. 664; 29 U.S.C. 50), H.R.447 - National Apprenticeship Act of 2021, 29 CFR part 29 subpart A, and part 30	Discretionary	No	21

### Program Goals

A. Expand Registered Apprenticeship through the registration of new sponsors and the expansion of existing sponsors.

### Program History

Following the creation of the first Registered Apprenticeship system in Wisconsin in 1911, the United States Congress passed the National Apprenticeship Act in 1937, establishing federal Registered Apprenticeship. Initially, Registered Apprenticeship programs consisted mainly of the manufacturing, construction and utilities industries. After World War II, Registered Apprenticeship began to expand into training of health and safety workers, including firefighters, police, and emergency medical technicians. The program guidelines were revised in late 2008 to allow for greater flexibility in serving apprentices and program sponsors in prevailing economic conditions. The National Apprenticeship Act authorizes the Federal government, in cooperation with the states, to oversee the nation's apprenticeship system. The U.S. Department of Labor's Office of Apprenticeship works in conjunction with the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training as well independent State Apprenticeship Agencies to administer the program. The purpose of Registered Apprenticeship (RA) is to develop an employer-driven, "Earn While You Learn" program model that combines on-the-job learning with related technical instruction that increases an apprentices' skill level and wages in both traditional and non-traditional industries. It is an immediate job; apprentices start working from day one. The Registered Apprenticeship system effectively meets the needs of both employers and workers. It is a flexible training system that is customized to meet the needs of every business. This program is used to grow and diversify apprenticeship opportunities for under-served populations, youth, new hires, and incumbent workers. Employer participation is the key to building a Registered Apprenticeship program, without employer participation there is no Registered Apprenticeship program. By promoting new and existing industry sectors Registered Apprenticeship will expand earn and learn opportunities statewide.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of active apprentices	A	2,135	2,182	1,960	2,100	1,907	2,378	2,855	2,016
2. Number of new apprentices	A	792	774	554	700	862	1,077	1,293	730
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Number of active programs	A	259	296	147	230	150	187	225	198
4. Number of new programs	A	61	81	14	60	17	21	26	37

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-			500,000	500,000	-
Federal Funds	1,357,975	1,005,150	134,166	717,007	585,040	522,271	513,108	574,785
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,357,975	\$ 1,005,150	\$ 134,166	\$ 717,007	\$ 585,040	\$ 1,022,271	\$ 1,013,108	\$ 574,785
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.1	7.1	7.1	2.0

## Sub\_Program: Kansas Main Street

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

With 35 Designated Kansas Main Street communities and 40 Affiliate communities, not funding this program would leave more than 70 communities without any guidance and resources to help in their downtown revitalization efforts. Twenty-five of those Designated communities were in the program when it was abruptly closed in 2012 and all state funding for the program ceased to exist.

The State program has brought in a significant number of consultants and resources for these Designated and Affiliate communities. Nearly \$250,000 in services and technical assistance has been provided in coordination with Main Street America and other downtown specialists, with another \$50,000 provided in design services that has helped property owners improve their downtown buildings. The state office now has three staff who provide a comprehensive level of technical assistance and on-site support.

Not funding the Kansas Main Street program would mean the loss of three new grant programs that were created for Designated communities. These grants are for building improvements, upper-floor housing in downtown buildings, entrepreneurial development, and connecting arts programs with downtown programs. To date, nearly \$660,000 in grants are being awarded, leveraging more than \$1 million in private, local investment. The loss of these funds would significantly impact the ability of the local programs to leverage private, local dollars for these kinds of projects.

Finally, Incentives Without Walls (IWW) grants were created in 1995 to stimulate private investment in Designated downtown districts. The last year those funds were awarded (FY13) \$176,000 in grants were awarded and those funds leveraged nearly \$1.3 million in private, local dollars. IWW funds have remained in most of the 25 communities since 2012, but the lack of funds added to the program has put a significant strain on the ability of the local programs to offer new loans for new projects.

#### Statutory Basis

General

#### Mandatory vs. Discretionary

Discretionary

#### MOE/Match Rqt.

No

#### Priority Level

22

### Program Goals

- A. To provide technical assistance and resources—based on the Main Street Four-Point Approach-- to Designated Kansas Main Street communities who are working to meet national accreditation standards for success.
- B. To educate communities on the Main Street Four-Point Approach so they may have increased local capacity in their downtown revitalization efforts.
- C. To maintain and grow membership in the Kansas Main Street Affiliate program.
- D. To develop and manage new grant opportunities for Designated communities and (where appropriate) other communities throughout the state.

### Program History

The Kansas Main Street program had a successful 27-year history beginning in 1985 and ending in 2012. During that time, dozens of communities in Kansas worked to revitalize their downtown districts and make the heart of their communities viable and strong. More than \$600 million in reinvestment took place and more than 3,800 small businesses were started or expanded, creating over 8,600 new jobs. In the last year of the program alone, 25 designated communities established 194 new and expended businesses, created 568 new jobs and generated \$18 million in reinvestment. With the rebirth of the program in late 2019, those 25 communities were grandfathered back into the program and once again have the resources and tools they need.

In 2021, three new Designated communities were added to the program—Atchison, Baldwin City and Junction City. In early 2022, seven Designated communities were added to the program—Eureka, Great Bend, Hays, Newton, Salina, Topeka and Valley Center. These communities are now eligible to receive a high-level of technical assistance and services, including market analysis, assistance building organizational capacity, design assistance, and other resources and assistance offered by Kansas Main Street and Main Street America.

The Affiliate program was created in 2021 and allows any community to pay an annual fee to participate in quarterly training typically offered to just Designated communities. To date, there are over 40 communities involved in the Affiliate program and those communities have received training and technical assistance in the areas of fund raising, dealing with the impact of COVID, entrepreneurial development, and how to develop upper-floor housing in downtown.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Grant dollars expended into local communities	D				\$ 140,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 660,000
2. Percent of Designated communities that meet or exceed national standards for accreditation*	A				90%	100%	60%	70%	100%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Number of requests responded to regarding communities interested in downtown revitalization and Designated status	B, C				35	35	40	45	35.0

4. Number of presentations made to communities and organizations interested in downtown revitalization and Designated status	B, C				8	12	15	18	12.0
5. Number of trainings provided to Designated and Affiliate Kansas Main Street communities	A				6	8	8	10	8.0
6. Number of Designated and Affiliate Kansas Main Street communities that received training	A				58	73	78	83	73.0

\*National accreditation standards will change in 2023 causing percentages to lower while communities work to adjust to new these new standards.

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund			\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds			333,943	1,344,158	775,484	1,138,181	782,818	554,714
Federal Funds			-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 333,943	\$ 1,344,158	\$ 775,484	\$ 1,138,181	\$ 782,818	\$ 369,809
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.0

## Sub\_Program: Rural Opportunity Zones (ROZ)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Approved participants in the program who are still actively in the 5 year program cycle will not receive their annual distribution. This would be a violation of statute 74-50,223(b). KDC will also not accept new applications for the program in any year there is no funding for participants.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific      KSA 74-50,222 - 74-50,223; KSA 79-32, 267	Mandatory	Yes	23

### Program Goals

- A. Combat population decline in rural Kansas and reduce out-migration
- B. Bring educated professionals to the rural parts of Kansas

### Program History

Established in 2012 with the primary goal of reducing out-migration in rural Kansas counties. The program has two components, each available for up to five years: state income tax waiver and student loan repayment assistance. The program now covers 95 of 105 counties with populations less than 40,000. The Department of Commerce is only responsible for the student loan portion of the ROZ program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. % of participants completed all 5 years	A	56.7%	52.9%	61.3%	64.9%	54.50%	57%	65%	56.2%
2. Active counties	A	76	76	74	75	92	95	95	81
3. Qualified ROZ participants	A, B	140	105	33	100	98	110	130	79
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Total dollar amount ROZ student loan payments - state portion	A	\$760,000	\$710,000	\$700,000	\$660,000	\$ 456,000	\$ 625,000	\$ 850,000	\$622,000
5. Total number of new ROZ applications received	B	106	34	59	100	146	165	185	80
6. Qualified counties	A	77	77	77	95	95	95	95	83
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
7. Number of individuals pending	B	202	145	148	140	97	65	50	130

## Kansas Department of Commerce

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	1,785,965	1,682,938	1,442,732	2,098,556	1,323,318	2,275,365	1,646,610	1,482,996
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,785,965	\$ 1,682,938	\$ 1,442,732	\$ 2,098,556	\$ 1,323,318	\$ 2,275,365	\$ 1,646,610	\$ 1,482,996
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	5.9	5.9	1.3

## Sub\_Program: Kansas Creative Arts Industries Commission (CAIC)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Kansas Creative Arts Industries Commission is focused on the creative industries sector of the Kansas economy and is dedicated to measuring, promoting, supporting, and expanding the creative industries to grow the state's economy and create creative industry-related jobs. If the program is not funded, Kansas will lose access to federal funds from the National Endowment for the Arts, there will be long-term damage to cultural infrastructure, an increase in out-migration due to a loss of community vitality, an increase in unemployment in creative sector and organizational collapse in the creative and cultural sector.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific      74-5210	Mandatory	Yes	24

### Program Goals

- A. Engage more citizens in grant funded projects
- B. Engage more creatives and organizations across KCAIC programs

### Program History

The Kansas Arts Commission was founded in 1966 under the name Kansas Cultural Arts Commission, changing its name in 1973. The Kansas Arts Commission was funded through the State Legislature and the National Endowment for the Arts until June 2011, when all staff were laid off and the budget for the program zeroed out. The Kansas Arts Commission continued to function through its commissioners. The Kansas Creative Arts Industries Commission was created in FY13 and is housed in the Kansas Department of Commerce.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals*	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals*	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of citizens benefiting	A			595,635	605,000	610,800	610,000	615,000	603,218
2. Number of creatives/organizations benefiting	B			1,275.00	1,300.00	2100	\$1,350	\$1,400	1,687.50
3. Grant investment vs. community leverage	B			\$ 2.00	\$2.06	\$ 0.80	\$ 2.07	\$ 2.08	\$1.40
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Number of CAIC grant applications*	A	101	230	92	95	240	92	102	187
5. Percent of CAIC grant applications approved	A	94.1%	85.0%	83.7%	83.0%	69%	90%	85%	79.2%
6. Total dollar amount of CAIC applications*	A	\$482,519	\$2,645,668	\$625,153	\$635,000	\$ 1,520,580.00	\$ 583,942.00	\$ 650,000.00	\$1,597,134
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

7. Total dollar amount of approved CAIC grant agreements*	A	\$445,449	\$ 2,248,818.00	\$530,793	\$535,000	\$ 1,348,080.00	\$ 544,207.00	\$ 580,000.00	\$ 1,375,897.00
---	---	-----------	-----------------	-----------	-----------	-----------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------

\*FY2020 and FY2022 Actuals include CARES and ARPA COVID relief programs

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	122,028	712,295	\$ 519,297	\$ 587,211	648,338	594,748	594,353	626,643
Federal Funds	543,347	1,064,937	1,303,339	777,020	1,346,921	1,361,369	1,362,100	1,238,399
<b>Total</b>	\$ 665,375	\$ 1,777,232	\$ 1,822,636	\$ 1,364,231	\$ 1,995,260	\$ 1,956,117	\$ 1,956,453	\$ 1,865,043
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.0

## Sub\_Program: Kansas International Trade Show Assistance Program (KITSAP)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Kansas International Trade Show Assistance Program (KITSAP) helps introduce Kansas companies to foreign markets by funding their participation in international trade shows. Without funding, fewer Kansas companies will have the support, technical assistance and expertise needed to export, which will result in a decrease in exports from Kansas and a reduction in sales.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General	Discretionary		25

### Program Goals

A. To help introduce Kansas Companies to foreign markets by funding their participation in international trade shows.

### Program History

The Kansas International Trade Show Assistance Program (KITSAP) helps introduce Kansas companies to foreign markets by funding their participation in international trade shows. Eligible companies are those whose product or service originates in Kansas or whose products receive substantial value-added processing in Kansas. The program was created in 1990 (KSA 74-5075) and later amended in 1994 (KSA 74-50141). It continues today to be one of the most useful and productive programs supporting Kansas trade expansion.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of approved applications*	A	20	19	2	13	11	18	18	11
2. Total value of estimated sales for companies assisted by the program	A		\$1,064,479	\$3,110,000	\$1,500,000	\$9,442,132	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$4,538,870
3. Number of new international sales agents	A	8	10	3	8	8	8	8	7
4. Total dollar amount of approved KITSAP agreements	A	\$54,375	\$52,038	\$7,006	\$50,000	\$27,577	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$28,874
<i>Output Measures</i>									
5. Number of KITSAP applications received	A	23	22	8	15	16	22	22	15

6. Percent of KITSAP applications approved	A	86%	86%	38%	80%	70%	86%	86%	65%
--	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

\*FY22 actuals lower than anticipated due to cancellation or postponement of trade shows.

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	48,969	20,096	12,456	50,000	21,847	50,000	50,000	18,133
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 48,969	\$ 20,096	\$ 12,456	\$ 50,000	\$ 21,847	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 18,133
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.1

## Sub\_Program: Kansas International Trade Marketing Assistance Program (KITMAP)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Kansas International Trade Marketing Assistance Program (KITMAP) helps introduce Kansas companies to foreign markets by funding their export marketing efforts including international airfare, overseas lodging on foreign sales trips, market research, new foreign language company brochures, etc. Without funding, fewer Kansas companies will have the support, technical assistance and expertise needed to export, which will result in a decrease in exports from Kansas and a reduction in sales.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General	Discretionary		26

### Program Goals

A. To help introduce Kansas companies to foreign markets by funding their participation in international trade shows.

### Program History

The Kansas International Trade Marketing Assistance Program (KITMAP) helps introduce Kansas companies to foreign markets by funding their export marketing efforts including international airfare, overseas lodging on foreign sales trips, market research, new foreign language company brochures, etc. Eligible companies are those whose product or service originates in Kansas or whose products receive substantial value-added processing in Kansas.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals*	FY 2020 Actuals*	FY 2021 Actuals*	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of approved applications	A	0	0	0	0	12	18	18	4
2. Total value of estimated sales for companies assisted by the program	A	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,513,437	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$2,171,146
3. Total dollar amount of approved and reimbursed KITMAP agreements	A	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$35,650	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$11,883
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Number of KITMAP applications received	A	0	0	0	0	22	22	22	7
5. Percent of KITMAP applications approved	A	0%	0%	0%	0%	55%	82%	82%	18%

\*Note: No data available prior to FY2022

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds					30,166	50,000	50,000	30,166
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 30,166	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 10,055
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.0

## Sub\_Program: State Trade Expansion Program (STEP)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The State Trade Expansion Program (STEP) provides assistance to Kansas companies to market and sell their products and services internationally. Without funding, fewer Kansas companies will have the support, technical assistance and expertise needed to participate in international trade and exporting, which could result in a decrease of Kansas exports. Additionally, fewer exporters will participate in the state-organized pavilion at annual European airshows as they will need to bear the entire cost of their participation.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General	Discretionary	Yes	27

### Program Goals

- A. Increase the number of Kansas companies starting to export  
B. Diversify the export markets for Kansas companies

### Program History

The Small Business Administration began the State Trade Expansion Program (STEP) in 2011 to provide assistance via qualifying state government delivery agencies to US companies to market and sell their products and services internationally. States apply for funding annually. Funding is not guaranteed and awards are made based upon program fund utilization plans. Kansas applied for and received this first STEP grant in 2011 and has continued to receive and deploy STEP funding to the present day.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of assistances provided	A, B	16	16	15	15	21	20	20	17
2. Number of companies assisted	A, B	16	16	12	15	20	20	20	16
3. Actual sales reported by companies assisted by the program	A, B	\$375,500	\$6,697,513	\$3,282,258	\$2,000,000	\$1,226,000 (ongoing)	\$1,800,000	\$2,400,000	\$3,735,257
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Number of applications received	A, B	16	16	15	15	21	20	20	17
5. Number of applications approved	A, B	16	16	15	15	21	20	20	17

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	10,206	25,167	13,588	23,336	5,295	18,255	1,776	14,684
Federal Funds	212,318	69,202	21,342	88,100	161,941	226,500	226,500	84,162
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 222,524</b>	<b>\$ 94,369</b>	<b>\$ 34,930</b>	<b>\$ 111,436</b>	<b>\$ 167,236</b>	<b>\$ 244,755</b>	<b>\$ 228,276</b>	<b>\$ 98,845</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.3</b>

## Sub\_Program: Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) Program

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This program is federally funded by the U.S. Dept. of Labor. If not funded by the state the program will not meet federal requirements.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	Trade Act of 1974, as amended (20 CFR Part	Mandatory	No	28

### Program Goals

- A. Provide aid to workers who lose their jobs or have hours of work and wages reduced as a result of increased imports.
- B. Provide a variety of benefits and reemployment services to help unemployed workers prepare for and obtain suitable employment.

### Program History

The Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) Program is a federal program established under the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2015 that provides aid to workers who lose their jobs or have hours of work and wages reduced as a result of increased imports. The TAA program offers a variety of benefits and reemployment services to help unemployed workers prepare for and obtain suitable employment. Workers may be eligible for training, job search and relocation allowances, income support, and other reemployment services. Reemployment TAA (RTAA) provides wage supplements for reemployed older workers whose reemployment resulted in lower wages than those earned in their trade-affected employment.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. TAA certified petitions	A	9	15	26	10	46	47	48	29
2. TAA customers served	A	488	498	1217	300	805	821	838	840
3. RTAA customers served	B	113	21	31	20	43	44	45	32

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	2,913,919	2,168,534	5,994,903	6,092,555	5,726,727	5,273,617	5,283,255	4,630,055
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,913,919</b>	<b>\$ 2,168,534</b>	<b>\$ 5,994,903</b>	<b>\$ 6,092,555</b>	<b>\$ 5,726,727</b>	<b>\$ 5,273,617</b>	<b>\$ 5,283,255</b>	<b>\$ 4,630,055</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>9.6</b>

## Sub\_Program: Rapid Response

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Rapid Response is a federally funded program by the U.S. Dept. of Labor that is required to be administered by each state. Not funding this program is not an option under federal statute and regulations. *Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act (WIOA) 20 CFR Part IV*

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	682.300-682.370	Mandatory	No	29

### Program Goals

A. For WARN and Non-WARN events, offer all employers informational meetings and/or Rapid Response packet information, regardless of number of laid off workers

### Program History

The 1988 passage of the Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance Act (EDWAA) required all states to establish state-level Dislocated Worker Units with Rapid Response teams that provide early-intervention services. Rapid Response is a pro-active, business-focused, and flexible strategy designed to respond to layoffs and plant closings by quickly coordinating services and providing immediate aid to companies and their affected workers. Rapid Response teams will work with employers and any employee representative(s) to quickly maximize public and private resources to minimize disruptions associated with job loss. Rapid Response can provide customized services on-site at an affected company, accommodate any work schedules, and assist companies and workers through the painful transitions associated with job loss. Rapid response encompasses strategies and activities necessary to (1) plan for and respond to as quickly as possible following either an announcement of a closure or layoff, or mass job dislocation resulting from a disaster, natural or otherwise; and (2) deliver services to enable dislocated workers to transition to new employment as quickly as possible. In August 1988, Congress passed the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act (WARN) to provide workers with sufficient time to seek other employment or retraining opportunities before losing their jobs. WARN helps ensure advance notice in cases of qualified plant closings and layoffs.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of WARN notices	A	94	62	17	15	9	9	9	29
2. Number of Non-WARN notices	A	61	55	22	20	9	9	9	29
3. Number of affected employees	A	20,966	16,857	4,140	4,000	623	635	648	7,207

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	546,168	559,051	517,845	392,921	365,233	368,191	370,631	480,710
<b>Total</b>	\$ 546,168	\$ 559,051	\$ 517,845	\$ 392,921	\$ 365,233	\$ 368,191	\$ 370,631	\$ 480,710
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	2.2	2.2	0.9

## Sub\_Program: Jobs for Veterans Grants

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This is a Federally Funded Program through DOL-Veterans Employment and Training Services (VETS). Commerce would not meet the statutory requirements of the Jobs for Veterans Services Grant (JVSG).

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific      38 U.S.C 4101 (4); 38 U.S.C 4211 (4)	Mandatory	No	30

### Program Goals

- A. Federal Outcome measure - Employment Rate 2nd quarter after exit (%), 54% or better  
 B. Federal Outcome measure - Employment Rate 4th quarter after exit (%), 50% or better  
 C. Federal Outcome measure - Median earnings 2nd quarter after exit (\$), \$5,939 or better

### Program History

The Jobs for State Veteran's Grants (JVSG) Program is a federally funded program which provides "priority of services" to eligible Veterans under 38 U.S.C. 4101 (4) and 4211 (4), and other eligible spouses as defined in 38 U.S.C. 4101 (5). This program is three-fold: 1) Disabled Veteran Outreach Program Consultants (DVOP) under guidance of 38 U.S.C. 4103A (a) provide intensive services and facilitates job placements to meet the employment needs of veterans prioritizing services to special disabled Veterans, disabled Veterans and other Veterans that may have Significant Barriers to Employment; 2) Local Veteran Employment Representatives (LVER) under 38 U.S.C. 4104 (b) principal duties are to: (1) Conduct outreach to employers to assist veterans in gaining employment; (2) Facilitate employment, training and placement services furnished under KANSASWorks (state delivery system); 3) Intensive Services Coordinator (ISC) acts a liaison between the Department of Commerce and the Department of Veteran Affairs (VA). This position accepts veteran referrals under Chapter 31 Veteran Readiness and Employment (VA (VR&E) that are entering the job readiness phase of their rehabilitation. The ISC additionally provides oversight on all other matters pertaining to the veteran including the (VR&E) counselor and DVOP to facilitate a smooth transition into civilian employment.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Employment rate -2nd quarter after exit	A	55.7%	54.8%	51.8%	54.0%	50.5%	66.5%	66.5%	52%
2. Employment rate -4th quarter after exit	B	51.7%	51.0%	51.4%	52.0%	52.3%	64.9%	64.9%	52%

## Veterans

## Kansas Department of Commerce

3. Median wages - 2nd quarter after  
exit

B

\$ 6,613	\$ 6,656	\$ 6,634	\$ 6,700	\$ 7,172	\$ 5,653	\$ 5,653	\$ 6,821
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	1,614,964	1,606,544	1,442,150	1,428,263	1,314,818	1,486,685	1,493,638	1,454,504
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,614,964	\$ 1,606,544	\$ 1,442,150	\$ 1,428,263	\$ 1,314,818	\$ 1,486,685	\$ 1,493,638	\$ 1,454,504
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.5	23.1	23.1	7.5

## Sub\_Program: Foreign Labor Certification

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This program is federally funded. If not funded by the state, the program will not meet federal requirements.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act of 2014 - CFR Title 20 Part 655 Subpart A & B	Mandatory	No	31

### Program Goals

A. Meet employer needs and enhance competitiveness of the nation.

### Program History

Foreign labor certification programs permit U.S. employers to hire foreign workers on a temporary or permanent basis to fill jobs essential to the U.S. economy. Certification may be obtained in cases where it can be demonstrated that there are insufficient qualified U.S. workers available and willing to perform the work at wages that meet or exceed the prevailing wage paid for that occupation in the area of intended employment. Foreign labor certification programs are designed to assure that the admission of foreign workers into the United States on a permanent or temporary basis will not adversely affect the job opportunities, wages, and working conditions of U.S. workers. Administration of the programs is mandated by the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) and delineated by regulations in each program published in the Code of Federal Regulations. Kansas receives funding from USDOL to administer the Foreign Labor Certification program to provide services to employers having difficulty finding qualified U.S. workers to fill job openings.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Inspected housing units	A	318	404	531	400	686	700	714	540
2. Workers certified	A	1,121	1,432	1,605	1,400	1,998	2,038	2,079	1,678
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. H2-A applications	A	204	265	327	300	402	410	418	331

## Foreign Labor

## Kansas Department of Commerce

4. H2-B applications	A	47	55	58	50	110	112	114	74
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
5. Adverse effect wage rate		\$ 14.39	\$ 14.99	\$ 15.89	\$ 16.00	\$ 16.47	\$ 16.80	\$ 17.14	\$ 15.78

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	135,607	124,108	108,511	77,964	139,582	89,162	90,185	124,067
<b>Total</b>	\$ 135,607	\$ 124,108	\$ 108,511	\$ 77,964	\$ 139,582	\$ 89,162	\$ 90,185	\$ 124,067
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.2	1.2	0.4

## Sub\_Program: Reemployment Services and Eligibility Assessment (RESEA)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

RESEA is a federally funded program through U.S. Dept. of Labor Employment and Training Administration. If not funded the program will not meet grant requirements and will lose associated grant funds

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific      42 U.S.C. 506	Mandatory	No	32

### Program Goals

- A. Number of claimants receiving Unemployment Benefits Served
- B. Decrease the number of RESEA customer who fail to report for services

### Program History

The Unemployment Insurance (UI) program is a required partner in the broader public workforce system and provides unemployment benefits to individuals who have lost their employment through no fault of their own and who otherwise meet initial and continuing UI eligibility requirements. Beginning in 2005, the U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration funded the voluntary UI Reemployment and Eligibility Assessment (REA) program to address individual reemployment needs of UI claimants, as well as prevent and detect improper benefit payments. In 2015, the Reemployment Services and Eligibility Assessment (RESEA) program replaced the REA program providing greater access to reemployment services in addition to services previously provided under the REA program. Reemployment Services and Eligibility Assessment (RESEA) is a collaboration between the Kansas Department of Commerce and the Kansas Department of Labor. Commerce has administered the program in some capacity since 2009. RESEA is provided in sixteen Job Centers around the state. There are fifteen grant-funded positions located at five Job Centers. Wagner-Peyser funded staff provide RESEA services in offices that do not have dedicated staff. Claimants scheduled for RESEA are required to report to a workforce center as a condition to receiving UI benefits. Due to COVID-19 related capacity constraints, RESEA was on hiatus until mid-March 2021.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of UI claimants scheduled for services	A	13,251	22,294	362	7,000	4,782	4,878	4,975	9,146
2.Failure to report rate (%)	B	30%	35%	22%	25%	32%	32%	32%	29%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	665,253	898,900	983,015	1,205,183	1,142,063	1,261,440	1,272,384	1,007,993
<b>Total</b>	\$ 665,253	\$ 898,900	\$ 983,015	\$ 1,205,183	\$ 1,142,063	\$ 1,261,440	\$ 1,272,384	\$ 1,007,993
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.9	21.5	21.5	7.3

## Sub\_Program: Private Activity Bonds (PAB)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Qualified Private Activity Bonds (PABs) are federally tax-exempt bonds. In Kansas, the primary demand for bond allocation has been for the issuance of exempt facility bonds, mortgage revenue bonds and qualified small issue bonds also known as Industrial Revenue Bonds (IRBs). Lack of funding could result in lack of funding for certain housing projects, the beginning farmers program, and the first-time home buyers program

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific      K.S.A. 74-5058	Mandatory	No	33

### Program Goals

- A. Process applications, provide allocations, and manage the bond cap
- B. Ensure that the allocation is expended each year for projects and first-time home buyers program

### Program History

Qualified Private Activity Bonds (PABs) are federally tax-exempt bonds. Under the federal volume cap, Kansas had a 2022 bond authority of \$325,115,000 to allocate for this purpose. The types of bonds qualifying for such tax-exempt status are: 1) Exempt facility bonds; 2) Qualified mortgage bonds; 3) Qualified veterans' mortgage bonds; 4) Qualified small issue bonds; 5) Qualified student loan bonds; 6) Qualified redevelopment bonds; and 7) Qualified 501(c)(3) bonds. The role of the Department of Commerce is to ensure that these bonds are being used for a Qualified Purpose and that the State does not exceed the maximum capacity set forth by the Federal Government for Tax Exempt Bonds.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	CY 2019*	CY 2020*	CY 2021*	CY 2022 To Date	CY 2022 Est Totals	CY 2023 Est.	CY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of applications received	A	13	8	11	7	12	14	14	10
2. Number of applications approved	A B	13	8	11	7	12	14	14	10
3. Total application fees	A	\$9,750	\$6,000	\$7,500	\$5,250	\$9,000	\$10,500	\$10,500	\$7,500
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Allocation amount received	A	\$321,775,000	\$321,775,000	\$324,995,000	\$335,115,000	\$335,115,000	\$340,000,000	\$345,000,000	\$327,295,000
5. Allocation amount approved	A B	\$321,775,000	\$321,775,000	\$324,995,000	\$335,115,000	\$335,115,000	\$340,000,000	\$345,000,000	\$327,295,000

## Kansas Department of Commerce

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund								\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds								-
Federal Funds								-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1

## Public Broadcasting Council

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Public Broadcasting Council is charged with achieving the goal of every Kansan having access to public media. To achieve this goal, member stations provide community service by delivering quality, informational, educational, and cultural content to all corners of Kansas. Not funding this program would result in possible reduction in staffing (especially in western Kansas), a reduction in capacity for local/regional programming, and a loss of federal dollars, which are in part calculated by the level of non-federal financial support.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
	Discretionary	No	34

### Program Goals

- A. Rural Public Media Services
- B. Literacy Support and Achievement
- C. Leverage Collaborative Partnerships

### Program History

The Kansas Public Broadcasting Council (KPBC) was established in 1993 by the Kansas Legislature and charged with coordinating public broadcasting activities in the state. State dollars are allocated through a statutory formula to nine member stations. More broadly, stations are charged with achieving the goal of every Kansan having access to the quality, informational, educational and cultural content of public media. KPBC shares the Department of Commerce's goal to improve and promote the quality of life for the entire population of Kansas. The nine KPBC stations have provided consistent service to all 105 Kansas counties--a unique degree of state coverage. We aspire to cover the entire population, but realistically our coverage will be only a portion of that total at any given moment. KPBC stations are usually primary providers of public media content for Kansas residents, especially residents of rural areas, and residents of western Kansas. Not reflected in our outcome measures at this time is the number of community partnerships KPBC member stations engage in. Many non-profits--volunteer fire departments, arts organizations, social service agencies, universities, and others--work with our stations to engage with their constituencies and the broader communities they serve.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of individuals reached by PBC resources <sup>1*</sup>	A/C	2,934,240	2,937,174	2,966,545	2,996,210	2,996,210	3,026,172	3,056,433	2,966,643

## Public Broadcasting

## Kansas Department of Commerce

2. Number of Kansans who might tune into KPBC content weekly\*

A/C

840,365	845,183	847,361	852,191	852,191	860,712	\$869,319	848,245
\$2.28	\$2.28	\$2.28	\$2.28	\$2.28	\$2.28	\$2.28	\$2.28

3. Cost per hour for KPBC station generated broadcast radio and television programming<sup>2</sup>

A

<sup>1</sup>KPBC provides coverage to the entire state population, available to anyone with access to a radio, television, computer, tablet and/or "smart" phone/device<sup>2</sup>Calculated based on KPBC funding received through the Kansas Department of Commerce. Amount is based upon grant total, thus remains the same.

## Output Measures

4. Number of programming hours generated by KPBC stations devoted to early childhood learning\*

B

35,040	35,112**	35,040	35,040	35,040	35,040	35,040	35,064
1,728,720	1,764,000	1,800,000	1,836,000	1,836,000	1,872,000	1,909,454	1,800,000

5. Number of unique visitors to KPBC websites per year\*

A/B

\*Data calculated from total KPBC program funding, including KPBC member station budgets.

\*\*KPBC created special KSDE programs when schools closed.

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Workforce AID (Aligned with Industry Demand)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Workforce AID provides employers with short-term, customized training with college credit and industry-recognized credentials to help build and sustain their talent pipeline. Employers would have more difficulty hiring trained and skilled employees without this program. Industries would not recognize Kansas as a location of choice due to not having the capacity to deliver a talent pipeline to meet their needs.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General	N/A	Discretionary	No	35

### Program Goals

- A. Utilize new and innovative industry-driven talent solutions to develop short-term, customized training projects with employers and education institutions.
- B. Deliver skilled employees to Kansas employers.
- C. Provide students with a contingent offer of employment and college credit/industry recognized credentials.
- D. Build and deliver a sustainable talent supply chain for Kansas industries.

### Program History

Workforce AID, which began in 2014, is a partnership between the Kansas Department of Commerce and the Kansas Board of Regents developed to address the skills gap in Kansas through development of a talent pipeline. Workforce AID is an industry-driven program that aligns industry opportunities and demands with workforce training and education. Using short-term, highly focused training programs in college credit and industry-recognized credentials, Workforce AID finds, trains and delivers Kansas employers a skilled, certified workforce. Workforce AID is nationally recognized by the US Chamber of Commerce Foundation and supports economic and workforce development by keeping Kansas businesses competitive and promoting a more robust economy.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percent of students enrolled in training programs receiving industry credential/credit hours	C	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
2. Number of new projects with schools/companies	A	2	4	1	8	2	8	10	2.3

3. Number of students enrolled

B

58	85	10	80	10	225	250	35.0
----	----	----	----	----	-----	-----	------

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund		\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds		227,204	186,461	649,572	137,623	699,058	698,799	183,763
Federal Funds		-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ 227,204	\$ 186,461	\$ 649,572	\$ 137,623	\$ 699,058	\$ 698,799	\$ 183,763
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.3

**Sub\_Program: My (Re)Employment****Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

If not funded the program would not meet the statutory requirement of HB 2196

<b>Statutory Basis</b>		<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific	HB2196	Mandatory	No	36

**Program Goals**

- A. Increase the Employment Rate 2nd quarter after exit (%)
- B. Increase Employment Rate 4th quarter after exit (%)

**Program History**

Beginning in June 2021, the My (Re)Employment Plan was revived and updated in HB2196. This collaboration between the Kansas Department of Labor, Kansas Department of Commerce and the KANSASWORKS Workforce system provides enhanced reemployment services to Kansans who are unemployed and looking for work. The program, called "My (Re)Employment Plan" connects unemployment recipients with workforce service professionals in their area.

Individuals selected for My (Re)Employment Plan are required to complete a Job Search Plan, Skills List and to create/upload their resume in KANSASWORKS.com. Customers needing assistance are encouraged to visit their nearest Workforce Center.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Participants exiting enrollments	A	N/A	N/A	N/A	70	37,015	37,755	38,510	N/A
2. Participants in compliance with services	A	N/A	N/A	N/A	68.8	25,212	25,716	26,231	N/A

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund								\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds				94,300	92,704	98,227	96,681	92,704
Federal Funds								-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 94,300	\$ 92,704	\$ 98,227	\$ 96,681	\$ 30,901
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0

## Sub\_Program: Older Kansas Employment Program (OKEP)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Older Kansans Employment Program provides specialized training, career assessment, job-matching, and job search assistance to Kansans aged 55 and older regardless of their income and facilitates the development of job opportunities for older Kansans in private industry. If the program is not funded we will not be able to provide employment placement services to Kansans 55 and older.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	KSA 75-5741	Mandatory	Yes	37

### Program Goals

A. Increase the number of placements into unsubsidized employment

### Program History

OKEP is funded by the Kansas Legislature and is designed to provide employment placement services to Kansan's 55 years of age and over with emphasis on employment in the private sector. The Older Kansans Employment Program provides specialized training, career assessment, job-matching and job search assistance to Kansans age 55 and older regardless of their income and facilitates the development of job opportunities for older Kansans in private industry. This funding is provided to non-profit 501(c)3s and other community-based, non-profit organizations who administer the program. OKEP has expanded to new areas of the state, allowing for more older workers to benefit from the specialized program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of participants	A	2,432	2,826	1,870	2,400	948	967	986	1,881
2. Number of placements	A	681	789	575	620	169	172	176	511

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	467,787	571,688	437,363	580,315	495,833	522,600	504,697	501,628
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 467,787</b>	<b>\$ 571,688</b>	<b>\$ 437,363</b>	<b>\$ 580,315</b>	<b>\$ 495,833</b>	<b>\$ 522,600</b>	<b>\$ 504,697</b>	<b>\$ 501,628</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.2</b>

## Sub\_Program: Retaining Employment and Talent after Injury/Illness Network Grant (RETAIN)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The adverse impacts of workers leaving the workforce because of illness or injury on state governments, as well as on the individuals and employers, can be significant and long-lasting. This can result in associated costs to the state due to a reduction in tax base and decreased individual spending; costs to employee due to reduction of income which can have a life-changing impact on health, family finances and quality of life. This impacts employers who shoulder the direct and indirect costs that result from the loss of valuable employees.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Grant	Discretionary	No	38

### Program Goals

- A. To increase employment retention and labor force participation of individuals who acquire and/or are at risk of developing work disabilities
- B. To reduce long-term work disability among project participants, including the need for federal disability benefits (SSDI and SSI)

### Program History

In September 2018, Commerce received a \$1,877,823 grant from the US Department of Labor, Office of Disability Employment Policy to establish relationships between the workforce system and medical service delivery system to develop processes to help individuals who have suffered a debilitating illness or injury to stay at or return to work. The program period of performance and subsequent funding has been extended an additional 12 months, from April 1, 2020 through March 31, 2021, with total funding increased to \$2,303,757. In 2021 the Kansas Department of Commerce, in partnership with all five Local Workforce Development Boards in Kansas, the Kansas Department of Health and Environment, Ascension Via Christi Healthcare System and four additional Healthcare systems, has been awarded an additional \$21.6 million for a Phase II of the grant.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of participants enrolled	A	1	42	30	1,200	39	1,500	1,700	37
2. Number of providers participating	A	6	22	19	75	34	50	75	25

\*FY19 had 7 month start up and planning phase, enrollment didn't begin until 6/26/19

RETAIN

## Kansas Department of Commerce

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	1,656,513	1,025,017	259,305	620,174	1,202,345	962,132	963,560	828,889
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,656,513	\$ 1,025,017	\$ 259,305	\$ 620,174	\$ 1,202,345	\$ 962,132	\$ 963,560	\$ 828,889
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.0	14.0	14.0	4.3

## Sub\_Program: Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The U.S. Department of Labor requires the state to match 10% of the funding for the Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP). Failure to allocate funding for SCSEP would result in the loss of the SCSEP program. This would be detrimental to older Kansans who rely on the training and subsidized wages provided by SCSEP. Many older Kansans rely on the subsidized wages to pay rent and utilities, keeping many from homelessness.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	Older American Act of 1965(amended, 2020)	Mandatory	Yes	39

### Program Goals

- A. Increase Median Earnings (Quarter) - (\$3465)
- B. Increase Employment Rate 2nd Quarter after exit - 29%
- C. Increase Employment Rate 4th Quarter after exit - 27.1%

### Program History

SCSEP is the only federally mandated job training program that explicitly serves low income adults, age 55 years and older. It was first authorized under Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and funded in 1965 as part of a demonstration project called Operation Mainstream. Operation Mainstream's objective was broader than just older adults, but seniors were one targeted population. Operation Mainstream was run by national nonprofit agencies until 1973 when the older worker component of the program was converted from a pilot project to an established program under Title IX of the OAA. The amendment modified the program to allow both state governments as well as national nonprofit agencies to receive funds. In 1978, the program was re-designated as Title V of the Older Americans Act, and this is still the statutory authorization of the program today. SCSEP provides part-time community service assignments for low-income adults, 55 years and older to promote transition to unsubsidized employment. The COVID pandemic resulted in greatly reduced community service assignments and on-the-job placements due to the temporary closure of most of the community-based organizations which provide on-the-job opportunities for SCSEP participants.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Median earning	A	\$7,631	\$3,775	\$2,651	\$3,500	\$2,582	\$3,317	\$3,317	\$3,003

2. Employment rate 2nd quarter after exit	B	21.40%	42.90%	40.70%	40%	25%	40%	40%	36%
3. Employment rate 4th quarter after exit	C	11.80%	26.70%	26.70%	30%	24%	22%	22%	26%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	8,865	11,072	\$ 10,047	\$ 8,421	8,350	8,142	8,071	9,823
Federal Funds	802,368	977,316	860,017	814,103	520,485	531,103	531,314	785,939
<b>Total</b>	\$ 811,233	\$ 988,388	\$ 870,064	\$ 822,524	\$ 528,835	\$ 539,245	\$ 539,385	\$ 795,762
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.2

**Sub\_Program: Wagner Peyser****Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

This is a federally funded program by U.S. Dept. of Labor with required activities by State merit staff. Not funding this program is not an option under federal statute and regulations. *Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act (WIOA) 20 CFR Part IV*

<b>Statutory Basis</b>		<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rgt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific	Title III of Workforce Innovation and	Mandatory	No	40

**Program Goals**

- A. WIOA, Title III Federal Outcome measure - Employment Rate 2nd quarter after exit (%)
- B. WIOA Title III, Federal Outcome measure - Employment Rate 4th quarter after exit (%)
- C. WIOA, Title III, Federal Outcome measure - Median earnings 2nd quarter after exit (\$)

**Program History**

The Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 established a nationwide system of public employment offices, known as the Employment Service. The Wagner-Peyser Act was amended in 1998 to make the Employment Service part of the one-stop delivery system under the Workforce Investment Act. In 2014, the Wagner-Peyser Act was amended again under Title III of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). The Wagner-Peyser Act establishes a national employment system to provide workforce services including assessment, testing, counseling, occupation and labor market information, referral to job openings, employment services for groups with special needs, and recruitment services and special technical services for employers. Customers seek services electronically or receive staff assistance by visiting a workforce center.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Employment rate 2nd quarter after exit(percent)	A	72.13%	70.60%	65.46%	70.00%	67.4%	66.5%	66.5%	68%
2. Employment rate 4th quarter after exit(percent)	B	71.37%	69.17%	64.60%	68.80%	65.5%	64.9%	64.9%	66%
3. Median earnings 2nd quarter after exit(dollars)	C	\$ 5,505.00	\$ 5,664.00	\$ 5,539.00	\$ 5,356.00	\$ 5,959	\$ 5,653	\$ 5,653	\$ 5,720.67
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Number of participants registered for services	A	378,607	369,339	830,283	562,902	909,963	928,162	946,726	703,195

5. Number of job seekers referred to employment A

6. Number of customer chats on live chat on KansasWorks.com A

54,924	50,819	32,830	49,424	32,847	33,504	34,174	38,832
N/A	5,892	11,861	9,498	16,922	17,260	17,606	11,558

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	\$ 5,981,689	\$ 5,879,736	\$ 4,928,452	4,963,076	4,624,782	5,145,597	5,152,029	5,144,323
<b>Total</b>	\$ 5,981,689	\$ 5,879,736	\$ 4,928,452	\$ 4,963,076	\$ 4,624,782	\$ 5,145,597	\$ 5,152,029	\$ 5,144,323
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	67.3	66.7	66.7	22.4

## Sub\_Program: Pathway Home 2

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Pathway Home 2 seeks to provide eligible, incarcerated individuals with workforce services within 20 and 180 days of release from a correctional facility. Lack of educational attainment and marketable skills blocks individuals returning from incarceration from much of the living wage work in their community. Individuals unable to access sustainable living wage employment risk returning to incarceration, which results in a cost to taxpayers of roughly \$30,000 annually and a decrease in public safety.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Grant	Discretionary	No	41

### Program Goals

- A. Increase living wage employment for individuals exiting Kansas correctional facilities.
- B. Completion of training or credential attainment in a high demand occupation.
- C. Reduction in recidivism for program participants.

### Program History

In June 2021, the Kansas Department of Commerce was awarded a \$3,997,764 grant from the US Dept. of Labor Employment and Training Administration for the Pathway Home 2 project. The period of performance is from July 1, 2021 to December 31, 2024. Pathway Home 2 seeks to provide eligible, incarcerated individuals with workforce services within 20 and 180 days of release from a correctional facility. Participating individuals will have access to services that aid them in preparation to enter sustainable, living wage employment in a high demand industry in the local labor market of the community which they plan to return. These services include, but are not limited to job preparation; individualized plans that address barriers to employment; career exploration and planning; counseling; assistance obtaining state identification required for employment; and assistance linking residents to the social services required to help them transition back to their communities. A key feature of this program is the participants' case manager, whom they have built a relationship with, will remain with them post-release to support skill-building, job attainment, and employment retention. Partnerships with internal and external service providers ensure that participants' barriers to employment are addressed, to aid in their success and reduce recidivism.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of participants enrolled	A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	49	117	117	49.0

2. Number of participants obtaining  
full range of services

A

N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	88	88	0.0
-----	-----	-----	-----	---	----	----	-----

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund								\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds								\$ -
Federal Funds				250,000	188,679	182,139	182,227	188,679
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 250,000	\$ 188,679	\$ 182,139	\$ 182,227	\$ 62,893
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1

## Sub\_Program: Individual Development Account Program

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The State Statute provides \$500,000 per year in tax credits for the program. The impact of not funding the program is that no new Individual Development Accounts will have a state match on the funds saved and this will directly impact the non-profits who administer IDA program across the state.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	KSA 74-50,201 - 74-50,208	Mandatory	Yes	42

### Program Goals

A. Facilitate self-sufficiency for low-income Kansans through asset development in a matched savings program.

### Program History

The program was created in 2005. In 2009 Commerce designated Interfaith Housing Services, located in Hutchinson, as a sole provider of IDA in Kansas due to their demonstrated ability in administering IDAs and utilizing the necessary tax credit. In 2012 the Legislature revoked an individuals ability to receive tax credits for donating to the program. In 2015, the Kansas Legislature re-authorized individual donors to receive tax credits that resulted in full utilization of available tax credits in 2015, 2016,2017, 2018 and 2019. In 2019, Commerce reopened bids for IDA providers to have increase impact across the state. In 2022, Commerce revised the bidding process and refined the application process to be consistent with other tax credit programs.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Tax credits issued	A	\$ 500,000.00	\$500,000.00	\$ 500,000.00	\$ 500,000.00	\$500,000.00	\$ 500,000.00	\$ 500,000.00	\$500,000.00
2. Number of non-profits administering the program	A	1	1	1	1	2	5	5	1
3. Number of successfully completed accounts	A	35	69	86	50	69	75	80	75

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund								\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds								\$ -
Federal Funds								\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.1

\*\*Program/overhead expenses not currently tracked

## Kansas Department of Credit Unions

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

State chartered credit unions would not be examined on a regular basis and Kansas citizens could be subject to undue risk that could have been eliminated by an exam.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific    K.S.A. 17-2201-2269	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Each Credit Union must be examined at least once every 18 months

### Program History

Kansas Department of Credit Union was established in 1968 under K.S.A 17-2234. Information related to the agency in general can be found at K.S.A 17-2201

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percentage of examination performed every 18 months	A	100%	100%	100%	100%	96%	100%	100%	99%

  

<i>Output Measures</i>									
2. Examinations performed	A	60	46	49	50	50	49	49	48
3. Callbacks performed	A	15	10	9	10	11	10	10	10

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	980,497	955,787	1,092,602	1,274,067	1,094,322	1,310,139	1,312,445	1,047,570
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 980,497</b>	<b>\$ 955,787</b>	<b>\$ 1,092,602</b>	<b>\$ 1,274,067</b>	<b>\$ 1,094,322</b>	<b>\$ 1,310,139</b>	<b>\$ 1,312,445</b>	<b>\$ 1,047,570</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

- Lack of oversight of KDOR core functions.
- Inability to adhere to State policies and procedures for accounting, procurement, and personnel management.
- Unable to handle administrative and court matters and legal analysis in-house.
- Reduced ability to manage vital tax, vehicle, and credential information.
- Fiscal notes, open records requests, and statistical reports not completed in a timely manner.
- Non-compliance with state and local tax statutes and taxpayers not remitting the correct amount of tax.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
General    KSA 75-5101 and 75-1527	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. The Office of the Secretary is responsible for ensuring the agency follows it's mission.
- B. Represent the agency in litigation and provide legal advice to the Department of Revenue.
- C. Support the development of efficient tax laws and consistent policies.

### Program History

KSA 75-5101 provides for the organization of the Department of Revenue and delineates the powers of the Secretary of Revenue. KSA 75-5127 allows the Secretary to organize the Department of Revenue in a manner that will promote efficiency.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percentage of fiscal notes	C	80.0%	80.0%	80.0%	80.0%	89.0%	80.0%	80.0%	83.0%
2. Total number of fiscal notes	C	292	294	372	225	292	225	225	319
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Administrative tax appeals docketed	B	355	250	279	450	406	500	500	311.7

Kansas Department of Revenue

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 3,172,217	\$ 6,073,649	\$ 6,322,805	\$ 5,387,928	\$ 5,650,286	\$ 3,512,520	\$ 3,544,063	\$ 6,015,580
Non-SGF State Funds	23,736,997	28,595,826	30,761,945	30,376,366	30,981,727	33,243,140	33,357,474	30,113,166
Federal Funds	5,676	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 26,914,890	\$ 34,669,475	\$ 37,084,750	\$ 35,764,294	\$ 36,632,013	\$ 36,755,660	\$ 36,901,537	\$ 36,128,746
<b>FTE</b>	297.5	282.3	272.3	273.3	273.3	273.2	273.2	275.9

## Aid to Local Units

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

• Violation of the established state statutes and regulations. The local jurisdictions would not receive revenue from the State of Kansas.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General    K.S.A. 79-4227 K.S.A. 79-5211 K.S.A. 82a-309 K.S.A. 8-2425	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Be accountable for the distribution of aid payments to local governments.
- B. Ensure that all aid payments are made on or before the scheduled distributions dates.

### Program History

This program provides for the distribution of certain State-collected taxes and fees to local units of government as aid. Local aid distributions include: sand royalties, fees collected from the sale of full-privilege motor vehicle dealer license tags, mineral production taxes and assessments of delinquent taxes and penalties imposed for nonpayment of taxes on marijuana and controlled substances.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percentage of aid payments distributed on schedule	B	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund								\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	\$ 4,705,447	\$ 3,557,420	\$ 1,993,678	3,491,210	4,394,844	6,105,710	5,606,710	3,315,314
Federal Funds								-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 4,705,447	\$ 3,557,420	\$ 1,993,678	\$ 3,491,210	\$ 4,394,844	\$ 6,105,710	\$ 5,606,710	\$ 3,315,314
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Alcoholic Beverage Control

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

- Threat to public safety particularly as it applies to minors.
- Potential influx of criminal activity masked within the industry.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific    K.S.A. 75-5117 K.S.A. 41-101 K.S.A. 41-2601	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Regulate licensees in an efficient, capable, fair, and professional manner.
- B. Make it as easy as possible to voluntarily comply with liquor laws by providing educational training to licensees.
- C. Protect public safety by performing random controlled buys to increase compliance rate for the sale of alcohol to underage persons.
- D. Contribute to and protect the integrity of KDOR revenue streams by monitoring the filing and remittance of taxes on the sale of alcoholic beverages.

### Program History

In 1949, the Kansas Legislature created the Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) to regulate the liquor industry after prohibition was lifted. ABC regulates and enforces the Liquor Control Act, Club and Drinking Establishment Act, and the Keg Tag Act. The Cereal Malt Beverage (CMB) Act requires ABC to add a State CMB stamp to locally issued CMB retailer licenses.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of controlled buys	C	380	404	291	612	922	950	950	539.0
2. Compliance rate for the controlled buys for the sale of alcohol to underage persons	C	87.0%	85.0%	84.0%	85.0%	83.0%	85.0%	85.0%	84.0%
3. ABC regulation cost per licensee	D	\$ 481.04	\$ 516.92	\$ 545.47	\$ 541.64	\$ 455.68	\$ 509.83	\$ 512.34	\$ 506.02

Kansas Department of Revenue

<i>Output Measures</i>								
4. Liquor Enforcement Tax violations	D	42	20	24	25	30	30	24.7
5. Liquor Drink Tax violations	D	209	105	119	115	203	200	142.3

Kansas Department of Revenue

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	2,929,569	3,081,384	3,329,486	3,318,077	3,005,715	3,365,876	3,382,663	3,138,862
Federal Funds	44,685	46,483	12,047	47,000	53,738	50,000	50,000	37,423
<b>Total</b>	\$ 2,974,254	\$ 3,127,867	\$ 3,341,533	\$ 3,365,077	\$ 3,059,453	\$ 3,415,876	\$ 3,432,663	\$ 3,176,284
<b>FTE</b>	39.0	39.8	39.8	38.8	38.8	36.8	36.8	39.5

## Tax Operations

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

- All personal, corporate and business taxation, motor fuel tax, excise tax administration, and customer service would cease.
- Delinquent tax debt would go unrecovered. No field presence would lead to an increase in non-compliance.
- Increase in tax fraud.
- No receiving and processing of tax returns.
- Inability to process and distribute \$9 billion to state and local entities, making Kansas government unable to function.
- Loss of federal highway funding due to non-compliance with International Fuel Tax Agreement.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific    K.S.A 75-5102 through K.S.A. 75-5104	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Administer and enforce tax laws with integrity, fairness, and civility.
- B. Increase voluntary compliance with tax laws through educational opportunities and the application of strategic decision/risk management processes to support and effective discovery and collection programs.
- C. Reduce accounts receivable and ensure prompt resolution by applying the latest best practices and latest technology in automation.
- D. Enforce laws relating to the sale of cigarette and tobacco products.
- E. Continually use new technologies and systems to reduce paper-based processing.

### Program History

In 1972, the Division of Taxation was created within and as a part of the Department of Revenue. The Division, headed by the Director of Taxation, administers almost all state taxes, including individual and corporate income, retail sales and compensating use, mineral severance, motor fuel, cigarette, and alcoholic beverage excise taxes. The Division also administers the Homestead Property Tax and Food Sales Tax refunds. For local governments, the Division administers retail sales, compensating use, liquor excise, and transient guest taxes.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. % of written correspondence	A	98.0%	87.0%	97.0%	97.0%	81.0%	85.0%	85.0%	88.3%
2. Compliance rate for random controlled buys for the sale of cigarette/tobacco products to minors	D	94.0%	95.0%	93.0%	90.0%	93.0%	90.0%	90.0%	93.7%
3. Delinquent tax collections	C	\$ 193,700,000	\$ 162,800,000	\$ 206,900,000	\$ 210,000,000	\$ 213,600,000	\$ 210,000,000	\$ 210,000,000	\$ 194,433,333

Kansas Department of Revenue

4. Delinquent tax accounts receivable turnover ratio	C	0.39	0.35	0.78	0.75	0.70	0.75	0.75	0.61
<i>Output Measures</i>									
5. Individual income tax returns filed	A	1,619,114	1,494,492	1,819,361	1,650,000	1,595,337	1,650,000	1,650,000	1,636,397
6. Sales and use tax returns filed	A	717,475	733,352	802,944	760,000	791,012	795,000	795,000	775,769
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
7. Percentage of electronically filed individual income tax return refunds issued within 14 days of receipt	E	96.0%	94.0%	94.0%	97.0%	97.0%	97.0%	97.0%	95.0%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 11,682,278	\$ 8,641,695	\$ 8,312,786	\$ 9,404,259	\$ 8,517,274	\$ 10,621,848	\$ 10,950,578	\$ 8,490,585
Non-SGF State Funds	53,255,851	19,959,515	20,359,540	17,951,132	18,204,898	17,691,043	17,041,102	19,507,984
Federal Funds	133,783	64,807	47,335	30,000	56,428	29,999	30,000	56,190
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 65,071,912</b>	<b>\$ 28,666,017</b>	<b>\$ 28,719,661</b>	<b>\$ 27,385,391</b>	<b>\$ 26,778,600</b>	<b>\$ 28,342,890</b>	<b>\$ 28,021,680</b>	<b>\$ 28,054,759</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>358.6</b>	<b>363.1</b>	<b>353.1</b>	<b>349.8</b>	<b>349.8</b>	<b>359.45</b>	<b>359.45</b>	<b>355.3</b>

## Property Valuation

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

- Failure to maintain a uniform and equal basis of property taxation as required by the Kansas Constitution.
- Loss of audit mechanisms to monitor compliance of the appraisal system with Kansas law.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General K.S.A. 79-1404	Mandatory	None	1

### Program Goals

- A. Provide counties, taxpayers, and staff with clear, useful, and accessible rules for valuing property.
- B. Provide education for county appraisers and officials, taxpayers, and staff regarding the valuation of property and other tax-related issues. Ensure that uniform and accurate valuations and assessments occur.
- C. Maintain the CAMA system and provide state and county personnel training on its use through training courses and workshops, in-depth procedural manuals, and user meetings to address and resolve system functionality issues.
- D. Conduct an annual independent review of county appraisal procedures to ensure compliance with Kansas laws, rules and regulations, and related policies.

### Program History

The Property Valuation Department became a division of the Department of Revenue under the executive reorganization of 1972 and provides overall supervision, training and education, assistance and support, and reporting for the Kansas ad valorem property tax system. The Director of Property Valuation has general supervision and direction of the county appraisers in the performance of their duties, and general supervision of the system of taxation throughout the state.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percent of residential valuations meeting state appraisal statistical compliance standards	D	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%	92.0%	90.0%	99.0%	96.7%
2. Percent of commercial valuations meeting state appraisal statistical compliance standards	D	95.0%	97.0%	80.0%	95.0%	53.0%	50.0%	95.0%	76.7%

Kansas Department of Revenue

3. Tax dollars generated from distribution to counties based on assessed value (in millions)	A								
		\$ 603.9	\$ 622.9	\$ 654.2	\$ 673.0	\$ 680.4	\$ 707.6	\$ 735.9	\$ 652.5
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Number of counties with qualified appraisers	B	102	105	98	105	103	105	105	102.0

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 856,407	\$ 1,243,829	\$ 612,817	\$ 16,181	\$ 606,766	\$ 1,278,430	\$ 1,523,594	\$ 821,137
Non-SGF State Funds	3,105,729	2,904,033	3,227,482	4,189,498	3,632,999	3,430,417	3,206,974	3,254,838
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 3,962,136	\$ 4,147,862	\$ 3,840,299	\$ 4,205,679	\$ 4,239,765	\$ 4,708,847	\$ 4,730,568	\$ 4,075,975
<b>FTE</b>	39.5	40.1	35.1	35.1	35.1	35.1	35.1	36.8

## Division of Vehicles

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

- Violation of established federal and state statutes and regulations.
- Unable to issue driver's license/identification cards.
- Unable to track vehicle registrations, titles, and issue license plates.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific    K.S.A. 75-5110	Mandatory	None	1

### Program Goals

- A. Provide exceptional service to customers, business partners, and stakeholders. Ensure information is presented in a consistent, efficient manner. Monitor business needs closely and adjust staffing to maintain quality service levels.
- B. Identify methods and technologies to improve efficiency for both internal and external customers, including county partners, lenders, and dealers.
- C. Adjust staffing to match business needs to decrease wait times in largest driver's license offices.

### Program History

On July 1, 1972, the Division of Vehicles was moved from the State Highway Commission to the Department of Revenue. The Division administers Kansas law relating to vehicle titling and registration, motor vehicle dealer licensing, and the issuance, maintenance, and renewal of drivers' licenses.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Average wait time at ten largest driver's license offices	C	20:43	10:30	9:15	8:30	7:05	9:40	9:30	8:56
2. Cost per registered vehicle	B	\$ 4.17	\$ 3.61	\$ 3.33	\$ 4.18	\$ 2.98	\$3.45	\$11.68	\$ 3.30
3. Cost per active credential	B	\$ 9.54	\$ 10.12	\$ 10.44	\$ 10.43	\$ 9.81	10.53	10.44	\$ 10.12
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Number of licenses/ID cards processed*	A	806,123	551,199	613,500	700,000	625,000	638,000	640,000	596,566
5. Percentage of online/mobile app renewals processed at county treasurers*	B	22.80%	31.81%	27.60%	32.50%	30.34%	30.50%	30.50%	29.92%

\*This metric is tracked on a calendar year basis. FY2022 is an estimate for calendar year 2022.

Kansas Department of Revenue

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 13,542	\$ 60	\$ -	\$ -				\$ 30
Non-SGF State Funds	28,947,841	29,543,527	30,600,018	34,178,157	34,908,738	34,715,820	60,187,274	31,684,094
Federal Funds	32,307	10,287	-					5,144
<b>Total</b>	\$ 28,993,690	\$29,553,874	\$30,600,018	\$ 34,178,157	\$34,908,738	\$ 34,715,820	\$ 60,187,274	\$ 31,687,543
<b>FTE</b>	344.0	364.0	349.0	352.2	352.2	352.6	352.6	355.0

## Compliance

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Discrimination, segregation or separation, and loss of equal opportunities in employment, housing, and public accommodations. Parties to the complaint do not have an administrative remedy to resolve allegations of discrimination.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory v. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General    K.S.A. 44-1005	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To provide prompt, professional and appropriate services to all citizens who contact the agency for assistance and maintain an effective and efficient complaint intake service to reduce or eliminate non-jurisdictional and frivolous complaints.
- B. To provide the opportunity for the early resolution through mediation of every complaint filed.
- C. On all cases not resolved by mediation, to conduct a prompt and thorough investigation of all allegations and to render a timely and appropriate determination that is supported by evidence of either probable cause or no probable cause in all cases submitted to Commissioners for such determination.

## Program History

Kansas Statutes Annotated 44-1004 provides the Kansas Human Rights Commission with the power to investigate complaints of discrimination based on race, color, ancestry, religion, sex, national origin, genetic testing (employment only), and disability, in the areas of employment, housing, and public accommodations. Effective January 1, 1992, the Commission was authorized to also investigate complaints of housing discrimination based upon familial status. The Kansas Age Discrimination in Employment Act (K.S.A. 44-1111, *et seq.*) authorizes the Commission to investigate age-based employment discrimination complaints.

In 1972, the Kansas Legislature gave the Commission the authority to process complaints alleging sex discrimination. In 1974, physical handicap was added, which had the effect of substantially expanding the Commission's coverage. In 1983, the Legislature passed the Kansas Age Discrimination in Employment Act, which gave the Commission the authority to process complaints of age discrimination in employment for persons between the ages of 40 to 70. At that time, the Federal Age Discrimination in Employment Act also covered persons from 40 to 70 years of age. However, in 1986, the Federal Law was changed in that the upper age limit of 70 was removed. In 1987, the Commission supported legislative efforts to make the same change in the Kansas law, i.e., to remove the upper age of 70. As a result of these efforts, the 1988 Kansas Legislature amended the age act to remove the age 70 limit. The amendments also changed the lower age coverage from 40 years to 18 years. Subsequently, House Bill 2771 of the 2008 Legislative Session changed the definition of age from the previous "18 or more years" to the current "40 or more years". Effective May 24, 1984, the Legislature authorized the Commission to award damages for mental pain, suffering, and humiliation up to an amount of \$2,000 where appropriate under the Kansas Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and in cases of employment or public accommodations discrimination under the Kansas Act Against Discrimination.

The 1991 Legislature made the most extensive and significant amendments to the Kansas Act Against Discrimination since the original enactment of the Kansas Act in 1953. The Kansas Act Against Discrimination was amended in an effort to make it similar to two federal laws, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988. Other amendments were also made to prohibit discrimination in membership practices of nonprofit, recreational or social associations, or corporations, on the basis of race, religion, sex, color, disability, national origin, or ancestry, if the organization has 100 or more members and provides regular meal service and receives payment for dues, and use of facilities. Religious or private fraternal and benevolent associations or corporations are excluded from this membership provision. These amendments also extended protection against discrimination to persons with a disability (prior law covered physical handicap) in the areas of employment, public accommodations, and housing, and to persons on the basis of familial status in the area of housing. Familial status is defined as having children less than 18 years of age domiciled with a parent or another person having legal custody of the children. The employment and public accommodations amendments were effective July 1, 1991, while the housing amendments became effective January 1, 1992.

**Program History, *continued***

In the 1992 Legislative session, further amendments were made to the housing discrimination section of the KAAD, which provided expanded damage and penalty awards when housing discrimination is proven. The 1995 Legislature amended the KAAD to require that complaints filed with the Kansas Human Rights Commission articulate in writing a statement of a prima facie case of discrimination pursuant to an established legal theory of discrimination. The Legislature also enacted statutory provisions authorizing the dismissal of complaints pending for more than 300 days under certain circumstances with a resulting right to assert the complaint in court action. The 1999 Legislature added restrictions on the use of genetic testing for pre-employment use.

Substitute for Senate Bill 77 of the 2005 Legislative Session became effective July 1, 2005, and prohibited law enforcement officers or agencies from relying, as the sole factor, on race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, or religious dress in selecting which individuals to subject to routine traffic stops, or in deciding upon the scope and substance of law enforcement activity following the initial routine traffic stop. Substitute for Senate Bill 77 was codified in K.S.A. 22-4606 through K.S.A. 22-4611. The law also provided that a representative from the Commission shall serve on a 15-member task force appointed by the governor. The governor's task force on racial profiling shall work in partnership with local and state law enforcement agencies to review current policies and make recommendations for future policies and procedures statewide for the full implementation of the provisions of K.S.A. 2006 Supp. 22-4606 through 22-4611, and amendments thereto. The law mandated that the Commission receive, review, and investigate, if necessary, complaints of racial and other profiling. Subsequently, SB 93 of the 2011 Legislative Session transferred the filing and investigation, if necessary, of profiling complaints from the Kansas Human Rights Commission to the Office of the Attorney General. The law became effective upon its publication in the Kansas Register on May 26, 2011.

House Bill 2582 of the 2006 Legislative Session amended the Kansas Act Against Discrimination to prohibit discrimination in homeowners associations' restrictive covenants based on race, religion, color, sex, disability, familial status, national origin, and ancestry. If the homeowners association fails to delete prohibited language, the Commission may bring action against the homeowners association for injunctive relief. The 2012 Legislative Session amended the disability provisions of K.S.A. 44-1002 and K.S.A. 44-1006 to bring the Kansas Act Against Discrimination into alignment with the federal Americans with Disabilities Act Amendments Act.

In August 2020, the Commission Board voted to concur with the U.S. Supreme Court ruling in *Bostock v. Clayton County, Georgia*, which determined that Title VII's "sex" discrimination provisions prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and transgender status. Because State of Kansas court rulings hold that federal court rulings are persuasive on the interpretation of the Kansas Act Against Discrimination, the U.S. Supreme Court ruling in *Bostock* is persuasive on the same prohibitions against "sex" discrimination by the Kansas Act Against Discrimination and "sex" is used uniformly in the Kansas Act Against Discrimination antidiscrimination provisions in employment, housing, and public accommodations. As such, the Kansas Human Rights Commission began accepting complaints of discrimination in employment, housing, and public accommodations based on "sex" inclusive of sexual orientation and gender identity.

The Kansas Act Against Discrimination has been declared equivalent to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as amended, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 as amended, Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 as amended, and the Genetic Information Non-Discrimination Act (GINA). Because of this equivalency determination, the Commission can enter into contractual agreements with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), which enforces comparable laws at the federal level.

Kansas Human Rights Commission

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Complaints Clearance Rate	<b>A, C</b>	97%	104%	100%	103%	102%	102%	101%	102%
2. Case Processing Time (in months)	<b>C</b>	9.97	8.29	9.31	9.00	9.73	9.28	9.15	9.11
3. Average SGF provided to Kansas Legal Services / Midland Mediation per case brokered through KLS / MM	<b>B, C</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 280.00	\$ -	\$ 289.00	\$ 258.00	\$ 251.00	\$ 189.67

**Performance Measures, continued**

<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
4. Number of Complaints Filed	<b>A</b>	1,054	911	951	875	799	900	915	887
5. Number of Complaints Closed	<b>C</b>	1,019	943	952	900	814	920	925	903

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,045,633	\$ 1,111,407	\$ 1,101,016	\$ 1,123,823	\$ 1,043,736	\$ 1,095,413	\$ 1,072,650	\$ 1,085,386
Non-SGF State Funds	-	23	23	23	3	3	3	16
Federal Funds	299,450	293,335	239,686	372,558	289,658	376,606	401,407	274,226
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,345,083</b>	<b>\$ 1,404,765</b>	<b>\$ 1,340,725</b>	<b>\$ 1,496,404</b>	<b>\$ 1,333,397</b>	<b>\$ 1,472,022</b>	<b>\$ 1,474,060</b>	<b>\$ 1,359,629</b>
<b>FTE</b>	23.00	23.00	23.00	23.00	23.00	23.00	23.00	23.00

## Education

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Increased discrimination and increased harassment. Loss of a training tool for employers, individuals, stakeholders, and other groups who want to address discrimination and prevent discrimination.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory v. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific      K.S.A. 44-1004 (10)	Mandatory	No	2

### Program Goals

**A.** Informs Kansans of what constitutes discrimination, the effects of unlawful discrimination, how to prevent discrimination, and provides an overview of discrimination laws. The public information program is the Commission's proactive effort to prevent future acts of discrimination.

**B.** To maintain a statewide education program to inform all citizens on what constitutes discrimination, the effects of unlawful discrimination, how to prevent discrimination, and how to obtain redress.

### Program History

See Program History under the Compliance Program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of People Trained Through Educational Presentations	A, B	666	794	595	625	613	630	650	667
2. Number of People Completing KHRC Online Training	A, B	11,330	9,891	11,010	11,100	12,347	12,375	12,400	11,083
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Number of educational presentations	A, B	18	19	26	28	21	24	26	22
4. Provide online training	A, B	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,020	\$ -	\$ 1,067	\$ 1,618	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	7,287	8,900	900	2,849	-	3,889	22,927	3,267
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 7,287</b>	<b>\$ 8,900</b>	<b>\$ 900</b>	<b>\$ 3,869</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 4,956</b>	<b>\$ 24,545</b>	<b>\$ 3,267</b>
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Insurance Regulation

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Without company examination the chances of insurance company insolvencies would increase. Without monitoring rates and forms, insurance may not be affordable or accessible. Without licensure of individuals, corporations and associations, insurance policies could be written by unqualified or suspect individuals. Without regulation of the firefighter relief associations FRA funds may be misappropriated. Without regulation of the workers compensation program eligible workers compensation claims would not be paid.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General	K.S.A. 40-101 et seq K.S.A. 40-1701 et seq K.S.A. 73-1209	Mandatory	No	1
Specific	K.S.A 44-581 through 592 K.S.A 12-2617 K.S.A. 44-501 through 580	Mandatory	No	

### Program Goals

- A. Protect the insurance consumers of Kansas through supervision, control and regulation of persons and organizations transacting the business of insurance in the state.
- B. To administer the Firefighter Relief Act.
- C. To administer the portion of the Workers Compensation Act for claims involving employers who are uninsured and unable to pay claims.

### Program History

The Kansas Insurance Department was established by the Kansas Legislature in 1871. Chapter 40 of the Kansas Statutes Annotated bestow many complex duties and responsibilities upon the Commissioner of Insurance by granting the Commissioner sole supervision, control and regulation of the various individuals and entities authorized to transact the business of insurance in this state, including supervision over many of their business transactions. Insurance is not regulated at the federal level, so the Department has exclusive jurisdiction over the \$22.2 billion business of insurance in Kansas.

Insurance Department

Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Amount of money recovered for Kansas consumers	A	\$4,250,114	\$1,883,718	\$2,657,248	\$3,000,000	\$7,181,996	\$3,800,000	\$3,500,000	\$3,907,654
2. No. of insurance fraud investigations submitted to AG for criminal disposition	A	14	14	9	14	21	20	20	15
3. Average cost per company examination	A	Didn't Track	Didn't Track	\$ 117,829	\$ 120,000	\$ 130,403	\$ 132,000	\$ 134,000	\$ 124,116

Output Measures

4. No. of financial exams performed each year	A	13	8	11	13	18	14	13	12
5. No. of company license applications approved each year	A	25	10	23	25	17	25	25	17
6. No. of active licensed producers, adjusters and agencies each year	A	158,948	168,294	186,998	205,000	197,578	207,500	220,000	184,290
7. No. of consumer complaint & inquiry files closed each year	A	3,435	3,589	2,938	3,500	3,157	3,000	3,000	3,228
8. No. of FRAs receiving a distribution each year	B	563	561	555	555	556	556	556	557
9. No. of open work comp cases each year	C	1,948	1,837	1,638	1,650	1,660	1,675	1,700	1,712

Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	26,457,401	28,430,793	27,452,228	32,628,524	29,047,403	34,298,230	34,294,990	28,310,141
Federal Funds	-	21,295	62,244	675,587	18,706	656,881	-	34,082
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 26,457,401</b>	<b>\$ 28,452,088</b>	<b>\$ 27,514,473</b>	<b>\$ 33,304,111</b>	<b>\$ 29,066,109</b>	<b>\$ 34,955,111</b>	<b>\$ 34,294,990</b>	<b>\$ 28,344,223</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>104.7</b>	<b>104.7</b>	<b>106.2</b>	<b>105.9</b>	<b>105.9</b>	<b>104.4</b>	<b>104.4</b>	<b>105.6</b>

## Securities Regulation

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Without funding to regulate capital formation and investment activity for the benefit of Kansas investors and businesses, extensive securities fraud and illegal or unethical conduct with significant financial damages would likely occur. Investor abuse and investment losses due to ignorance of best practice knowledge on investing and awareness of fraudulent schemes would likely increase and have significant financial impacts. Also, lack of funding could hamper support of prosecutions by the Attorney General and County and District Attorneys.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General    K.S.A. 17-12a101 et. seq.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To administer and enforce the registration and examination provisions of the Kansas Uniform Securities Act.
- B. To develop and implement investor education and protection initiatives to inform the public about investing in securities and protect the public from violations of the Kansas Uniform Securities Act.

### Program History

Kansas was the first state to regulate the sale of securities for protection of its investor citizens and capital markets when the original version of the Kansas Securities Act was passed in 1911. Securities regulation began in Kansas because, according to J. N. Dolley, Kansas Bank Commissioner at that time who was the driving force behind passage of the new law, it was intended to prevent the sale of securities by promoters who promised rain but delivered only "blue sky". During the next few years, several other states passed similar laws, and now all states have securities laws that are referred to as "Blue Sky" laws. The Kansas and other states' securities laws were enacted many years before the first federal Securities Act of 1933. The Kansas Securities Act (K.S.A. 17-1252 et seq.) was supplemented and refined many times since 1911 until enactment of the Kansas Uniform Securities Act (KUSA) in 2004 which became effective on July 1, 2005 (K.S.A. 17-12a101 et seq.). The Securities Commissioner and staff also administer and enforce the Kansas Loan Broker's Act (KLBA, K.S.A. 50-1001 et seq.) to regulate the services of loan brokers in Kansas who are not otherwise regulated or exempt.

Insurance Department

Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Court ordered restitution	A	\$150,000	\$230,814	\$751,296	\$500,000	\$1,301,400	\$870,000	\$400,000	\$761,170
2. No. of individual suspects referred to criminal prosecution each year	A	8	7	-	6	1	2	2	3
3. Cost of advertising per hit on the website each year	B	N/A	N/A	8k hits/\$200k \$25.00/hit	25k hits/\$430k \$17.20/hit	13,166 hits/\$430k \$32.66/hit	25k hits/\$471k \$18.84/hit	22k hits/ \$471k \$21.41/hit	\$19.22

Output Measures

4. BD registrations & renewal filings each year	A	1,474	1,463	1,452	1,447	1,457	1,436	1,450	1,457
5. IA registrations/IA notice filings & renewals each year	A	1,461	1,491	1,517	1,545	1,552	1,573	1,575	1,520
6. BD Agent/IA Rep/Agent of issuer registrations & renewals each year	A	154,800	156,443	161,517	163,275	163,153	164,875	164,875	160,371
7. Issuer registrations and renewals each year	A	66	67	71	73	77	75	75	72
8. No. of compliance examinations performed each year	A	18	57	50	59	27	32	50	45
9. No. of complaints investigated each year	A	28	12	33	25	58	50	50	34
10. No. of enforcement investigations initiated each year	A	31	16	21	20	20	20	20	19

Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	2,615,665	3,280,255	3,283,962	4,913,596	3,660,677	4,826,450	4,620,395	3,408,298
Federal Funds	-	1,252	17,756	-	-	-	-	6,336
<b>Total</b>	\$ 2,615,665	\$ 3,281,507	\$ 3,301,718	\$ 4,913,596	\$ 3,660,677	\$ 4,826,450	\$ 4,620,395	\$ 3,414,634
<b>FTE</b>	30.9	29.8	29.8	29.6	29.6	30.6	30.6	29.7

## Kansas Legislative Research Department

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Reduce or eliminate the availability of nonpartisan information and policy options to legislators when deliberating on bills, hamper operations of legislative committees for the reception and distribution of information, negatively impact the development of the state annual budget via the appropriations bills, impede the development of biannual consensus revenue estimates, and require a separate nonpartisan entity to facilitate the redistricting process.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>		<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
General	KSA 46-1210 KSA 75-6701	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Perform legislative reseach functions and other such duties as are directed by the Legislative Coordinating Council or by statute.
- B. Provide staff services to all special committees, select committees and standing committees when the Legislature is not in session.
- C. Collaborate with the Division of the Budget in the development of biannual consensus revenue estimates.
- D. Facilitate information sharing with the general public, and others with interest in the legislative process, legislative matters and the state budget.
- E. Coordinate, maintain, and report agency data and information as directed by committees or statute.

### Program History

The Kansas Legislative Research Department (KLRD) is one of four nonpartisan agencies that provide support services for the Kansas Legislature. The Department has provided nonpartisan, objective research and fiscal analysis for the Kansas Legislature since 1934.

The Legislative Research Department provides research and fiscal analysis for the Legislature, its committees, and individual legislators. The Department provides staff for all legislative committees during both the Session and the Interim, including statutorily created committees (i.e., Legislative Budget Committee, Joint Committee on State Building Construction, and others). The Legislative Coordinating Council appoints the Director of Legislative Research, approves the budget proposed for its operation, and generally establishes the broad policies under which the Department operates.

## Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Legislator satisfaction regarding the quality of committee support. *	A,B	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.8
2. Legislator satisfaction regarding preparation of staff to respond to questions in committee.*	A,B	N/A	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
3. Legislator satisfaction regarding timely, accurate and complete responses to questions.*	A,B	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.9	4.7
4. Legislator satisfaction regarding whether agency Supp Notes and CCRB are timely, accurate, and easy to understand.*	A,B	5.0	4.7	4.6	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.9	4.7
5. Legislator general satisfaction with the Department.*	A,B	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.8
6. Percent variation between actual and consensus revenue estimates.	C	1.9%	1.1%	9.5%	4.5%	5.4%	5.0%	5.0%	5.3%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
7. Number of Supp Notes published per year.	A,B	333	337	535	400	424	450	425	432
8. Average number of Committee assignments by analyst per year.	A,B	6.20	7.20	7.26	6.5	6.1	6.5	6.5	6.9

\* Note - Measure includes 5 possible responses that are allocated 5-1 points with 5 being the best and 1 being the worst. Measures are reported as an average of responses to annual survey data.

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 3,776	\$ 3,780	\$ 4,067	\$ 4,825	\$ 4,385	\$ 5,127	\$ 5,038	\$ 4,077
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 3,776	\$ 3,780	\$ 4,067	\$ 4,825	\$ 4,385	\$ 5,127	\$ 5,038	\$ 4,077
<b>FTE</b>	40.0	40.0	40.0	40.0	40.0	41.0	41.0	40.0

## Legislature

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Legislature: Inability to function as a representative government for the citizens of Kansas.

If the Information Systems and Services of the Kansas Legislature are not maintained, functionality will eventually cease. Support will not be available to users on operation of applications and services resulting in issues with systems and services not being resolved causing the legislative processes to be interrupted and potentially cease.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	Kansas Constitution, Article 2; KSA 75-7208	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Operate as a representative form of government, utilizing committee system for participation in the legislative process.
- B. Appropriate funds and sufficient revenues to operate Kansas state government.
- C. Ensure continuous operation of all Information Systems and Services.
- D. Ensure information technology system operates in a secure and efficient manner.

### Program History

The Kansas Legislature consists of a 125-member House of Representatives and a 40-member Senate. Representatives are elected for a two-year term and Senators are elected for a four-year term. As prescribed in the Kansas Constitution, the Legislature convenes on the second Monday in January for an annual session and generally adjourns in early May. During the interim period, joint and special committees meet to discuss issues assigned to them by legislative leadership or by statute.

In 2011, the Legislature implemented updated information systems across the legislative branch of government. These systems required an updated support structure and reorganization of resources in the form of the Kansas Legislative Office of Information Services. This office supports all aspects of information technology, systems, and services required by the Kansas Legislature. The head of the office is the Legislative Chief Information Technology Officer (KSA 75-7207).

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of bills introduced	A	660	589	769	675	560	770	560	639
2. Number of bills submitted to the Governor	A	70	17	122	116	107	125	115	82

Legislature

3. Number of bills signed into law	A	66	13	115	111	100	120	100	76
4. Legislative Session Days Halted Due to IS Issues	C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. Legislative Committee Meetings Cancelled due to IS Issues	C	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.3

*Output Measures*

6. Website page cache ratio	D	N/A	N/A	66%	75%	80%	75%	75%	73%
7. Number of Virtual Meetings Conducted	C, D	N/A	N/A	2,274	2,500	2923	3000	3000	2,599
8. Number of email viruses and malware detected and blocked	D	N/A	N/A	13,899,590	14,000,000	8,847,512	14,000,000	14,000,000	11,373,551
9. Technical Services Tickets Resolution Time	D	N/A	N/A	5,431 tickets opened, 3,338 tickets closed, avg time to close 86.8 hours	Close 85% in 15 minutes	935 tickets opened, 914 tickets closed, avg time to close 6.5 hours, 80% of tickets closed within 30 minutes	Close 85% in 15 minutes	Close 85% in 15 minutes	3,183 tickets opened, 2,126 tickets closed, avg time to close 46 hours
10. Number of System Servers	D	N/A	N/A	264	253	287	276	270	275.5
11. Percent of App Services Support Issues Resolved	C, D	N/A	N/A	83.0%	90.0%	86%	90%	90%	84.5%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source (in millions)</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 17.4	\$ 17.8	\$ 18.6	\$ 24.3	\$ 19.2	\$ 30.4	\$ 25.6	\$ 18.5
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	4.7	-	-	-	-	2.4
<b>Total</b>	\$ 17.4	\$ 17.8	\$ 23.2	\$ 24	\$ 19	\$ 30.4	\$ 25.6	\$ 20.1
<b>FTE</b>	48.0	48.0	48.0	50.0	50.0	56.0	56.0	48.7

## Traditional Lottery

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Lottery was established by statute and revenues from lottery sales fund a number of state programs. Failure to adequately fund the program would lead to a decrease in available revenues for the state.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	K.S.A. 74-8701 through 74-8780	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Maintain public confidence in all lottery products, and provide services that meet or exceed the expectations of the Kansas citizenry.  
 B. Produce the greatest amount of revenue possible for the State of Kansas while ensuring the integrity of all games.

### Program History

In November 1986, a constitutional amendment was approved by the Kansas voters authorizing a State Lottery. During the 1987 Legislative session, the State Legislature adopted the Lottery Act (the Act), and created the Kansas Lottery (the Lottery) as an independent component unit of the State of Kansas to operate lottery games. The Lottery was organized on March 19, 1987 and commenced administrative operations on May 21, 1987 but was strictly in the development stage through fiscal year 1987. Instant win tickets games began November 12, 1987. On February 2, 1988, the Lottery began participating in Lotto America, a multi-state draw game now called Powerball. In the current year, the Lottery offered several multi-state draw games (Powerball, Mega Millions, Lucky for Life, 2 by 2, and the new Lotto America), Kansas only draw games (Keno, Pick 3, Super Kansas Cash, Holiday Raffle and Racetrax) and instant scratch and pull-tab games.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019		FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022		FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
		Actuals				Previous Est.					
Transfers to SGRF/SGF	A,B	\$ 73,709,328		\$ 66,151,571	\$ 69,702,589	\$ 69,590,000		\$ 71,475,762	\$ 67,990,000	\$ 68,490,000	\$ 69,109,974
Transfers for Mental Health	A,B	\$ -		\$ 1,716,218	\$ 5,563,671	\$ 6,000,000		\$ 7,418,897	\$ 8,000,000	\$ 8,000,000	\$ 4,899,595
Transfers to Veterans' programs	A,B	\$ 1,200,000		\$ 1,260,000	\$ 1,260,000	\$ 1,260,000		\$ 1,260,000	\$ 1,260,000	\$ 1,260,000	\$ 1,260,000
Amounts captured for Setoff program	A,B	\$ 323,614		\$ 192,334	\$ 347,149	\$ 250,000		\$ 333,795	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 291,092
State of Kansas Withholding	A,B	\$ 1,369,513		\$ 697,694	\$ 1,022,928	\$ 1,000,000		\$ 946,085	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 888,902
Sales	A,B	\$295,282,190		\$ 274,992,121	\$ 326,010,583	\$ 317,600,000		\$ 312,985,036	\$ 310,600,000	\$ 313,600,000	\$ 304,662,580
Commissions Earned by Retailers	A,B	\$ 17,237,773		\$ 16,242,063	\$ 19,176,483	\$ 18,594,746		\$ 18,402,762	\$ 18,315,788	\$ 18,446,243	\$ 17,940,436
Prizes Paid to Players	A,B	\$172,676,708		\$ 166,527,213	\$ 200,187,234	\$ 194,944,000		\$ 191,473,867	\$ 191,032,000	\$ 193,027,000	\$ 186,062,771
PlayOn - Increase in members*	A,B	N/A		25%	32%	10%		7%	10%	10%	10%
PlayOn - Increase in tickets entered	A,B	N/A		6%	35%	10%		1%	5%	5%	14%
PlayOn - Avg monthly engagement	A,B	N/A		23%	24%	25%		24%	25%	25%	24%
Vending Machines in Service **	A,B	7		176	204	300		196	260	330	192

\* In FY 2022, the Lottery began the process of removing dormant PlayOn accounts. This would include accounts that were never activated, accounts transferred from previous Players Club program that never engaged, duplicate accounts that had been deactivated, and any accounts with no activity within the last 15 months. This process accounted for a decrease of approximately 146,000 total members in February 2022.

\*\* With the FY 2021 budget appropriation, the Lottery initiated purchase of 72 machines that were hoped to be placed in service late in FY 2022. Due to supply chain issues, those machines were just starting to be placed in August 2022. Similarly, 72 machines purchased using the FY 2022 budget appropriation are expected to arrive late in FY 2023.

# Kansas Lottery

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Non-SGF State Funds	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Federal Funds	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

## Expanded Lottery

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Lottery was established by statute and revenues from state operated casino gaming funds a number of state and local programs. Failure to adequately fund the program would lead to a decrease in available revenues for the state and local governments.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	K.S.A. 74-8701 through 74-8780	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Maintain public confidence in all casino gaming, and provide services that meet or exceed the expectations of the Kansas citizenry.
- B. Produce the greatest amount of revenue possible for the State of Kansas while ensuring the integrity of all games.

### Program History

The 2007 Legislature passed Senate Bill 66, the Kansas Expanded Lottery Act. The Act also allows for the Lottery, upon county voter approval, to operate lottery gaming facilities in four specific gaming zones. Casino gaming operations in the Southwest gaming zone (Boot Hill in Dodge City) commenced in December 2009. Casino gaming operations in the South Central gaming zone (Kansas Star in Mulvane) commenced on December 20, 2011. Casino gaming operations in the northeast gaming zone (Hollywood Casino in Kansas City) commenced on February 3, 2012. Casino gaming operations in the South East gaming zone (Kansas Crossing in Pittsburg) commenced on March 29, 2017.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2022		FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
		Actuals	Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.				
Transfers to ELARF	A, B	\$ 90,466,114	\$ 73,622,301	\$ 82,422,361	\$ 88,000,000	\$ 88,214,021	\$ 89,518,000	\$89,650,000	\$ 81,419,561.00
Transfers PGAGF	A, B	\$ 8,220,556	\$ 6,681,238	\$ 7,492,942	\$ 8,000,000	\$ 8,019,456	\$ 8,138,000	\$ 8,150,000	\$ 7,397,878.67
Transfers to City & County Gov't	A, B	\$ 12,330,835	\$ 10,021,858	\$ 11,239,412	\$ 12,000,000	\$ 12,029,183	\$ 12,207,000	\$12,225,000	\$ 11,096,817.67
Amounts captured for Setoff program	A, B	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,055,781	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,201,788	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 2,085,856.40

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2022		FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
	Actuals	Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Approved				
State General Fund	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Non-SGF State Funds	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Federal Funds	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%

## Expanded Lottery Act Regulation Program

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Without this program there would be no regulatory oversight of gaming ownership and operations in Kansas Casinos. There would be no protection for Kansas citizens from the nefarious influences of the criminal element that had such a large impact on the early years of gaming in the United States. Additionally, the statutory requirements of K.S.A. 74-8733 through 74-8773 would not be met.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific K.S.A. 74-8733 through 74-8773	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Uphold and promote the integrity of gaming at lottery and racetrack gaming facilities.
- B. Protect gaming operations from the influence of individuals or entities seeking to harm the integrity of gaming in Kansas.
- C. Protect the state of Kansas and its citizens from criminal activity and other potential issues related to the operation of lottery and racetrack gaming
- D. Investigate complaints and alleged violations of the KRGC rules and regulations and applicable state and federal laws.
- E. Coordinate with state agencies and local authorities to reduce and minimize illegal gaming in Kansas.
- F. Promote responsible gambling in the state of Kansas.

### Program History

Under KELA, the State of Kansas is authorized to contract with entities to operate casino-style games owned by the Kansas Lottery Commission. KELA established four gaming zones where lottery gaming facilities could be located and exclusively operated. Additionally, KELA provided that the Kansas Lottery Commission was authorized to contract with racetrack gaming facility managers in three of the four gaming zones to operate slots machines at pari-mutuel facilities.

**Program History (Continued)**

K.S.A. 74-8772 requires the KRGC to establish and enforce rules and regulations that include but are not limited to: 1) promoting the integrity of gaming and the finances of gaming activity in Kansas that meet or exceed industry standards for monitoring and controlling lottery and racetrack gaming facility managers; 2) prescribing the on-site security at lottery and racetrack gaming facility enterprises in Kansas; 3) reporting of information concerning lottery and racetrack facility managers, their employees, vendors and vendor finances necessary or desirable to ensure the security of lottery or racetrack gaming facility operations; and 4) reporting and auditing of the financial information of lottery or racetrack gaming facility managers, and other information the KRGC requires to determine compliance with KELA and KRGC rules and regulations. KRGC rules and regulations shall include but not be limited to oversight provisions related to: 1) internal controls; 2) security of facilities; 3) performance of background investigations; 4) determination of qualifications and credentialing of employees, contractors and agents of lottery or racetrack gaming facility managers, ancillary lottery gaming facility operations and racetrack gaming facilities; 5) auditing of lottery gaming facility revenue and racetrack gaming facility slot machine income; 6) enforcement of all state laws; and 7) maintaining of the integrity of lottery and racetrack gaming facility operations.

K.S.A. 74-8769 requires that each person subject to a background check under KELA shall be subject to a state and national criminal history records check that conforms to federal standards for the purpose of verifying an applicant's identity and determining whether the applicant has been convicted of any crime that would disqualify the applicant from engaging in activities at lottery or racetrack gaming facilities or ancillary lottery gaming facilities.

K.S.A. 74-8710(a)(13)(B) states that the Kansas Lottery Commission must issue rules and regulations to enforce management contract provisions that require lottery and racetrack gaming facility managers to provide a program to alleviate problem gambling including a requirement that each lottery and racetrack gaming facility maintain a self-exclusion list by which individuals may exclude themselves from access to slots machines and other lottery facility games. Under K.S.A. 74-8772, the KRGC issues rules and regulations to provide regulatory oversight of these management contract provisions that include responsible gambling and voluntary exclusion programs.

K.S.A. 74-8750(c) requires the KRGC to collect from any manufacturer, supplier, provider, lottery gaming facility manager, racetrack gaming facility manager or other person the anticipated actual costs in advance for the examination and certification of electronic gaming machines or lottery facility games. KRGC will reimburse any overpayment and collect any under payment from the appropriate vendor.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percentage of employee licenses denied by the Commission	A, B, C	1.0%	1.0%	0.5%	2.0%	1%	2%	2%	0.8%
2. Number of VEP enrollees granted access to lottery gaming facility	F	85	86	99	95	80	95	95	88
3. Improper gaming outcome discovered after complaint	D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0

<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Number of Criminal Case Reports	D	486	409	457	550	340	550	550	402
5. Number of background investigations completed (individual & corporate)	A, B, C	1,123	927	606	1,260	1247	1260	1260	927

Kansas Racing and Gaming Commission

*Additional Measures as Necessary*

6. Number of initial EGM inspections/certifications	A, C	791	375	108	300	204	300	300	229
7. Illegal gaming machines seized (# does not include components, prizes and other related items seized)	E	47	39	6	25	10	25	25	18
8. Illegal gambling complaints received	E	176	143	145	157	121	157	160	136
9. Number of new Voluntary Exclusion Program enrollments	F	289	200	174	200	172	180	180	182
10. EGM Hardware/Software Components Tested and Approved	A, C	2,634	2,683	1,706	2,400	1626	2300	2400	2,005

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	\$ 6,207,553	\$ 6,400,385	\$ 6,275,022	\$ 7,586,794	\$ 6,766,978	\$ 8,785,037	\$ 8,891,670	\$ 6,480,795
Federal Funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ 6,207,553	\$ 6,400,385	\$ 6,275,022	\$ 7,586,794	\$ 6,766,978	\$ 8,785,037	\$ 8,891,670	\$ 6,480,795
<b>FTE</b>	86.5	86.5	86.5	86.5	86.5	92.5	92.5	86.5

## Racing Regulation

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Currently, there are breeders of horses and greyhounds who continue to register their animals as Kansas bred. Not funding this program would result in their being no mechanism for these breeders to be able to register their animals as Kansas bred. The distinction can be important within the industry and not having this mechanism may have a negative impact on some breeders. Not funding this program would result in the loss of historical documents prior to their approved destruction.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific K.S.A 74-8801 through 74-8842	Mandatory	No	2

### Program Goals

A. To maintain the integrity of pari-mutuel wagering systems and to protect the public and the health, safety and welfare of the racing animal.

### Program History

K.S.A. 74-8804 (a) through (q) require the commission to observe and inspect all racetrack facilities; administer oaths and take depositions; examine any books, paper records or memoranda of any licensee, racetrack or business involved in simulcasting races to racetrack facilities in Kansas; issue subpoenas; allocate race meeting dates, racing days, and hours to all organization licensees; authority to exclude, or cause to be expelled from any race meeting or racetrack facility or to prohibit a licensee from conducting business with any person who has violated the provision of this act or any rule and regulation or order of the commission, been convicted of a violation of the racing or gambling laws or has been adjudicated of committing as a juvenile an act which if committed by an adult, would constitute such a violation, whose person reflects adversely on the honesty and integrity of horse or greyhound racing or interferes with the conduct of a race meeting; review and approve all proposed construction and major renovations to racetrack facilities; review and approve all proposed contracts with racetracks or businesses involved in simulcasting races to racetrack facilities in Kansas; suspend a horse or greyhound from participation in races; impose a civil fine; adopt rules and regulations and require fingerprinting and background information of all persons for employment, license or simulcasting license.

### Performance Measures

There were no performance measures submitted for this program.

Kansas Racing and Gaming Commission

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	610	1,388	2,826	3,972	3,271	889,410	1,372,711	2,495
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 610	\$ 1,388	\$ 2,826	\$ 3,972	\$ 3,271	\$ 889,410	\$ 1,372,711	\$ 2,495
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.0	13.0	0.0

## Tribal Gaming

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Lack of regulation and oversight as required by the tribal-state gaming compacts, the Tribal Gaming Oversight Act, and the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act. Without this program there would be no agency to monitor compliance with tribal-state gaming compacts and no agency to perform the duties provided for in the tribal-state compacts. There would be no protection from criminal activity in the tribal gaming arena for Kansas and its citizens.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 74-9801 through 74-9809	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Ensure compliance with the four tribal-state compacts and the Tribal Gaming Oversight Act and that gaming is conducted in accordance with said compacts and applicable state and federal laws.
- B. Protect the state of Kansas and its citizens from criminal activity in the Tribal gaming arena.
- C. Ensure accurate and complete information is provided to the different tribal gaming commissions for licensing purposes and to review all licensing decisions to ensure compliance.
- D. To conduct thorough background investigations on all gaming employees, management contractors, manufacturers and distributors of gaming devices seeking licensure at gaming facilities located in this state.
- E. Investigate any alleged violations of the tribal-state compacts and the Tribal Gaming Oversight Act.

### Program History

K.S.A. 74-9801 through 74-9809 (a) mandate the agency shall be responsible for oversight, monitoring and compliance of class III gaming conducted pursuant to tribal-state compacts. It is the responsibility of the agency to monitor compliance with tribal-state gaming compacts and perform the duties of the state gaming agency as provided for in the tribal-state gaming compacts. The agency may examine and inspect all tribal gaming facilities and facilities linked to Kansas tribal gaming facilities for gaming, including but not limited to all machines and equipment used for tribal gaming, books, papers, records, electronic records, computer records or surveillance and security tapes and logs of any tribal gaming facility. The executive director may issue subpoenas. The agency can review all licensing and disciplinary actions and reports of noncompliance with the tribal-state compacts. Enforcement agents are vested with the power and authority of law enforcement officers.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Average days to complete background investigations	C, D	41	40	31	45	31	31	31	34
2. Average days to preliminary suitability	C, D	1	2	2.25	2	2	2	2	2

Kansas Racing and Gaming Commission

*Output Measures*

3. Number of internal control inspections (NEW during FY16)	A, B	3271	2316	1903	2750	1874	2000	2000	2,031
4. Number of background investigations.	C, D	514	432	487	470	411	470	470	443

*Additional Measures as Necessary*

5. Number of official slot machine inspections	A, B	342	318	255	470	339	350	350	304
6. Number of compliance inspections	A, B	230	457	183	200	190	200	200	277

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	1,385,601	1,378,569	1,249,657	1,361,044	1,226,584	1,473,092	1,481,267	1,284,937
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,385,601</b>	<b>\$ 1,378,569</b>	<b>\$ 1,249,657</b>	<b>\$ 1,361,044</b>	<b>\$ 1,226,584</b>	<b>\$ 1,473,092</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,284,937</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>15.5</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>15.0</b>	<b>15.0</b>	<b>13.8</b>

## Licensing

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

K.S.A. 65-2801 et. seq. authorizes the licensing of Healing Arts in Kansas. If healing arts and other medical professions were to be practiced in Kansas without licensure and regulation, the people of Kansas would be unprotected from untrained and possibly unethical people practicing in an unsafe or unprofessional manner. This would likely lead to serious injury, illness, death, and abusive practices against Kansas patients.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific    K.S.A. 65-2801 et.seq.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Issue licenses within 10 days of final review.  
B. Total number of licenses issued

### Program History

The 1957 legislature created the State Board of Healing Arts. This act abolished three other state agencies (the Board of Medical Registration and Examination, the Board of Osteopathic Examination and Registration, and the Board of Chiropractic Examinations). The Board underwent many iterations over the many decades since it's inception adding many professions to it's current form where it now licenses and regulates 16 professions. The Board has grown from 5 staff in 1957 to it's current staff size of 61. Between 1957 and present many additional statutes and regulations have been added and/or amended to shape the practice of the Board today. The Board is a fully fee-funded agency that is a net contributor to the state general fund.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Issue licenses within 10 days of final review.	A	1,665	1,745	2,119	2,330	2,585	2,563	2,700	2,150
2. Total number of licenses issued	B	2,854	3,130	3,554	3,944	4,015	4,377	4,500	3,566

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	793,957	793,336	821,832	-	855,131	1,021,247	1,030,741	823,433
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 793,957</b>	<b>\$ 793,336</b>	<b>\$ 821,832</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 855,131</b>	<b>\$ 1,021,247</b>	<b>\$ 1,030,741</b>	<b>\$ 823,433</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>15.0</b>	<b>15.0</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>

\*KSBHA is not able to attach an outcome measure to dollars. Our entire Operations program is fee funded with fees collected from the professionals the agency licenses and regulates. These fees pay for all operating expenses of the agency. There are no specific dollar amounts to a specific outcome within a sub-program.

## Litigation

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

K.S.A. 65-2800 et.seq. gives the Board the authority to investigate and sanction those professionals licensed and regulated by the Board. The Disciplinary Department receives complaints and determines which ones meet the statutory requirements for an investigation. The Disciplinary Department is funded via the agency fee fund. If the agency ceased funding the Disciplinary Department, patients, hospitals, licensees and the general public would have nowhere to file a complaint when they felt a licensee was practicing outside their scope of practice or committed a boundary violation. This would leave patients and the general public unprotected from the unethical and below standard of care practice of medicine thereby putting people at risk of harm, injury or even death.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific K.S.A. 65-2800 et.seq.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A.Total investigations sent to litigation and opened as a case

### Program History

The 1957 legislature created the State Board of Healing Arts. This act abolished three other state agencies (the Board of Medical Registration and Examination, the Board of Osteopathic Examination and Registration, and the Board of Chiropractic Examinations. The Board underwent many iterations over the many decades since it's inception adding many professions to it's current form where it now licenses and regulates 17 professions. The Board has grown from 5 staff in 1957 to it's current staff size of 61. Between 1957 and present many additional statutes and regulations have been added and/or amended to shape the practice of the Board today. The Board is a fully fee-funded agency that is a net contributor to the state general fund.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Total investigations sent to litigation and opened as a case	A	328	244	111	300	97	300	300	150.7

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

# Kansas Board of Healing Arts

Non-SGF State Funds		961,130	993,640	982,841	-	892,358	1,040,684	1,045,910	956,280	
Federal Funds		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
<b>Total</b>	\$	961,130	\$ 993,640	\$ 982,841	\$	-	\$ 892,358	\$ 1,040,684	\$ 1,045,910	\$ 956,280
<b>FTE</b>		0.0	0.0	0.0		11.0	11.0	12.0	12.0	3.7

\*KSBHA is not able to attach an outcome measure to dollars. Our entire Operations program is fee funded with fees collected from the professionals the agency licenses and regulates. These fees pay for all operating expenses of the agency. There are no specific dollar amounts to a specific outcome within a sub-program.

## Disciplinary

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

K.S.A. 65-2800 et.seq. gives the Board the authority to investigate and sanction those professionals licensed and regulated by the Board. The Disciplinary Department receives complaints and determines which ones meet the statutory requirements for an investigation. The Disciplinary Department is funded via the agency fee fund. If the agency ceased funding the Disciplinary Department, patients, hospitals, licensees and the general public would have nowhere to file a complaint when they felt a licensee was practicing outside their scope of practice or committed a boundary violation. This would leave patients and the general public unprotected from the unethical and below standard of care practice of medicine thereby putting people at risk of harm, injury or even death.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 65-2800 et.seq.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Total number of investigations opened.  
B. Total number of complaints received.

### Program History

The 1957 legislature created the State Board of Healing Arts. This act abolished three other state agencies (the Board of Medical Registration and Examination, the Board of Osteopathic Examination and Registration, and the Board of Chiropractic Examinations). The Board underwent many iterations over the many decades since it's inception adding many professions to it's current form where it now licenses and regulates 17 professions. In 1984, the legislature established the position of Disciplinary Counsel. This position was specified as required to be an attorney and was designed to deal with disciplinary matters. At this time, the Board was also authorized to hire one full-time investigator. The Board has grown from 5 staff in 1957 to it's current staff size of 61. Between 1957 and present many additional statutes and regulations have been added and/or amended to shape the practice of the Board today. The Board is a fully fee-funded agency that is a net contributor to the state general fund.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Total number of investigations opened.	A	946	1,216	773	1,500	570	620	650	853
2. Total number of complaints received.	B	4,383	4,437	3,322	4,615	3,329	3,350	3,375	3,696

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

# Kansas Board of Healing Arts

Non-SGF State Funds		1,148,621	1,150,762	1,161,677	-	1,211,744	1,440,205	1,452,739	1,174,728
Federal Funds		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		\$ 1,148,621	\$ 1,150,762	\$ 1,161,677	\$ -	\$ 1,211,744	\$ 1,440,205	\$ 1,452,739	\$ 1,174,728
FTE		0.0	0.0	0.0	17.0	17.0	19.0	19.0	5.7

\*KSBHA is not able to attach an outcome measure to dollars. Our entire Operations program is fee funded with fees collected from the professionals the agency licenses and regulates. These fees pay for all operating expenses of the agency. There are no specific dollar amounts to a specific outcome within a sub-program.

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Improper disposition, failure to adhere to the wishes of the legal next-of-kin and taking advantage of consumers in a vulnerable situation.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 65-1701 and 74-1701	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Ensure that all funeral homes, crematories, licensees, apprentices, and student embalmers operate according to state law.
- B. Ensure that all funeral homes, crematories, licensees, apprentices, and student embalmers operate to serve in the best interest of the consumer by meeting and maintaining licensing and regulatory requirements
- C. Education and inform the public of their options when conducting business with licensees.

### Program History

The Kansas State Board of Embalming has been in existence since May of 1907. The name was changed to the Kansas State Board of Mortuary Arts in 1985. The board operates under K.S.A. 65-1701 et. seq. and K.S.A. 74- 1701 et. seq.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percent of applicants NOT meeting licensure requirements with their initial application	A	9.0%	10.0%	11.0%	10.0%				10.5%
2. Average number of hours in staff time of assistance provided to individuals needing assistance with the licensure process	A	640	640	650	645				645
3. Approximate number of days it takes for an applicant to be notified that their initial application is either acceptable or unacceptable	A	7	7	7	7				7

# Board of Mortuary Arts

4. Percent of complaints requiring investigation that result in the finding of any possible violations (by calendar year)	B	54%	42%	40%	40%		41.0%
5. Hours of administrative time spent involving complaints (by calendar year)	B	741	655	700	700		677.5
6. Percent of investigations that result in a disciplinary action or warning/advisory notification taken by either the Board or another regulatory authority (by calendar year)	B	59%	42%	65%	65%		53.5%
7. Percent of inquiries resulting in additional information provided by the agency	C	42%	41%	40%	40%		40.5%
8. Approximate percent of inquiries resulting in the filing of a complaint	C	29%	25%	24%	25%		24.5%
<i>Output Measures</i>							
9. Number of ALL licenses/registrations on file with the agency		2170	2140	2190	2165		2165
10. Number of individuals seeking assistance with the licensure		550	550	560	565		555
11. Number of updates relating to the licensure process made to files or the agency's Microsoft ACCESS data bank computer software program which is used for licensing documentation		1903	1925	1955	1960		1940
12. Number of written funeral director & assistant funeral director examinations (including retakes) administered by the agency		68	50	39	60		44.5
13. Number of embalmer/funeral director/reciprocal interviews conducted by the Board		21	27	21	25		24

Board of Mortuary Arts

14. Number of complaints received (by calendar year)	28	24	35	30				29.5
15. Number of complaints requiring investigation (by calendar year)	24	24	35	26				29.5
16. Number of consumer inquiries involving administrative staff--NOT including website hits	832	800	826	840				813
17. Number of informational brochures distributed to consumers--including off the website	341	345	340	350				342.5

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	288,283	307,820	261,828	367,875	240,234	317,670	322,934	\$ 269,961
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 288,283</b>	<b>\$ 307,820</b>	<b>\$ 261,828</b>	<b>\$ 367,875</b>	<b>\$ 240,234</b>	<b>\$ 317,670</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 269,961</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>

## Administration

## Consequences of Not Funding this Program

If this program was not funded there would be no regulation of professional individual and business licensure for Engineers, Architects, Surveyors, Landscape Architects, and Geologists.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	K.S.A. 74-7001	Mandatory	No	1

## Program Goals

- A. Ensure only qualified individuals become licensed as Architects, Engineers, Surveyors, Landscape Architects, and Geologists.
- B. Ensure all business entities obtain a certificate of authorization to legally practice a technical profession.
- C. Ensure only qualified persons and businesses continue to be licensed in Kansas by licensure renewals.

## Program History

In 1976, K.S.A. 74-7001 was established by the Legislature to create the Board of Technical Professions by combining the Engineering Examiners Registration Board (including Land Surveyors), the Architects Registration Board, and the Landscape Architects Registration Board. K.S.A. 74-7004 provides that the purpose of the Board of Technical Professions is to establish and maintain a high standard of integrity, skills, and practice in the technical professions and to safeguard the life, health, property and welfare of the public. The Board is authorized to collect licensing fees, renewal fees, and other fees as necessary to administer provisions of K.S.A. 74-7001 *et. seq.* In 1980, K.S.A. 74-7036 was established by the Legislature outlining the practice of technical professions by a business entity, applications for certificate of authorizations, renewals, fees, and liability of services performed. In the 1997 Legislature, H.B. 2490 created the licensing of geologists starting July 1, 2000, by the Board of Technical Professions.

## Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of intern and by exam applications for all disciplines.	A	468	356	387	430	524	430	480	422
2. Number of reciprocity applications for all disciplines.	A	660	696	728	675	798	728	675	741
3. Number of new business applications	B	208	166	204	170	218	200	200	196

# Board of Technical Professions

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
4. Number of individual license renewals for all disciplines	<b>C</b>	7,284	8,447	7,291	7,460	8,510	7,735	7,735	8,083
5. Number of business license renewals	<b>C</b>	1,490	1,087	1,459	1,300	1,098	1,200	1,200	1,215
6. Reciprocity application fee (\$250)	<b>A</b>	\$ 165,000	\$ 174,000	\$ 182,000	\$ 168,750	\$ 199,500	\$ 182,000	\$ 168,750	\$ 185,167
7. Business application fee (\$170)	<b>B</b>	\$ 35,360	\$ 28,220	\$ 34,680	\$ 28,900	\$ 37,060	\$ 34,000	\$ 34,000	\$ 33,320
8. Individual license renewal fee (\$70)	<b>C</b>	\$ 509,880	\$ 591,290	\$ 510,370	\$ 522,200	\$ 595,700	\$ 541,450	\$ 541,450	\$ 565,787
9. Business license renewal fee (\$95)	<b>C</b>	\$ 141,550	\$ 103,265	\$ 138,605	\$ 123,500	\$ 104,310	\$ 114,000	\$ 114,000	\$ 115,393

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	652,315.00	649,778.00	622,473.00	786,172.00	641,176.00	805,483.00	808,720.00	637,809.00
Federal Funds	-	94.00	59.00	-	-	-	-	51.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 652,315</b>	<b>\$ 649,872</b>	<b>\$ 622,532</b>	<b>\$ 786,172</b>	<b>\$ 641,176</b>	<b>\$ 805,483</b>	<b>\$ 808,720</b>	<b>\$ 637,860</b>
<b>FTE</b>	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

## Legislative Coordinating Council

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Legislative Coordinating Council: Inability to represent the Legislature when the Legislature is not in session. Rules applicable to the affairs of the Council or to the meetings and activities of special committees, standing committees or advisory committees would not be adopted. The Legislative Coordinating Council would not be able to govern the mechanics and procedure of all legislative committee work and activities.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific    K.S.A. 46-1201, <i>et seq.</i>	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Ensure continuous administrative operations of the Legislature through the Legislative Research Department, Office of Revisor of Statutes, and Division of Legislative Administrative Services.  
 B. Ensure the governance of mechanics and procedure of all legislative committee work and activities continues throughout the calendar year.

### Program History

The Legislative Coordinating Council (LCC) was established in 1971. The LCC is the successor to the Kansas Legislative Council.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Interim Meeting Days Authorized	A, B	101	92	73	109	109	74	100	91
2. Legislative Agency Budgets Authorized	A, B	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Salary and Expenses paid for 165 Legislators	A, B	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
4. Out of State Travel Reimbursement Requests Entered Into Payables System After Received from Legislator	A, B	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Legislative Coordinating Council

5. Accounts Payables Processed Within Statutory Kansas Prompt Payment Act	A, B	94%	98%	99%	100%	98%	100%	100%	98%
---	------	-----	-----	-----	------	-----	------	------	-----

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 608,300	\$ 647,000	\$3,059,700	\$ 779,439	\$ 711,544	\$ 783,653	\$ 758,613	\$ 1,472,748
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 608,300</b>	<b>\$ 647,000</b>	<b>\$3,059,700</b>	<b>\$ 779,439</b>	<b>\$ 711,544</b>	<b>\$ 783,653</b>	<b>\$ 758,613</b>	<b>\$ 1,472,748</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>8.0</b>

## Legislative Post Audit

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Kansas Legislature would no longer have an office to audit state and local government if this program is not funded. Moreover, state law includes several specific audit requirements our office is required to perform. Those include a requirement that audit work be performed at each state agency at least every three years (K.S.A. 46-1106), that audits be performed at the request of the Governor or any member or committee of the Legislature (K.S.A. 46-1109), that information technology audits be done at the direction of the Post Audit Committee (K.S.A. 46-1135), that a performance audit of KPERS be done at least once every three years (K.S.A. 46-1136), and that a systematic and comprehensive evaluation of all economic development incentive programs be done every three years (K.S.A. 46-1137).

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific    K.S.A. 46-1101 et. seq.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To conduct and issue audits that are responsive to the needs and mandates of the Legislature.
- B. To conduct audits that promote improved efficiency, effectiveness, and financial management practices in Kansas government.
- C. The agency will conduct audits in accordance with all applicable government auditing standards.

### Program History

The Legislative Post Audit Committee and the Legislative Division of Post Audit were established in 1971.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percent of recommendations implemented by auditees (standard audits)	B	92.3%	90.9%	100.0%	90.0%	75%	80%	80%	88.6%
2. Percent of unique state agencies audited annually (standard, limited-scope, and IT security audits & IT monitoring)	A/B	25.5%	30.5%	20.4%	25.5%	30%	25%	25%	27.0%
3. Average cost per audit (standard and IT security audits)	A/C	\$ 177,029	\$ 147,530	\$ 143,190	\$ 150,000	\$ 207,012	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 165,911

Legislative Post Audit

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 2,478,401	\$ 2,655,532	\$ 3,019,921	\$ 3,356,162	\$ 3,105,174	\$ 4,006,691	\$ 3,534,391	\$ 2,926,876
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 2,478,401	\$ 2,655,532	\$ 3,019,921	\$ 3,356,162	\$ 3,105,174	\$ 4,006,691	\$ -	\$ 2,926,876
<b>FTE</b>	26.0	26.0	26.0	26.0	26.0	26.0	26.0	26.0

## Office of Administrative Hearings

### Due Process Hearings

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Constituents will be denied due process and a mechanism to contest the actions of state agencies determining their legal rights and in resolving other types of disputes lawfully.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 75-37,121	Mandatory	No	1
Specific K.S.A. 77-561	Mandatory	No	1
Specific K.S.A. 77-562	Mandatory	No	1
Specific K.S.A. 59-29a26	Mandatory	No	2
Specific 7 CFR § 273.15	Mandatory	No	2
Specific 7 CFR § 273.16(a)-(f)	Mandatory	No	2
Specific 34 CFR § 361.57	Mandatory	No	2
Specific 45 CFR § 205.10	Mandatory	No	2
Specific 42 CFR § 431.151	Mandatory	No	2
Specific 42 CFR § 431.200	Mandatory	No	2
Specific 42 CFR § 483.204	Mandatory	No	2

#### Program Goals

- A. Deliver administrative due process for cases within timeframes specified by applicable law.
- B. Deliver administrative due process for parties efficiently and economically.

#### Program History

On July 1, 1998, the OAH was established. Its original purpose was to conduct all adjudicative proceedings for the Kansas Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services (now the Department for Children and Families) pursuant to K.S.A. 75-37,121. Six years later in 2004, K.S.A. 77-561 and 77-562 authorized an independent OAH, phased in over time as the statute mandated, and took full effect on July 1, 2009.

The OAH adjudicates disputes in accordance with the Kansas Administrative Procedure Act (KAPA) for many state agencies and a variety of programs within those agencies. These different agencies and their programs had their fair hearing functions phased into the OAH which now serves as their central hearing panel. State agencies must utilize the OAH unless their hearings are segregated from the OAH by statute or whenever the agency head elects to directly preside over any of their cases.

The State agencies, boards and commissions include but are not limited to: Department for Children and Families (DCF), Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE), KDHE/Division of Health Care Finance (DHCF), Kansas Department for Aging and Disability Services (KDADS), Kansas Department of Agriculture (Ag), Kansas Department of Administration, Kansas Department of Education, Kansas Department of Commerce, Kansas Department of Labor (KDOL), Board of Accountancy, Office of the State Bank Commissioner, Kansas Civil Service Board, Dental Board, Board of Healing Arts, Kansas Board of Pharmacy, Board of Nursing, Kansas Public Employee Retirement System (KPERs), Office of the Attorney General, Behavioral Sciences Regulatory Board, Board of Cosmetology, Board of Veterinary Examiners, and Kansas

#### Program History (Continued)

## Office of Administrative Hearings

For DCF, KDADS and KDHE/DHCF, the hearings involve federal programs in which the state participates, and the agencies administer. These programs include Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Medicaid, Low Income Energy Assistance Program (LIEAP), Vocational Rehabilitation, and Food Assistance. Food Assistance, TANF, and childcare disqualification hearings are also conducted by the OAH. are home residents.

Additionally, legislation enacted in 2015 requires the OAH to provide specific hearings, K.S.A. 59-29a26, for which counties are financially responsible.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Rank OAH cost per case vs other states	B	2nd lowest cost	3rd lowest cost	7th lowest cost	6th lowest cost	not available	not available	not available	
2. Average days per decision	B	90	85	87	90 or less	84	90 or less	90 or less	85.3
3. Average cases per judge	B	1,014	905	584	687	504	607	627	664.2
Volume, completion, and status of fiscal year cases	A								
4. Number of appeals filed	A	3,276	2,763	1,814	2,631	1,826	2,938	3,251	2,134.3
5. Number of appeals closed	A	3,119	3,658	2,614	2,701	2,121	2,751	3,100	2,797.7
6. Pending FY carryover appeals	A	779	773	522	802	692	701	510	662.3
7. OAH Cost per case	B	256	318	527	434	508	472	452	451.2

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	1,036,569	1,125,150	1,187,769	1,491,479	1,278,880	1,718,067	1,699,945	1,197,266
Federal Funds	-	49	44,203	-	-	-	-	14,751
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,036,569</b>	<b>\$ 1,125,199</b>	<b>\$ 1,231,972</b>	<b>\$ 1,491,479</b>	<b>\$ 1,278,880</b>	<b>\$ 1,718,067</b>	<b>\$ 1,699,945</b>	<b>\$ 1,212,017</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>

## Grants Office

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Office of Recovery serves to ensure the state is maximizing the federal relief dollars with federal compliance, allowability, and reporting guidelines. The State increases its risk significantly without the oversight and management from the Office of Recovery.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-107	Discretionary	Yes	2

### Program Goals

A. The KGGP strategic goal is to prioritize funding to applicants demonstrating the guiding principle of a criminal justice system and victim-centered "whole community" approach to services that enhances accountability across systems. The whole community approach centers on developing accessible, evidence-based trauma-informed, culturally effective, and equitable services. The strategies to address this goal are (1) leverage service through coordination and collaboration among agencies; (2) enhance services within the agency; and (3) engage and empower through training and awareness. The KGGP meets this goal by providing grant management, reporting, technical assistance, and compliance training to subrecipients receiving grant funds.

### Program History

The KGGP was established in 2003 to consolidate and coordinate the administration of crime victim assistance and criminal justice improvement funding. In doing so, the grant management of these types of programs was streamlined and increased technical assistance provided for state, tribal, county, and local subgrantees.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. # of Subgrant Awards Issued	A	245	227	237	225	310	250	225	258
2. # of Sugrant Reports Reviewed		1,152	2,980	5,241	5,000	4,842	5,060	4,600	4,354
3. Dollar amount of Subgrant Awards Issued		\$ 36,483,920	\$ 34,029,293	\$ 35,077,203	\$ 36,000,000	\$ 42,607,921	\$ 37,328,000	\$ 28,000,000	\$ 37,238,139
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. # of Monitoring Reviews		170	273	322	240	245	162	160	280
5. # of Grant Trainings Provided		6	9	14	16	20	20	20	14

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 5,399,319	\$ 5,968,446	\$ 5,451,448	\$ 5,578,999	\$ 4,997,019	\$ 6,260,129	\$ 5,679,902	\$ 5,472,304
Non-SGF State Funds	789,210	711,973	749,350	777,275	788,270	835,845	837,105	749,864
Federal Funds	19,152,459	24,656,411	26,857,280	34,152,439	27,154,129	35,217,860	24,337,313	26,222,607
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 25,340,988</b>	<b>\$ 31,336,830</b>	<b>\$ 33,058,078</b>	<b>\$ 40,508,713</b>	<b>\$ 32,939,418</b>	<b>\$ 42,313,834</b>	<b>\$ 30,854,320</b>	<b>\$ 32,444,775</b>
<b>FTE</b>	11.0	12.0	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.3	13.3	12.7

## Office of Recovery

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Office of Recovery serves to ensure the state is maximizing the federal relief dollars with federal compliance, allowability, and reporting guidelines. The State increases its risk significantly without the oversight and management from the Office of Recovery.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt. No	Priority Level
General			1

### Program Goals

A. Providing transparency through timely and accurate communication;  
 B. Utilizing key controls to ensure compliance with federal requirements, compliance and reporting; and  
 C. To provide appropriate guidance and support for minimized findings on external audits while ensuring compliance with statutory deadlines.

### Program History

The Office of Recovery was established in June 2020 in response to the global COVID-19 pandemic in an effort to manage the federal relief dollars coming into the state. The Office of Recovery's mission and purpose is to deliver maximum impact with COVID-19 relief funding for Kansans. The Office of Recovery has purview over various COVID-19 relief funding for Kansas funding such as ARPA, CARES Act, CRF, CAA, HR133, etc.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of Public Inquiry Forms Received	A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
2. Percentage of Inquiries forms responded	A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%
3. Percentage Federal reporting submitted on time (CRF)	B	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%
4. Percentage Federal reporting submitted on time (ARPA -SFRF)	B	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%
5. Single Audit-Discretionary Relief Funds - Number of material weaknesses	C	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	4	--	2
6. Single Audit-Discretionary Relief Funds - Number of repeat audit findings	C	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	--	1	--	--

Office of the Governor

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --
Non-SGF State Funds	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Federal Funds	--	--	11,593,237	19,476,217	14,791,808	4,790,573	4,814,812	8,795,015
<b>Total</b>	\$ --	\$ --	\$ 11,593,237	\$ 19,476,217	\$ 14,791,808	\$ 4,790,573	\$ 4,814,812	\$ 8,795,015
<b>FTE</b>	0.00	0.00	16.05	27.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	9.35

*Note: Expenditures exclude Aid to Local Governments, Other Assistance, and Non-Expense Items.*

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Office of Information Technology Services (OITS) serves as the enterprise level infrastructure for all state IT operations. OITS provides central oversight, management, security, and support of various critical IT operations, including the network, that state agencies utilize for their daily operations. If this program is not funded these functions would cease to exist for the state and would have severe operational and financial implications for the state and state agencies. While some functions can be replicated in each state agency through their IT divisions, the enterprise level knowledge, coordination, efficiencies, and economies of scale would be lost. Additionally, there are certain key and critical aspects that cannot be performed within an agency irrespective.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 75-4701 et seq., K.S.A. 75-4703, K.S.A. 75-7201 et seq.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Facilitates the strategic development of vision, mission and strategic roadmap for OITS.
- B. Ensures administrative and operational needs of OITS are met including human resources, finance, contract and vendor management, asset management, project management and agency communication.

### Program History

The Office of Information Technology Services (OITS) was formerly known as the Division of Information Systems and Communications (DISC). This name change became effective in fall 2011. The history of the former organization began when the Division of Information Systems and Computing merged with the Telecommunications office on July 1, 1984 creating the Division of Information Systems and Communications. Newly available technologies had the potential to reduce unit costs for information processing and to provide the ability to perform functions never possible under a consolidated unit. The State realized the need to coordinate the infusion of new technologies to maximize its return on investment before replacement. The merger placed more authority over computer and communications plans with the Secretary of Administration without changing the responsibilities of the two organizations.

K.S.A. 75-4701 et seq. contains the original statutory legislation of the Division of Information Systems and Communications. Established in 1972, DISC centralized computer data processing for all state agencies except Board of Regents Institutions. In addition, it was responsible for approving the acquisition of data processing equipment for all state agencies, including Regents Institutions and developing computer programs for those state agencies wishing to contract for the service. The division operated without directly appropriated funds and relied on receipts derived from charges for services provided. In 1998, legislation (K.S.A. 75-7201 et seq.) revised the State's approach to the governance of information technology. The bill created a Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO) for each branch of government, a Chief Information Technology Architect (CITA), and the Information Technology Executive Council (ITEC). The bill also established a \$250,000 level for approval of information technology projects with oversight provided by the renamed and reconstituted Joint Committee on Information Technology (JCIT). In August 2011, the name of the Division of Information Systems and Communications was changed to the Office of Information Technology Services. The central mail service operation was transferred to the Department of Administration. In July 2018, the Office of Information Technology Services changed its agency number and separated from the Department of Administration.

## Administration

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percentage of Requested EB Agencies submitting 3yr IT Plans	95%	0.0%	91.8%	87.1%	95.0%	90%	95%	95%	89.6%
2. Number of Contracts and RFPs executed	15	17	19	2	15	12	15	15	11.0
3. Employee Turnover Rate	20%		18.8%	23.7%	18.0%	23.3%	20.0%	20.0%	21.9%
4. Percentage of A/P invoices paid on time	100%	99.5%	99.8%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99.9%

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	2,951,984	3,010,071	3,911,839	3,446,072	3,507,698	3,500,825	3,513,877	3,476,536
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,951,984</b>	<b>\$ 3,010,071</b>	<b>\$ 3,911,839</b>	<b>\$ 3,446,072</b>	<b>\$ 3,507,698</b>	<b>\$ 3,500,825</b>	<b>\$ 3,513,877</b>	<b>\$ 3,476,536</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>

## Business Productivity Tools (O365)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Office of Information Technology Services (OITS) serves as the enterprise level infrastructure for all state IT operations. OITS provides central oversight, management, security, and support of various critical IT operations, including the network, that state agencies utilize for their daily operations. If this program is not funded these functions would cease to exist for the state and would have severe operational and financial implications for the state and state agencies. While some functions can be replicated in each state agency through their IT divisions, the enterprise level knowledge, coordination, efficiencies, and economies of scale would be lost. Additionally, there are certain key and critical aspects that cannot be performed within an agency irrespective.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	K.S.A. 75-4701 et seq., K.S.A. 75-4703	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Provide secure, standardized, and redundant email services for Executive branch Agency customers.
- B. Provide secure, standardized, and redundant collaboration services (Teams/SharePoint) for Executive branch Agency customers.
- C. Provide standardized email and collaboration feature set for Executive branch Agency customers.

### Program History

OITS has migrated to the email and collaboration platform known as Office 365 (O365) hosted by Microsoft. This upgrade provided a secure multi-tenant solution built to comply with government security requirements. This service replaced the Exchange Email service and other email systems that operated independently in each agency in most cases. Some agencies still provide their own legacy Microsoft email services or are in their own O365 tenant not managed by OITS. The O365 solution provides predictable costs, email and business data capabilities that is secured in multiple data centers across the U.S., and a fully redundant hosted solution.

**Business Productivity Tools (O365)****Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percentage of time O365 is available	100 %	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.00%	99.90%	99.90%	100%
2. Number of O365 users	N/A	17,526	17,700	19,681	19,681	18,720	20,000	20,000	18,700
3. Teams Meetings hosting in O365	N/A	N/A	N/A	264,000	250,000	297,426	300,000	300,000	280,713
4. Collaboration Teams Sites	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,471	1,500	1,799	2,000	2,000	1,635

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	2,689,440	1,416,542	5,438,862	7,975,449	5,171,152	5,993,956	5,996,938	4,008,852
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,689,440</b>	<b>\$ 1,416,542</b>	<b>\$ 5,438,862</b>	<b>\$ 7,975,449</b>	<b>\$ 5,171,152</b>	<b>\$ 5,993,956</b>	<b>\$ 5,996,938</b>	<b>\$ 4,008,852</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>

## Hosted Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Office of Information Technology Services (OITS) serves as the enterprise level infrastructure for all state IT operations. OITS provides central oversight, management, security, and support of various critical IT operations, including the network, that state agencies utilize for their daily operations. If this program is not funded these functions would cease to exist for the state and would have severe operational and financial implications for the state and state agencies. While some functions can be replicated in each state agency through their IT divisions, the enterprise level knowledge, coordination, efficiencies, and economies of scale would be lost. Additionally, there are certain key and critical aspects that cannot be performed within an agency irrespective.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	K.S.A. 75-4701 et seq., K.S.A. 75-4703	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Provide secure, standardized, and redundant mainframe services for Executive branch Agency customers through a partner solution.
- B. Provide secure, standardized, and redundant managed data center services for Executive branch Agency customers through a partner solution.
- C. Provide secure and standardized data center hosting services for State of Kansas Agency customers in the Eisenhower State Office Building.
- D. Provide standardized Microsoft Azure public cloud guidance and support for Executive branch Agency customers.

### Program History

The Hosted Services department provides both mainframe and data center hosting services to customers. Mainframe services are now contracted to a vendor that monitors maintenance, performance, information security, and allows for more predictable operation costs. The data center hosting service is hosted by a third party which has centralized most of the existing physical and virtual server environments into a secure environment. The data center hosted facilities provides managed services for state agencies. This partnership greatly reduces the risk the State incurs due to outdated data center facilities, aged server and storage hardware, and provides a redundant disaster recovery solution for critical agency applications. The hosted environment provides an improved attention to hardware and system maintenance, reliability and performance of State applications, and an improved information security posture for the State. Services provided by the vendor are consumption based and will provide a predictable cost model for the service. This partnership also provides a backup solution for data recovery, provides stable, reliable, and highly available data storage and retrieval, and provides 24x7 monitoring of the environment. It includes hardware, virtual machine(s), server operating system(s), and all associated support and administration. OITS continues to provide a small Topeka located data center facilities, primarily located in the Eisenhower State Office Building as needed. All services have consolidated service desk and security monitoring services.

## Hosted Services

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percentage of time mainframe service is available	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	99.9%	99.9%	100.0%
2. Average percentage of utilization of mainframe CPU	40.0%	76.0%	52.0%	40.0%	40.0%	40.0%	40.0%	40.0%	44.0%
3. Average percentage of utilization of mainframe storage	70.0%	80.0%	64.0%	72.0%	70.0%	66.0%	70.0%	70.0%	67.3%
4. Percent of successfully completed mainframe backup job	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	100.0%	95.0%	95.0%	96.7%
5. Average communication line latency to Unisys DCaaS (minutes)	4.0		22.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	10.0
6. Percentage of time Unisys DCaaS is available	100.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
7. Percentage of time Microsoft Azure is available	99.5%	N/A	N/A	N/A	99.5%	100.0%	99.5%	99.5%	100.0%

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 3,071,329	\$ 14,360,840	\$ 5,400,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,586,947
Non-SGF State Funds	7,862,729	7,205,475	8,634,512	14,765,291	15,060,621	14,534,416	14,036,103	\$ 10,300,203
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 10,934,058</b>	<b>\$ 21,566,315</b>	<b>\$ 14,034,512</b>	<b>\$ 14,765,291</b>	<b>\$ 15,060,621</b>	<b>\$ 14,534,416</b>	<b>\$ 14,036,103</b>	<b>\$ 16,887,149</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.5</b>

## Network and Telecommunication Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Office of Information Technology Services (OITS) serves as the enterprise level infrastructure for all state IT operations. OITS provides central oversight, management, security, and support of various critical IT operations, including the network, that state agencies utilize for their daily operations. If this program is not funded these functions would cease to exist for the state and would have severe operational and financial implications for the state and state agencies. While some functions can be replicated in each state agency through their IT divisions, the enterprise level knowledge, coordination, efficiencies, and economies of scale would be lost. Additionally, there are certain key and critical aspects that cannot be performed within an agency irrespective.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 75-4709 et seq., K.S.A. 75-4701 et seq., K.S.A. 75-4703	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Provide secure, standardized, and redundant local, metro, and wide area network (LAN, MAN, WAN) services for State of Kansas Agency customers.
- B. Provide standardized network circuits across the State of Kansas to allow for secured communication between Agency customers.
- C. Provide secure, standardized, and redundant voice over IP telephone services for State of Kansas Agency customers.

### Program History

The Network and Telecommunications group operates the Kansas Wide-area Information Network (KanWIN), the single largest IP network in the State of Kansas, ensuring 24/7 monitoring and response capabilities, as well as the routine planning, expansion, repair, and maintenance of the State's primary network. This network provides service to all three branches of government through 17,000 data jacks at more than 1,500 locations statewide. The group also supports wireless connectivity at more than 60 locations statewide. Additionally, OITS supports more than 10,000 voice handsets throughout state offices and call centers and also provides Domain Name Services for ks.gov, Kansas.gov, and more than 50 other domains throughout the State.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percentage of network uptime in the capitol complex	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%
2. Percentage of network uptime in the metropolitan area network	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%
3. Percentage of network uptime in the wide area network	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%
4. Percentage of uptime in the voice environment	99.9%	N/A	98.1%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.3%

## Network and Telecommunication Services

<i>Funding Source</i>	<b>Funding</b>							<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ 232,853	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 4,250,000	\$ 4,250,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 2,994,284
Non-SGF State Funds	10,908,464	10,856,498	8,308,456	8,458,450	7,988,232	7,762,414	8,124,697	\$ 9,051,062
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ 10,908,464	\$ 11,089,351	\$ 12,808,456	\$ 12,708,450	\$ 12,238,232	\$ 10,762,414	\$ 11,124,697	\$ 12,045,346
<b>FTE</b>	23.0	23.0	23.0	23.0	22.0	22.0	22.0	22.7

## Client Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Office of Information Technology Services (OITS) serves as the enterprise level infrastructure for all state IT operations. OITS provides central oversight, management, security, and support of various critical IT operations, including the network, that state agencies utilize for their daily operations. If this program is not funded these functions would cease to exist for the state and would have severe operational and financial implications for the state and state agencies. While some functions can be replicated in each state agency through their IT divisions, the enterprise level knowledge, coordination, efficiencies, and economies of scale would be lost. Additionally, there are certain key and critical aspects that cannot be performed within an agency irrespective.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 75-4701 et seq., K.S.A. 75-4703	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Reduce customer wait time at OITS and across all agencies that use our services.
- B. Continue to support non-cabinet agencies with quality support.

### Program History

Client services encompasses several teams that provide a variety of information technology services to various agencies that fulfill statutory requirements for the State of Kansas. The user services team supports the environment, secure accessibility into the environment, and devices used by state employees to run mission critical applications. The Client Services department includes End-User Support Services including Executive Services, Consolidated IT Service Desk, and the IT Service Management (ITIL processes and ServiceNow Platform). These services are supported through inclusive rates across our three major lines of services and other hourly on-demand rates for those agencies not in a hosted environment.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Service Desk hold time less than or equal to 2 minutes	99%	N/A	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%
2. Number of tickets closed by Client Services team.	21,000	N/A		20,959	21,000	21,064	22,000	22,500	21,012
3. Number of non-Cabinet agencies receiving services from the Client Services Group	22	13	14	16	17	22	24	25	17

### Client Services

#### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 1,250,000	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	2,390,412	3,178,681	3,634,258	3,795,798	3,038,908	4,077,015	4,183,887	\$ 3,283,949
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ 2,390,412	\$ 3,178,681	\$ 3,634,258	\$ 3,795,798	\$ 3,038,908	\$ 5,327,015	\$ 5,433,887	\$ 3,283,949
<b>FTE</b>	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	26.0	26.0	25.0

## Kansas Information Security Office

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Office of Information Technology Services (OITS) serves as the enterprise level infrastructure for all state IT operations. OITS provides central oversight, management, security, and support of various critical IT operations, including the network, that state agencies utilize for their daily operations. If this program is not funded these functions would cease to exist for the state and would have severe operational and financial implications for the state and state agencies. While some functions can be replicated in each state agency through their IT divisions, the enterprise level knowledge, coordination, efficiencies, and economies of scale would be lost. Additionally, there are certain key and critical aspects that cannot be performed within an agency irrespective.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>		<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	K.S.A 75-7236 through 75-7243	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Continue to ensure KISO staff is prepared for and can quickly response to critical events to ensure that they do not become full blown cybersecurity incidents.
- B. Continue to drive a cybersecurity aware culture among State of Kansas Employee through various education and awareness campaigns. These efforts will ultimately culminate in a lower risk to the State of Kansas by reducing employee susceptibility to phishing attacks
- C. Continue to raise awareness of cybersecurity standards and practices to raise the State of Kansas cyber hygiene. The results of the efforts will lead to a better cyber risk rating.

### Program History

In 2018, the Kansas Legislature passed K.S.A 75-7236 through 75-7243, which is known as the Kansas Cybersecurity Act (KCA). The KCA formally created the position of the Chief Information Security Officer and identified the positions duties. The KCA also created the Kansas Information Security Office and outlined its powers and duties. The KISO program provides enterprise security services, security consulting services, information security officer services, and technical security services across all OITS service offerings including hosted services, business productivity tools, and telecommunication services. Security information, resources, tools, and training are provided to all executive branch agencies including policy development, risk assessment, compliance management, disaster recovery and business continuity plan development, and cyber incident management and response plan development. Technical security management services include configuration management, engineering, scanning, continuous monitoring, and reporting.

## Kansas Information Security Office

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
1. Respond to high priority incidents/requests within 8 hours per Service Level Agreements 100% of the time	100.0%	N/A	N/A	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	1000%	100.0%
2. Yearly ticket resolution should be no less than 90% of the yearly opened tickets	95%	N/A	90.0%	95.0%	93.0%	99.0%	97.0%	97.0%	94.7%
3. Achieve and maintain a 3% 'phished' rate in email security testing of service participating agency state employees	3%	8.0%	6.0%	6.0%	4.0%	4.0%	3.0%	3.0%	5.3%
4. Maintain a minimum information risk rating of 730 for state government agencies	730	640	680	730	750	710	760	760	707

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	1,635,983	2,310,941	2,372,024	4,311,003	4,511,027	5,227,084	5,232,160	\$ 3,064,664
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,635,983	\$ 2,310,941	\$ 2,372,024	\$ 4,311,003	\$ 4,511,027	\$ 5,227,084	\$ 5,232,160	\$ 3,064,664
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	17.0	17.0	17.0	18.0	18.0	18.0	17.3

## Kansas Information Technology Office

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Office of Information Technology Services (OITS) serves as the enterprise level infrastructure for all state IT operations. OITS provides central oversight, management, security, and support of various critical IT operations, including the network, that state agencies utilize for their daily operations. If this program is not funded these functions would cease to exist for the state and would have severe operational and financial implications for the state and state agencies. While some functions can be replicated in each state agency through their IT divisions, the enterprise level knowledge, coordination, efficiencies, and economies of scale would be lost. Additionally, there are certain key and critical aspects that cannot be performed within an agency irrespective. Executive, Judicial and Legislative CITO's would require alternative processes to fulfill statutory responsibilities for the collection of project information pursuant to K.S.A. 75-7209.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>		<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	K.S.A. 75-7204, K.S.A. 75-7201 et seq.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Review project submissions for completeness and facilitate CITO review/approval within 20 days of agency submission.
- B. Promote Project Management best practices by facilitating regular offerings of the Kansas Project Management Methodology Certification class and by supporting participants throughout the certification process.
- C. Promote and provide training for the Accessibility Management Platform (AMP) for agency use when modifying a website.

### Program History

The Kansas Information Technology Office supports the statutory responsibilities of the Executive, Judicial, and Legislative Branch Chief Information Technology Officers (CITO's) and the Chief Information Technology Architect (CITA). It provides oversight of information technology projects as outlined in statute, ITEC policies, and JCIT guidelines and recommendations. Consultation services are available for major IT projects throughout Kansas government, and KITO administers the project management training program which includes the certification program for the State of Kansas project management methodology.

## Kansas Information Technology Office

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Project plans are reviewed, and approval provided to the agency within 20 days of receipt	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
2. Number of agencies running the Accessibility Management Platform (AMP)	75%	79.0%	71.0%	66.0%	75.0%	68.0%	75.0%	75.0%	68.3%

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	356,239	640,247	503,377	836,129	342,133	1,227,003	1,191,972	\$ 495,252
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 356,239</b>	<b>\$ 640,247</b>	<b>\$ 503,377</b>	<b>\$ 836,129</b>	<b>\$ 342,133</b>	<b>\$ 1,227,003</b>	<b>\$ 1,191,972</b>	<b>\$ 495,252</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>5.7</b>

# Office of the Attorney General

## Administration Division

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The office management functions of the Kansas Attorney General's office would not take place.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
Kan. Const., Art. 1, § 1	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. To provide timely and accurate information to the Legislature and the public on legal matters affecting the state, and to provide for the effective servicing of citizen advisory groups. Kan. Const., art. 1, § 1. Objective #1: To inform and educate the electronic and print news media about the Office of the Kansas Attorney General, the actions and activities of the Attorney General as they relate to matters of public interest, and laws of the State of Kansas.

B. To provide timely and accurate information to the Legislature and the public on legal matters affecting the state, and to provide for the effective servicing of citizen advisory groups. Kan. Const., art. 1, § 1. Objective #2: Discuss and prepare, in a timely manner, accurate information for testimony to or for meetings with the Kansas Legislature.

### Program History

The Administration Division provides communications and day-to-day office management of the agency.

### Performance Measures

Output Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	3- yr. Avg.
		Actuals	Actuals	Actuals	Est.	Actuals	Est.	Est.	
1. Number of formal releases of opinions, news, information and the Attorney General's consumer protection advice	A	290	298	252	275	241	250	250	264
2. Percentage of fiscal note inquiries responded to in a timely manner	B	98%	98%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%
3. Number of fiscal note inquiries responded to in a timely manner	B	79	63	99	65	53	75	60	72
4. Number of brochures, documents, reports, media releases, videos, and other informational materials created or made available on the agency website.	B	6,731	7,618	8,512	9,400	9,366	10,250	11,100	8,499

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	3-yr. Avg.
	Actuals	Actuals	Actuals	Approved	Actuals	Est.	Est.	
State General Fund	\$ 82,600	\$ 1,995	\$ 1,521	\$ 1,860	\$ 309	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,275
Non-SGF State Funds	554,668	759,370	671,465	785,241	848,842	978,685	980,990	759,892
Federal Funds	151,406	141,347	85,261	-	139,952	62,500	62,500	122,187
	\$ 788,673	\$ 902,713	\$ 758,248	\$ 787,101	\$ 989,103	\$ 1,041,185	\$ 1,043,490	\$ 883,354
<b>FTE</b>	8.98	8.98	8.98	8.98	8.98	8.98	8.98	8.98

# Office of the Attorney General

## Fiscal

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The agency would need to rely on Department of Administration resources to accomplish these day-to-day tasks.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
Kan. Const., Art. 1, § 1	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

To provide skilled and comprehensive administrative support to the Office of the Kansas Attorney General. K.S.A. 75-709, 75710, 75311175 -3717, 75-3729, 75-3736; 75-4701 et seq.; 75-5501 et seq.; and amendments thereto.

- A. Prepare and present the annual budget and support it before the Division of Budget, Governor and Legislature. Monitor administration of the approved
- B. Provide timely, detailed, and accurate fiscal services in accordance with the budget plan.
- C. Acquire necessary goods and services, including adequate office facilities and motor vehicles of appropriate quality and quantity, within established funding, in a timely manner and at competitive prices. Purchases are made in accordance with state purchasing guidelines and contracts.

### Program History

Fiscal provides budgetary and financial support for the agency.

### Performance Measures

		FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	
		Goal	Actuals	Actuals	Actuals	Est.	Actuals	Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of Programs and subprograms addressed in the strategic plan through goals, objectives, strategies, outcome and output measurements.	A	45	47	48	49	50	51	52	48
2. Number of transactions processed	B	11989	10,948	10,089	10,250	10,929	11,000	11,250	10,655

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	
	Actuals	Actuals	Actuals	Approved	Actuals	Est.	Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 10,405	\$ 600	\$ 300	\$ 255	\$ 50	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 317
Non-SGF State Funds	175,142	200,618	200,080	262,275	258,608	289,641	292,227	219,769
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	5,000	5,000	-
	\$ 185,547	\$ 201,218	\$ 200,380	\$ 262,530	\$ 258,658	\$ 294,641	\$ 297,227	\$ 220,085
<b>FTE</b>	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8

# Office of the Attorney General

## Information Technology

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The agency would need to rely on Department of Administration and Office of Information and Technology Services resources to accomplish these day-to-day tasks.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
Kan. Const., Art. 1, § 1	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. To provide skilled and comprehensive administrative support to the Office of the Kansas Attorney General. K.S.A. 75-709, 75710, 75311175 -3717, 75-3729, 75-3736; 75-4701 et seq.; 75-5501 et seq.; and amendments thereto.

### Program History

The Information Technology Division provides information technology related support for the agency.

### Performance Measures

*There are no performance measures for this program.*

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 34,388	\$ 1,275	\$ 675	\$ 720	\$ 138	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 696
Non-SGF State Funds	185,284	343,202	378,639	401,599	446,911	500,540	505,009	389,584
Federal Funds	-	-	-		3,445	5,000	5,000	1,148
	\$ 219,672	\$ 344,477	\$ 379,314	\$ 402,319	\$ 450,494	\$ 505,540	\$ 510,009	\$ 391,428
<b>FTE</b>	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5

# Office of the Attorney General

## Human Resources

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The agency would need to rely on Department of Administration resources to accomplish these day-to-day tasks.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
Kan. Const., Art. 1, § 1	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. To provide skilled and comprehensive administrative support to the Office of the Kansas Attorney General. K.S.A. 75-709, 75710, 75311175 -3717, 75-3729, 75-3736; 75-4701 et seq.; 75-5501 et seq.; and amendments thereto. Objective #2: To ensure that the Office of the Kansas Attorney General is staffed with competent and qualified employees, to maintain a quality work environment for those employees and to ensure that federal and state employment laws are adhered to concerning the hiring, firing, discipline, and treatment of employees who work in the Office of the Kansas Attorney General.

### Program History

Human Resources supports the staff of the agency.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	3- yr. Avg.
		Actuals	Actuals	Actuals	Est.	Actuals	Est.	Est.	
1. Number of openings for which applications for employment are processed	A	45	41	37	45	43	55	45	40

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	3-yr. Avg.
	Actuals	Actuals	Actuals	Approved	Actuals	Est.	Est.	
State General Fund	\$ 6,042	\$ 50	\$ -	\$ 165	\$ -			\$ 17
Non-SGF State Funds	93,092	99,214	99,578	148,064	157,374	176,259	177,833	118,722
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	2,500	2,500	-
	\$ 99,134	\$ 99,264	\$ 99,578	\$ 148,229	\$ 157,374	\$ 178,759	\$ 180,333	\$ 118,739
FTE	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1

## Office of the Attorney General

### Criminal Litigation Division (Kansas Intelligence Fusion Center)

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The risk to Kansas posed by these threats will be undetermined if Kansas is left to depend on increasingly insufficient federal efforts that are not focused on Kansas Security concerns. Adequate threat and risk analysis will not be performed by federal agencies in support of Kansas security efforts leaving the state unaware of threats, with an understanding of the veracity of perceived threats and with no intelligence support to develop defensive/mitigation strategies. Law enforcement and HLS entities in Kansas will be left without vetting and dissemination of national level threat reporting, and no capacity to support effective access to classified threat reporting by cleared leadership. Threats will go undetected by increasingly insufficient federal efforts that are increasingly overwhelmed and cannot build the local, state and infrastructure relationships necessary to identify local threat activity in Kansas. Threats will go undetected by increasingly insufficient federal efforts that are increasingly overwhelmed and excessively bureaucratic and simply not focused on Kansas Security concerns.

#### Statutory Basis

K.S.A. 48-3701 through 3710

#### Mandatory vs. Discretionary

Mandatory

#### MOE/Match Requirement

No

#### Priority Level

1

#### Program Goals

A. The Kansas Intelligence Fusion Center Act (K.S.A. 48-3701 et seq.) establishes the Kansas Intelligence Fusion Center as part of the Adjutant General's department. The attorney general is tasked with chairing and providing administrative support of the Kansas Intelligence Fusion Center Oversight Board as well as assigning an attorney to serve as privacy and civil liberties counsel to the Center and appointing a Deputy Director for law enforcement. Objective #1: To support the work of the Kansas Intelligence Fusion Center through providing appropriate oversight, legal counsel and liaison with the law enforcement community.

#### Program History

The Kansas Intelligence Fusion Center (KIFC) was established with legislative authority through the appropriations process and by executive action of the governor, the adjutant general and the attorney general. The KIFC put in place careful provisions to ensure the protection of civil liberties and has continued to work closely with appropriate federal agencies to break down silos and ensure that information related to threats to our homeland receives the appropriate analysis. The Kansas approach to operating its fusion center has been noticed nationally as a model that ensures effectiveness in intelligence sharing while ensuring that the focus remains on homeland security issues and protecting civil liberties.

#### Performance Measures

*There are no performance measures for this program.*

# Office of the Attorney General

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 57,864	\$ 59,948	\$ 64,358	\$ 65,583	\$ 64,768	\$ 73,746	\$ 74,625	\$ 63,025
Non-SGF State Funds	-	1,984	510	132	477	-	-	\$ 990
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -
	\$ 57,864	\$ 61,932	\$ 64,868	\$ 65,715	\$ 65,245	\$ 73,746	\$ 74,625	\$ 64,015
<b>FTE</b>	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

# Office of the Attorney General

## COVID

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

N/A
-----

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
-----------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------

### Program Goals

N/A
-----

### Program History

--

### Performance Measures

<i>There are no performance measures for this program.</i>
--

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ 182	\$ 2,236	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 806
Non-SGF State Funds	-	20,557	(11,144)	-	-	-	-	3,138
Federal Funds	-	57,111	95,009	-	-	-	-	50,707
	\$ -	\$ 77,850	\$ 86,101	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 54,650
<b>FTE</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Office of the Attorney General

### Solicitor's Division

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

See respective program tabs for specific consequences of each program.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Requirement</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
See respective program tabs.	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

A. K.S.A. 75-764 requires that notice be provided to the Attorney General or prosecuting attorney, as appropriate, when the validity of a Kansas law is challenged on grounds that the law violates the state constitution, federal constitution, or federal law. All notices sent to the Attorney General are directed to the Solicitor Division for handling. Objective #1: Review and recommend for possible intervention or litigation or appellate support all Notices of Constitutional Challenges received by the OAG pursuant to K.S.A. 75-764 and Supreme Court Rules 11.01, 147, and 148.

B. K.S.A. 75-764 requires that notice be provided to the Attorney General or prosecuting attorney, as appropriate, when the validity of a Kansas law is challenged on grounds that the law violates the state constitution, federal constitution, or federal law. All notices sent to the Attorney General are directed to the Solicitor Division for handling. Objective #2: When appropriate, file all necessary motions to intervene and required related pleadings in support of the constitutionality of Kansas laws under challenge in district or appellate courts.

C. Support the traditional role of the Attorney General in providing the Governor advice about the legal sufficiency of extradition documents and when requested by the Governor, investigating demands made upon the Governor by the executive authorities of other states for the surrender of a person in this state who has been charged with a crime in another state. Objective #1: Provide legal assistance to the Governor of Kansas for extradition of fugitives who have taken asylum in Kansas and to county and district attorneys of other states when the State of Kansas is requesting the return of fugitives from justice.

D. Build and sustain a team of appellate attorneys who can efficiently, effectively, and ethically represent the State of Kansas in criminal direct appeals and collateral appeals before state and federal appellate courts. K.S.A. 75-702, K.S.A. 75-703, K.S.A. 75-764, and amendments thereto; K.S.A. 60-1501, K.S.A. 60-1507, 28 U.S.C. § 2241 et seq. and amendments thereto; Memorial Hospital Ass'n, Inc. v. Knutson, 239 Kan. 663, 667-68, 772 P.2d 1093 (1986). Objective #5: Provide for the defense of the State, its agencies and employees in collateral appeals and petitions for state habeas corpus relief filed pursuant to K.S.A. 60-1501 and 1507 by individuals held in the custody of State institutions.

# Office of the Attorney General

## Program History

The Solicitor Division was created as a free-standing Division within the Office of Attorney General at the beginning of FY 2017. The Division as it now stands was made up of components that were housed within the Administration, Civil Litigation, and Criminal Litigation Divisions of the OAG. Within the Solicitor Division are housed four programs: Civil Appeals, Criminal Appeals, Contracted County Criminal Appeals, and Review of Notices of Constitutional Challenges. Civil Appeals: In FY 2017 the new freestanding Solicitor Division was established with two Civil appeals attorneys. Criminal Appeals: Starting with Fiscal Year 2017, the Criminal Appeals program was folded into the new freestanding Solicitor Division. Contracted County Appeals: In 2014, the Attorney General was granted new statutory authority to allow the attorney general's office to enter into contracts with county and district attorneys to handle the appeals from locally prosecuted criminal cases. Commencing in FY 2015 the OAG began contracting with County and District Attorneys to handle their criminal appeals. Participation has grown each year and interest has been expressed by several additional counties. Review of Notices of Constitutional Challenges: New Section 1 of 2016 Senate Bill 334, codified at K.S.A 75-764, requires that notice be provided to the Attorney General or prosecuting attorney, as appropriate, when the validity of a Kansas law is challenged on grounds that the law violates the state constitution, federal constitution, or federal law. All notices sent to the Attorney General are directed to the Solicitor Division for handling. Extraditions: In 2021, this responsibility was transferred to the Solicitor Division from the Criminal Division.

## Performance Measures

<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
		<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	
1. Notices Received and Reviewed by the Solicitor Division	A	104	173	109	150	85	150	150	122
2. Cases in which Interventions or Other Relevant Pleadings are filed by the Solicitor Division pursuant to K.S.A. 2016 Supp. 75-764	B	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	4
3. Extradition requests processed.	C	138	144	139	130	171	130	130	151

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Approved</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	
State General Fund	\$ 59,753	\$ 26,987	\$ 3,713	\$ 15,740	\$ 2,474	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 11,058
Non-SGF State Funds	137,930	132,879	111,368	94,244	87,741	94,676	95,870	110,663
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$ 197,683	\$ 159,866	\$ 115,081	\$ 109,984	\$ 90,215	\$ 104,676	\$ 105,870	\$ 121,721
<b>FTE</b>	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.35

## Office of the Attorney General

### Solicitor's Division (Criminal)

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Failure to respond to criminal appeals may result in the reversal of the underlying conviction to the detriment of public safety. A failure to file a responsive brief in an appeal of a habeas corpus petition may result in the release of the person imprisoned. A failure to participate in criminal appeals may result in the reversal of the underlying conviction to the detriment of public safety. A failure to respond to a habeas corpus petition may result in the release of the person imprisoned. A failure to respond to criminal appeals may result in the release of the underlying conviction to the detriment of public safety. The state's legal interests may be unheard by cases in which the State is not a party.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Requirement</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
K.S.A. 75-702, 75-704; K.S.A. 22-3612; K.S.A. 60-1501, 60-1507; K.S.A. 75-108; Supreme Court Rule 6.10.; 28 U.S.C. §§2241 and 2254.	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

A. Build and sustain a team of appellate attorneys who can efficiently, effectively, and ethically represent the State of Kansas in criminal direct appeals and collateral appeals before state and federal appellate courts. K.S.A. 75-702, K.S.A. 75-703, K.S.A 75-764, and amendments thereto; K.S.A. 60-1501, K.S.A. 60-1507, 28 U.S.C. § 2241 et seq. and amendments thereto; Memorial Hospital Ass'n, Inc. v. Knutson, 239 Kan. 663, 667-68, 772 P.2d 1093 (1986). Objective #1: Utilize well-trained and resourced appellate attorneys to prepare and submit briefs to the Kansas Court of Appeals or Kansas Supreme Court, and argue relevant cases before these courts.

B. Build and sustain a team of appellate attorneys who can efficiently, effectively, and ethically represent the State of Kansas in criminal direct appeals and collateral appeals before state and federal appellate courts. K.S.A. 75-702, K.S.A. 75-703, K.S.A 75-764, and amendments thereto; K.S.A. 60-1501, K.S.A. 60-1507, 28 U.S.C. § 2241 et seq. and amendments thereto; Memorial Hospital Ass'n, Inc. v. Knutson, 239 Kan. 663, 667-68, 772 P.2d 1093 (1986). Objective #2: Utilize well-trained and resourced appellate attorneys to represent the State in criminal proceedings before the United States Court of Appeals for the 10th Circuit.

C. Build and sustain a team of appellate attorneys who can efficiently, effectively, and ethically represent the State of Kansas in criminal direct appeals and collateral appeals before state and federal appellate courts. K.S.A. 75-702, K.S.A. 75-703, K.S.A 75-764, and amendments thereto; K.S.A. 60-1501, K.S.A. 60-1507, 28 U.S.C. § 2241 et seq. and amendments thereto; Memorial Hospital Ass'n, Inc. v. Knutson, 239 Kan. 663, 667-68, 772 P.2d 1093 (1986). Objective #3: Utilize well-trained and resourced appellate attorneys to represent the State in criminal appeals proceedings before the Supreme Court of the United States.

## Office of the Attorney General

D. Build and sustain a team of appellate attorneys who can efficiently, effectively, and ethically represent the State of Kansas in criminal direct appeals and collateral appeals before state and federal appellate courts. K.S.A. 75-702, K.S.A. 75-703, K.S.A. 75-764, and amendments thereto; K.S.A. 60-1501, K.S.A. 60-1507, 28 U.S.C. § 2241 et seq. and amendments thereto; Memorial Hospital Ass'n, Inc. v. Knutson, 239 Kan. 663, 667-68, 772 P.2d 1093 (1986). Objective #4: Provide for the defense of the State of Kansas, its agencies and employees in all petitions for federal habeas corpus relief filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241 and 2254 by individuals held in the custody of State institutions.

E. Build and sustain a team of appellate attorneys who can efficiently, effectively, and ethically represent the State of Kansas in criminal direct appeals and collateral appeals before state and federal appellate courts. K.S.A. 75-702, K.S.A. 75-703, K.S.A. 75-764, and amendments thereto; K.S.A. 60-1501, K.S.A. 60-1507, 28 U.S.C. § 2241 et seq. and amendments thereto; Memorial Hospital Ass'n, Inc. v. Knutson, 239 Kan. 663, 667-68, 772 P.2d 1093 (1986). Objective #5: Provide for the defense of the State, its agencies and employees in collateral appeals and petitions for state habeas corpus relief filed pursuant to K.S.A. 60-1501 and 1507 by individuals held in the custody of State institutions.

F. Build and sustain a team of appellate attorneys who can efficiently, effectively, and ethically represent the State of Kansas in criminal direct appeals and collateral appeals before state and federal appellate courts. K.S.A. 75-702, K.S.A. 75-703, K.S.A. 75-764, and amendments thereto; K.S.A. 60-1501, K.S.A. 60-1507, 28 U.S.C. § 2241 et seq. and amendments thereto; Memorial Hospital Ass'n, Inc. v. Knutson, 239 Kan. 663, 667-68, 772 P.2d 1093 (1986). Objective #6: Utilize well-trained and resourced appellate attorneys to provide efficient, effective, and ethical legal advice and assistance to county and district attorneys in appellate and other post-conviction practice before the state courts.

G. Build and sustain a team of appellate attorneys who can efficiently, effectively, and ethically represent the State of Kansas in criminal direct appeals and collateral appeals before state and federal appellate courts. K.S.A. 75-702, K.S.A. 75-703, K.S.A. 75-764, and amendments thereto; K.S.A. 60-1501, K.S.A. 60-1507, 28 U.S.C. § 2241 et seq. and amendments thereto; Memorial Hospital Ass'n, Inc. v. Knutson, 239 Kan. 663, 667-68, 772 P.2d 1093 (1986). Objective # 7: Provide efficient, effective, and ethical legal advice concerning whether to join criminal amicus curiae briefs, and when in the best interests of the State, draft criminal amicus curiae briefs for cases before the United States Supreme Court or other appellate courts, and when advisable before trial courts.

### Program History

Criminal Appeals: Starting with Fiscal Year 2017, the Criminal Appeals program was folded into the new freestanding Solicitor Division.

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance Measures

		FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022 Previous	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	
<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. State appellate briefs completed and filed	A	14	26	28	30	22	30	30	25
2. Appellate briefs completed and filed in the 10th Circuit	B	3	0	3	2	1	2	2	1
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
3. U.S. Supreme Court petitions and briefs completed	C	5	5	0	3	2	3	3	2
4. Federal habeas corpus cases answered	D	10	21	20	15	27	15	15	23
5. Number of K.S.A. 60-1501 & 60-1507 cases and other post-conviction attacks opened	E	5	7	5	7	5	7	7	6
6. Number of appellate briefs submitted to this office by local prosecutors for review and approval as to form and legal substance	F	649	618	438	500	304	500	500	453
7. Number of criminal amicus briefs reviewed and acted on by the Agency	G	15	13	9	17	9	17	17	10

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	FY 2019 <i>Actuals</i>	FY 2020 <i>Actuals</i>	FY 2021 <i>Actuals</i>	FY 2022 <i>Approved</i>	FY 2022 <i>Actuals</i>	FY 2023 <i>Est.</i>	FY 2024 <i>Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 381,440	\$ 377,399	\$ 456,897	\$ 456,450	\$ 350,074	\$ 255,387	\$ 247,536	\$ 394,790
Non-SGF State Funds	53,570	96,149	86,394	72,495	91,320	311,728	319,390	91,288
Federal Funds	690	1,028	155	3,000	447	3,145	3,145	543
	\$ 435,700	\$ 474,576	\$ 543,446	\$ 531,945	\$ 441,841	\$ 570,260	\$ 570,071	\$ 486,621
<b>FTE</b>	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0

## Office of the Attorney General

### Solicitor's Division (Civil)

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Other programs would have to be discontinued to provide funding for this program. The state's legal interests may be unheard by cases in which the State is not a party. The state's legal and sovereign interests may be harmed by the unchallenged implementation of unlawful or unwarranted federal administrative rulemaking. The Sexually Violent Predator (SVP) unit of the Civil Division would need to be expanded to handle all the SVP appeals within the unit.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Requirement</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
K.S.A. 75-702; 75-710, 75-108, 75-6108, 75-6116	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

A. Build and sustain a team of appellate attorneys that can efficiently, effectively, and ethically represent the State of Kansas in civil appeals before state and federal appellate courts. K.S.A. 75-702 and 75-764. For civil appeals cases initiated by, retained, or referred to the Solicitor Division for action at the appellate court level, ensure that each and every action is handled professionally, competently, and ethically.

B. Build and sustain a team of appellate attorneys that can efficiently, effectively, and ethically represent the State of Kansas in civil appeals before state and federal appellate courts. K.S.A. 75-702 and 75-764. Objective # 2: Provide efficient, effective, and ethical legal advice concerning whether to join civil amicus curiae briefs, and when in the best interests of the State, draft civil amicus curiae briefs for cases before the United States Supreme Court or other appellate courts, and when advisable before trial courts.

C. Build and sustain a team of appellate attorneys that can efficiently, effectively, and ethically represent the State of Kansas in civil appeals before state and federal appellate courts. K.S.A. 75-702 and 75-764. Objective # 3: When in the best interests of the State, provide civil litigation support, including the handling of specialized litigation or the drafting of motions and dispositive pleadings.

D. Build and sustain a team of appellate attorneys that can efficiently, effectively, and ethically represent the State of Kansas in civil appeals before state and federal appellate courts. K.S.A. 75-702 and 75-764. Objective # 4: When in the best interests of the State, file petitions for review of federal administrative actions, including the drafting of motions, briefs, and presentation of oral argument.

#### Program History

Civil Appeals: In FY 2017 the new freestanding Solicitor Division was established with two Civil appeals attorneys

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance Measures

		FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022 Previous	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	
<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of new appellate cases filed (Does not include continuing appellate cases or amicus cases the OAG is involved in or appeals handled exclusively in any other Division of the office)	A	21	21	27	30	33	30	30	27
2. Number of civil amicus briefs reviewed and acted on by the Agency	B	113	120	116	120	149	120	120	128
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
3. Number of civil amicus briefs drafted by the Agency	B	2	2	1	3	1	3	3	1
4. Number of civil cases handled or assisted by the civil Assistant Solicitors General and/or Chief Deputy	C	25	20	23	20	24	20	20	22
5. Number of civil petitions for review filed, handled or assisted by the civil Assistant Solicitors General and/or Chief Deputy	D	5	8	5	5	1	5	5	5

## Funding

	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	
<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Approved</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 214,301	\$ 322,874	\$ 385,427	\$ 314,793	\$ 332,069	\$ 348,672	\$ 351,172	\$ 346,790
Non-SGF State Funds	231,670	267,255	180,306	222,629	159,590	185,000	185,000	202,384
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$ 445,971	\$ 590,129	\$ 565,733	\$ 537,422	\$ 491,659	\$ 533,672	\$ 536,172	\$ 549,174
<b>FTE</b>	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5

## Office of the Attorney General

### Solicitor's Division (Criminal Appeals)

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Absent the contracted appeals program, there is increased risk of inconsistent case law results and positions by elements of the state before the state appellate courts. The appellate expertise brought to bear by the Solicitor Division also increases the likelihood that dangerous criminals will be brought to justice.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
K.S.A. 75-702, 75-704; K.S.A. 22-3612; Supreme Court Rule 6.10	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

A. By contracting with County and District Attorneys around the State, build, deploy, and sustain a team of appellate attorneys that can efficiently, effectively, and ethically represent the State of Kansas in criminal direct appeals and collateral appeals before state and federal appellate courts to achieve efficiency and uniformity. K.S.A. 75-702, K.S.A. 75-703, K.S.A. 75-764, and amendments thereto; K.S.A. 601501, K.S.A. 60-1507, 28 U.S.C. § 2241 et seq. and amendments thereto; Memorial Hospital Ass'n, Inc. v. Knutson, 239 Kan. 663, 66768, 772 P.2d 1093 (1986). Objective #1: Contract with County and District Attorneys across the state to handle criminal appeals on behalf of the county for the entire Fiscal Year for a pre-set fee with a goal toward achieving efficiency, economies of scale, and greater uniformity in the handling of the State's criminal appellate work.

#### Program History

Contracted County Appeals: In 2014, the Attorney General was granted new statutory authority to allow the attorney general's office to enter into contracts with county and district attorneys to handle the appeals from locally prosecuted criminal cases. Commencing in FY 2015 the OAG began contracting with County and District Attorneys to handle their criminal appeals.

#### Performance Measures

		FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>		<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	
1. Number of counties under contract for appellate services	A	34	37	41	40	44	40	40	41
2. Number of state appellate briefs completed and filed	A	149	187	128	150	135	150	150	150

#### Funding

# Office of the Attorney General

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ 851	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 284
Non-SGF State Funds	314,670	305,744	298,402	304,481	312,406	262,654	264,084	305,517
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	78	-	-	26
	\$ 314,670	\$ 306,595	\$ 298,402	\$ 304,481	\$ 312,484	\$ 262,654	\$ 264,084	\$ 305,827
<b>FTE</b>	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6

## Office of the Attorney General

### Fraud and Abuse Litigation Division (Prosecutions)

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Local prosecutors will be required to prosecute cases without any assistance on complex cases requiring an enormous amount of time and resource commitment. This will return us to a time when these cases were not prosecuted by local law enforcement due to complexity, case load, and/or a lack of interest. There will be no central resource to to effectively, consistently, and ethically litigate complex financial cases. Victims may not recieve justice and defendants may escape being held accountable for their actions simply due to the type of crime they choose to commit.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Requirement</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Kan. Constitution, Article 1, § 1; K.S.A. 22-2202(q), 75-702, 75-704, 75-708 and amendments thereto; State ex rel Stephan v. Reynolds, 234 Kan. 574, 673 P.2d 1188 (1984).	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

A. Provide efficient, effective, and ethical enforcement of the applicable criminal statutes pertaining to general white collar crimes, insurance fraud, securities fraud, and cases generated by the Kansas Department of Revenue. Kan. Constitution, Article I, § 1; K.S.A. 22-2202(17), K.S.A. 75-108, K.S.A. 75-702, K.S.A. 75-708, and amendments thereto; State ex rel. Stephan v. Reynolds, 234 Kan. 574, 673 P.2d 1188 (1984), K.S.A. 40-113 and amendments thereto, K.S.A. 17-12a508 and amendments thereto. Objective #1: Review and prosecute white collar crimes, insurance fraud, securities fraud, and cases generated by the Kansas Department of Revenue.

B. To investigate and prosecuted criminal offenses identified by 2022 SB 84 which identify offenses related to wagering, unauthorized gambling, and violations of the Kansas Expanded Lottery Act 2022 SB 84.

#### Program History

Pursuant to statute, the Attorney General's office has historically prosecuted criminal cases of all kinds around the state in coordination with local county and district attorneys. This function was traditionally conducted within the confines of the Criminal Litigation Division. In January of 2013, the Attorney General moved prosecution of white collar crimes to the Consumer Protection Division. By transferring criminal white collar cases to the Consumer Protection Division, these cases no longer had to compete with homicides and child sex cases for resources.

## Office of the Attorney General

### Program History (Continued)

Prosecution of white collar crimes continued within the Consumer Protection Division until July 1, 2016. In July 2016, K.S.A.75-723 was amended to allow for the Attorney General to assist in the investigation and prosecution of cases involving abuse, neglect, or exploitation of adults. This required the ANE unit to be removed from the Victim Services Division. At that time, the Attorney General made a decision to create a new division titled Fraud and Abuse Litigation Division. The purpose of doing this was not just to provide a home for the ANE unit, but also to fulfill a broader vision regarding the prosecution of cases involving a financial component. The intent of the Fraud and Abuse Litigation Division is to be a statewide resource assisting local authorities in investigating and prosecuting very difficult cases involving vulnerable adults. In addition to providing direct investigation and prosecution resources, the division also provides an educational resource to lawyers, law enforcement, and the general public.

In 2017, the Attorney General supported the passage of Senate Bill 23. This new legislation relocated existing prosecution resources from the Office of the Securities Commissioner and the Kansas Insurance Department to the Attorney General's Office. These resources are now located within the Fraud and Abuse Litigation Division. In March of 2018, the Attorney General's Office entered into agreement with the Kansas Department of Revenue (KDOR) to assist in the enforcement and prosecution of cases arising out of investigations conducted by their Office of Special Investigations. This process is coordinated with the appropriate county or district attorney. Through co-location, cross training, and integrated case management the State is able to gain efficiencies and allow stronger enforcement of the criminal statutes that prohibit financial crimes. In addition, the statewide Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) program is housed within the Fraud and Abuse Litigation Division.

In the spring of 2022, the Kansas Legislature passed and the Governor signed into law, Senate Bill 84. This bill expanded gambling in Kansas to include sports wagering. In addition, the bill creates the White Collar Crime Fund, to be administered by the Governor. The bill allows for the attorney general, on or before August 1, to submit requests to the governor for the amount of money necessary to carry out the mission of the fund. The mission of the fund is to investigate and prosecute criminal cases related to illegal activity in wagering, unauthorized gambling, etc.

### Performance Measures

		<i>FY 2019</i>		<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
						<i>Previous</i>				
		<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
<i>Output Measures</i>										
1. General white collar cases being criminally litigated	A	59	79	75	82-84	86	70-93	70-93	80	

# Office of the Attorney General

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 28,064	\$ 6,203	\$ 3,465	\$ 53,150	\$ 5,466	\$ 48,000	\$ 14,000	\$ 5,045
Non-SGF State Funds	682,998	777,545	871,960	885,834	907,330	975,339	1,030,288	852,278
Federal Funds	465	-	-	-	4,901	-	-	1,634
	\$ 711,527	\$ 783,748	\$ 875,425	\$ 938,984	\$ 917,697	\$ 1,023,339	\$ 1,044,288	\$ 858,957
<b>FTE</b>	10.34	10.34	10.34	10.34	10.34	9.50	9.50	10.34

## Office of the Attorney General

### Fraud and Abuse Litigation Division (Abuse, Neglect and Exploitation)

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

A return to the systemic landscape prior to the Kaufman case in which cases of abuse, neglect, and exploitation go undetected or are not investigated or prosecuted timely or at all. There will be no central resource to provide education to law enforcement and prosecution to effectively, consistently, and ethically investigate and litigate cases of abuse, neglect, and exploitation of adults. Also, the general public will have less opportunity to be provided information which will protect themselves or a loved one from being a victim of abuse, neglect, or exploitation.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
K.S.A. 75-723	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

A. Participate in the review, referral, investigation, prevention, and prosecution of abuse, neglect, and exploitation cases involving adults pursuant to K.S.A. 75-723. Objective #1: Review and follow-up all law enforcement referrals and substantiated reports of abuse, neglect, and exploitation for adults.

B. Participate in the review, referral, investigation, prevention, and prosecution of abuse, neglect, and exploitation cases involving adults pursuant to K.S.A. 75-723. Objective #2: Prevention through education of law enforcement and prosecutors.

C. To develop and maintain a coordinated response to prevent serious harm and deaths of vulnerable adults as per K.S.A. 75-754 and amendments thereto. The Silver Alert tracking responsibilities were shifted from the Victim Service division to the Abuse, Neglect & Exploitation Unit of the Fraud and Abuse Litigation Division of the OAG starting in SFY 2021.

#### Program History

In July of 2016, K.S.A.75-723 was amended to allow for the Attorney General to assist in the investigation and prosecution of cases involving abuse, neglect, or exploitation of adults. This required the ANE unit to be removed from the Victim Services Division. At that time, the Attorney General made a decision to create a new division entitled Fraud and Abuse Litigation Division. The purpose of doing this was not just to provide a home for the ANE unit, but also to fulfill a broader vision regarding the prosecution of cases involving a financial component. The intent of the Fraud and Abuse Litigation Division is to be a state wide resource assisting local authorities in investigating and prosecuting very difficult cases involving vulnerable adults. In addition to providing direct investigation and prosecution resources, the division also provides an educational resource to lawyers, law enforcement, and the general public.

## Office of the Attorney General

### Program History (Continued)

---

The Abuse, Neglect, and Exploitation (ANE) unit was established by statutory mandate in the summer of 2006, largely in response to the Kaufman case, which occurred in Newton, Kansas. Arlan and Linda Kaufman operated a mental health group home for adults. Complaints of abuse had been made by residents over a period of years; however, due to inadequacies in the State's system of reporting and investigation, the complaints went uninvestigated. The Disability Rights Center of Kansas eventually gained access to the home which then allowed for subsequent law enforcement investigation, which then led to arrest, prosecution, and conviction of the Kaufmans in U.S. District Court. During the criminal investigation and subsequent review, it became clear there had been systemic failures which led to the abuse going undetected. As a result, the legislature in 2006 created the Abuse, Neglect, and Exploitation Unit pursuant to K.S.A. 75-723.

The ANE unit created by statute in 2006, was required to review all cases involving a confirmed finding of abuse by a state agency. The statute applied to both children and adults. The Unit was also required to provide a report to the legislature every year detailing its activities. This resulted in the Unit reviewing about 1800 cases of substantiated abuse every year, with roughly 375 of those cases involving adults and the rest involving children. Available resources in the Attorney General's Office were simply not adequate to handle such a case load.

The Attorney General was faced with only two realistic options. First, was to add enough skilled staff to the Unit to properly review and follow up on all cases (child and adult) which are referred to the office. This was the General's preferred option. However, at an estimated annual increase of \$400,000, the State's financial situation made this an inopportune time to request such expansion. The second option was to amend the ANE statute to focus our resources on adult cases by amending K.S.A. 75-723.

In the spring of 2016, the legislature passed and the Governor signed SB 408, amending K.S.A. 75-723. While retaining the ability to review cases of child abuse, neglect, and exploitation within the limits of available resources, the statute narrowed the focus of cases requiring mandatory review by our office. Under the amended statute state agencies are now only required to forward substantiated cases of adult abuse, neglect, or exploitation to our office. In addition, the amended statute provides a new requirement that state agencies concurrently notify our office when a case of suspected adult abuse, neglect, or exploitation is referred to law enforcement. This allows us to make timely contact with local law enforcement agencies to determine from the outset whether they desire assistance in what can be very difficult cases to investigate.

The amended statute also provides that the Attorney General's Office, can now assist in the investigation, prosecution, and prevention of cases involving abuse, neglect, and exploitation. This means the ANE unit is no longer just simply a monitoring or auditing unit. This change of focus to investigation and prosecution, meant it was no longer appropriate for the ANE unit to be located in Victim Services Division. As part of the Attorney General's focus on fraud and abuse cases, in July 2016, the ANE unit was moved to a newly created division named the "Fraud and Abuse Litigation Division".

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance Measures

		<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i> <i>Previous</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Law enforcement referrals by State agencies regarding abuse, neglect, and exploitation of adults requiring review and potential follow up	A	5,063	5,201	4,694	5,000	5,815	5,500	5,500	5,237
2. Substantiated cases of abuse, neglect, and exploitation of adults forwarded to office by state agencies requiring review and potential follow up	A	666	672	498	650	374	450	450	515
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
3. Cases being criminally litigated	A	15	19	15	12-18	16	12-18	12-18	17
4. Cases being criminally investigated	A	36	40	34	30-40	47	40-50	40-50	40
5. Educational presentations made to the law enforcement, prosecutors, or the general public	B	16	14	16	12-16	18	14-20	14-20	16
6. Silver alerts	C	20	34	32	35	34	32-36	32-36	33

## Funding

	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Approved</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 292,375	\$ 324,464	\$ 374,094	\$ 361,481	\$ 354,582	\$ 367,876	\$ 362,410	\$ 351,047
Non-SGF State Funds	27	1,014	7	-	209	200	200	410
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	3,214	-	-	1,071
	\$ 292,402	\$ 325,478	\$ 374,101	\$ 361,481	\$ 358,005	\$ 368,076	\$ 362,610	\$ 352,528
<b>FTE</b>	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.4	3.4	3.9

## Office of the Attorney General

### Fraud and Abuse Litigation Division (D.A.R.E.)

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Officers around the State will fail to receive necessary training for D.A.R.E. and SRO certification. Without this program relationships and coordination between the D.A.R.E. program and schools across the state would be weakened which would risk the effectiveness of the D.A.R.E. program in Kansas.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
K.S.A. 75-721, 75-721(b)(3)	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

A. To provide training and resources for Kansas school-based police (SBP) to reduce victimization of youth and help ensure a safer environment for the youth of Kansas. K.S.A. 75-721 and amendments thereto. Objective #1: Provide trainings needed for D.A.R.E. and School Resource Officer (SRO) certification in Kansas along with collaborating with schools, communities, and other organizations to provide for the expansion of school based policing (SBP) programs in Kansas.

#### Program History

The statewide Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) program is housed within the Fraud and Abuse Litigation Division. The D.A.R.E. program was created in 1983 in Los Angeles. It was a partnership between the Los Angeles Police Department and the Los Angeles School District. The focus of the D.A.R.E. program is focused on drug abuse prevention as well as violence prevention. The curriculum has changed over the years to adapt to drug trends such as the rise of addiction to prescription medication and also crime trends such as school shootings or bullying. The way in which the D.A.R.E. program is taught has also changed, keeping up with research in curriculum and effective instruction techniques. In 1999, the Kansas legislature passed K.S.A. 75-721 which required the Attorney General to appoint a statewide D.A.R.E. coordinator to assist local law enforcement agencies and schools in creation of local D.A.R.E. programs. The statewide coordinator is also required to provide training to local law enforcement in how to teach the D.A.R.E. curriculum. Finally, the statewide coordinator also must perform services and provide information as necessary to support the success of the D.A.R.E. program in Kansas.

#### Performance Measures

		FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022 Previous	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	
Output Measures	Goal	Actuals	Actuals	Actuals	Est.	Actuals	Est.	Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of officers trained through the D.A.R.E. and school resource officer training programs	A	174	173	38	100	89	90-110	90-110	100
2. Number of educational programs participated in and outreach conducted	A	30	13	17	15	8	15	15	13

# Office of the Attorney General

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	10,563	5,642	6,612	7,750	8,082	21,650	21,681	6,779
Federal Funds	59,739	44,963	53,561	69,701	73,670	47,656	50,681	57,398
	\$ 70,302	\$ 50,605	\$ 60,173	\$ 77,451	\$ 81,752	\$ 69,306	\$ 72,362	\$ 64,177
<b>FTE</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.83

# Office of the Attorney General

## Elder Abuse MDT

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

--

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
K.S.A. 75-782	Mandatory	NO	1

### Program Goals

A.To facilitate the convening of an elder and dependent adult multidisciplinary team in each judicial district. The purpose of such teams is to coordinate investigations of elder and dependent adult abuse, as well as identifying opportunities with local jurisdictions to improve policies and procedures in the notification and response to abuse, neglect, and exploitation of elder and dependent adults. K.S.A. 75-782 and amendments thereto.

### Program History

In the spring of 2021, the legislature passed HB 2114 which in part became K.S.A. 75-782. This bill was brought to the legislature by the Elder and Dependent Adult Abuse Prevention Council. The Council was formed in 2019 and one of its primary purposes was to research multidisciplinary teams, also known as MDTs, in the context of the investigation of abuse, neglect, and exploitation of elder and dependent adults. The purpose of the bill was to improve communication and coordination between multiple agencies which investigate cases of abuse, neglect, and exploitation. The statutes requires specific agencies such as the County or District Attorney, the Sheriff, Department of Children and Families, Department of Aging and Disability Services, and State Long-term Care Ombudsman to participate. It also allows for additional members as needed by the particular team. The teams are to coordinate investigations of elder and dependent adult abuse within the judicial district and is also allowed to identify opportunities to improve policies and procedures in the notification and response to such cases.

### Performance Measures

<i>There are no performance measures for this program.</i>
--

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds				-	-	71,920	72,510	-
Federal Funds				-	-	-	-	-
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 71,920	\$ 72,510	\$ -

## Office of the Attorney General

FTE	--	--	--	--	--	1.0	1.0	--
-----	----	----	----	----	----	-----	-----	----

## Office of the Attorney General

### Criminal Litigation Division

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Lack of funding will eliminate the ability of the Kansas Attorney General's Office to prosecute homicides and child sex crimes, which are often the most difficult and demanding cases, throughout Kansas. Any decrease in experienced prosecutorial capacity would most negatively impact counties with smaller populations and more limited resources. The lack of prosecution capacity in homicide and child sex crime cases would further impact the victims or their family members ability to achieve justice for those criminal acts in a timely manner. Lack of funding will decrease the ability for Kansas prosecutors and law enforcement to receive specialized training. This lack of training will further impact Kansas prosecutors' ability to effectively handle cases, particularly in jurisdictions with a smaller population and more limited training resources. The overall impact of a decrease in funding would severely undermine public confidence in the criminal justice system.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Requirement</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Kan. Constitution, Article 1, § 1; K.S.A. 22-2202(r), 75-702, 75-704, 75-708 and amendments thereto; State ex rel Stephan v. Reynolds, 234 Kan. 574, 673 P.2d 1188 (1984).	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

A. Build and sustain a group of highly skilled prosecutors who can efficiently, effectively, and ethically prosecute persons charged with violations of Kansas criminal laws. Kan. Constitution, Article I, § 1; K.S.A. 22-2202(17), K.S.A. 75-108, K.S.A. 75-702, K.S.A. 75-708, and amendments thereto; State ex rel. Stephan v. Reynolds, 234 Kan. 574, 673 P.2d 1188 (1984). Objective #1: Utilizing well trained and resourced Assistant Attorneys General, prosecute the most difficult and demanding cases throughout Kansas.

B. Build and sustain a group of highly skilled prosecutors who can efficiently, effectively, and ethically prosecute persons charged with violations of Kansas criminal laws. Kan. Constitution, Article I, § 1; K.S.A. 22-2202(17), K.S.A. 75-108, K.S.A. 75-702, K.S.A. 75-708, and amendments thereto; State ex rel. Stephan v. Reynolds, 234 Kan. 574, 673 P.2d 1188 (1984). Objective #2: Build positive relationships with state and local law enforcement officers and officials to foster core competencies in the investigation and prosecution of homicides, child sex crimes, illegal drug manufacture and distribution crimes, and crimes involving public officials.

C. This section supports the prosecution section through witness interviews, criminal history checks, and subpoena service. In addition, it provides training, assistance, and investigation support for other law enforcement-related investigations in accordance with the Kansas Attorney General's statutory and constitutional duties. The section also supports investigations conducted by the Livestock/Branding Unit within the section, and Special Agents of the section that are assigned to the Northeast Kansas Crimes Against Children initiative, as well as other investigative personnel within the Attorney General's Office. Objective #1: Provide certified law enforcement capability within the Kansas Attorney General's Office.

## Office of the Attorney General

D. This section supports the prosecution section through witness interviews, criminal history checks, and subpoena service. In addition, it provides training, assistance, and investigation support for other law enforcement-related investigations in accordance with the Kansas Attorney General's statutory and constitutional duties. The section also supports investigations conducted by the Livestock/Branding Unit within the section, and Special Agents of the section that are assigned to the Northeast Kansas Crimes Against Children initiative, as well as other investigative personnel within the Attorney General's Office. Objective #2: Provide certified law enforcement capability as an agency member of the Northeast Kansas Crimes Against Children initiative.

### Program History

The Criminal Litigation Division maintains a group of highly skilled prosecutors who assist county and district attorneys in prosecuting the most difficult and demanding criminal cases throughout Kansas. The Division develops and facilitates an annual forum for county and district attorneys to discuss issues related to the prosecution of homicides and child sex crimes in Kansas. The Division hosts regional Attorney General Calls that provide an opportunity to present continuing legal education on emerging prosecution and appellate issues and provides special training to law enforcement officers and officials, victims' advocates, and court services personnel on major criminal issues. The Division is also responsible for the investigation and licensing of applicants for concealed carry, private detective, and bail enforcement agent permits.

### Performance Measures

		FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022 Previous	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	
<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Criminal cases accepted from county and district attorney offices	A	44	22	41	40	36	25	30	33
2. Jury trials conducted	A	5	2	2	10	5	8	12	3
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
3. Annual Focus Four Forum attendance	B	70	0	0	40	0	30	35	0
4. Regional AG Call attendance	B	57	60	0	50	65	35	40	42
5. OAG to entity training events conducted	B	38	16	4	10	7	9	12	9
6. Assist other agency requests supported	C	29	27	25	25	44	45	50	32
7. Prosecution assistance request supported	C	31	20	27	25	48	50	50	32
8. Constituent inquiries reviewed	C	163	188	122	130	238	240	240	183
9. Other investigations initiated	C	7	6	2	6	3	4	4	4

# Office of the Attorney General

10. Safety and security incidents investigated 11. Task Force Investigations opened or supported by OAG Special Agents assigned to the Task Force	C	11	6	5	7	4	4	4	5
	D	14	25	29	30	44	45	45	33

# Office of the Attorney General

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$1,590,296	\$1,549,671	\$1,872,916	\$2,120,520	\$2,057,429	\$ 1,952,610	\$1,866,419	\$1,826,672
Non-SGF State Funds	147,007	198,567	223,027	234,899	203,905	391,497	486,951	\$ 208,500
Federal Funds	167,147	180,514	57,269	78,751	54,905	72,500	72,500	\$ 97,563
	\$1,904,450	\$1,928,752	\$2,153,212	\$2,434,170	\$2,316,239	\$ 2,416,607	\$2,425,870	\$2,132,734
<b>FTE</b>	19.13	19.13	19.13	19.13	19.13	19.13	19.13	19.13

## Office of the Attorney General

### Criminal Litigation Division (Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutors)

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

If this Federally funded grant position was eliminated, there would be a reduction in Federal transportation dollars received by KDOT. By the state having this position, it allows the state to qualify for additional Federal funding. Additionally, prosecutors and law enforcement would not have a statewide resource for information and training on the current best practices and potential legal issues they may face when detecting, arresting and prosecuting impaired drivers.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Requirement</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
General	Discretionary	No	2

#### Program Goals

A. The Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor (TSRP) program is funded by the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration (NHTSA) through a grant from the Kansas Department of Transportation. The TSRP provides training, education and technical support to prosecutors and law enforcement agencies throughout the state on traffic crimes and safety issues. While the TSRP's focus is on alcohol and drug impaired driving, the TSRP also serves as a resource in other areas of traffic safety including distracted driving, occupant restraint, and other highway safety issues. Objective #1: Provide support to local prosecutors to review and prosecute traffic safety crimes with an emphasis on DUI fatalities.

B. The Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor (TSRP) program is funded by the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration (NHTSA) through a grant from the Kansas Department of Transportation. The TSRP provides training, education and technical support to prosecutors and law enforcement agencies throughout the state on traffic crimes and safety issues. While the TSRP's focus is on alcohol and drug impaired driving, the TSRP also serves as a resource in other areas of traffic safety including distracted driving, occupant restraint, and other highway safety issues. Objective #2: Produce or co-produce with one or more agencies or organizations, training events relating to detection and apprehension of impaired drivers for law enforcement or in conjunction with prosecutors.

C. The Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor (TSRP) program is funded by the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration (NHTSA) through a grant from the Kansas Department of Transportation. The TSRP provides training, education and technical support to prosecutors and law enforcement agencies throughout the state on traffic crimes and safety issues. While the TSRP's focus is on alcohol and drug impaired driving, the TSRP also serves as a resource in other areas of traffic safety including distracted driving, occupant restraint, and other highway safety issues. Objective #3: Inform prosecuting attorneys and law enforcement officers of significant developments about the DUI and Implied Consent laws as well as other traffic safety related news including upcoming training opportunities.

#### Program History

The TSRP position originated in 2008 as a partnership between the Shawnee County DAs office and the OAG. The position was formalized after a grant funding review by the OAG. The position provides expert review and analysis of current DUI law, practice and case study for prosecutors and other interested parties across the state.

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance Measures

		FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022 Previous	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	
<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Prosecutors provided technical assistance	A	130	67	143	150	192	175	190	134
2. Criminal cases accepted for prosecution	A	2	3	0	2	2	2	2	2
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
3. Law enforcement trainings conducted	B	18	3	4	20	17	20	20	8
4. Cumulative attendees at law enforcement trainings conducted	B	662	52	130	500	432	450	475	205
5. Number of prosecutor trainings conducted	B	7	1	18	10	13	12	12	11
6. Cumulative attendees at prosecutor trainings conducted	B	236	20	294	250	269	225	225	194
7. Newsletter Subscribers	C	668	681	652	680	665	680	680	666
8. Law Enforcement Officers Receiving Newsletter	C	493	492	460	480	456	450	450	469
9. Prosecutors Receiving Newsletter	C	122	130	131	140	145	145	145	135
10. Other Traffic Safety Professionals Receiving Newsletter	C	53	29	27	35	37	40	40	31

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	9,858	239	203	1,189	2,567	941	941	1,003
Federal Funds	146,247	185,622	153,523	160,652	179,777	190,788	191,760	172,974
	\$ 156,105	\$ 185,861	\$ 153,726	\$ 161,841	\$ 182,344	\$ 191,729	\$ 192,701	\$ 173,977
<b>FTE</b>	1.0	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3

## Office of the Attorney General

### Criminal Litigation Division (Livestock Investigation/Brand Unit)

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

There would be no law enforcement entity to investigate livestock crimes with resources to conduct multi-jurisdictional investigations.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Requirement</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
K. S. A. 75-3111, 47-416, 47-425	Discretionary	No	2

#### Program Goals

A. The section supports the prosecution section through witness interviews, criminal history checks, and subpoena service. In addition, it provides training, assistance, and investigation support for other law enforcement-related investigations in accordance with the Kansas Attorney General's statutory and constitutional duties. The section also supports investigations conducted by the Livestock/Branding Unit within the section, and Special Agents of the section that are assigned to the Northeast Kansas Crimes Against Children initiative, as well as other investigative personnel within the Attorney General's Office.

B. To provide efficient, effective, and ethical enforcement of the Kansas Brand Law. K.S.A. 47-414 et seq.

Objective #1: To receive, process, investigate and act on complaints pertaining to the Kansas Brand Law, and ethically prosecute or otherwise enforce the matters falling within the parameters of the Kansas Brand Law.

#### Program History

The Livestock Investigation/Brand Unit of the Criminal Litigation Division is a cooperative effort between the Attorney General of Kansas and the Kansas Secretary of Agriculture. The partnership provides the ability for sworn law enforcement officers employed by the State of Kansas to assist local law enforcement officers in rural and frontier Kansas counties in the investigation of criminal offenses associated with livestock, including investigations that are multi-jurisdictional in nature. The Unit, consisting of two Kansas certified law enforcement officers (Special Agents) commissioned by the Attorney General, was originally established in FY 2014, as a unit of the Attorney General's Consumer Protection Division. In FY 2016, the Unit was moved from the Consumer Protection Division to the Criminal Litigation Division, as a unit in the Investigation Section. Additional investigative resources and support for the unit is provided by the Special Agent in Charge, Investigation section.

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance Measures

<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
		<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	
1. Number of request for assistance	B	34	42	45	45	45	45	45	44
2. Number of requests for assistance or investigations resolved or closed	B	22	63	45	30	45	45	45	51
3. Number of head of livestock recovered	B	58	36	0	20	700	800	800	245
4. Number of entities reached in public education and law enforcement training presentations	B	3	4	0	4	8	8	10	4

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Approved</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	32,455	45,319	35,896	39,639	51,286	52,500	55,000	44,167
Federal Funds	-	2,902	-	2,450	4,809	2,500	2,500	2,570
	\$ 32,455	\$ 48,221	\$ 35,896	\$ 42,089	\$ 56,095	\$ 55,000	\$ 57,500	\$ 46,737
<b>FTE</b>	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0

## Office of the Attorney General

### Criminal Litigation Division (Concealed Carry Licensing Unit)

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The elimination of funding would result in the inability to issue concealed carry licenses or answer questions for those already licensed. The reduction in funding would also eliminate the ability to renew licenses and would also prevent the revocation of licensees who are not in compliance with state law and that may be prohibited from possessing a firearm. The section would also be unable to defend administrative actions which would eliminate due process to applicants or licensees who were previously denied a license or had their license revoked. Additionally, concealed carry instructors would no longer be certified or regulated to provide firearms safety classes.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Requirement</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
K.S.A. 75-7c01 et seq., K.A.R. 16-11-1 through K.A.R. 16-11-8	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

A. Administer and regulate the issuance of concealed carry handgun licenses (CCHL) pursuant to the 2006 Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act (K.S.A. 75-7c01 et seq.) (K.A.R. 16-11-1 through K.A. R. 16-11-8). The Act became effective July 1, 2006 and the first licenses were issued January 3, 2007. Per statute, licenses are charged at \$132.50 with \$100 going to the Office of the Attorney General and \$32.50 to the sheriff of the county where the applicant resides to pay for fingerprinting and processing the initial application. A budget proviso reduced the application fee paid to the OAG to \$79.50 for FY 2022. Currently, \$47 of each initial application fee paid to the OAG is in turn paid to the KBI for conducting the state and national background checks. Licenses are valid for four years. Renewal licenses are charged at \$25 (plus a \$15 late fee- if renewing within 6 months after expiration) and deposited with the Office of the Attorney General. There is no fee paid to the sheriff's offices during the renewal process as the renewal applications are submitted directly to the Office of the Attorney General. A renewed license is also valid for four years. Objective #1: Receive license applications from the county sheriffs, conduct background checks on the applicants and either approve or deny requests for a license within the 90-day period allowed by the Act.

B. Administer and regulate the issuance of concealed carry handgun licenses (CCHL) pursuant to the 2006 Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act (K.S.A. 75-7c01 et seq.) (K.A.R. 16-11-1 through K.A. R. 16-11-8). The Act became effective July 1, 2006 and the first licenses were issued January 3, 2007.

Per statute, licenses are charged at \$132.50 with \$100 going to the Office of the Attorney General and \$32.50 to the sheriff of the county where the applicant resides to pay for fingerprinting and processing the initial application. A budget proviso reduced the application fee paid to the OAG to \$79.50 for FY 2022. Currently, \$47 of each initial application fee paid to the OAG is in turn paid to the KBI for conducting the state and national background checks. Licenses are valid for four years.

## Office of the Attorney General

### Program Goals (Continued)

Renewal licenses are charged at \$25 (plus a \$15 late fee- if renewing within 6 months after expiration) and deposited with the Office of the Attorney General. There is no fee paid to the sheriff's offices during the renewal process as the renewal applications are submitted directly to the Office of the Attorney General. A renewed license is also valid for four years. Objective #5: Certify and regulate concealed carry handgun instructors authorized to conduct the required weapons and safety training class.

### Program History

In 2006, the Personal and Family Protection Act was signed into law. The Act's passage marked the first time that licensed concealed carry of handguns was allowed in Kansas. As a result, the Attorney General was tasked with overseeing the licensing process; as a result, the Concealed Carry Licensing Unit (CCLU) was created. The CCLU is the centralized unit in Kansas which administers and enforces the licensing provisions of the Act. The CCLU section reviews original concealed carry of handgun applications and either approves or denies them, suspends or revokes licensees that come out of compliance with applicable statutes and reviews renewal applications for those that reapply and approves eligible applicants or denies those that are ineligible; The CCLU also monitors recognition of the Kansas licensees by other jurisdictions and assists with litigation involving denials, suspensions and revocations through administrative actions. In addition, the CCLU approves or denies applications to be a concealed carry handgun training instructor and monitors those instructors for continued compliance. The CCLU also provides instruction and education to various groups across the state.

### Performance Measures

		<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i> <i>Previous</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of new licenses issued	A	4,282	4,645	6,893	6,000	4,952	5,000	5,000	5,497
2. Number renwals issued	A	12,630	12,630	14,532	25,000	18,361	20,000	20,000	15,174
3. Percentage of license applications fully processed within 90 days	A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Instructor orientation classes held	B	3	2	0	2	0	2	2	1
5. Instructor certifications withdrawn	B	26	33	167	25	34	25	25	78

# Office of the Attorney General

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	808,478	821,036	938,676	1,099,620	893,633	1,006,317	1,011,325	884,448
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$ 808,478	\$ 821,036	\$ 938,676	\$ 1,099,620	\$ 893,633	\$ 1,006,317	\$ 1,011,325	\$ 884,448
<b>FTE</b>	8.25	8.25	8.25	8.25	8.25	8.25	8.25	8.3

## Office of the Attorney General

### Criminal Litigation Division (Private Detective Unit)

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The PDLU would be unable to pay the overhead and staffing costs associated with the administration of new licenses and certifications issued by the PDLU; the litigation of any challenged administrative action that is taken/proposed against an applicant or licensee within the reach of the PDLU. While discretionary in most instances, Licenses that are subject to suspension, revocation or other administrative process would not have those actions taken against them – resulting in persons being licensed by the State when the law may not allow them to hold such status; Applicant's inability to challenge a denial of a license/permit/certification; and persons remaining licensed by the State when the law may not allow them to hold such status. The PDLU would be unable to pay OAH administrative appeal costs, resulting in, at best, an in-house employee serving as an administrative hearing officer and pulling them away from their other necessary duties or a lack of any administrative actions being taken against problematic licensees because those funds cannot be covered. Licenses would expire with no advanced warning and no recourse; licensees would be unable to renew their licensures/certifications where the law generally requires an approval unless disqualified; licensees would be unable to challenge the lack of an approval or denial of their renewal application(s) for continued licensure/certification. The law generally requires an approval unless shown disqualified; Overall, applicants and licensees would generally be deprived of the due process that current Kansas statutes afford them.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Requirement</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
K.S.A. 75-7b01 through 75-7b23; K.A.R. 16-1-7 through 16-6-3	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

A. Provide licensing services and maintain accurate information on persons and agencies licensed as private detectives and agencies in the State of Kansas. Maintain the licensing records in a manner that supports office use and public access. Objective #1: Strive to effectively and efficiently manage the PDLU.

#### Program History

The agency provides licensing services and maintains accurate information on persons and agencies licensed as private detectives and agencies in the State of Kansas and maintains the licensing records in a manner that support office use and public access. This fund and the responsibilities were brought over from the Kansas Bureau of Investigation on July 1, 2012.

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance Measures

		<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of licensed independent private detectives	A	121	121	128	120	134	125	125	128
2. Number of private detective agencies	A	121	124	110	120	99	110	110	111
3. Number of private detectives licensed through agencies	A	287	284	250	250	238	250	250	257
4. Private detectives with firearm permits	A	116	115	111	110	113	110	110	113
5. Certified firearms trainers	A	11	11	12	10	10	10	10	11
6. Complaint cases resolved	A	5	5	2	5	1	5	5	3
<i>Output Measures</i>									
7. New applications processed	A	61	78	77	70	85	70	70	80
8. Renewal applications processed	A	288	128	171	200	104	275	225	134
9. Complaint cases opened	A	5	0	7	5	3	5	5	3

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	79,569	72,114	78,888	88,087	28,997	45,340	45,659	60,000
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$ 79,569	\$ 72,114	\$ 78,888	\$ 88,087	\$ 28,997	\$ 45,340	\$ 45,659	\$ 60,000
<b>FTE</b>	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5

## Office of the Attorney General

### Criminal Litigation Division (Bail Enforcement Licensing Unit)

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The elimination of funding would result in an inability to process new applications and administer those already licensed, eliminate the ability to litigate challenged administrative actions and eliminate the ability to investigate and/or litigate complaints against licensees and those who are unlicensed in accordance with the Kansas Consumer Protection Act.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
K.S.A. 75-e01 through 75-7e09; K.A.R. 16-15-1 through K.A.R. 16-15-4	Mandatory	No	3

#### Program Goals

A. Provide licensing services and maintain accurate information on persons and agencies licensed as bail enforcement agents (or “bounty hunters”) in the State of Kansas. Maintain the licensing records in a manner that supports office use and public access. Objective #1: Strive to effectively and efficiently manage the BEALU.

#### Program History

The Bail Enforcement Agent Unit began under the Attorney General’s Office in 2016. The Bail Enforcement Agent Licensing Act (BEALA), or “bounty hunter” licensing act. The BEALA was instituted to license BEAs (those that track down persons who have skipped court proceedings while on a bail bond – but also do not have the approval/licensure of a Court or the Kansas Insurance Department to issue bail bonds). This unit is responsible for processing new and renewal applications and monitoring compliance with license requirements.

#### Performance Measures

		<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Initial BEA applications received	A	23	27	30	25	20	25	25	26
2. BEA renewal applications received	A	7	5	9	10	7	10	10	7

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance Measures (Continued)

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022 Previous	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	3- yr. Avg.
		Actuals	Actuals	Actuals	Est.	Actuals	Est.	Est.	
4. Application denials	A	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. Application administrative challenges	A	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
6. Administrative hearings: Prehearing Resolution	A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Administrative hearings: Hearings Conducted	A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. Complaint cases opened	A	1	1	3	1	2	1	1	2
9. Complaint cases closed	A	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
10. Action taken on License	A	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1

## Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	3,105	3,109	3,371	4,551	2,900	5,000	5,000	3,127
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$ 3,105	\$ 3,109	\$ 3,371	\$ 4,551	\$ 2,900	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 3,127

FTE                      --                      --                      --                      --                      --                      --                      --

## Office of the Attorney General

### Legal Opinions and Government Counsel Division

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Attorney General would not be able to comply with the long-standing statutory duties. Legislators, the governor, secretary of state, state treasurer, state board of education, commissioner of insurance, county attorneys and other state agencies or officials would not be able to benefit from the research and legal analysis of the Office of the Attorney General; opinions help to provide uniformity across the state on legal issues addressed. While we do not provide legal advice to legislators, public agencies and state or local public officials unless they are a client, we do provide resources and educational materials that will assist the person or entity to understand the law in order to draw their own legal conclusion in light of the particular facts. The consequence of not funding this program is a potential increase in costs to the public official or agency to obtain a basic understanding of the law. If this program is not funded, the State may be disadvantaged in litigation or unable to meet requirements imposed by the Legislature.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Requirement</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
K.S.A. 75-704, K.S.A. 77-701 et seq.	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

A. To provide formal written opinions to the Legislature, Governor, Secretary of State, State Treasurer, State Board of Education, Commissioner of Insurance and other public officials that may settle a question of law or provide a certain and uniform method of analyzing a legal question in an unbiased manner. To provide County and District Attorneys with consultation and advice in all matters pertaining to their official duties. When assigned by Administration, to appropriately respond to emails, letters, and other communication from legislators, public agencies and state or local public officials requesting information on a legal issue. To annually update guidelines to assist state agencies in evaluating proposed governmental actions and in determining whether such actions may constitute a taking. To assist the Office of the Attorney General with legal research and special projects, such as promulgating regulations in response to a newly enacted state law. K.S.A. 75-704, K.S.A. 77701 et seq. Objective #1: To research and issue written legal opinions requested by legislators, public agencies, and officials.

B. To provide formal written opinions to the Legislature, Governor, Secretary of State, State Treasurer, State Board of Education, Commissioner of Insurance and other public officials that may settle a question of law or provide a certain and uniform method of analyzing a legal question in an unbiased manner. To provide County and District Attorneys with consultation and advice in all matters pertaining to their official duties. When assigned by Administration, to appropriately respond to emails, letters, and other communication from legislators, public agencies and state or local public officials requesting information on a legal issue. To annually update guidelines to assist state agencies in evaluating proposed governmental actions and in determining whether such actions may constitute a taking. To assist the Office of the Attorney General with legal research and special projects, such as promulgating regulations in response to a newly enacted state law. K.S.A. 75-704, K.S.A. 77701 et seq. Objective #2: Consult with and advise county and district attorneys, when requested by them, in all matters pertaining to their official duties. When assigned by Administration, appropriately respond to emails, letters, and other communication from legislators, public agencies and state or local public officials requesting information on a legal issue.

## Office of the Attorney General

### Program Goals (Continued)

C. To provide formal written opinions to the Legislature, Governor, Secretary of State, State Treasurer, State Board of Education, Commissioner of Insurance and other public officials that may settle a question of law or provide a certain and uniform method of analyzing a legal question in an unbiased manner. To provide County and District Attorneys with consultation and advice in all matters pertaining to their official duties. When assigned by Administration, to appropriately respond to emails, letters, and other communication from legislators, public agencies and state or local public officials requesting information on a legal issue. To annually update guidelines to assist state agencies in evaluating proposed governmental actions and in determining whether such actions may constitute a taking. To assist the Office of the Attorney General with legal research and special projects, such as promulgating regulations in response to a newly enacted state law. K.S.A. 75-704, K.S.A. 77701 et seq. Objective #3: Annually update guidelines to assist state agencies in evaluating proposed governmental actions and in determining whether such actions may constitute a taking. Assist the Attorney General with research and special projects, such as responding to requirements imposed by the Legislature or other authority and anticipating legal developments in the State to put the State in the best posture in the event litigation arises.

D. To respond to inquiries of the public, as directed by Administration, by providing information and directing individuals to appropriate public agencies or private entities for assistance as needed. Objective #1: Respond to miscellaneous correspondence, email, and telephone inquiries from the public, as directed by Administration.

E. To respond to inquiries of the public, as directed by Administration, by providing information and directing individuals to appropriate public agencies or private entities for assistance as needed. Objective #2: Catalogue and disseminate written legal opinions as they are issued. Assist the public in accessing older opinions.

F. Investigate complaints that suggest potential Kansas Architectural Accessibility Act (KAAA) violations, or refer investigation of such matters to local prosecutors. K.S.A. 58-1304.

### Program History

This Division is responsible for researching and issuing written legal opinions requested by legislators, public agencies, and other officials; for annually updating guidelines to assist state agencies in evaluate whether proposed governmental actions may constitute a taking; for reviewing new and amended proposed agency rules and regulations; for reviewing bond and temporary note issue transcripts; and for reviewing deeds easements, leases, and special assessments on state property. The Division also serves as general counsel to 29 state boards and commissions that have no in-house counsel. The Division is also responsible for providing public education and training on the Kansas Open Meetings Act (KOMA) and the Kansas Open Records Act (KORA). In addition, the Division is responsible for investigating potential violations of the Kansas Architectural Accessibility Act. Since 1879, it has been a statutory responsibility for the Attorney General to consult with and advise county attorneys, and to research and draft formal written opinions, without fee, upon all questions of law submitted to him or her by the legislature, or either branch thereof, or by the governor, secretary of state, state treasurer, state board of education, or commissioner of insurance. K.S.A. 75-704.

## Office of the Attorney General

### Program History (Continued)

The Attorney General Opinions are issued upon the request of other public officials at the discretion of the Attorney General, taking into consideration the significance of the issue to the state, the resources required to address the issue, the availability of such resources, and other determinative factors. K.S.A. 75-704 has been amended on two occasions to substitute or strike an entity from the list of entities to whom the Attorney General is required to give a written opinion. While not a statutory responsibility, the Office of the Attorney General provides resources and educational materials to legislators, public agencies and state or local public officials to assist the person or entity to understand the law applicable to their issue. The review of regulations, municipal bond transcripts, deeds and easements and interlocal agreements are statutory responsibilities for the Attorney General. See K.S.A. 77-420, K.S.A. 10-108, 12-3425, 75-3743 and numerous statutes in Chapter 76 dealing with approval of Regents Institutions land transactions, and K.S.A. 12-2904. There have been no significant amendments to the laws relating to the reviews listed above. The OAG provides government counsel to boards and commissions as required by specific statutes and under the general authority to represent the State. Government counsel includes attending meetings and hearings, drafting orders, pleadings and other legal documents, providing legal advice, reviewing contracts and memoranda of understanding, revising regulations, and any other legal services as needed by the client. Larger, fee-funded agencies are billed for these services on an annual basis.

In 2016, the OAG separated the responsibility for enforcing open government laws from the responsibility for training and outreach to assist in compliance. Separating the two tasks, which historically have been combined, set the stage for stepped-up enforcement of the Kansas Open Records Act and Kansas Open Meetings Act as well as increased training and outreach activities. Training and Compliance remains within the LOGIC Division. The OAG, as with other public agencies, is dedicated to assisting constituents in obtaining a resolution to their issues, if possible. However, the OAG is not permitted to provide legal advice to private citizens but often assists the constituent by providing resources or educational materials, as directed by Administration. Since 1991, it has been the responsibility of the OAG to oversee the enforcement of the Kansas Architectural Accessibility Act (KAAA).

### Performance Measures

		<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i> <i>Previous</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percentage of written legal opinions requested that are considered in a timely manner	A	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%
2. Percentage of communication responded in a timely manner	B	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance Measures (Continued)

### Output Measures

3. Number of written legal opinions issued	A	16	12	6	15	9	15	15	9
4. Number of communications received	B	1,580	2,253	2,845	3,000	2,198	2,500	2,500	2,432

### Additional Measures as Necessary

5. Number of special projects handled	C	24	71	23	45	13	25	25	36
6. Number of inquiries received from the public	D	253	583	526	600	165	300	300	425
7. Number of KAAA investigations conducted by office or referrals made	F	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 513,434	\$ 350,208	\$ 243,633	\$ 181,851	\$ 153,104	\$ 226,043	\$ 228,277	\$ 248,982
Non-SGF State Funds	109,611	152,992	117,281	374,606	106,164	528,358	530,053	125,479
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$ 623,045	\$ 503,200	\$ 360,914	\$ 556,457	\$ 259,268	\$ 754,401	\$ 758,330	\$ 374,461
<b>FTE</b>	7.75	7.75	7.75	4.95	4.95	4.95	4.95	6.82

## Office of the Attorney General

### Legal Opinions and Government Counsel Division (Bond Review)

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Bond review is required by state statute and demanded by the market before bonds and notes are registered and sold to protect the governmental entities, taxpayers and purchasers by ensuring compliance with state law. State real property may be improperly disposed of or used in an illegal or unauthorized manner. Municipalities may enter into agreements that do not comply with state law.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Requirement</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
K.S.A. 10-108; K.S.A. 75-750	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

A. To review for legality all proposed rules and regulations. To review the issuance of bond and temporary notes for legality and sufficiency of associated transcripts of proceedings. To review contracts affecting state property, including deeds, easements, leases and special assessments. To review interlocal agreements submitted by local units of government. K.S.A. 77-420, 10-108, 12-3425, 75-3743, 74-3264, 75-2131, 122904 and others. Objective #1: Review any proposed adoption, amendment, or revocation of agency rules and regulations pursuant to K.S.A. 77-420 to determine whether the proposed action is within the scope of the agency's authority and appears to be consistent with applicable statutory and constitutional law.

B. To review for legality all proposed rules and regulations. To review the issuance of bond and temporary notes for legality and sufficiency of associated transcripts of proceedings. To review contracts affecting state property, including deeds, easements, leases and special assessments. To review interlocal agreements submitted by local units of government. K.S.A. 77-420, 10-108, 12-3425, 75-3743, 74-3264, 75-2131, 122904 and others. Objective #2: Perform an independent review of the legality of the issuance of bonds and notes by governmental entities and the sufficiency of the transcript of proceedings used by municipalities to issue bonds and temporary notes.

C. To review for legality all proposed rules and regulations. To review the issuance of bond and temporary notes for legality and sufficiency of associated transcripts of proceedings. To review contracts affecting state property, including deeds, easements, leases and special assessments. To review interlocal agreements submitted by local units of government. K.S.A. 77-420, 10-108, 12-3425, 75-3743, 74-3264, 75-2131, 122904 and others. Objective #3: Review easements, special assessments, deeds and leases on state property as statutorily required for form and/or substance.

D. To review for legality all proposed rules and regulations. To review the issuance of bond and temporary notes for legality and sufficiency of associated transcripts of proceedings. To review contracts affecting state property, including deeds, easements, leases and special assessments. To review interlocal agreements submitted by local units of government. K.S.A. 77-420, 10-108, 12-3425, 75-3743, 74-3264, 75-2131, 122904 and others. Objective #4: Review Interlocal Cooperation Act agreements as statutorily required for form and/or substance.

#### Program History

The attorney general is authorized to fix, charge and collect fees for review and examination of the transcripts of the proceedings of municipalities for the issuance of municipal bonds under K.S.A. 10-108.

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance Measures

		<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percentage of proposed State agency regulations reviewed in a timely manner	A	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
2. Number of Regulations reviewed	A	626	632	701	750	645	750	750	659
3. Number of bond/temporary note transcripts reviewed	B	226	319	336	340	246	320	320	300
4. Number of easements, special assessments, deeds and leases reviewed	C	13	15	11	15	13	15	15	13
5. Number of interlocal agreements reviewed	D	91	74	43	50	44	45	45	54

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4
Non-SGF State Funds	120,983	103,531	89,637	90,328	89,414	95,768	96,122	94,194
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$ 120,983	\$ 103,531	\$ 89,648	\$ 90,328	\$ 89,414	\$ 95,768	\$ 96,122	\$ 94,198
<b>FTE</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.92

## Office of the Attorney General

### Legal Opinions and Government Counsel Division (Open Government)

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Office of the Attorney General would not be able to comply with its statutory duties under the Kansas Open Records Act and the Kansas Open Meetings Act. The Office of the Attorney General would not be able to comply with its statutory duty under the Kansas Open Meetings Act and the Kansas Open Records Act. The Office of the Attorney General is the primary resource for information on Kansas open government laws. If the function is not funded, inadvertent violations of the law would likely increase, hindering the objectives of the statutes. In addition, constituents would not understand their rights under the open government law.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Requirement</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
K.S.A. 75-761; 45-216; 45-218; 75-4317	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

A. To provide training and outreach to public officials, public agencies, and the public to help prevent violations of the Kansas Open Meetings Act (K.S.A. 75-4317 et seq.) and the Kansas Open Records Act (K.S.A. 45-215 et seq.). To provide for the information and education of governmental entities and the public on matters related to the Kansas Open Meetings Act and the Kansas Open Records Act. To respond to open records request submitted to the Office of the Attorney General. K.S.A. 75-4317 et seq., 45-215 et seq., 75-761. Objective #1: Provide training for public officials and the public throughout the state.

B. To provide training and outreach to public officials, public agencies, and the public to help prevent violations of the Kansas Open Meetings Act (K.S.A. 75-4317 et seq.) and the Kansas Open Records Act (K.S.A. 45-215 et seq.). To provide for the information and education of governmental entities and the public on matters related to the Kansas Open Meetings Act and the Kansas Open Records Act. To respond to open records request submitted to the Office of the Attorney General. K.S.A. 75-4317 et seq., 45-215 et seq., 75-761. Objective #2: Provide information and education on the Open Meetings Act and the Open Records Act to governmental entities subject to those acts, interested persons contacting the office, and the public at large. Respond to open records requests submitted to the Office of the Attorney General.

#### Program History

The Office of the Attorney General created the Open Government Training Advisory Group in response to KSA 75-761 passed in 2015. The group assists in developing the training and outreach the OAG provides to public officials, public agencies, and the public to help prevent violations of the Kansas Open Meetings Act (K.S.A. 75-4317 et seq.) and the Kansas Open Records Act (K.S.A. 45-215 et seq.). To provide for the information and education of governmental entities and the public on matters related to the Kansas Open Meetings Act and the Kansas Open Records Act. To respond to open records request submitted to the Office of the Attorney General.

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance Measures

		<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i> <i>Previous</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of KOMA/KORA presentations	A	27	35	43	50	46	50	50	41
2. Number of inquiries (e.g. emails, letters, and telephone calls) regarding KOMA/KORA, including records requests	B	2,425	3,173	3,254	3,300	3,571	3,600	3,600	3,333

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019</i> <i>Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020</i> <i>Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021</i> <i>Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022</i> <i>Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022</i> <i>Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023</i> <i>Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024</i> <i>Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 91,001	\$ 95,154	\$ 96,821	\$ 98,128	\$ 123,672	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 105,216
Non-SGF State Funds	1,771	5,350	5,981	6,639	6,289	6,289	6,289	5,873
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$ 92,772	\$ 100,504	\$ 102,802	\$ 104,767	\$ 129,961	\$ 131,289	\$ 131,289	\$ 111,089
<b>FTE</b>	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.3

## Office of the Attorney General

### Legal Opinions and Government Counsel Division (Contract General Counsel)

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The counseled agencies may not be able to access legal counsel trained in state legal and regulatory affairs on an affordable basis. Not using or under-utilizing legal counsel could result in violation of state law, expense to the state to defend and/or settle lawsuits, a delay in handling licensing discipline matters, and harm to the agencies' interests as the result of unfavorable contracts. By representing a number of smaller agencies, the OAG provides the most efficient and cost effective legal representation for the State. The OAG would not be able to comply with its duty with respect to these important statutorily created entities.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Requirement</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
K.S.A. 75-769; K.S.A. 41-201 (Alcohol Beverage Control); 74-8715 (Lottery); 75-1515 (State Fire Marshal); and generally pursuant to 75-702 and 75-710; 77-423 (State Rules and Regulations Board); 75-4101 (Surety Bonds and Insurance); 46-2303 (Joint Committee on State/Tribal Relations); and as designated by the Attorney General pursuant to 75-710; 66-106 (Corporation Commission); 74-4206 (Real Estate Commission); 74-7029; 74-8809; and 74-4908.	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

A. To serve as general counsel for state boards and commissions that have no in-house counsel, helping them to pursue a proper course of conduct and avoid litigation through the provision of advice and consultation. Pursuant to K.S.A. 75-769, the Office of the Attorney General has authority to charge legal representation charges to state agencies. To serve as the Attorney General's designee on certain statutorily created entities. K.S.A. 77-423, 75-4101, 46-2303, 75-710, 66-106, 74-4206, 74-4908, 74-7029, 41-201, 75-1515, 75-1516, 74-8715, 77-8809. Objective #1: As general counsel for 29 boards and commissions that have no in-house counsel, attend administrative board meetings and hearings, draft orders, and assist with other legal matters as necessary.

B. To serve as general counsel for state boards and commissions that have no in-house counsel, helping them to pursue a proper course of conduct and avoid litigation through the provision of advice and consultation. Pursuant to K.S.A. 75-769, the Office of the Attorney General has authority to charge legal representation charges to state agencies. To serve as the Attorney General's designee on certain statutorily created entities. K.S.A. 77-423, 75-4101, 46-2303, 75-710, 66-106, 74-4206, 74-4908, 74-7029, 41-201, 75-1515, 75-1516, 74-8715, 77-8809. Objective #2: Serve as the Attorney General's designee on statutorily created entities such as the State Rules and Regulations Board, State Records Board, Committee on Surety Bonds and Insurance, and the Joint Committee on State/Tribal Relations or as directed.

# Office of the Attorney General

## Program History

Effective June 1, 2017, S.B. 149, sec. 2(a) (Now codified in K.S.A. 75-769) established that, "The attorney general may determine, fix and establish a system of legal representation charges and collect such charges from any state agency to which the attorney general provides legal services. The attorney general may determine the amount of legal representation charges due from the state agency by use of a schedule of fees and costs for legal services published by the attorney general or by entering into an agreement with a state agency for payment by such agency for legal services. Such schedule of fees and costs shall not exceed the amount of compensation established pursuant to K.S.A. 22-4507, and amendments thereto, for attorneys appointed by the court to perform services for an indigent person.

## Performance Measures

		FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022 Previous	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	
<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. State agency meetings/hearings attended	A	240	295	453	475	323	400	400	357
2. Legal documents created or reviewed	A	600	1,049	1,214	1,200	1,017	1,200	1,200	1,093
3. Communications (letter, email, telephone calls) with agencies	A	6,887	9,719	12,741	12,000	16,426	17,000	17,000	12,962
4. Statutorily created entity meetings/hearings attended	B	27	24	26	26	9	26	26	20

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	FY 2019 <i>Actuals</i>	FY 2020 <i>Actuals</i>	FY 2021 <i>Actuals</i>	FY 2022 <i>Approved</i>	FY 2022 <i>Actuals</i>	FY 2023 <i>Est.</i>	FY 2024 <i>Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	(571)	320,625	28,612	377,640	156,281	330,600	330,600	168,506
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$ (571)	\$ 320,625	\$ 28,612	\$ 377,640	\$ 156,281	\$ 330,600	\$ 330,600	\$ 168,506
<b>FTE</b>	--	--	--	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8	0.9

## Office of the Attorney General

### Legal Opinions and Government Counsel Division (Racial/Biased Based Policing)

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The program is not currently funded. The administrative responsibilities of the act were absorbed into this division.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
K.S.A. 22-4606 et seq	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

A. To carry out the Office of the Attorney General's duties under the racial or other biased based policing statutes, K.S.A. 22-4606 et seq, including processing and reviewing complaints received by the OAG; collecting and publishing law enforcement agency Racial or Other Biased Based Policing annual reports; and providing training and community outreach on racial and other bias based policing. The LOGiC Division assumed responsibility for this activity on May 1, 2017. Objective #1: Review each racial or other biased based policing complaint filed with this office and make a determination of the appropriate action on each complaint.

B. To carry out the Office of the Attorney General's duties under the racial or other biased based policing statutes, K.S.A. 22-4606 et seq, including processing and reviewing complaints received by the OAG; collecting and publishing law enforcement agency Racial or Other Biased Based Policing annual reports; and providing training and community outreach on racial and other bias based policing. The LOGiC Division assumed responsibility for this activity on May 1, 2017. Objective #2: Collect and publish law enforcement agency Racial and Other Biased Based Policing annual reports.

#### Program History

To carry out the Office of the Attorney General's duties under the racial or other biased based policing statutes, K.S.A. 22-4606 et seq, including processing and reviewing complaints received by the OAG; collecting and publishing law enforcement agency Racial or Other Biased Based Policing annual reports; and providing training and community outreach on racial and other bias based policing. The LOGiC Division assumed the administrative responsibilities for this activity on May 1, 2017.

#### Performance Measures

		FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Outcome Measures		Goal	Actuals	Actuals	Actuals	Actuals	Est.	Est.	
1. Percent of racial profiling complaints which were acknowledged within 10 days	A		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
2. Percent of non-exempt agencies filing annual report	B		98%	94%	99%	99%	99%	99%	97%

# Office of the Attorney General

<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Number of racial profiling related complaints received and opened for review	A	26	17	26	25	25	30	30	23
4. Number of racial profiling complaints resolved or closed	A	22	20	27	25	24	30	30	24

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,334	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	240	1	-	-	28	-	-	10
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$ 1,574	\$ 1	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 28	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10
<b>FTE</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Office of the Attorney General

### Consumer Protection Division

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

There would not be an entity authorized to enforce the Kansas Consumer Protection Act throughout the state, that work would be shifted to the County and District level. By not enforcing the act, businesses would be allowed to conduct business in deceptive and unconscionable ways without consequence, other than the private action of consumers. The less informed consumers are of common schemes and scams, the less equipped consumers will be to protect themselves from the financial and personal hardships that they might suffer as a result of falling victim to these fraud. The KCPA specifically provides penalties for fraud against vulnerable consumers, and much of the education and outreach of the Office of Attorney General is to that demographic, e.g. senior citizens.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Requirement</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
K.S.A. 50-623 through K.S.A. 50-643, in particular K.S.A. 50-632	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

A. To provide efficient, effective, and ethical enforcement of the Kansas Consumer Protection Act (KCPA) and other state and federal consumer protection laws. K.S.A. 50-623 et seq. Objective #1: To receive, process, investigate, and act on consumer complaints in a timely manner.

B. To provide efficient, effective, and ethical enforcement of the Kansas Consumer Protection Act (KCPA) and other state and federal consumer protection laws. K.S.A. 50-623 et seq. Objective #2: To effectively, efficiently, and ethically prosecute or otherwise enforce the Kansas Consumer Protection Act against suppliers for violations of the Act.

C. To provide efficient and effective education of the public, law enforcement officials, legal profession, and providers of goods and services on issues related to the Kansas Consumer Protection Act in order to reduce or prevent the occurrence of consumer fraud. Objective #1: Prevent consumers from becoming victims of deceptive and unconscionable acts and practices by educating them and providing them with written educational materials.

D. To provide efficient, effective and ethical enforcement of the Kansas False Claims Act (KFCA). K.S.A. 75-7501–7511. Objective #1: To receive, process, investigate and act on complaints pertaining to the KFCA, and ethically prosecute or otherwise enforce the matters falling within the parameters of the KFCA.

E. To provide efficient, effective and ethical enforcement of the Unauthorized Practice of Law statute, K.S.A. 50-6,142. Objective #1: To receive, process, investigate and act on complaints pertaining to the Unauthorized Practice of Law (UPL) statute and ethically prosecute or otherwise enforce matters falling within the parameters of the UPL statute.

F. To provide efficient, effective and ethical enforcement of the Kansas Wayne Owen Act (KWOA), K.S.A. 50-6,139 et seq. Objective #1: To receive, process, investigate and act on complaints pertaining to KWOA, and ethically prosecute or otherwise enforce the matters falling within the parameters the statute.

G. To provide efficient, effective and ethical enforcement of the Kansas Data Breach Statutes. K.S.A. 50-7a01 et seq., and K.S.A. 50-6,139b. Objective #1: To receive, process, investigate and act on complaints pertaining to data breaches, and ethically prosecute or otherwise enforce the matters falling within the parameters the statute.

## Office of the Attorney General

H. To provide efficient, effective, and ethical enforcement of the Kansas No Call Act. Objective #1: To receive, process, investigate, and act on consumer no call complaints in a timely manner.

## Office of the Attorney General

### Program History

This Division is responsible for safeguarding the citizens of Kansas by educating consumers and businesses and providing efficient, effective, and ethical enforcement of consumer protection laws, including the Kansas Consumer Protection Act, the Kansas Charitable Organizations and Solicitations Act, the Kansas False Claims Act, the Kansas Roofing Registration Act, the Kansas Wayne Owen Act, the Kansas No Call Act, the Scrap Metal Theft Reduction Act, the unauthorized practice of law statutes, consumer information data protection laws, and state and federal antitrust laws.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>		<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
<i>Goal</i>		<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percent of filed complaints processed in a timely manner 2. Percent of requests for consumer educational outreach presentations granted 3. Percent of filed complaints processed in a timely manner 4. Percent of filed complaints processed in a timely manner 5. Percent of filed complaints processed in a timely manner 6. Percent of filed complaints processed in a timely manner 7. Percent of complaint files in which timely responses are filed, served or conveyed	A	99%	95%	98%	99%	99%	99%	99%	97%
	C	96%	100%	91%	97%	100%	97%	97%	97%
	D	100%	95%	98%	99%	99%	99%	99%	97%
	E	100%	95%	100%	99%	99%	99%	99%	98%
	F	100%	95%	100%	99%	99%	99%	99%	98%
	G	100%	95%	78%	99%	98%	99%	99%	90%
	H	99%	95%	93%	99%	98%	99%	99%	95%

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance (Continued)

<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
8. Complaint files opened	A	2,399	2,817	3,856	3,500	3,099	3,500	3,500	3,257
9. Complaints resolved or closed	A	2,459	2,626	4,032	3,500	3,138	3,500	3,500	3,265
10. Amount of consumer savings returned directly to consumers, as a result of investigations in the form of refunds, debts or obligations canceled, and products delivered, repaired or replaced without litigation	A	\$2,795,962	\$2,288,319	\$2,077,333	\$2,000,000	\$2,427,250	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,264,301
11. Amount of recoveries resulting from investigations through Assurance of Voluntary Compliance Agreements	A	\$4,519,990	\$25,000	\$418,276	\$200,000	\$1,474,234	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$639,170
12. Litigation files opened on new complaints	B	13	21	27	25	16	25	25	21
13. Amount of penalties and fees recovered in enforcement actions deposited into the State General Fund as consistent with the related court order	B	\$77,746	\$11,559	\$77,432	\$50,000	\$674,450	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$254,480

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance (Continued)

Output Measures									
		FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	
	Goal	Actuals	Actuals	Actuals	Previous Est.	Actuals	Est.	Est.	3- yr. Avg.
14. Amount of penalties (which go into Court Cost Fund) and fees recovered in enforcement actions deposited into the Consumer Court Cost Fund as consistent with the related court order	B	\$3,761,072	\$3,309,293	\$1,543,752	\$1,000,000	\$39,143	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,630,729
15. Consumer educational outreach presentations made	C	43	7	10	20	12	50	50	10
16. Complaints filed concerning false claims	D	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	2
17. Litigation files opened on new complaints	D	1	0	0	2	0	2	2	0
18. Number of complaints concerning false claims resolved or closed	D	4	1	5	5	2	5	5	3
15. Number of new complaints filed concerning UPL	E	10	8	12	10	11	10	10	10
16. Number of litigation files opened on new complaints	E	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0
17. Number of complaints concerning UPL resolved or closed	E	18	5	15	10	12	12	12	11
18. Number of new complaints filed concerning KWOA	F	2	6	17	3	0	5	5	8
19. Number of litigation files opened on KWOA investigations	F	0	0	0	3	0	3	3	0
20. Number of complaints concerning KWOA resolved or closed	F	5	4	7	3	3	3	3	5

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance (Continued)

		FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	
Output Measures	Goal	Actuals	Actuals	Actuals	Previous Est.	Actuals	Est.	Est.	3- yr. Avg.
21. Number of new complaints filed concerning data breaches	G	14	13	18	30	20	20	20	17
22. Number of litigation files opened on data breach investigations	G	2	0	0	2	1	2	2	0
23. Number of complaints concerning data breaches resolved or closed	G	33	9	15	30	23	30	30	16
24. Number of new complaints filed concerning no call violations	H	513	356	364	500	248	250	250	323
25. Number of litigation files opened on no call investigations	H	2	0	2	3	0	3	3	1
26. Number of complaints concerning no call violations resolved or closed	H	536	385	466	500	245	500	500	365
27. Amount of penalties and fees recovered in enforcement actions deposited into the No Call Court Cost Fund as consistent with the related court order	H	\$14,140	\$21,500	\$15,000	\$20,000	\$0	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$12,167

## Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 128,540	\$ 135,217	\$ 136,558	\$ 131,424	\$ 74,364	\$ 75,547	\$ 75,992	\$ 115,380
Non-SGF State Funds	1,754,610	1,964,194	1,918,006	5,567,985	2,793,631	36,511,922	10,424,077	2,225,277
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$1,883,150	\$2,099,411	\$2,054,564	\$ 5,699,409	\$2,867,995	\$36,587,469	\$10,500,069	\$2,340,657
FTE	19.45	19.45	19.45	20.25	20.25	20.25	20.25	19.72

# Office of the Attorney General

## Consumer Protection Division (Roofing Registration)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This Roofing Registration Unit was created pursuant to legislation authorizing the Attorney General to administer and implement the provisions of the KRRRA. This program is funded by fees generated by the program (registration fees, judgments, etc.). Not funding the program would leave Kansas consumers without the information that they need to protect themselves from unscrupulous contractors.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Requirement</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
K.S.A. 50-6,121 et seq	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. To provide efficient, effective and ethical enforcement of the Kansas Roofing Registration Act, K.S.A. 50-6,121 et seq. Objective #1: To receive, process, investigate, and publish annual roofing registration applications in a timely manner.

B. To provide efficient, effective and ethical enforcement of the Kansas Roofing Registration Act, K.S.A. 50-6,121 et seq. Objective #2: To investigate and recommend for prosecution any violations of the Roofing Registration Act (Act).

### Program History

The Kansas Roofing Registration Act (KRRRA) went into effect July 1, 2013. The KRRRA helps ensure Kansas consumers contract with reputable roofing contractors. Pursuant to K.S.A. 50-6,138, the KRRRA is a part of and supplemental to the KCPA, and any violation of the KRRRA is deemed to be a deceptive or unconscionable act or practice under the KCPA.

### Performance Measures

		<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percent of submitted roofing registrations which were reviewed and responded to within 60 days	A	100%	100%	99%	99%	100%	99%	99%	100%

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance Measures (Continued)

<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
		<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	
2. Number of roofing companies applying annually for registration	A	1,642	1,531	1,719	1,650	1,612	1,750	1,750	1,621
3. Number of roofing companies successfully completing the application process	A	1,631	1,455	1,408	1,600	1,464	1,500	1,500	1,442
4. Number of complaints filed concerning a roofing registration violation	B	133	145	106	175	86	130	130	112
5. Number of litigation files opened on new complaints	B	32	15	2	20	16	20	20	11
6. Number of complaints concerning roofing registration violations resolved or closed	B	142	131	133	150	64	130	130	109
7. Amount of penalties and fees recovered in enforcement actions deposited into the Roofing Civil Penalty Fund consistent with the related court order	B	\$101,682	\$87,521	\$79,035	\$90,000	\$18,631	\$90,000	\$90,000	\$61,729

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	388,763	442,408	406,000	489,155	397,687	497,159	499,073	415,365
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$ 388,763	\$ 442,408	\$ 406,000	\$ 489,155	\$ 397,687	\$ 497,159	\$ 499,073	\$ 415,365
<b>FTE</b>	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.83

## Office of the Attorney General

### Consumer Protection Division (Scrap Metal Licensing Unit)

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This program was created in order to register all scrap metal dealers, combat scrap metal theft, and provide law enforcement a resource to track scrap metal sales throughout the state.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Requirement</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
K.S.A. 50-6,109 et seq.	Mandatory	No	

#### Program Goals

- A. To provide efficient, effective, and ethical enforcement of the Scrap Metal Theft Reduction Act (SMTRA), K.S.A. 50-6,109 et seq. Objective #1: To receive, process, investigate, and publish annual scrap metal dealer registration applications in a timely manner.
- B. To provide efficient, effective, and ethical enforcement of the Scrap Metal Theft Reduction Act (SMTRA), K.S.A. 50-6,109 et seq. Objective #2: To enforce the Scrap Metal Theft Reduction Act through suspension and revocation of registration certificates.

#### Program History

On July 1, 2015 the "Scrap Metal Theft Reduction Act" (the Act) became effective by adding and amending laws related to scrap metal dealer registration and scrap metal sales. Additionally, the law amended certain criminal provisions related to scrap metal theft. In 2015, the Attorney General had authority over the implementation, administration, and enforcement of the Act, including creating and operating a registration process, creating and maintaining a database of registered dealers and transactions, and investigating and prosecuting violations of the Act. The Act established the Scrap Metal Theft Reduction Fee Fund to be administered by the Attorney General, which would be credited with all fees, charges, or penalties collected by the Attorney General under the Act. Expenditures from the Fund are used for the administration of the duties, functions, and operating expenses incurred under the Act. In 2017, the Kansas State Legislature amended the law, delaying implementation of certain provisions of the Act. In 2018, that delay was extended until January 1, 2019. When the Act was initially adopted, it was incorrectly estimated that there were approximately 200 scrap metal dealers in the State of Kansas, indicating that the revenue generated would likely have been sufficient to operate the program. However, at the time the Act was suspended, only 75 scrap metal dealers had completed the registration process. This resulted in a significant underfunding of the program. Because the Kansas State Legislature did not appropriate funds for this program until a year following the initial adoption, there was a delay in the request for proposal (RFP) process to create the transactional database required by the law. At the time of the suspension of this program, bids were undergoing review as part of the RFP process. In 2019, the legislature transferred responsibilities for the law enforcement database to the Kansas Bureau of Investigation. Prior to the Act, this Division has no history of enforcement of scrap metal related offenses. The Division educates the public, law enforcement officials, members of the legal profession, and providers of goods and services regarding issues relating to the KCPA and other consumer statutes in order to reduce or prevent consumer fraud.

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance Measures

		<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i> <i>Previous</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percent of submitted scrap metal registrations which were reviewed and responded to within 30 days	A	N/A	N/A	100%	99%	99%	99%	99%	100%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
2. Number of scrap metal dealers applying annually for registration	A	N/A	N/A	78	85	130	135	135	104
3. Number of complaints filed or investigations conducted concerning a Scrap Metal Theft Reduction Act registration violation	B	0	3	22	5	57	50	50	27
4. Number of complaints or investigation files concerning scrap metal theft reduction act violations resolved or closed	B	0	3	14	5	40	50	50	19

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019</i> <i>Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020</i> <i>Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021</i> <i>Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022</i> <i>Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022</i> <i>Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023</i> <i>Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024</i> <i>Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	19,217	8,510	18,874	237,100	157,389	19,750	15,000	61,591
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$ 19,217	\$ 8,510	\$ 18,874	\$ 237,100	\$ 157,389	\$ 19,750	\$ 15,000	\$ 61,591

**FTE**                      --                      --                      --                      --                      --                      --                      --

## Office of the Attorney General

### Consumer Protection Division (Antitrust)

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Harm to the economy of the state and consumers due to unchecked anticompetitive conduct. Inability to adequately comply with the enforcement requirements of K.S.A. 50-109 or adequately represent the interests of the state and its consumers. The Act concentrates enforcement power in the Attorney General, so without adequate funding to enforce these statutes, there would be little to no antitrust enforcement in the State of Kansas, absent a few individual actions for individual damages. Antitrust investigation and litigation tends to be a long term process—frequently spanning several years by the time investigation, litigation, settlement or judgment, and appeals are complete. If an Assistant Attorney General is not engaged and involved at each step of the process, the State could lose out on and forego recovery in the matter.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Requirement</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
K.S.A. 50-101 through K.S.A. 50-163, in particular K.S.A. 50-103 and K.S.A. 50-153	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

A. To provide efficient, effective and ethical enforcement of state and federal antitrust laws on antitrust matters referred to the office, ensure that each allegation is examined by an Assistant Attorney General, and that appropriate action is taken. K.S.A. 50-101 to 50-1,105.

#### Program History

Kansas was the first state in the Union to enact a state-level antitrust law of general application when the first version was enacted in 1889, before the federal Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890 was passed. The Kansas Restraint of Trade Act was first enacted in 1897. Antitrust was first reported as a complaint category by the Kansas Attorney General in the 1999 Annual Report of the Consumer Protection Division. There were 14 antitrust complaints filed that year. Major revisions to the Kansas Restraint of Trade Act were passed in both 2000 and 2013. In 2000, criminal antitrust enforcement was repealed, certain antiquated provisions were removed, and the Attorney General was given modern investigative powers, including administrative subpoena power. At that time, enforcement power for the Act was concentrated in the Office of the Attorney General, rather than in county and district attorneys' offices. To the extent the State of Kansas is involved in antitrust litigation, the Attorney General is the state's litigator. In 2013, the Act was further revised to clarify the law's application, and synchronize its application with federal antitrust laws.

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance Measures

		<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i> <i>Previous</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percentage of citizen-filed antitrust complaints processed in a timely manner	A	100%	95%	100%	99%	100%	99%	99%	98%
2. Percentage of interstate antitrust case referrals from the federal government, or from another state's attorney general's office, processed in a timely manner	A	100%	100%	100%	99%	100%	99%	99%	100%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Number of new complaints filed concerning antitrust	A	5	8	4	3	2	3	3	5
4. Number of litigation files opened on new complaints	A	1	1	1	2	0	2	2	1
5. Number of complaints concerning antitrust resolved or closed	A	3	5	6	2	2	2	2	4
6. Number of cases in active litigation	A	3	4	4	6	6	7	7	5

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019</i> <i>Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020</i> <i>Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021</i> <i>Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022</i> <i>Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022</i> <i>Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023</i> <i>Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024</i> <i>Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 205	\$ 219	\$ 86	\$ 170	\$ 21	\$ 25	\$ 25	\$ 109
Non-SGF State Funds	126,786	119,693	208,634	151,698	250,530	250,000	250,000	192,952
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$ 126,991	\$ 119,912	\$ 208,720	\$ 151,868	\$ 250,551	\$ 250,025	\$ 250,025	\$ 193,061
<b>FTE</b>	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	--	--	0.8

## Office of the Attorney General

### Consumer Protection Division (Charitable Organizations)

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Kansas Charitable Organizations and Solicitations Act has no private remedy. Only the Attorney General or County and District Attorneys are authorized to enforce the Act. If the charitable work of the agency is not funded, consumer complaints and reports from volunteers, employees and others regarding fraudulent charitable solicitation practices will not be investigated or pursued.

#### Statutory Basis

K.S.A. 17-1759, et seq.

#### Mandatory vs. Discretionary

Mandatory

#### MOE/Match Requirement

No

#### Priority Level

1

#### Program Goals

A. To provide efficient, effective and ethical legal advocacy on behalf of the State of Kansas in matters relating to the enforcement of the Kansas Charitable Organizations and Solicitations Act, K.S.A. 17-1767 & 1768. Objective #1: To receive, process, and publish annual registration applications of charitable organizations, professional fund raisers, and professional solicitors employed by charitable organizations in a timely manner.

B. To provide efficient, effective and ethical legal advocacy on behalf of the State of Kansas in matters relating to the enforcement of the Kansas Charitable Organizations and Solicitations Act, K.S.A. 17-1767 & 1768. Objective #2: To receive, process, investigate and act on consumer complaints pertaining to the Kansas Charitable Organizations and Solicitations Act and effectively, efficiently, and ethically prosecute or otherwise enforce the Act against charitable organizations or solicitors.

#### Program History

The Kansas Charitable Organizations and Solicitations Act was passed in 1988. The Act governs the registration of charities and solicitation requirements and violations. In 2021, the Kansas Legislature amended the Act, adding registration of charitable organizations, fund raisers, and professional solicitors to the purview of the Kansas Attorney General. Now, both the registration of these entities and the enforcement of registration or solicitation violations are the responsibility of the Consumer Protection Division. Violations of the Kansas Charitable Organizations and Solicitations Act may be prosecuted by the Attorney General, or a county or district attorney. The Attorney General has investigative subpoena authority, and is authorized to bring an action in civil court, or obtain a consent judgment, for violation of provisions of the Act.

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance Measures

		<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i> <i>Previous</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percent of submitted charitable organization, professional fundraiser, and professional solicitor registrations to which staff reviewed and responded within 60 days:	A, B	NA	NA	100%	75%	89%	99%	99%	95%
2. Percent of complaints filed concerning charitable organizations or solicitations complaints processed in a timely manner:	A, B	NA	95%	88%	99%	99%	99%	99%	94%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Number of charitable organizations applying annually for registration:	A, B	NA	NA	599*	2,100	5,692	5,500	5,500	5,692
4. Number of charitable organizations successfully completing the application process:	A, B	NA	NA	1298*	2,050	5,382	5,300	5,300	5,382
5. Number of professional fundraisers applying annually for registration:	A, B	NA	NA	100*	250	258	400	400	258
6. Number of professional fundraisers successfully completing the application process:	A, B	NA	NA	93*	225	258	400	400	258
7. Number of professional solicitors applying annually for registration:	A, B	NA	NA	242*	300	300	350	350	300
8. Number of professional solicitors successfully completing the application process:	A, B	NA	NA	242*	300	300	350	350	300
9. Number of complaints filed concerning charitable organizations or solicitations:	A, B	NA	16	25	30	22	25	25	21
10. Number of litigation files opened on new complaints:	A, B	NA	0	0	2	0	2	2	0
11. Number of complaints concerning charitable organizations or solicitations resolved or closed:	A, B	NA	16	33	35	21	35	35	23

# Office of the Attorney General

12. Number of professional solicitors successfully completing the application process:	A, B	NA	NA	242*	200	300	350	350	300
--	------	----	----	------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds				61,600	75,867	76,913	77,524	\$ 75,867
Federal Funds				-	-	-	-	\$ -
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 61,600	\$ 75,867	\$ 76,913	\$ 77,524	\$ 75,867
<b>FTE</b>	--	--	--	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.3

# Office of the Attorney General

## Civil Forfeiture

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

If the program were not funded, an income stream that funds expenditure allowed by the Federal Guide for Equitable Sharing for the OAG would be eliminated and local entities that equitably share in the program would cease to receive their share of the funding as well.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Requirement</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
K.S.A. 60-4109 et seq.	Discretionary	No	2

### Program Goals

A. Through sharing agreements, receive revenues derived from federal forfeiture cases with a state nexus to improve Assistant Attorney General and Appellate Attorney competency, and to build capability to effectively and efficiently present cases to juries through the acquisition and use of quality equipment.

Objective #1: Support forfeiture actions against the proceeds and facilitating property of criminal activity.

### Program History

The Equitable Sharing Program is a long-standing partnership with the US Attorney's and the OAG. The assigned AAG is embedded with the US Attorney's office in Wichita.

### Performance Measures

<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
		<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	
1. Number of forfeiture cases opened	A	17	0	7	15	8	10	10	5
2. Asset forfeiture amounts placed in the Kansas Attorney General's forfeiture fund	A	\$ 99,085	\$ 282,132	\$ 1,565	\$ 75,000	0	75,000	75,000	94,566

# Office of the Attorney General

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	58,638	39	49,787	49,579	99,727	105,973	106,466	49,851
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$ 58,638	\$ 39	\$ 49,787	\$ 49,579	\$ 99,727	\$ 105,973	\$ 106,466	\$ 49,851
<b>FTE</b>	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	--

*Output Measures 1-2: The previous forfeiture attorney was appointed as a District Judge in early January 2019. The position was not filled until December 2020. As a result, the number of new cases filed for FY 2020 was impacted.*

# Office of the Attorney General

## Sexually Violent Predator Program

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Public safety would be threatened and the diagnosed dangerous sexually violent predators would not receive needed treatment, care, and restraint required for the small subset of individuals deemed suitable for the program.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
K.S.A. 59-29a01 et seq.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. To provide efficient, effective and ethical legal representation on behalf of the State of Kansas in civil commitment proceedings for the extremely dangerous class of individuals determined to be sexually violent predators. K.S.A. 59-29a01 et seq., Kansas v. Hendricks, 521 U.S. 346, 117 S. Ct. 2072, 138 L. Ed. 2d. 501(1997). This program is administered by the Civil Litigation Division in cooperation with the Criminal Litigation Division.

Objective #1: Ensure safety of the public and the continuing care and treatment of individuals determined to be sexually violent predators by advocating for the commitment of such individuals until such time as the individual's mental abnormality or personality disorder has changed so that the individual is safe to be at large among the general public.

### Program History

To provide efficient, effective and ethical legal representation on behalf of the State of Kansas in civil commitment proceedings for the extremely dangerous class of individuals determined to be sexually violent predators. K.S.A. 59-29a01 et seq., Kansas v. Hendricks, 521 U.S. 346, 117 S. Ct. 2072, 138 L. Ed. 2d. 501(1997). This program is administered by the Civil Litigation Division in cooperation with the Criminal Litigation Division.

### Performance Measures

Output Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022 Previous	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	3- yr. Avg.
		Actuals	Actuals	Actuals	Est.	Actuals	Est.	Est.	
1. Number of potential sexually violent predator cases referred to prosecutor's review committee for assessment	A	380	295	368	300	427	375	375	363
2. Number of cases reviewed that are filed in court against potential sexually violent predators	A	14	12	6	10	10	10	10	9

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance Measures (Continued)

<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
		<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	
3. Number of Sexually Violent Predator trials	A	7	11	14	12	1	15	10	9
4. Number of Sexually Violent Predator commitments	A	7	8	7	8	4	10	10	6
5. Number of Sexually Violent Predator post-commitment litigation cases opened	A	126	88	203	200	273	300	300	188

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 272,103	\$ 304,733	\$ 285,625	\$ 292,952	\$ 285,857	\$ 291,238	\$ 291,196	\$ 292,072
Non-SGF State Funds	37,545	108,871	21,128	157,216	35,585	36,000	36,000	55,195
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$ 309,648	\$ 413,604	\$ 306,753	\$ 450,168	\$ 321,442	\$ 327,238	\$ 327,196	\$ 347,266
<b>FTE</b>	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0

*Output Measures 1-2: The previous forfeiture attorney was appointed as a District Judge in early January 2019. The position was not filled until December 2020. As a result, the number of new cases filed for FY 2020 was impacted.*

## Office of the Attorney General

### Civil Litigation

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

If the civil litigation division did not represent the state in these legal matters, outside counsel would have to be retained in every legal matter. This would result in significant additional cost to the state. The division handles a large number of cases covering a wide range of legal issues.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Requirement</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
K.S.A. 75-702, K.S.A. 75-6108, 75-6116, 75-6117	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

A. To provide efficient, effective and ethical legal advocacy on behalf of the State of Kansas, its agencies and employees, in civil matters contested before a Kansas or Federal court or administrative agency. *Memorial Hospital Ass'n, Inc. v. Knutson*, 239 Kan. 663, 667, 772 P.2d 1093 (1986); K.S.A. 75-702, -703, -708 -713; K.S.A. 75-6108 & -6117, and amendments thereto; and numerous other statutes found within the Kansas Statutes Annotated and the United States Code.

Objective #1: In the defense of the State and/or its agencies and employees, ensure that each and every action or threatened action is responded to in a timely manner.

B. To provide efficient, effective and ethical legal advocacy on behalf of the State of Kansas, its agencies and employees, in civil matters contested before a Kansas or Federal court or administrative agency. *Memorial Hospital Ass'n, Inc. v. Knutson*, 239 Kan. 663, 667, 772 P.2d 1093 (1986); K.S.A. 75-702, -703, -708 -713; K.S.A. 75-6108 & -6117, and amendments thereto; and numerous other statutes found within the Kansas Statutes Annotated and the United States Code.

Objective #2: As to cases initiated by, retained or referred to the Civil Litigation Division for action at the trial court level, ensure that each and every action is a pursuit for justice.

C. To provide efficient, effective and ethical legal advocacy on behalf of the State of Kansas, its agencies and employees, in civil matters contested before a Kansas or Federal court or administrative agency. *Memorial Hospital Ass'n, Inc. v. Knutson*, 239 Kan. 663, 667, 772 P.2d 1093 (1986); K.S.A. 75-702, -703, -708 -713; K.S.A. 75-6108 & -6117, and amendments thereto; and numerous other statutes found within the Kansas Statutes Annotated and the United States Code.

Objective #3: As to cases initiated by, retained, or referred to the Civil Litigation Division for action at the appellate court level, ensure that each and every action is a pursuit for justice.

D. To provide efficient, effective and ethical legal advocacy on behalf of the State of Kansas, its agencies and employees, in civil matters contested before a Kansas or Federal court or administrative agency. *Memorial Hospital Ass'n, Inc. v. Knutson*, 239 Kan. 663, 667, 772 P.2d 1093 (1986); K.S.A. 75-702, -703, -708 -713; K.S.A. 75-6108 & -6117, and amendments thereto; and numerous other statutes found within the Kansas Statutes Annotated and the United States Code.

Objective #4: Prosecute violations of Kansas administrative law on behalf of Kansas licensing boards and agencies.

## Office of the Attorney General

### Program Goals (Continued)

E. To provide efficient, effective and ethical legal advocacy on behalf of the State of Kansas, its agencies and employees, in civil matters contested before a Kansas or Federal court or administrative agency. *Memorial Hospital Ass'n, Inc. v. Knutson*, 239 Kan. 663, 667, 772 P.2d 1093 (1986); K.S.A. 75-702, -703, -708 -713; K.S.A. 75-6108 & -6117, and amendments thereto; and numerous other statutes found within the Kansas Statutes Annotated and the United States Code.

Objective # 5: To provide efficient, effective and ethical legal advocacy on behalf of the State of Kansas in matters relating to the approval of trustee accountings for charitable trusts and protection of charitable assets and beneficiaries. *Troutman v. DeBoissiere*, 66 Kan. 1, 9, 71 Pac. 286 (1903); K.S.A 58a-110.

F. To provide efficient, effective and ethical legal advocacy on behalf of the State of Kansas, its agencies and employees, in civil matters contested before a Kansas or Federal court or administrative agency. *Memorial Hospital Ass'n, Inc. v. Knutson*, 239 Kan. 663, 667, 772 P.2d 1093 (1986); K.S.A. 75-702, -703, -708 -713; K.S.A. 75-6108 & -6117, and amendments thereto; and numerous other statutes found within the Kansas Statutes Annotated and the United States Code.

Objective #6: With regard to bankruptcy litigation, the Civil Litigation Division gives legal advice and assistance to state agencies, including Regents Institutions, involved in bankruptcy litigation and protects against the discharge of student loans, fines, penalties, criminal restitution and other types of debts owed to state government.

G. To provide efficient, effective and ethical legal advocacy on behalf of the State of Kansas, its agencies and employees, in civil matters contested before a Kansas or Federal court or administrative agency. *Memorial Hospital Ass'n, Inc. v. Knutson*, 239 Kan. 663, 667, 772 P.2d 1093 (1986); K.S.A. 75-702, -703, -708 -713; K.S.A. 75-6108 & -6117, and amendments thereto; and numerous other statutes found within the Kansas Statutes Annotated and the United States Code.

Objective #7: In matters involving Indian Tribes and the placement of tribal land into trust with the Federal government, the Civil Litigation Division reviews the tribes' applications and, where appropriate, objects to the application before the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the Department of Interior, and, where appropriate, Federal court.

H. To provide efficient, effective and ethical legal advice and technical assistance to the Attorney General and agency employees, as well as to any branch, department, agency, authority, institution or other instrumentality of the State of Kansas; other State legal counsel in the performance of their duties, as well as education to the public and profession. *Memorial Hospital Ass'n, Inc. v. Knutson*, 239 Kan. 663, 667, 772 P.2d 1093 (1986); K.S.A. 75-702, -703, 704, -708, & -710; K.S.A. 75-3111 and numerous other statutes found within the Kansas Statutes Annotated.

Objective #1: Respond in a timely manner to questions from State agencies, officials, and employees.

I. To provide efficient, effective and ethical legal advice and technical assistance to the Attorney General and agency employees, as well as to any branch, department, agency, authority, institution or other instrumentality of the State of Kansas; other State legal counsel in the performance of their duties, as well as education to the public and profession. *Memorial Hospital Ass'n, Inc. v. Knutson*, 239 Kan. 663, 667, 772 P.2d 1093 (1986); K.S.A. 75-702, -703, 704, -708, & -710; K.S.A. 75-3111 and numerous other statutes found within the Kansas Statutes Annotated.

Objective #2: Help educate the public and the profession about the role of the office and generally applicable legal issues.

## Office of the Attorney General

### Program Goals (Continued)

J. To provide efficient, effective, and ethical legal advocacy on behalf of the State of Kansas in matters concerning 1) the enforcement of the Kansas Funeral and Cemetery Merchandise Agreements, Contracts and Plans Act, Cemetery Merchandise Contracts Act, and the Kansas Cemetery Corporations Act, as those Acts relate to the protection of cemetery trust funds required to be maintained by law; and 2) the investigation of abandoned cemeteries to determine the necessity of the dissolution of the cemetery corporation owning the abandoned cemetery.

Objective #1: To receive, process, investigate, and act on matters referred by the Kansas Secretary of State concerning the Kansas Funeral and Cemetery Merchandise Agreements, Contracts and Plans Act, Cemetery Merchandise Contracts Act, and the Kansas Cemetery Corporations Act as those Acts relate to the protection of cemetery trust funds required to be maintained by law, and to effectively, efficiently, and ethically prosecute actionable cases in a timely manner; and to investigate and take action on abandoned cemeteries.

### Program History

The Civil Litigation Division is primarily responsible for providing for the defense of the State of Kansas and its agencies and employees in civil matters contested before Kansas or Federal courts and before administrative agencies. The Division is responsible for carrying out the Attorney General's administration of the Kansas Tort Claims Fund and for providing or arranging for the defense of civil actions or proceedings against covered persons and entities. The Division also acts as Litigation Counsel for numerous, smaller state agencies in disciplinary and licensure matters under the Kansas Administrative Procedures Act or the Kansas Judicial Review Act.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of case files handled by the Civil Litigation Division	A	1956	2506	2066	2100	2067	2100	2100	2213
2. Number of cases using outside contract counsel	A	18	18	21	21	31	30	25	23
3. Number of new appellate cases opened involving appeals of Civil Litigation Division cases (Does not include continuing appellate cases)	C	14	11	12	12	12	12	12	12
4. Number of Administrative Prosecution cases	D	451	1083	852	900	684	750	800	873
5. Number of new petitions for approval of Trustee motions and actions filed and reviewed	E	21	14	15	15	15	15	15	15

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance Measures (Continued)

		FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	
Outcome Measures	Goal	Actuals	Actuals	Actuals	Previous Est.	Actuals	Est.	Est.	3- yr. Avg.
6. Number of bankruptcy cases monitored to protect the State's interest	F	17	45	70	50	25	40	40	47
7. Number of applications for taking land into trust received and reviewed	G	3	2	0	2	2	2	2	1
8. Number of Requests for Involvement in Cemetery Cases received and handled	J	1	0	1	2	2	1	2	1

## Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 1,138,626	\$ 1,023,598	\$ 383,117	\$ 219,917	\$ 312,929	\$ 387,597	\$ 380,267	\$ 573,215
Non-SGF State Funds	3,933,413	4,659,628	4,572,553	3,789,873	5,508,465	3,673,457	3,686,858	4,913,549
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$5,072,039	\$5,683,226	\$4,955,670	\$ 4,009,790	\$ 5,821,394	\$ 4,061,054	\$ 4,067,125	\$ 5,486,763
<b>FTE</b>	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0

Outcome Measure 6: The economic conditions due to the COVID-19 pandemic have resulted in a significant increase in bankruptcy filings, which has continued in FY 2021.

# Office of the Attorney General

## Tobacco Enforcement Unit

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

If the state were found to be not diligently enforcing the terms of the Master Settlement Agreement (MSA), there could be a potential loss of part or all of the annual payment made to the state pursuant to the MSA. In recent years, these payments have ranged between 50-60 million dollars per year and mainly fund programs of the Kansas Endowment for Youth fund.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
K.S.A. 50-6A01, et seq.	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

A. In the implementation and enforcement of the provisions of the Master Settlement Agreement (MSA) of 1999 resulting from the case of State ex rel. Stovall v. RJR, et al., the Division will identify and take action against participating manufacturers who violate the MSA and enforce the provisions of the Requirements for Sale of Cigarettes Act against Non-Participating Manufacturers (NPM). The Division is also responsible for the implementation and enforcement of the settlement agreement arising from the NPM adjustment arbitration. As a result of this settlement, the Division has assumed new enforcement obligations at increased costs to the Division.

### Program History

The 2008 Legislature authorized this fund for attorney salaries, operating expenditures and fees for outside counsel to assist in arbitration. Expenditures from the fund are financed through annual transfers from the annual tobacco Master Settlement Agreement.

### Performance Measures

*There are no performance measures for this program.*

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	352,181	398,962	358,878	439,478	401,271	447,616	450,733	386,370
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$ 352,181	\$ 398,962	\$ 358,878	\$ 439,478	\$ 401,271	\$ 447,616	\$ 450,733	\$ 386,370
<b>FTE</b>	4.54	4.54	4.54	4.54	4.54	4.54	4.54	4.54

## Office of the Attorney General

### Open Government Enforcement

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

State agencies and employees would still need this service. Private attorneys would have to be employed to provide this service. Questions from the public would go unanswered as there would be no one to educate the public because private attorneys will not provide that service.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
K.S.A. 45-215 et seq., 45-222, 45-251; K.S.A. 75-4320, 75-4320b, 75-4320d, 75-4320f.	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

A. Effective July 2015, the Kansas Legislature expanded the investigatory and enforcement authority of the attorney general and county/district attorneys under both the Kansas Open Meetings Act and the Kansas Open Records Act. Beginning in January 2016, the enforcement duties were transferred to the Civil Litigation Division from the Legal Opinions and Government Counsel (LOGIC) Division.  
Objective #1: Investigate possible violations of Kansas Open Government laws and take appropriate action when violations are found.

#### Program History

Effective July 2015, the Kansas Legislature expanded the investigatory and enforcement authority of the attorney general and county/district attorneys under both the Kansas Open Meetings Act and the Kansas Open Records Act. Beginning in January 2016, the enforcement duties were transferred to the Civil Litigation Division from the Legal Opinions and Government Counsel (LOGIC) Division.

#### Performance Measures

		<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of KOMA/KORA investigations conducted by office	A	113	158	182	175	253	250	250	198
2. Number of KOMA/KORA complaints referred to county or district attorney	A	7	5	17	10	18	20	20	13

# Office of the Attorney General

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 123,504	\$ 119,671	\$ 118,399	\$ 120,525	\$ 118,479	\$ 120,281	\$ 120,735	\$ 118,850
Non-SGF State Funds	3,040	12,073	11,175	11,624	11,069	11,000	11,000	11,439
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$ 126,544	\$ 131,744	\$ 129,574	\$ 132,149	\$ 129,548	\$ 131,281	\$ 131,735	\$ 130,289
<b>FTE</b>	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

## Office of the Attorney General

### Crime Victims Compensation

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Per 34 U.S.C 20102, Federal VOCA Compensation Grants are a match award based on expenditures for Crime Victims Compensation. If state expenditures decrease, the Federal VOCA Grant Award decreases. Payments would have to be prioritized and some victim expenses would go unpaid. Victims would not receive referrals for additional services.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Requirement</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
K.S.A. 74-7302, 74-7304, 74-7305; K.S.A. 74-7317; 74-7312; K.S.A. 74-7333; K.S.A. 75-773; 34 U.S.C. 20102	Mandatory	Yes	1

#### Program Goals

A. To award just compensation to the victims of crime for economic loss arising from criminally injurious conduct. K.S.A. 74-7302, et seq. Objective #1: The Executive Director will ensure that every claim is thoroughly investigated and that the monies awarded by the Board are properly distributed in a timely manner.

B. To obtain additional funds to satisfy victim's claims through the pursuit of subrogation rights, restitution, and fees from offenders. K.S.A. 74-7312, -7317(c), K.S.A. 75-5211, -5268(e), Atty. Gen. Op. 90-65 and K.A.R. 44-5-115(b). Objective #1: The Executive Director will ensure the Crime Victims Compensation Board receives funds to which it is entitled from subrogation rights, court ordered restitution and fees collected from offenders.

C. To assist in the education of the public to improve methods of providing compensation to victims of crime. K.S.A. 74-7304 (l), (j) and amendments thereto. Objective #1: The Executive Director, with the aid of the staff, will inform public officers and employees, health care providers, judges, attorneys, law enforcement officers, victim advocates, other interested groups and the public of the crime victim compensation program.

D. To assist crime victims in connecting with resources beyond crime victims compensation. Objective #1: The Executive Director and the Division of Crime Victims Compensation staff will communicate with victims to help determine their needs and provide referrals outside of crime victim's compensation to assist victims in their recovery.

#### Program History

This Division is responsible for supporting the Crime Victims Compensation Board (CVCB) to ensure that just compensation is awarded to victims of crime for economic loss from criminal conduct and in obtaining funds to satisfy victims' claims through the pursuit of subrogation rights, restitution, and fees from offenders. As part of this responsibility, the Division seeks to educate public officers and employees, health care providers, judges, attorneys, law enforcement officers, victims' advocates, and others about the board and the division. Our goal is to serve more victims of crime with empathy and efficiency. The Kansas Crime Victims Compensation program was established by the Legislature in 1978 (K.S.A 74-7301 to 74-7337).

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percentage of claims processed in 75 days or less	A	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%
2a. Percentage of referrals made by law enforcement	C	19%	23%	23%	20%	17%	20%	20%	21%
2b. Percentage of referrals made by providers	C	27%	30%	31%	30%	24%	30%	30%	28%
3a. Percentage of referrals made by victim advocates	C	43%	38%	38%	30%	38%	30%	30%	38%
3b. Percentage of referrals made by prosecutors	C	11%	9%	8%	20%	21%	20%	20%	13%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4a. Claims Processing Data: New Claims	A	NA	1,298	1,598	1,650	1,425	1,650	1,700	1,440
4b. Claims Processing Data: Claims Approved	A	NA	704	813	850	703	850	900	740
4c. Claims Processing Data: Claims Denied	A	NA	114	91	85	80	85	90	95
4d. Claims Processing Data: % of Claims Approved	A	NA	86%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	1
4e. Claims Processing Data: Pending Claims	A	NA	212	222	190	318	200	200	251
5a. Claims compensation data: Amount Paid	A	\$ 3,358,731	\$ 2,604,925	\$ 2,577,073	\$ 3,500,000	\$2,602,811	\$ 3,500,000	\$3,750,000	\$2,594,936
5b. Claims compensation data: Number of Claims Paid	A	918	790	743	950	715	800	900	749
5c. Claims compensation data: Total Payments	A	3,801	2,777	2,316	3,900	2,249	3,000	3,500	2,447

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance Measures (Continued)

<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
		<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	
6. Amount collected from inmates, probationers and parolees for restitution and from subrogation claims	B	\$ 1,002,196	\$ 1,158,532	\$ 1,171,757	\$ 1,025,000	\$1,906,028	\$ 1,900,000	\$1,900,000	\$1,412,106
7. Percentage of applicants screened for additional services	D	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
8. Percentage of applicants referred to the Attorney General's Office Victims Assistance Program and/or others	D	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%
9. Number of educational presentations made	D	8	6	15	15	16	15	15	12

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Approved</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	2,854,580	2,444,917	1,584,009	2,209,792	1,584,730	2,205,147	2,208,500	\$1,871,219
Federal Funds	804,028	508,838	1,460,488	1,243,900	1,199,597	1,243,900	1,243,900	\$1,056,308
	\$3,658,608	\$2,953,755	\$3,044,497	\$ 3,453,692	\$2,784,327	\$ 3,449,047	\$3,452,400	\$2,927,526
<b>FTE</b>	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0

## Office of the Attorney General

### Victim Services

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The OAG Victim Services division provides unique advocacy on behalf of all victims of crime by providing training and technical assistance to criminal justice professionals about prioritizing the importance of victims' rights, such as victim notification and informed participation in the criminal justice system. Additionally, victim services staff make nearly 2500 contacts each year with crime victims directly or on their behalf to meet their needs. Without funding, many victims of crime would not learn about their rights or learn of the resources that exist for their support. Within this program, the OAG VS division focuses on training and skill development for system based victim assistance staff (SBVAS) based in law enforcement agencies and County/District attorney offices. SBVAS serve a critical role with victims of crime as they navigate the criminal justice system and access resources in their community.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Requirement</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
K.S.A. 74-7337; and amendments thereto (Victims Rights Coordinator); K.S.A. 74-7333 (Crime Victims Bill of Rights); and K.S.A.75-758	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

A. To strengthen and enhance the quality of services to victims and witnesses of crime in all 105 counties of the state. K.S.A. 74-7337; and amendments thereto; K.S.A. 74-7337(c); K.S.A. 74-7325 and amendments thereto; K.S.A. 20-370; and K.S.A.75-758. Objective #1: Improve local response to victims by providing technical assistance and resource material to local crime victim services and witness assistance programs in all counties of Kansas.
B. To strengthen and enhance the quality of services to victims and witnesses of crime in all 105 counties of the state. K.S.A. 74-7337; and amendments thereto; K.S.A. 74-7337(c); K.S.A. 74-7325 and amendments thereto; K.S.A. 20-370; and K.S.A.75-758. Objective #2: Ensure victims and witnesses receive appropriate assistance and referrals by responding to all requests for assistance from crime victims and witnesses of criminal conduct, and requests from all 105 Kansas counties and perform the functions of victim/witness coordinator for the office.
C. To strengthen and enhance the quality of services to victims and witnesses of crime in all 105 counties of the state. K.S.A. 74-7337; and amendments thereto; K.S.A. 74-7337(c); K.S.A. 74-7325 and amendments thereto; K.S.A. 20-370; and K.S.A.75-758. Objective # 3 To increase victim safety by ensuring that victims of crime and the general public have access to a timely and reliable automated victim notification program as per K.S.A. 75-771.
D. To strengthen and enhance the quality of services to victims and witnesses of crime in all 105 counties of the state. K.S.A. 74-7337; and amendments thereto; K.S.A. 74-7337(c); K.S.A. 74-7325 and amendments thereto; K.S.A. 20-370; and K.S.A.75-758. Objective #5: Educate and inform the public and professionals working with crime victims to improve the response to victims throughout the state. K.S.A. 74-7337 and amendments thereto; K.S.A. 75-758.
E. To reduce domestic violence in Kansas by ensuring domestic violence offenders have access to quality intervention services as provided by K.S.A. 75-7d01 to 7d13. Objective #1: To increase domestic violence offender accountability and victim safety through a statewide certification program for batterer intervention programs (BIPs).
F. To reduce domestic violence in Kansas by ensuring domestic violence offenders have access to quality intervention services as provided by K.S.A. 75-7d01 to 7d13. Objective #2: The BIP Unit Coordinator will assist communities in the development of batterer intervention programs in underserved areas in Kansas.

## Office of the Attorney General

### Program Goals (Continued)

G. To coordinate and implement a statewide address confidentiality program for designated victims of crime that includes first class mail forwarding services at no cost to victims as outlined in K.S.A. 75-451 through 75-458.

Objective #1: To ensure the Kansas SaH program is appropriately and effectively implemented, including the efficient enrollment of safe at home participants and a timely first class mail forwarding system for those enrolled.

H. To coordinate and implement a statewide address confidentiality program for designated victims of crime that includes first class mail forwarding services at no cost to victims as outlined in K.S.A. 75-451 through 75-458.

Objective #2: Provide training, education, and technical assistance for SaH enrolling agencies and enrolling assistants.

### Program History

The Victims Services Division of the Office of the Attorney General was established in 2007 to improve the ability of this agency to meet the responsibilities given the statewide Victims' Rights Coordinator in 1989 (K.S.A. 74-7337), and assure that victims are afforded their rights as noted in the Kansas Crime Victims Bill of Rights (K.S.A. 74-7333). The ongoing statutory responsibilities assigned to the Victims' Rights Coordinator include to create, coordinate and assist in the operation of local victim-witness programs throughout the state; respond to a statewide victims' rights telephone hotline; and administer the Kansas crime victims' assistance fund. Victim-focused programs and initiatives were combined under this division for administration and coordination. This includes providing statewide coordination of crime victim and witness assistance programs; assisting in the development and implementation of statewide training curricula designed to promote best practice for crime victim response; providing direct assistance to crime victims and their families through the hotline and other contact; providing oversight, certification, and training for batterer intervention programs; administering state funded grants for victim service agencies; providing oversight and risk identification of child death trends and risk factors; coordinating statewide training, service delivery, and public awareness regarding human trafficking, providing coordination for the automated victim notification system in conjunction with county jails, coordination of the Safe At Home address confidentiality program; and coordination of youth suicide prevention efforts.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	3- yr. Avg.
		Actuals	Actuals	Actuals	Previous Est.	Actuals	Est.	Est.	
1. Number of BIPs that are certified	E	43	43	43	45	43	40	45	43
2. Number of Judicial Districts with access to a certified BIP out of 31 Judicial Districts statewide	E	24	24	24	25	23	31	31	24
3. Number of domestic violence offenders served by a certified program	E	5,067	3,654	3,666	4,000	5,136	5,000	5,000	4,152
4. Number of victims provided service notification, referrals, or resources by a certified program	E	2,007	1,813	1,929	1,900	1,946	1,900	1,900	1,896
5. Number of Trainings provided	F	13	18	13	20	14	20	20	15

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance Measures (Continued)

<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
6. Number of collaborative meetings/contacts with providers and/or community partners	F	2,104	1,222	1,518	1,700	1,048	1,500	1,500	1,263
7. Number of directories, brochures, and other printed materials disseminated	A	78,476	56,483	32,980	50,000	36,169	40,000	40,000	41,877
8. Number of contacts made or received to provide victims assistance	B	2,485	1,726	2,438	2,700	2,210	2,500	2,500	2,125
9. Number of educational presentations made	D	162	182	161	200	150	100	100	164
10. Number of participants in educational presentations	D	8,155	7,883	2,175	3,500	2,875	3,500	3,000	4,311
11. Number of Active Participants	G	NA	NA	212	250	283	300	300	248
12. Number of contacts providing assistance or information to potential or enrolled SaH participants	G	NA	NA	30	200	130	200	200	80
13. Number of current enrolling assistants	H	NA	NA	105	200	30	50	70	68
14. Number of trainings provided to enrolling assistants or community partners	H	NA	NA	0	25	10	10	10	5
15. Number of technical assistance contacts to partners, agencies or the public	H	NA	NA	10	200	23	50	50	17

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 353,368	\$ 224,224	\$ 392,207	\$ 422,294	\$436,330	\$ 464,314	\$467,067	\$350,920
Non-SGF State Funds	45,330	288,371	238,538	45,542	121,380	175,594	117,595	216,096
Federal Funds	39,625	37,800	-	-	-	-	-	12,600
	\$438,323	\$550,395	\$630,745	\$ 467,836	\$557,710	\$ 639,908	\$584,662	\$579,617
<b>FTE</b>	8.5	8.5	8.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	7.3

## Office of the Attorney General

### Child Death Review Board

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Kansas State Child Death Review Board serves in the capacity as one of three Citizen Review Panels in the State. Each state is required by the Federal Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) to establish citizen review panels in order to receive federal funding for child abuse prevention services.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
K.S.A. 22a-241 through 22a-244	Mandatory	Yes	1

#### Program Goals

A. Conduct a review of all child deaths in Kansas pursuant to K.S.A. 22a-243 and amendments thereto. Objective #1: Impact decision making in Kansas by collecting, maintaining, and reporting on data pertaining to child deaths.

B. To provide guidance and information to advocacy groups, law enforcement agencies, and other related agencies in all 105 Kansas counties regarding trends, risk factors, and patterns surrounding child death. K.S.A. 22a-243(h) and amendments thereto. Objective #1: Serve on task forces and committees and attend meetings related to child death.

#### Program History

The State Child Death Review Board was created by K.S.A 22a-243 in 1992 and is charged with reviewing all deaths of children ages birth through 17 years' old who die within Kansas and Kansas residents in that age group who die outside the state. The board works to identify patterns, trends, and risk factors and to determine the circumstances surrounding child fatalities. The ultimate goal is to reduce the number of child fatalities in the state by informing policies and practices that can save lives.

#### Performance Measures

		<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of child death cases the Board referred to the County Attorney for further investigation/review	A	7	9	2	4	4	4	4	5
2. Number of public policy recommendations and prevention strategies proposed	B	15	17	17	12	20	15	15	18

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance Measures (Continued)

		<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
3. Number of child death cases reviewed by the Board	A	396	414	362	375	365	350	350	380
4. Public meetings and training seminars held or participated in concerning child deaths	B	67	77	88	60	68	60	60	78
5. Number of individuals trained by SCDRB staff and/or members	B	302	238	279	200	100	100	100	206
6. Informational releases, annual reports and training materials produced and disseminated by the Board	B	6	4	5	4	4	4	4	4

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 152,998	\$ 155,413	\$ 142,332	\$ 148,861	\$ 181,405	\$ 247,115	\$ 243,755	\$159,717
Non-SGF State Funds	9,368	16,234	17,577	15,000	22,546	22,621	28,342	18,786
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$162,366	\$171,647	\$159,909	\$ 163,861	\$ 203,951	\$ 269,736	\$ 272,097	\$178,502
<b>FTE</b>	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.3

## Office of the Attorney General

### Anti-Human Trafficking

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

There will be less capacity of criminal justice personnel statewide to respond effectively to human trafficking. There will be less coordination of training for law enforcement agencies throughout Kansas. Victim service agencies and allied professionals will not receive the necessary training for identification of human trafficking victims, and may not have the capacity to provide services to them. Less awareness of what human trafficking is and what it looks like in Kansas communities which could potentially lead to less reporting to law enforcement and a reduced number of victims recovered and criminals brought to justice. Loss of statewide coordination of policies to combat human trafficking that are mutually developed by state agencies, victim service groups and law enforcement.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Requirement</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
K.S.A. 75-756; K.S.A. 75-758 and K.S.A. 74-7337; K.S.A. 75-757, K.S.A. 75-759	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

A. To coordinate and enhance the efforts to stop the commercial exploitation of children and other forms of human trafficking in Kansas as per KSA 75- 756 to 759. Objective #1: To enhance the human trafficking reduction efforts in Kansas through policy analysis by the Human Trafficking Advisory Board as per K.S.A. 75-757.
B. To coordinate and enhance the efforts to stop the commercial exploitation of children and other forms of human trafficking in Kansas as per KSA 75- 756 to 759. Objective #2: To increase the capacity of Kansas to reduce human trafficking through awareness efforts as per K.S.A. 75-759.
C. To coordinate and enhance the efforts to stop the commercial exploitation of children and other forms of human trafficking in Kansas as per KSA 75- 756 to 759. Objective #3: To increase capacity of criminal justice personnel statewide to respond effectively to human trafficking as per K.S.A. 75-756.
D. To coordinate and enhance the efforts to stop the commercial exploitation of children and other forms of human trafficking in Kansas as per KSA 75- 756 to 759. Objective # 4: To increase capacity of victim service agencies to respond effectively to human trafficking in Kansas as per K.S.A. 75-758.

#### Program History

In 2010, The Attorney General's Office developed the Human Trafficking Advisory Board to improve the Kansas response to human trafficking, focusing on prevention, protection, prosecution, and partnership. This group worked to create awareness through training, and identified needs of the state to improve the response. In 2011, Anti-Human Trafficking Unit was developed in the Office of the Attorney General to provide the resources to coordinate and enhance the efforts to stop the commercial exploitation of children and other forms of human trafficking in Kansas as per K.S.A 75-756 to 75-759. The Unit continues to focus on providing education and training to professionals and the public on topics that promote a greater understanding of anti-trafficking practices.

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance Measures

		<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of public policy and prevention strategies recommended	A	7	8	6	6	90	8	10	35
2. Number of presentations provided	B	101	88	19	40	36	25	30	48
3. Number of law enforcement trainings provided	C	13	16	10	15	8	10	10	11
4. Number of law enforcement officers trained	C	535	520	574	500	455	400	500	516
5. Number of grants awarded	D	5	6	6	5	5	5	5	6
6. Number of victim service personnel trained	D	1,334	1,356	401	1,000	964	1,000	1,000	907
<i>Output Measures</i>									
7. Number of informational releases, annual reports, and training materials produced and disseminated	A	33,444	17,134	12,134	20,000	20,034	20,000	30,000	16,434
8. Number of trainings provided	D	93	31	16	25	28	25	30	25

## Funding

	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Approved</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 305,579	\$ 175,246	\$ 150,361	\$ 250,000	\$ 247,141	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 190,916
Non-SGF State Funds	17,296	129,378	110,160	75,000	8,353	8,300	8,300	82,630
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$322,875	\$304,624	\$260,521	\$ 325,000	\$ 255,494	\$ 8,300	\$ 8,300	\$ 273,546
<b>FTE</b>	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.45

## Office of the Attorney General

### Youth Suicide Prevention

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The YSP coordinator has been important to the development and promotion of multidisciplinary and interagency strategies statewide, to help communities, schools, mental health professionals, medical professionals, law enforcement and others work together and coordinate efforts to prevent and address youth suicide. This position was created at the OAG because the legislature noted a lack of coordinated efforts directed at addressing youth suicide specifically. If this were no longer funded, it would be necessary for other entities to pick up this responsibility and the focus on youth suicide may be lost in larger bureaucratic responses.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
K.S.A. 75-772	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

A. The Kansas youth suicide prevention coordinator will work toward zero deaths by suicide of Kansas youth through the identification, creation, coordination, and support of youth suicide awareness and prevention efforts throughout the state as per K.S.A. 75-772. Objective #1: To lead the development, implementation, and marketing of a website, online application and mobile phone application to facilitate communication with youth for the purpose of preventing youth suicide and promoting youth safety and wellbeing as per K.S.A. 75-772.

B. The Kansas youth suicide prevention coordinator will work toward zero deaths by suicide of Kansas youth through the identification, creation, coordination, and support of youth suicide awareness and prevention efforts throughout the state as per K.S.A. 75-772. Objective #2: To develop and promote multidisciplinary and interagency strategies to help communities, schools, mental health professionals, medical professionals, law enforcement and others work together and coordinate efforts to prevent and address youth suicide as per K.S.A. 75-772.

C. The Kansas youth suicide prevention coordinator will work toward zero deaths by suicide of Kansas youth through the identification, creation, coordination, and support of youth suicide awareness and prevention efforts throughout the state as per K.S.A. 75-772. Objective #3: To increase capacity of youth leadership in prevention of youth suicide as per K.S.A. 75-772.

D. The Kansas youth suicide prevention coordinator will work toward zero deaths by suicide of Kansas youth through the identification, creation, coordination, and support of youth suicide awareness and prevention efforts throughout the state as per K.S.A. 75-772. Objective # 4: To increase capacity of service agencies to respond effectively to high risk youth as per K.S.A. 75-772.

#### Program History

## Office of the Attorney General

The Youth Suicide Prevention unit was created in the OAG in 2019 by the KS legislature in K.S.A. 75-772, in part due to the efforts of a task force that OAG created in 2018 to study the alarming trend of young people dying by suicide. The unit is charged with the following core responsibilities: lead the development, implementation and marketing of a website, online application and mobile phone application to facilitate communication with youth for the purpose of preventing youth suicide; develop and promote multidisciplinary and interagency strategies to help communities, schools, mental health professionals, medical professionals, law enforcement and others work together and coordinate efforts to prevent and address youth suicide; organize events that bring together youth, educators and community members from across the state to share information; and disseminate and promote information focused on suicide reduction to professionals and the public.

### Performance Measures

		<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of public policy and prevention strategies recommended	D	NA	10	22	10	8	10	10	13
<i>Output Measures</i>									
2. Number of youth in crisis who receive assistance through the app	A	NA	0	0	TBD	0	TBD	TBD	0
3. Number of presentations to communities, school, mental health, medical professionals, law enforcement personnel, businesses and allied professionals	B	NA	14	2	25	5	25	25	7
4. Number of committee meetings provided	B	NA	0	0	4	9	10	10	3
5. Number of technical assistance provided to communities and organizations	B	NA	135	112	125	26	125	125	91
6. Number of attendees to the annual conference	C	NA	25	0	100	95	150	150	40

### Funding

	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Approved</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	37,931	28,321	33,126	28,587	82,838	83,692	31,613
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$ -	\$ 37,931	\$ 28,321	\$ 33,126	\$ 28,587	\$ 82,838	\$ 83,692	\$ 31,613

## Office of the Attorney General

<b>FTE</b>	--	--	--	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.3
------------	----	----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

*Output Measure 4: Development and implementation of the app was delayed by COVID-19 in FY 2020. With the expenditure authority limitation imposed by the Legislature for FY 2021, the future of the app development is uncertain.*

## Office of the Attorney General

### VINE Program

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Prior to the implementation of Kansas VINE, victim information and notification practices in Kansas were fragmented and varied in each jurisdiction. Notification to victims often relied on the voluntary practices of a local jail; or the prosecutor based Victim Witness Coordinator; or the few automated jail system notification programs. Without VINE, crime victims may not receive timely notifications of the release of the person who perpetrated against them from jail, and therefore could be in increased danger of re-offense, if not notified and able to plan for their safety. Additionally, professionals, such as victim advocates, court services officers, law enforcement and others would not be able to sign up for notifications in order to better assist the crime victims they are serving.

#### Statutory Basis

K.S.A. 75-771

#### Mandatory vs. Discretionary

Mandatory

#### MOE/Match Requirement

No

#### Priority Level

1

#### Program Goals

A. To increase victim safety by ensuring that victims of crime and the general public have access to a timely and reliable automated victim notification program as per K.S.A. 75-771.

#### Program History

In 2015, the Kansas Department of Labor, the Kansas Sheriff's Association (KSA), and the Kansas Attorney General's Office collaborated for the successful implementation of Kansas VINE, the automated victim notification portion of this project. During the initial implementation phase, Kansas VINE completed activation in 80 county jails. In May 2019, the Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE) became a contract holder joining the Kansas Department of Labor and the collaborative partners for the 2nd phase implementation of the remaining 16 county jails. Kansas victim advocates, law enforcement representatives, and concerned stakeholders have worked towards automated victim notification for over 20 years. Prior to the implementation of Kansas VINE, victim information and notification practices in Kansas were fragmented and varied in each jurisdiction. Notification to victims often relied on the voluntary practices of a local jail; or the prosecutor based Victim Witness Coordinator; or the few automated jail system notification programs. Kansas notification statutes do not address the time from the arrest of a suspect to the time when that suspect becomes a defendant charged with a crime. During the 2019 Legislative Session, K.S.A. 75-771 provided for the creation of the Kansas VINE Coordinator within the Office of Attorney General and the establishment of the Kansas VINE Advisory Board. The Kansas VINE Advisory Board task is to provide the Attorney General recommendations regarding implementation and operation of Kansas VINE. Kansas Administrative Regulations 16-19-1, 16-19-2, and 16-19-3, which became effective on March 20, 2020, establish the Board. In 2021, Kansas VINE implementation was completed and is active in 96 county jails (8 KS counties do not have jail facilities and 1 did not implement VINE).

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance Measures

		<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i> <i>Previous</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of advisory board meetings	A	NA	NA	3	4	6	4	4	5
2. Number of technical assistance provided	A	NA	579	186	400	168	200	200	311
3. Number of searches for offenders in custody conducted through the Kansas VINE program	A	451,086	293,974	301,597	325,000	362,185	325,000	325,000	319,252
4. Number of newregistration for notification in the Kansas VINE program	A	8,584	10,352	10,771	10,000	13,453	11,000	11,000	11,525
5. Number of notifications regarding offender custody status sent through the Kansas VINE program	A	26,922	38,483	41,369	40,000	50,437	40,000	40,000	43,430

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019</i> <i>Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020</i> <i>Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021</i> <i>Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022</i> <i>Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022</i> <i>Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023</i> <i>Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024</i> <i>Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund				\$ 79,276	\$ 79,276	\$ 87,750	\$ 88,979	\$ 79,276
Non-SGF State Funds				-	921	1,000	1,000	921
Federal Funds				-	-			-
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 79,276	\$ 80,197	\$ 88,750	\$ 89,979	\$ 80,197
<b>FTE</b>	--	--	--	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.3

## Office of the Attorney General

### Victim Services Grants

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The CVAF grant is awarded to several types of agencies throughout the state of Kansas. Examples of the types of agencies receiving CVAF funding are: Child Advocacy Centers, CASA programs and Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault programs. Many of the grantees are dependent upon Victim Services grants to sustain the programming to victims listed above. If not funded, services to victims would be reduced significantly in the communities served by the grantee.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
K.S.A. 74-7334 et seq; K.S.A. 74-7325 et seq; K.S.A. 74-7334(d)	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

A. To strengthen and enhance the quality of services to victims and witnesses of crime in all 105 counties of the state. K.S.A. 74-7337; and amendments thereto; K.S.A. 74-7337(c); K.S.A. 74-7325 and amendments thereto; K.S.A. 20-370; and K.S.A. 75-758. Objective #4: Improve the services available to victims statewide through the administration of crime victim assistance grant funds. K.S.A. 74-7337; and amendments thereto; K.S.A. 74-7337(c); K.S.A. 74-7325 and amendments thereto; K.S.A. 20-370; and K.S.A. 75-758.

#### Program History

The grants program at the Attorney General's office was created in 1989 in conjunction with the passage of the crime victim bill of rights and the creation of the State Victim Rights coordinator role. With this, the legislature created the crime victim assistance fund (CVAF) in K.S.A. 74-734 et seq. and transferred the responsibility of distributing the Protection From Abuse fund (created in 1984, K.S.A. 74-7325 et seq) to the Office of the Attorney General. As years have gone on and additional funds for serving victims of crime were created by the legislature, the distribution and monitoring of these grants were added to the responsibilities of the grant unit. This includes: Child Exchange and Visitation funds (1996, K.S.A. 74-7334 (e) and 75-720), Child Advocacy Center funds (2004, K.S.A. 20-370 and 74-7336) and Human Trafficking Victim Assistance fund (2013, K.S.A. 75-58).

#### Performance Measures

		FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024		
Output Measures		Goal	Actuals	Actuals	Actuals	Previous Est.	Actuals	Est.	Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of grants awarded and monitored		A	92	90	90	96	96	98	98	92

#### Funding

# Office of the Attorney General

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 717,278	\$ 697,247	\$ 698,392	\$ 878,850	\$ 691,963	\$ 937,900	\$ 937,900	\$ 695,867
Non-SGF State Funds	1,510,053	1,467,300	1,430,332	1,765,075	1,467,241	1,638,630	1,638,630	1,454,958
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$2,227,331	\$2,164,547	\$2,128,724	\$ 2,643,925	\$ 2,159,204	\$ 2,576,530	\$ 2,576,530	\$ 2,150,825
<b>FTE</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Office of the Attorney General

### Medicaid Fraud Control Unit

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

If Kansas had no MFCU, it would lose eligibility to receive all federal money (the federal share of the more than \$4 Billion spent by Kansas on Medicaid provider claims in FY 2021, according to the Kansas Medical Assistance Report for Fiscal Year 2021, published by KDHE, Division of Health Care Finance), it now relies on to provide Medicaid benefits.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Requirement</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
K.S.A. 75-725, K.S.A. 75-726, 42 USC 1396a(a)(61) and, 42 USC 1396b(q), K.S.A. 21-5925 et seq., K.S.A. 75-708	Mandatory	Yes	1

#### Program Goals

A. To efficiently, effectively, and ethically investigate and litigate against providers found to be committing fraud in or against the Kansas Medicaid program, recover state and federal monies fraudulently obtained by Medicaid providers, and reimburse the appropriate state and federal agencies. Objective #1: Staff a division, independent of the State Medicaid Agency (the Kansas Department of Health and Environment, Division of Health Care Finance), that will develop and implement specific procedures to effectively and efficiently investigate and prosecute criminal instances of fraud by Medicaid providers.

B. To efficiently, effectively, and ethically investigate and litigate against providers found to be committing fraud in or against the Kansas Medicaid program, recover state and federal monies fraudulently obtained by Medicaid providers, and reimburse the appropriate state and federal agencies. Objective #2: Staff a division, independent of the State Medicaid Agency (the Kansas Department of Health and Environment, Division of Health Care Finance), that will develop and implement specific procedures to effectively and efficiently investigate and litigate civil instances of fraud by Medicaid provider.

C. To review allegations of patient abuse, neglect, or the exploitation or misappropriation of patients' private funds committed by healthcare providers in residential care facilities that receive Medicaid funds, to efficiently, effectively and ethically investigate those allegations with substantial potential for criminal prosecution and to prosecute the perpetrators of such misconduct or refer cases to agencies for appropriate sanctions. Objective #1: Develop and implement procedures to effectively and efficiently review, investigate and prosecute cases of patient abuse, neglect or misappropriation of patients' private funds.

D. To provide for the efficient and effective education of the public and health care providers to aid in the fight against Medicaid fraud and abuse through awareness and cooperation, as well as the coordination of private, state and federal resources. 42 U.S.C. § 1396b(q)(3); K.S.A. 75-708. Objective #1: Create procedures to ensure that Medicaid providers and the general public are provided with relevant information concerning Medicaid provider fraud and vulnerable adult abuse, neglect and exploitation.

## Office of the Attorney General

### Program History

The Medicaid Fraud and Abuse Division (the Division) was established in 1995 and operates under the statutory authority granted at K.S.A. 75-725, K.S.A. 75-726, and K.S.A. 21-5925, et seq., to comply with the requirements of 42 USC 1396a(a)(61) and 42 USC 1396b(q). The Division is the only state entity responsible for receiving, investigating and prosecuting, either civilly or criminally, all cases of suspected fraud by Medicaid providers committed against the Kansas Medicaid program. The Division is tasked with recovering state and federal tax monies fraudulently obtained by Medicaid providers, and for returning said monies to the appropriate state and federal agencies. In addition, the Division receives, investigates and prosecutes allegations of patient abuse, neglect, or exploitation or misappropriation of patients' private funds committed by healthcare providers in residential care facilities, home health care and, other non institutional settings receiving Medicaid funds.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of Medicaid open investigations being handled by the Division	A	251	293	261	275	297	310	325	283.7
2. Number of Medicaid cases filed	A	20	2	2	30	31	35	40	11.7
3. Number of sentences/judgments received	A	13	17	15	28	13	15	18	15.0
4. Number of Medicaid provider fraud open criminal investigations being handled by the Division	A	137	152	145	160	183	190	195	160.0
5. Number of Medicaid provider fraud cases filed	A	8	1	1	25	17	20	25	6.3
6. Number of Medicaid provider fraud cases sentenced	A	6	7	5	12	5	10	12	5.7
7. Number of Medicaid provider fraud open civil investigations being handled by the Division	B	30	34	26	45	22	24	26	27.3
8. Number of Medicaid provider fraud civil cases filed	B	2	0	0	4	2	7	10	0.7
9. Number of Medicaid provider fraud civil judgments received	B	7	6	7	2	3	5	8	5.3

# Office of the Attorney General

## Performance Measures (Continued)

		<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
10. Number of open criminal investigations alleging abuse, neglect, or exploitation or misappropriation of patients' private funds	C	84	107	90	110	91	120	130	96.0
11. Number of open criminal investigations alleging abuse, neglect, or exploitation or misappropriation of patients' private funds: cases filed	C	12	1	1	10	12	15	20	4.7
12. Number of open criminal investigations alleging abuse, neglect, or exploitation or misappropriation of patients' private funds: sentences received	C	7	4	3	12	3	5	6	3.3
13. Number of open civil investigations alleging abuse, neglect, or exploitation or misappropriation of patients' private funds	C	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0.0
14. Number of open civil investigations alleging abuse, neglect, or exploitation or misappropriation of patients' private funds: cases filed	C	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0.0

# Office of the Attorney General

15. Number of open civil investigations alleging abuse, neglect, or exploitation or misappropriation of patients' private funds: judgments received	C	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0.0
16. Number of educational and informational sessions presented	D	21	17	17	26	24	28	30	19.3
17. Number of attendees at educational and informational sessions presented	D	1425	1063	1858	1600	1396	1400	1500	1439.0

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	445,627	496,102	465,616	646,054	585,515	628,089	645,661	515,744
Federal Funds	1,087,792	1,197,892	1,260,605	1,928,911	1,707,159	1,884,268	1,936,985	1,388,552
	\$ 1,533,420	\$ 1,693,993	\$ 1,726,220	\$ 2,574,965	\$ 2,292,674	\$ 2,512,357	\$ 2,582,646	\$ 1,904,296
<b>FTE</b>	17.0	17.0	24.0	24.0	24.0	24.0	24.0	1,439.0

# Office of the Attorney General

## Office of Medicaid Inspector General

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The State of Kansas would be left without an independent watchdog to ensure that Medicaid funds are being properly managed. The office is also critical in identifying areas to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of Medicaid operations.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
K.S.A. 75-7427	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. To establish a full-time program of audit, investigation and performance review to provide increased accountability, integrity and oversight of the state Medicaid program, the state mediKan program and the state children's health insurance program and to assist in improving agency and program operations and in deterring and identifying fraud, waste, abuse and illegal acts. Objective #1: Staff an office, independent of the State Medicaid Agency (the Kansas Department of Health and Environment, Division of Health Care Finance), that will develop and implement specific procedures to effectively and efficiently audit, investigate and provide performance reviews to increase accountability, integrity and oversight of the State Medicaid Agency programs.

### Program History

The Inspector General Division is a new division transferred from KDHE on July 1, 2017, with the amendments in SB 149 to K.S.A. 2016 Supp. 75-7427. The Inspector General (IG), which was created by the 2007 Kansas Legislature in K.S.A. 75-7427, was the first statutorily created Office of Inspector General in Kansas. The purpose of the inspector general is to establish a full-time program of audit, investigation and performance review to provide increased accountability, integrity and oversight of the state Medicaid program, the state mediKan program and the state children's health insurance program and to assist in improving agency and program operations and in deterring and identifying fraud, waste, abuse and illegal acts.

### Performance Measures

		<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>	<i>FY 2024</i>	
<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>Actuals</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of audits, reviews and investigations completed	A	5	5	2	10	13	20	24	6.7
2. Number of audit, review and investigation related trainings attended by IG staff	A	5	36	11	18	19	23	26	22.0
3. Number of program integrity related meetings and conferences attended by IG staff	A	7	30	22	26	40	45	45	30.7

# Office of the Attorney General

4. Number of recommendations for improving outcomes and processes provided to the attorney general	A	0	10	0	9	26	30	35	12.0
5. Number of referrals received and evaluated by IG staff	A	NA	351	1033	1200	1351	1450	1550	911.7
6. Number of allegations referred for further criminal/civil investigation	A	NA	6	32	35	38	40	45	25.3
7. Amount of money identified for repayment or recovery	A	NA	\$ 6,044	\$ 1,362,470	\$ 3,200,000	\$ 193,253,240	\$ 40,000,000	\$ 40,000,000	\$ 64,873,918
8. Amount of monetary savings or wasteful spending identified	A	NA	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 12,548,904	\$ 8,000,000	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 4,182,968

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 126,677	\$ 300,772	\$ 244,512	\$ 710,727	\$ 532,133	\$ 800,016	\$ 642,466	\$ 359,139
Non-SGF State Funds	663	1,465	541	-	-	-	143,514	\$ 669
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -
	\$ 127,340	\$ 302,237	\$ 245,053	\$ 710,727	\$ 532,133	\$ 800,016	\$ 785,980	\$ 359,808
<b>FTE</b>	4.0	4.0	4.0	6.0	5.6	5.6	5.6	4.5

## Office of Revisor of Statutes

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Legislature would not be provided legal services including the drafting of essential legislative documents to facilitate the operation of the legislature and not be provided relevant legal advice and consultation. Additionally, the compilation and publication of the laws of Kansas would not be completed as required by law.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>		<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	46-1211, 77-137 LCC 77-151, 77-163 et seq.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Drafting bills, amendments, committee reports, resolutions and other legislative documents; staffing legislative committees; and providing legal advice and consultation, and researching legal questions and issues on legislative matters pursuant to statute, or as directed by members of the Legislature or the Legislative Coordinating Council.

The performance measure with this program objective is the preparation of specified legal documents to the highest professional standards of competency consistent within the time restrictions for their preparation placed on the office by legislative requirements. Performance would be measured by whether the legislative imposed deadlines are met and the level of technical accuracy in the drafting. This performance objective relates to providing competent professional legal services to the legislature as required by law and legislative directives.

B. Compiling, editing, indexing and publishing Kansas Statutes Annotated and annual supplements.

This performance objective centers on the office's responsibility in compiling, editing, indexing and publishing the general laws of the state in the Kansas Statutes Annotated and annual supplements. Performance objectives would be measured according to publication of the volumes according to set goals of publication and accuracy of the publication work.

### Program History

The Office of Revisor of Statutes was created in 1929 by the Kansas Legislature. The current statute governing the office was enacted in 1971 and is codified at K.S.A. 46-1211.

The Revisor of Statutes is appointed by and serves under the direction of the Legislative Coordinating Council. The Office of Revisor of Statutes is a nonpartisan, legal agency that serves the members of the Kansas Legislature regardless of political affiliation. Legislative documents prepared by the office are drafted in an unbiased, professional manner for all legislators.

All Revisors are attorneys licensed to practice law in the State of Kansas. Revisors provide drafting services and legal advice and consultation at the request of individual legislators and legislative committees.

Office of Revisor of Statutes

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Meeting legislative deadline for introduction of bills.	A	100%	100%	100%	na	100%	100%	100%	100%
2. Meeting legislator deadline for committee reports.	A	100%	100%	100%	na	100%	100%	100%	100%
3. Meeting legislator deadline for floor amendments.	A	99%	98.6%	99%	na	98%	98%	98%	99%
4. Meeting legislative expectation regarding conference committee reports.	A	100%	100%	100%	na	100%	100%	100%	100%
5. Timely publication of statute books and supplements.	B	100%	100%	100%	na	100%	100%	100%	100%
6. Number of bills and resolutions drafted.	A	1,003	1,007	1,184	na	928	1050	1000	1,040
7. Number of floor amendments, committee reports and conference committee reports drafted.	A	695	560	997	na	777	800	778	778
8. Number of statute books and supplements published.	B	14	12	10	13	11	10	10	11

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund -Program A	\$ 2,785,616	\$ 2,948,540	\$ 3,007,951	\$ 3,446,603	\$ 3,095,923	\$3,697,890	\$3,717,721	\$ 3,017,471
State General Fund - Program B	\$ 869,107	\$ 540,096	\$ 718,662	\$ 794,508	\$ 713,669	\$ 729,470	\$ 733,382	\$ 657,476
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 3,654,723	\$ 3,488,636	\$ 3,726,613	\$ 4,241,111	\$ 3,809,592	\$4,427,360	\$4,451,103	\$ 3,674,947
<b>FTE</b>	31.5	31.5	31.5	31.5	31.5	33.5	33.5	31.5

## Administration (ADM)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Administration Program would not be able to fulfill its statutory responsibilities if the program was not funded.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 45-106-107; 77-430; 77-415-436; 75-430; 45-401-45-414; 45-408; 75-438; 75-444	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Document retention updates to ensure records are accurately and appropriately filed and to improve record modernization and maintenance (record filing modernization).
- B. Migration off the AS400 operating system by FY 2024.
- C. Establish an online store on the agency website for constituents to order publications, Kansas flags, and obtain other services from the agency.
- D. Establish an electronic regulations process to improve speed and transparency of the regulatory process.
- E. Produce a full set of Kansas Administrative Rules & Regulations in FY2022.

### Program History

The Administration Program consists of four divisions: Administration, Publications, Legal Services, and Information Technology. Not funding this program would mean critical functions of the agency would be inoperable including, payroll; financial transactions; official publications including the Kansas Register, Kansas Administrative Rules and Regulations, and the Session Laws of Kansas; legal review and retention schedules; IT operations and AS 400 migration.

The Administration Division provides operating services for the entire agency and is led by the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration. This Division is responsible for overseeing human resources, payroll, financial transactions, fiscal and office management and emergency response policies and training.

The Publications Division is led by the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Communications and Policy. This Division is responsible for all public affairs, press inquiries, policy matters, official agency website content, and official publications including the Kansas Register, Kansas Administrative Rules and Regulations, and the Session Laws of Kansas.

The Legal Services Division is led by the General Counsel. This Division is responsible for overseeing office litigation, providing legal counsel to the Secretary and staff regarding office-related matters, reviewing and responding to all KORA requests, and maintaining all contracts and official documents.

The Information Technology (IT) Division is led by the IT Director. This Division is responsible for developing and maintaining security and recovery plans for the agency network and data, developing and maintaining software applications, assessing and installing upgrades to the servers and workstations when appropriate, providing expert technical support to both employees and customers, and developing technical relationships with both public and private partners.

## Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Document Retention Update (record modernization)	A			90%	100%	100%	0%	0%	95%
2. Agency system upgrade	B			20%	65%	65%	90%	100%	43%
3. Online Store	C			20%	30%	30%	65%	90%	25%
4. Electronic Regulations	D			20%	65%	0%	5%	25%	10%
5. Kansas Administrative Rules & Regulations (Full-Set Publication)	E			80%	100%	100%	0%	0%	90%

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	2,435,026	2,411,021	2,664,781	4,330,383	2,738,310	2,582,166	3,058,810
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ 2,435,026	\$ 2,411,021	\$ 2,664,781	\$ 4,330,383	\$ 2,738,310	\$ 2,582,166	\$ 3,058,810
<b>FTE</b>	16.00	19.00	20.25	23.74	21.00	23.74	23.74	20.10

## Business Services (BS)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Business Services Division would not be able to fulfill its statutory requirement to file business formation and related business filings if the program was not funded.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 17-7903, K.S.A. 17-7904, K.S.A. 17-7905, K.S.A. 17-7906	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. In FY 2020, approximately 25% of business entity filings could be filed online. The agency is developing and plans to implement a new business entity filing system that will enable additional filings to be submitted online. The agency has a goal of achieving any necessary legislative, regulatory, and internal policy adjustments to enable at least 80% of filings to be able to be submitted online by the end of FY 2023. With additional legislative changes the agency anticipates 80% of this goal will be achieved by end of FY 2024.

B. The agency has a goal to increase customer use of the existing online business services filing system. Currently, most business formation documents can be filed online. In FY 2019, 73% of business formation documents were filed online. In general, online filing has increased from year to year. The agency has a goal to increase online filing to 80% by the end of FY 2022. For FY 2021, the agency exceeded its goal of 78% of business formation documents filed online by the end of FY 21. Therefore, the agency is revising this goal to further increase online formation filings to 83% in FY 23.

C. The agency has a goal to increase customer use of the existing online business services filing system. Currently, most annual reports can be filed online. In FY 2019, 74% of annual reports were filed online. In general, online filing has increased from year to year. The agency has a goal to increase online filing to 80% by the end of FY 2022. In FY 2021, the agency met its FY 22 goal of 80% of annual reports filed online. Therefore, the agency is revising this goal to further increase online annual report filings to 85% in FY 23.

### Program History

The Business Services Division is primarily responsible for administering Kansas business entities filings and the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) and places a high value on delivering outstanding customer service. Business Services files formation, annual report, and amendment documents for corporations, limited liability companies, limited partnerships, limited liability partnerships, cooperatives, banks and other entities. The Division also maintains records on active, forfeited, withdrawn, merged, canceled, and dissolved business entities. In FY 2022, the number of annual reports processed exceeded 208,000.

Other documents filed by the Business Services division include notary applications, service agents, warehouse bonds, cemetery corporation filings, and health care card suppliers. The Division administers the UCC by filing financing statements, amendments and terminations, performing searches and issuing copies to the public. The program currently has over 326,000 active UCC filings on record. In FY 2022, over 94% of nearly 91,500 annual UCC transactions were filed electronically.

Kansas Secretary of State

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Online filing availability	A	NA	25%	32%	40%	40%	50%	80%	32%
2. Percentage of annual online filings: Annual Reports	B	74%	74%	81%	83%	81%	85%	86%	79%
3. Percentage of annual online filings: Business Formation	C	73%	76%	79%	81%	79%	83%	84%	78%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	784,959	916,808	833,928	801,340	1,037,712	1,087,608	834,369
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ 784,959	\$ 916,808	\$ 833,928	\$ 801,340	\$ 1,037,712	\$ 1,087,608	\$ 834,369
<b>FTE</b>	12.0	12.0	11.75	12.73	12.00	12.73	12.73	11.9

## Elections (ELM)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Elections Division would not be able to fulfill its statutory requirements if the program was not funded.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific    K.S.A. 25-2504; K.S.A. 25-124	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Increase electronic filings of statement of substantial interests [SSI] forms. Current law does not require individuals to file SSI's electronically. Filing SSIs electronically streamlines the process and allows for efficient public access of these documents. In FY 2021, approximately 90% of SSIs were filed electronically. This is not a significant change from FY 2020. The agency anticipated a 95% electronic filing rate by the end of FY 2022 and exceeded that goal with 97% filing online. The agency anticipates a 100% filing rate by the end of FY 2023. In future years, the agency will work to maintain this goal as new filers use the system.

B. Increase electronic filing of campaign finance reports for state officeholders and candidates for state office. Current law only requires candidates for statewide office to file electronically. Electronic filing of campaign finance reduces the amount of time and resources needed to provide services to the public and modernizes the process. In FY 2021, 40% of all candidates filed campaign finance reports electronically. The agency has a goal to increase electronic campaign finance report filings to 55% by the end of FY 2022. The agency exceeded this goal in FY 2022 with 76% of filings submitted electronically. As a result, the agency has adjusted its goal from 75% to 80% by the end of FY 2023. Migrating off the AS400 computer system will enable the agency to redesign and improve the user experience of the campaign finance system, which is anticipated to occur once the new system is implemented. The agency estimates that 90% of filings will be filed electronically once a new system is implemented.

### Program History

The Elections Division is primarily responsible for overseeing national and state elections, candidate filings for national and state offices, and assisting local election officers administer elections. The Division is also responsible for lobbyist registrations, issuing lobbying badges, providing public access to state campaign finance documents and public disclosure documents, implementing federal legislation pertaining to election administration, selling and distributing Kansas Statutes Annotated, Kansas Session Laws, Kansas Administrative Rules and Regulations, and selling Kansas flags. The Division also serves as a repository for statements of substantial interest for state officers and certain state employees. The Division places high importance on excellent customer service and ensuring the administration and integrity of elections.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. SSI Electronic Filings	A			90%	95%	97%	100%	100%	94%
2. Electronic filing of campaign finance reports	B			40%	55%	55%	75%	90%	48%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	414,373	480,838	520,681	523,041	573,176	457,465	472,751
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ 414,373	\$ 480,838	\$ 520,681	\$ 523,041	\$ 573,176	\$ 457,465	\$ 472,751
<b>FTE</b>	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

## Help America Vote Act (HAVA)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Functions of the HAVA program are essential to the administration of elections by the State of Kansas. The HAVA program would not be able to fulfill its requirements if the program was not funded.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>		<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	P.L. 107-252; K.S.A. 25-2504; K.S.A. 25-124	Mandatory	Yes	1

Note: A one time state match is occasionally required for new HAVA grant funds, but not ongoing. The state is requesting a match of \$200,000 for the most recent HAVA grant of \$1,000,000 received May 2022.

### Program Goals

- A. The agency has a goal to purchase cyber security services within the HAVA program for counties statewide. The state, in coordination with a private vendor, worked with counties to enhance existing security profiles and network security. Due to COVID-19, the agency had to delay implementation of this goal for FY 2020. The agency had a 50% completion rate in FY 2021 and met its 100% completion goal by the end of FY 2022. Continued efforts for maintenance will likely continue in FY 2023 and FY 2024.
- B. The agency has a goal to ensure the security of voting equipment across the state within the HAVA program. The agency has a goal to work with counties to ensure paper trail ballots for voting equipment in the state. The agency achieved a 100% completion rate by the end of FY 2022.
- C. In FY 2021, the agency has a goal to continue its coordination with the National Guard and Department of Homeland Security to provide virtual statewide security training to all county election officials. Approximately 98% of county election officials participated by the end of FY 2021. The agency has a goal to continue training with 100% completion by the end of FY 2022. The agency is reviewing this training and will implement a cybersecurity training program with 100% expected participation in FY 2024.
- D. The agency has a goal to implement a new training program for all 105 county election officers specifically for the administration of elections. K.S.A. 25-124 requires the Secretary of State to provide instruction to county election officers in a method determined by the Secretary of State. This program is in addition to other mandated annual training for local election offices. The goal is to have at least one certified election official in every county prior to the 2024 General Election.
- E. The agency has a goal to begin preparation for the expiration and replacement of the current statewide voter registration and election management system contract.

**Program History**

The Help America Vote Act (HAVA) Program is administered by the Elections Division. The Help American Vote Act [HAVA] of 2002 created new mandatory minimum standards for states to follow in the several key areas of election administration. These areas included provisional voting, providing voting information to the public, updating and upgrading voting equipment, creating a statewide list of registered voters, creating a process to file administrative complaints, and developing voter identification procedures. Since 2002, the Program has accomplished the following objectives:

- Designed, purchased, developed and installed a statewide computerized voter registration and election management database that is the system of records for all 105 counties;
- Negotiated contracts with voting equipment manufacturers and oversaw the purchase of more than 2,000 voting machines to enable counties to provide at least one ADA-compliant voting machine per polling place to allow voters with disabilities, including visual impairment, to vote secret and unassisted ballots. These contracts have expired and counties now negotiate their own contracts for voting equipment;
- Received and administered more than \$30 million in federal funds

States received federal funds for use in paying the costs of complying with HAVA and each state is audited by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, Office of the Inspector General. The Kansas audit took place beginning January 31, 2011. A final audit report was filed by the Inspector General with the federal Election Assistance Commission in August 2011. In FY 2016, a new statewide voter registration and election management system was procured. The current contract ends January 18, 2026. Per federal law, the state must have a centralized voter registration system. While the program is focused on post-implementation responsibilities including management, oversight and upgrades in FY 2023, the agency will begin preparation for the expiration and replacement of the current statewide voter registration and election management system contract.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Cyber-security for counties	A			50%	100%	100%	0%	0%	75%
2. Voting equipment updates	B			99%	100%	100%	0%	0%	100%
3. Virtual security training	C			98%	100%	100%	0%	0%	99%
4. Local election official training/certification program	D			0%		25%	50%	100%	13%
5. Statewide registration system	E			0%	0%	0%	5%	15%	0%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	1,989,514	7,174,917	1,963,713	798,582	1,348,564	1,095,330	3,321,004
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,989,514</b>	<b>\$ 7,174,917</b>	<b>\$ 1,963,713</b>	<b>\$ 798,582</b>	<b>\$ 1,348,564</b>	<b>\$ 1,095,330</b>	<b>\$ 3,321,004</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

Note: A majority of HAVA expenditures in FY 2020 and 2021 included one-time funding for COVID-19 through the HAVA program. These funds were appropriated for states to prepare for elections during the pandemic.

## State Banking & Trust Regulation

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

There would not be appropriate regulation of state-chartered banking institutions which may cause financial harm to Kansas consumers and business. Federal regulators would still conduct examinations; however, the result would be potential loss of loans and deposits of Kansas state-chartered institutions and the conversion of banking and trust entities to national charters so appropriate regulation could be achieved.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
K.S.A. 9-1701; K.S.A. 75-Specific 1304; K.S.A. 74-3004	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Maintain independent examination turnaround time at 30 days or less
- B. Maintain Conference of State Bank Supervisor's (CSBS) accreditation
- C. Review, evaluate, and adjust hybrid examination protocol for optimal efficiency

### Program History

Authority for this program and the powers of the OSBC were established in K.S.A. 9-101 et seq. The OSBC was established in 1891 by the Legislature to regulate and examine all financial institutions. The regulation of savings and loan associations, credit unions, and securities activities was later removed. Authority for the OSBC is found in K.S.A. 75-1304 et seq., while the State Banking Board is authorized by K.S.A. 74-3004 et seq.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percent of independent bank exams	A	2%	25%	93%	95%	98%	95%	95%	72%
1.a. Percent of independent trust exams with turn around time of less than 30 days in fiscal year.	A	6%	50%	100%	95%	100%	95%	95%	83%
2. Percent of scheduled exams completed within the agency's established/scheduled timeframe of 36 months.	A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
3. Average regulatory cost incurred per bank examination.	A	\$ 31,606	\$ 33,572	\$ 37,606	\$ 43,515	\$ 47,384	\$ 52,122	\$ 57,335	\$ 39,521
3.a. Average regulatory cost incurred per trust examination.	A	\$ 5,863	\$ 6,890	\$ 6,628	\$ 6,708	\$ 7,347	\$ 7,714	\$ 8,100	\$ 6,955

## Office of the State Bank Commissioner

*Output Measures*

4. Number of bank exams (joint and independent)		69	69	66	64	65	63	64	67
4.a. Number of trust exams		16	18	14	17	13	18	19	15

*Additional Measures as Necessary*

5. Number of state-chartered banks		191	187	183	177	177	172	166	182
6. Number of problem banks (CAMELS Rating of 3, 4, or 5)		13	15	8	9	6	9	11	10
7. Total assets of problem banks as a percentage of total bank assets		2.5%	3.1%	0.7%	1.0%	0.9%	2.5%	4.0%	1.6%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0
Non-SGF State Funds	5,443,235	5,568,753	5,428,551	6,003,406	5,534,553	6,252,141	6,277,530	5,510,619
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 5,443,235	\$ 5,568,753	\$ 5,428,551	\$ 6,003,406	\$ 5,534,553	\$ 6,252,141	\$ 6,277,530	\$ 5,510,619
<b>FTE</b>	55	55	57	57	59	62	62	57

## Consumer Mortgage Lending Program

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Kansas consumers would not have protections such as clear terms, compliant rates/fees, as intended by the legislation that enacted the laws. If the program is not funded, licenses would not be issued and thus examinations not performed. This may lead to contract issues, fraud, and other harmful acts toward consumers.

	<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	K.S.A. 9-1701; K.S.A. 75-1304; K.S.A. 74-3004	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Conduct periodic examinations of regulated entities.  
B. Promote lawful business practices by informing licensees of their compliance responsibilities.

### Program History

The Consumer and Mortgage Lending (CML) program oversees and supervises consumer credit lenders; mortgage lenders, servicers, and brokers; money transmitters, debt management companies, sales finance companies, and other credit providers. The CML Division administers the Uniform Consumer Credit Code, the Kansas Mortgage Business Act, Credit Services Organization Act, as well as Federal Regulation Z, RESPA, Regulation M, Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Fair Credit Reporting Act, Equal Credit Opportunity Act, and other applicable federal laws and regulations.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percent of scheduled exams completed within the agency's established/scheduled timeframe of 36-48 months.	A	80%	75%	87%	87%	81%	85%	85%	81%
2. Percent of completed initial examinations within 6 months of an entity licensing with the agency.	A	84%	39%	48%	50%	33%	40%	50%	40%
3. Average regulatory cost incurred per CML regulated entity examination	A	\$ 4,174	\$ 3,993	\$ 3,657	\$ 3,478	\$ 2,780	\$ 3,163	\$ 3,215	\$ 3,477

## Office of the State Bank Commissioner

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	3,757,614	3,249,573	3,182,611	3,354,286	3,180,444	3,618,873	3,616,989	3,204,209
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 3,757,614	\$ 3,249,573	\$ 3,182,611	\$ 3,354,286	\$ 3,180,444	\$ 3,618,873	\$ 3,616,989	\$ 3,204,209
<b>FTE</b>	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34

## Technology Enabled Fiduciary Financial Institutions (TEFFI)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Failure to fund the TEFFI Program would violate the Technology-Enabled Fiduciary Financial Institutions Act, K.S.A. 9-2301 et seq. 2022 Senate Bill 337 was effective March 10, 2022, and 2022 House Bill 2489 was effective July 1, 2022. Failure to fund would also void the completion of the TEFFI business model and eliminate Kansas' position as the only state in the union authorizing TEFFI's.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 9-1701; K.S.A. 75-1304; K.S.A. 74-3004	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Evaluate rules and regulations to properly regulate TEFFI entities and amend as needed
- B. Develop examination processes and procedures to assess the operating condition of a TEFFI
- C. Conduct examinations to assess IT, BSA, and statute compliance

### Program History

The TEFFI bill was introduced to the Kansas legislature during the 2021 legislative session. Senate Sub for HB 2074 was passed overwhelmingly in both the House and Senate. No program history exists as this is the first business of this kind, i.e., no other TEFFIs are in existence. For this reason, Outcome Measures and Output Measures have not yet been developed. Outcome Measures and Output Measures will be adopted as the TEFFI program gets closer to and into transactional operation.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
None									

## Office of the State Bank Commissioner

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	486,029.00	284,049.00	698,771.00	719,734.00	94,683.00
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 486,029	\$ 284,049	\$ 698,771	\$ 719,734	\$ 284,049
<b>FTE</b>				3	2	3	3	3

State Treasurer  
**Administration**

---

**Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

The office would not be able to administer and provide support for designated programs. Lack of funding would impact the ability to support and maintain Treasurer data processing applications used by internal users, external users, and trusted third parties, including critical state banking functions. It would also greatly impact the ability to support and maintain central data processing applications hosted for other state agencies including the Kansas Debt Recovery System (KDRS), Kansas Treasury Offset Program (KTOP), and Kansas Municipal Investment Pool (KMIP) resulting in the potential loss of millions of dollars in state revenue collected through debt recovery.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
General  The Office of State Treasurer was created in Article I of the Kansas Constitution. In 1972, Article I was amended to eliminate the position of State Treasurer as a constitutional office. The office continued as an elective one and in 1979, KSA 25-101b was amended to change the Treasurer's term from two years to four years. The Treasurer is a member of the Pooled Money Investment Board and was designated as chairperson by KSA 75-4222 until May of 1996 due to amendments made by the 1996 Legislature. KSA 74-4905, as amended, provides for KPERS board membership for the State Treasurer.	Mandatory	No	1

**Program Goals**

- A. Provide leadership to the agency through establishing priorities and policies, properly allocating available resources, and evaluating performance.
- B. Promote the responsible management of state finances and increase government transparency.
- C. Increase awareness of office services to the public through digital and traditional marketing efforts, coordinated virtual and in-person events, and participation in community events.
- D. Provide for efficient, cost-effective data processing for the specific banking functions and programs for the Treasurer's Office. Make sure the financial needs of all state agencies can be met. Plan for continuity of operations in the event in a disruption of service.

# State Treasurer

## Program History

This program is responsible for the overall management and direction of all activities of the State Treasurer's office. Administration establishes policy, assigns and directs the work of the other operating programs, determines priorities, allocates available resources on the basis of those priorities, and requires internal reviews of operations and procedures. Management functions performed or delegated by this program include personnel and payroll issues, budgeting, administrative correspondence, and the collating and distributing of management information to other state agencies and other interested parties. The State Treasurer is a member of the Pooled Money Investment Board, and as of July 1, 1993, a board trustee of the Kansas Public Employees Retirement System. The administrative staff provides general office support for all areas in the Treasurer's Office. General office support services include telephone and fax communication support supplies, purchasing, and accounts payable. Treasurer Lynn Rogers, who took office in January 2021, devotes time and resources assisting citizens throughout Kansas to know and understand the programs in the Treasurer's office which could be beneficial for them.

## Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Treasurer attended KPERS Board, PMIB Board, and Learning Quest 529 Treasurer Advisory Committee Meetings	A,B	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A
2. Total number of public appearances (virtual or in-person) by the State Treasurer or designee.	C	no data	no data	50 (partial year)	75	83	85	90	83
3. Total number of followers on social media channel at year end.	C	no data	no data	26,506	27,000	26,647	27,000	27,500	26,577
4. Total impressions for digital and print advertising placements.	C	no data	no data	5,316,015	7,000,000	5,986,247	6,000,000	7,000,000	5,651,131
5. Average new visitors to the website	C	no data	no data	37,075	37,250	37,075	37,250	37,500	37,075
6. Total number of emails sent	C	no data	no data	24	35	37	40	45	31

## Output Measures

7. Number of help desk requests	D	687	421	164	500	229	500	500	271
8. Average help desk response time	D	13	16	34	13	41	13	13	30
<b>Systems Designed/Maintained for Treasurer's Office</b>									
9. Lines of system code	D	872,002	839,875	756,634	760,000	769,813	362,000	362,000	788,774
10. Size of systems by number of records	D	57,268,460	65,237,096	65,401,001	67,000,000	70,237,312	7,000,000	7,000,000	66,958,470
11. Size of systems by number tables	D	418	409	409	409	435	260	260	418
12. Major modifications requested	D	8	4	5	4	7	4	4	5
<b>Systems Designed/Maintained for Other Agencies</b>									
13. Lines of system code	A,D	403,917	402,843	404,372	420,000	405,686	420,000	420,000	404,300
14. Size of systems by number of records	A,D	59,046,976	55,258,898	69,998,321	57,000,000	72,623,064	57,000,000	57,000,000	65,960,094

**State Treasurer**

15. Size of systems by number tables	A,D	260	267	272	270	277	270	270	272
16. Major modifications requested	A,D	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	1
17. Number of Unclaimed Property inquiries	A,D	1,212,270	1,075,258	875,325	1,300,000	794,426	1,300,000	1,300,000	915,003
18. Number of online claims submitted	D	25,598	27,967	26,411	30,000	28,834	30,000	30,000	27,737
19. Number of ACH claims via the website	A,D	8,589	6,371	4,402	9,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	5,387
20. Number of check status searches	D	32,004	22,305	45,673	25,000	43,916	25,000	25,000	37,298

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	676,006	687,673	703,138	824,841	658,084	892,692	880,240	682,965
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 676,006	\$ 687,673	\$ 703,138	\$ 824,841	\$ 658,084	\$ 892,692	\$ 880,240	\$ 682,965
<b>FTE</b>	11.0	12.0	13.0	13.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.3

State Treasurer  
**Cash Management**

**Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

The State of Kansas could not provide the necessary 'checks and balances' with the State's accounting system and bank transactions. Distributions would not be calculated. Cash balance and cash projection information would not be provided to the PMIB, Department of Administration, and the Division of the Budget. Funds would not be collected by entities or be distributed back to fund designated projects.

	<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
General	KSA 75-603, KSA 75-604, KSA 75-640 thru 646; KSA 75-4201; KSA 75-4276: KSA 75-4215 (daily depositing) Agricultural Production and Home Loan Linked Deposits - K.S.A. 75-4268 thru K.S.A. 75-4275. KSA 79-3425c (Special City & County Highway) KSA 79-2959 & KSA 19-2694 (LAVTR); KSA 79-2964 (CCRSF); KSA 12-1775a (Tax Increment Financing Revenue Replacement).	Mandatory	No	1

**Program Goals**

- A. To record in an accurate and timely manner all receipts and disbursements for the State of Kansas and to promote electronic methods of receiving a distributing State monies.
- B. To ensure the safety of deposits held in the name of the State.
- C. To accurately determine the amounts due to local governments under the provisions of the various statutes which regulate each program, and to distribute these amounts to the local governmental units at the statutorily mandated times.
- D. To provide funding for low-interest loans for qualified linked deposit program borrowers.

**Program History**

In 1879, KSA 75-603 requires that the State Treasurer keep an accurate account of the receipts and disbursements of the State Treasury. KSA 75-604, enacted in 1923, entrusts the State Treasurer with the possession of all public moneys paid into the treasury and permits the Treasurer to deposit moneys in Kansas banks designated as state depositories. The State Moneys Law (KSA 75-4201, et seq.), enacted in 1967, regulates the designation of banks that receive state accounts, the pledging of securities by these banks, and the rate of interest to be paid on deposits of state moneys. KSA 75-4218 as amended by the 1985 Legislative Session requires that banks pledge securities, the market value of which is equal to 100% of all funds on deposit over the Federal Deposit Insurance corporation coverage.

State Treasurer  
Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1.Percentage of items received before 2:30pm deposited the same day	A,B					100%	100%	100%	100%
2. Percentage of State dollars received by electronic methods	A,B					71%	80%	85%	71%
3. Percentage of dollars disbursed electronically	A,B					98%	98%	98%	98%
4. Number of checks issued by the State	A,B					434,270	450,000	430,000	434,270

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	692,760	665,166	886,212	970,777	913,743	1,016,143	919,085	821,707
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 692,760	\$ 665,166	\$ 886,212	\$ 970,777	\$ 913,743	\$1,016,143	\$ 919,085	\$ 821,707
<b>FTE</b>	8.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	8.7

State Treasurer  
**Bond Services**

**Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

Would impact the ability to perform the statutory duty to determine the sufficiency of transcripts and to register bonds in the municipal bonds register resulting in the lack of a consolidated record and a complete picture of the state's bond indebtedness. Lack of bond registry could prevent future issuances of municipal bonds.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rgt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific    PL 97-248, KSA 10-103, KSA 10-601, contractual obligation	Mandatory	No	1

**Program Goals**

- A. To register all municipal bonds and temporary notes issued in the State of Kansas in a timely and accurate manner per K.S.A. 10-108.
- B. To compile and have published the annual indebtedness report by September 30th per K.S.A. 10-1007a.
- C. To perform paying agent services on Kansas municipal bonds and temporary notes.
- D. To develop employee skills and professional skills for a stronger team.

**Program History**

The Municipal Bond Services program is responsible for the registration of all municipal bonds issued in the State. In addition, this program provides registrar and paying agent services for the majority of all local municipal bond issues, as well as state issues. The State Treasurer was named fiscal agent for the State of Kansas in 1908. With the enactment of 1982 PL 97-248, the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act (TEFRA) requiring municipal obligations issued after June 30, 1983, to be in registered form, legislation was passed enabling municipalities to issue registered bonds (KSA 10-103).

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of registration numbers issued	A	220	305	348	275	240	275	225	297.7
2. Annual indebtedness report published by September 30th	B	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
3. Percent of new Municipal bonds with State as Paying Agent	A,C	93%	91%	90%	90%	86%	90%	90%	89%
4. Percent of new Municipal temporary notes with State as Paying Agent	A,C	73%	78%	80%	73%	88%	73%	73%	82%

State Treasurer

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	601,021	489,181	500,751	616,671	493,290	671,196	691,163	494,407
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 601,021	\$ 489,181	\$ 500,751	\$ 616,671	\$ 493,290	\$ 671,196	\$ 691,163	\$ 494,407
<b>FTE</b>	7.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0

State Treasurer  
**Education Savings**

**Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

No state oversight of the program manager contract to include plan design, performance management, and marketing. Would lead to the end of the popular 529 Learning Quest Savings Program. Would lead to the inability to match KIDS program contributions. Lack of outreach to low- to moderate- income families to encourage saving for higher education. Would result in a lack of resources to continue the educational curriculum.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>		<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rgt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific	Sec 529 of IRS code of 1986; KSA 1999 Supp 75-640 through 75-650; K.A.R. 3-4	Mandatory	Yes	1

**Program Goals**

- A. Allow more children the chance to go to post-secondary school by providing an opportunity for individuals and organizations to save for post-secondary education tuition and expenses.
- B. To actively market and promote the Kansas Learning Quest Educations Savings Program in all areas of the State of Kansas.
- C. To reach Kansans with information on Learning Quest through educational meetings and outreach opportunities.
- D. Increase the amount of assets transferred to our plan from competitors relative to those transferred out.

**Program History**

The Kansas Postsecondary Education Savings Program, (Learning Quest® Education Savings Program), was created by the 1999 Kansas Legislature, as authorized by section 529 of the federal Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended. The purpose of the education savings program is to establish higher education savings accounts. The program permits individuals and organizations to contribute to education savings accounts to pay postsecondary education expenses for individuals they designate or for themselves. The 2009 Legislature created the KIDS Matching Grant program allowing for low-income families to have a portion of their contributions matched by state funds.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of KS Counties reached through marketing	A,B, C	105/105	105/105	105/105	105/105	105/105	105/105	105/105	N/A
2. Dollars spent on marketing by American Century Investments	A,B, C	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
3. Total number of active accounts (total program, cumulative)	A,D	242,403	258,540	282,147	285,040	350,299	325,258	346,522	296,995
4. Total number of active accounts (Kansas only, cumulative)	A,D	69,325	71,169	73,490	75,327	75,452	77,315	79,223	73,370

**State Treasurer**

5. Total Plan assets (in billions)	A,D	6.94	7.46	9.61	10.00	8.8	9.6	10.5	9
6. Total Kansas assets (in billions)	A,D	1.21	1.26	1.53	1.70	1.36	1.42	1.5	1
7. Total Purchases (program total)	A,D	730.0	844.5	1,061.0	878.5	1.15	1.28	1.42	636
8. Total Purchases (Kansas)	A,D	115.0	121.5	129.9	122.1	144.3	151.7	159.6	132
9. Accounts opened per year	A,B, D	11,942	14,778	36,429	21,050	36,504	40,110	44,073	29,237
10. Rollovers in (KS residents)	D	7.65	5.96	8.59	7.40	9.92	12.2	15	8
11. Rollovers out (KS residents)	D	8.13	7.46	5.81	7.13	6.52	7.32	8.23	7
12. Difference (in millions)	D	0.48	(1.50)	2.70	0.56	3.4	4.9	6.83	2
13. Rollovers in (plan total) (in millions)	D	140.17	184.88	272.03	199.03	235.8	276.1	323.1	231
14. Rollovers out (plan total) (in millions)	D	63.88	69.38	60.84	64.70	64.16	64.99	75.83	65
15. Difference (in millions)	D	76.29	115.50	211.19	134.33	171.7	211.1	257.36	166
16. Number of Presentations by Treasurer's Staff and ACI	C	19.00	32.00	21.00	32.00	35	37	39	29

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 393,166	\$ 371,030	\$ 407,641	\$ 425,000	\$ 371,289	\$ 425,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 383,320
Non-SGF State Funds	361,339	363,527	365,609	387,660	364,066	402,708	420,551	364,401
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 754,505</b>	<b>\$ 734,557</b>	<b>\$ 773,250</b>	<b>\$ 812,660</b>	<b>\$ 735,355</b>	<b>\$ 827,708</b>	<b>\$ 870,551</b>	<b>\$ 747,721</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.3</b>

**ABLE****Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

No state oversight of the program manager contract to include plan design, performance management, and marketing. Failure to fund would lead to the end of the ABLE Savings program for the disabled in Kansas.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rgt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific    2015 Legislature created the Achieving a Better Life Experience Savings Program with HB 2215	Mandatory	No	1

**Program Goals**

- A. Continue partnership with the multi-state consortium to expand the Kansas Achieving a Better Life Experience (ABLE) Savings Program.
- B. Continue to increase awareness of the role an ABLE account can play in the lives of Kansans living with a disability.
- C. Identify and implement efficiencies that align with the federal treasury regulations and to increase accessibility to the program by the disability community and their families.

**Program History**

2015 Legislature created the Achieving a Better Life Experience savings program with H.B. 2215. This program is based on a new federal statute which allows individuals diagnosed with a disability before the age of 26 to save in accounts that they own with tax deferred growth and tax free withdraw of earnings used for qualified expenses related to their disability under section 529A of the Internal Revenue Code.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of educational programs presented or ABLE meetings attended.	B	27	26	24	30	31.0	30.0	36.0	27.0
2. Number of new accounts KS ABLE	A,B, C	239	285	489	513	266.0	366.0	296.0	346.7
3. Number of KS ABLE accounts (total)	A,B, C	420	657	1,041	1,343	1,313.0	1,679.0	1,975.0	1,003.7
3. Number of KS ABLE accounts (funded)	A,B, C	394	627	988	1,276	1,262.0	1,612.0	1,896.0	959.0

State Treasurer

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	61,703	48,686	17,623	83,615	40,772	98,508	93,035	35,694
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 61,703	\$ 48,686	\$ 17,623	\$ 83,615	\$ 40,772	\$ 98,508	\$ 93,035	\$ 35,694
<b>FTE</b>	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

State Treasurer  
**Unclaimed Property**

**Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

Kansans would be deprived of their rightful property. Properties would not be remitted to the State and property owners would not be able to claim property. UP legislation provides each State with the authority to create a centralized place for persons to search for lost property and a process to claim the property.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific    K.S.A 58-3934 thru 3978; KSA 58-3901 et seq	Mandatory	No	1

**Program Goals**

- A. Ensure the accurate and timely reporting and remitting of various types of unclaimed property to the State Treasurer and the identification and return of property to its rightful owner(s) or heir(s).
- B. To approve or deny 100% of all claims for abandoned property delivered to the State Treasurer as quickly as possible after the filing of the claim and the receipt of the necessary information to make a legal determination and explore new strategies for identifying potential owners of unclaimed property.

**Program History**

The Disposition of Unclaimed Property Act (KSA 58-3934 et seq.), originally enacted in 1979 (KSA 58-3901 et seq.), designates the State Treasurer to administer functions established by the Act. In 1983, SB 213 amended KSA 58-3905 and 58-3914, broadening the definition of abandoned property as it applies to intangible interests in business associations and specifying procedures for delivery to the State Treasurer of such property. In 1989, SB 326 amended the Act to shorten the time it takes for property to be presumed abandoned from seven years to five years and raised the dollar amount that could be reported in the aggregate from \$3 to \$25. In 1994, SB 393 brought the Unclaimed Property program into compliance with the then most current uniform code for unclaimed property. In 1996, HB 2643 amended the Act to raise the aggregate dollar amount to \$100, redefined when a financial institution must presume a demand account to be abandoned, and provided additional flexibility in the advertisement of owner names. In 1999, SB 17 amended the Act to relieve a holder of its requirement to file a report if it has no individual property over \$100 and the total of its aggregated property is under \$250.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Value of unclaimed property receipts to State General Fund	A	N/A	N/A	57.5	58.2	56.2	57.6	57.6	56.9
2. Number of active holders (businesses)	A	N/A	N/A	41,157	41,201	40,790	41,809	41,809	40,974
3. Amount returned to rightful owners (in millions)	B	N/A	N/A	\$ 18.0	\$ 27.2	\$ 26.0	\$ 23.6	\$ 23.6	\$ 22.0
4. Number of claims paid	B	N/A	N/A	112,769	114,000	86,115	90,076	90,076	99,442
5. Inquiries (name searches) (thousands)	B	N/A	N/A	800	900	800	900	900	800
6. Number of outreach actions recorded	B	N/A	N/A	33,295	34,500	12,031	13,100	13,100	22,663

State Treasurer

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	1,179,644	1,142,330	1,123,728	1,697,980	1,141,775	1,691,292	1,839,912	1,135,944
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,179,644	\$ 1,142,330	\$ 1,123,728	\$ 1,697,980	\$ 1,141,775	\$ 1,691,292	\$ 1,839,912	\$ 1,135,944
<b>FTE</b>	11.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Pooled Money Investment Board (PMIB) and its authority are established under the State Money's Law, K.S.A. 75-4201 et. seq. The PMIB manages the investable state money available from the State General Fund and the hundreds of other individual state agency funds received by the State Treasurer's Office. The PMIB also provides investment management services for individual state agencies with statutorily authorized investment authority. The PMIB is the only entity within the State system charged with this responsibility. The PMIB's Budget is entirely FEE FUNDED and any fees collected above our annual budget are transferred to the State General Fund.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 75-4201 et. Seq.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. The Pooled Money Investment Board (PMIB) aspires to be a premier financial services organization; serving both the citizens and the State of Kansas through professionalism, integrity, and efficiency. The PMIB strives to maximize the return on those resources entrusted to our care while remaining steadfast to our primary objectives of safety and liquidity.

### Program History

The Program History of the PMIB is outlined in very specific detail in the DA-400 Budget Narrative.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Spread to Benchmark (+/-)	A	0.07%	0.23%	0.06%	0.00% - 0.10%	-0.14%	+/- 0.10%	+/- 0.10%	0.05%
2. Number of Days Interest Earnings to Cover PMIB Annual Budget	A	3.7	3.7	22.2	71.0	29.3	3.0	2.0	18.4
3. SGF Fee Transfer	A	\$ 3,450,000	\$ 4,100,000	\$ 3,225,000	\$ 2,400,000	\$ 4,225,000	\$ 6,500,000	\$ 6,500,000	\$ 3,850,000
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Pooled Money Investment Portfolio Average Balance	A	\$ 3,280,000,000	\$3,960,000,000	\$ 5,057,000,000	\$ 6,200,000,000	\$ 6,816,000,000	\$ 6,850,000,000	\$ 6,350,000,000	\$ 5,277,666,667
5. Pooled Money Investment Portfolio Net Interest Income	A	\$ 68,700,000	\$ 70,300,000	\$ 12,000,000	\$ 3,900,000	\$ 9,100,000	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 150,000,000	\$ 30,466,667
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
6. Pooled Money Investment Portfolio Weighted Average Rate	A	2.35%	1.51%	0.15%	0.07%	0.15%	2.25%	3.00%	0.60%
7. Pooled Money Investment Portfolio Weighted Average Maturity	A	49.0	51.0	54.0	60	76	60	60	60.3

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	704,200	717,600	730,000	762,595	730,416	812,795	805,463	726,005
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 704,200	\$ 717,600	\$ 730,000	\$ 762,595	\$ 730,416	\$ 812,795	\$ 805,463	\$ 726,005
<b>FTE</b>	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

If administration is not funded, the agency would not be able to license appraisers to do Federally Related Real Estate Appraisals in KS. The KREAB Board will be reviewing renewal fees for both AMC's and Appraisers in FY-2023. It is anticipated both will be increased.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific 58-4101 et seq. 58-4701 et seq.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Maintaining and/or processing any changes to statutes or regulations to ensure that the Kansas Appraisal Program is in compliance with the Appraisal Subcommittee (ASC) requirements.
- B. Continue to work diligently to get complaints processed in the one-year timeframe mandated by the ASC.
- C. Completing the transition to the new data base and work with Appraisers, AMC's and Education Providers to assist them in using it.
- D. Continue to maintain excellent reviews conducted by the ASC.

### Program History

The Kansas State Certified and Licensed Real Property Appraisers Act became effective on April 19, 1990. The act established the Kansas Real Estate Appraisal Board and provided for the licensure and certification of real estate appraisers. Under K.S.A. 58-4121, the act requires all state certified and licensed appraisers to comply with the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice promulgated pursuant to federal law.

The 1993 legislature amended the act to separate the Appraisal Board from the Real Estate Commission on October 1, 1993. This created the establishment of an independent agency.

Legislation was passed in 2008 to require anyone performing appraisals for real estate-related financial transactions be licensed or certified with the Board with certain exceptions as set out in the Act.

The Appraisal Subcommittee (ASC) of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council (FFIEC) was created on August 9, 1989, pursuant to Title XI of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989. Title XI's purpose is to provide that federal financial and public policy interests in real estate transactions will be protected by requiring the real estate appraisal utilized in connection with federally related transactions are performed in writing, in accordance with uniform standards, by individuals whose competency has been demonstrated and whose professional conduct will be subject to effective supervision. In general, the ASC oversees the real estate appraisal process as it relates to federally related transactions, as defined in section 1121(4) of Title XI. The ASC is an FFIEC subcommittee. The FFIEC was established pursuant to Title X of the Financial Institutions Regulatory and Interest Rate Control Act of 1978 to create an interagency body empowered to prescribe uniform principles for the Federal examination of regulated financial institutions.

Legislation was passed in 2012, Under K.S.A. 58-4701, Appraisal Management Companies working in Kansas to be registered with the Board effective October 1, 2012. This was put in place so KS would comply with enacted Dodd Frank Legislation.

Real Estate Appraisal Board

Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	FY 2025 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
AARO Meetings and Webinars	A	-	-	-	4	8	12	8	8	3
Number of Staff and Board Members attending Conferences and Webinars	A					6	6	7	7	6
Regulations Changed or New Statutes	A					100%	100%	100%	100%	
Complaints Received	B		27	20	20	19	24	24	24	22
Settled in 3-6 Months	B		12	9	10	6	9	9	9	9
Settled in 6-9 Months	B		10	7	10	10	11	11	11	9
Settled in 9-12 Months	B		5	4	3	3	4	4	4	4
Longer than 1 year	B		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Number of AMC Rewals Mailed Out	C					116	116	116	116	
Number of Education Renewals Mailed Out	C					25	25	25	25	
Number of Appraiser renewals Mailed Out	C					1,063	1,063	1,063	1,063	
Program Review by ASC	D	Excellent					Excellent			

Output Measures

Statutes and Regulation Comply	A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
--------------------------------	---	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

Real Estate Appraisal Board

Complaints Processed in Timely	B	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Renewals sent out by email	C						100%	100%	100%	
ASC Reviews Compliance	D	1					100%	100%	100%	

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 EST</i>	<i>FY 2025 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	291,761	331,776	268,759	344,867	333,618	353,175	357,227	362,805	311,384
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 291,761	\$ 331,776	\$ 268,759	\$ 344,867	\$ 333,618	\$ 353,175	\$ 357,227	\$ 362,805	\$ 311,384
<b>FTE</b>	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Real estate licensure imposes important fiduciary duties meant to minimize the danger of financial harm: The duty to fully disclose all material facts to the client; a duty to fully disclose all purchase offers to sellers; a duty to handle client information and affairs with loyalty and confidentiality; and the duty to act honestly and in good faith, and without self-dealing and conflicts of interest.

Foreseeable harms attendant to real estate transactions are primarily financial, although when a property sale involves a residence, personal risks can also arise. Foreseeable financial harms include, but are not limited to, purchase of properties that are noncompliant with local laws, have latent defects or that will otherwise necessitate considerable unanticipated expenses due to failure to understand the requirements or operation of state and local law, or failure of a contract to properly specify terms and conditions.

Real estate requires considerable specialized knowledge. Applicants for real estate licenses must demonstrate proficiency in the principles and practices of the profession; state real estate and license law; professional standards; state agency law; real estate financing; real estate settlement procedures; escrow responsibilities; state record-keeping requirements; government regulations applicable to real estate; and a familiarity with state contract law.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	KSA 74-4202(b)	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Licensing only those individuals who have successfully completed all pre-licensing and continuing education requirements required by Kansas law
- B. Increasing licensees' knowledge of Kansas real estate law through education and outreach
- C. Regulating real estate licensed activities to require compliance with commission statutes and regulations

### Program History

The Kansas Real Estate Commission operates under the authority granted by K.S.A. 74-4201 et seq. K.S.A. 58-3034 et seq. prescribes licensing standards for real estate brokers and salespersons. K.S.A. 58-30,101 et seq. governs brokerage relationships between real estate salespersons, brokers, and their clients and customers. Since 1949, the Kansas Real Estate Commission administers a program of licensure, education, and compliance relating to the transacting of real estate by salespersons and brokers in Kansas. The commission is composed of five members appointed by the Governor for staggered four-year terms. One member is appointed from each congressional district and one member from the state at large. At least three members shall have been real estate brokers for at least five years and at least one member shall have never been a real estate broker.

Kansas Real Estate Commission

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percent of licenses renewed online	A	91%	94%	95%	96%	95%	96%	96%	95%
2. Number of compliance reviews performed	C	397	281	249	300	260	300	325	263
3. Average regulatory cost per real estate license	A, C	\$78.53	\$75.94	\$65.82	\$67.98	\$66.47	\$84.00	\$73.91	\$69.41

*Output Measures*

4. Number of Active Real Estate Licensees	A	16,188	16,498	16,999	17,300	18,389	18,500	18,500	17,295
5. Percentage of licenses issued within one business day of completion	A	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%

*Additional Measures as Necessary*

6. Number of salesperson prelicenses courses approved	B	20	24	48	50	56	50	52	43
7. Percentage of companies found with violations during compliance review	C	75%	73%	55%	65%	57%	55%	55%	62%
8. Number of complaints logged	C	248	252	270	285	362	375	350	295
9. Number of applications denied	A	18	42	18	28	21	20	20	27
10. Number of persons taking licensing exam	A	3,155	2,651	4,160	3,500	3,486	3,400	3,400	3,432

Kansas Real Estate Commission

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source (in millions)</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	\$ 1.3	\$ 1.3	\$ 1.3	\$ 1.3	\$ 1.3	\$ 1.6	\$ 1.4	\$ 1.3
Federal Funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1.3	\$ 1.3	\$ 1.3	\$ 1.3	\$ 1.3	\$ 1.6	\$ 1.4	\$ 1.3
<b>FTE</b>	11.8	11.7	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	11.9

## Client Service Delivery

*Child and Adult Protective Services Field Staff*

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Children and adults would experience abuse and neglect. The Title IV-B State Plan would not be approved.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 38-2226 KSA 39-1433 42 USC 1397a	Discretionary	Y	1	1
<b>Program Goals</b>				

- A. Accurately assess the safety and needs of children and adults during abuse investigations
- B. Perform accurate and timely service assessments and eligibility determinations
- C. Provide case management and services appropriate to client needs
- D. Provide services resulting in gainful employment and self-sufficiency

### Program History

The Social Services Field subprogram provides services in the following areas: child protective services, prevention and assessment, foster care grant coordination, independent living, support services, adult protective services.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Percent of initial assessment decisions completed within the timeframe established in policy	A	69.4%	78.5%	95.2%	96.0%	90.9%	93.4%	95.6%	88.2%
2. Percent of Adult Protective Service investigations completed timely	A	82.8%	84.6%	84.2%	84.4%	77.0%	81.0%	85.0%	81.9%

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est	FY 2024 Est	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 31,034,617	\$ 34,270,240	\$ 31,582,730	\$ 34,787,351	\$ 31,719,162	\$ 38,396,999	\$ 37,056,114	\$ 32,524,044
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	6,993,226	6,160,423	8,214,120	5,780,872	5,899,436	6,437,969	6,379,032	6,757,993
<b>Total</b>	\$ 38,027,843	\$ 40,430,663	\$ 39,796,850	\$ 40,568,223	\$ 37,618,598	\$ 44,834,968	\$ 43,435,146	\$ 39,282,037
<b>FTE</b>	768.0	736.6	757.0	753.0	753.0	762.5	762.5	748.9

## Client Service Delivery

### *Economic and Employment Eligibility Field Staff*

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Persons living in poverty may be unable to meet basic needs and care for their children. State plans would not be approved and federal funding would be jeopardized.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 39-709 7 USC 2020(a)(1) 42 U.S.C. 601-602 42 USC 9858c	Discretionary	Y	1	2

#### Program Goals

- A. Accurately assess the safety and needs of children and adults during abuse investigations
- B. Perform accurate and timely service assessments and eligibility determinations
- C. Provide case management and services appropriate to client needs
- D. Provide services resulting in gainful employment and self-sufficiency

#### Program History

Economic and Employment Services field staff determine an individual's or family's eligibility and benefits for cash, child care, and food assistance. The field staff review applications, conduct interviews, and verify client information. They also convey program requirements and perform periodic eligibility redeterminations. The Quality Assurance Program included in this subprogram monitors the accuracy of eligibility and benefit determinations.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Percent of EES applications processed timely	B	96.6%	95.9%	95.5%	97.0%	84.0%	90.0%	90.0%	91.8%
2. Food Assistance payment error rate	B	6.1%	5.9%	6.6%	5.5%	5.5%	5.5%	5.5%	6.0%
<i>Output Measures</i>									

Department for Children and Families

*Economic and Employment Eligibility Field Staff*  
**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 13,622,659	\$ 13,962,323	\$ 14,235,148	\$ 13,921,682	\$ 13,009,544	\$ 14,902,334	\$ 14,500,757	\$ 13,735,672
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	15,888,568	16,993,420	17,383,501	20,125,666	18,382,783	19,165,225	17,004,058	17,586,568
<b>Total</b>	\$ 29,511,227	\$ 30,955,743	\$ 31,618,649	\$ 34,047,348	\$ 31,392,327	\$ 34,067,559	\$ 31,504,815	\$ 31,322,240
<b>FTE</b>	645.0	632.0	641.0	695.0	695.0	689.0	681.0	656.0

## Client Service Delivery

### TANF Employment Services Field Staff

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Job skills, training, and employment case management would not be available for TANF recipients and DCF would incur a penalty for failing to meet the TANF work participation requirements.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 39-709(b)(3) 42 U.S.C. 602(a)(1)(A)	Discretionary	Y	1	3

#### Program Goals

- A. Accurately assess the safety and needs of children and adults during abuse investigations
- B. Perform accurate and timely service assessments and eligibility determinations
- C. Provide case management and services appropriate to client needs
- D. Provide services resulting in gainful employment and self-sufficiency

#### Program History

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Employment Services case managers conduct assessments to develop individualized plans that identify the services that best support a client's self-sufficiency goals and which reinforce the client's strengths, needs, and abilities. Clients are provided information on work opportunities, resources, and program requirements to support them in making decisions on case-plan activities. Case managers monitor each client's compliance with their case plan and progress toward self-sufficiency.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Percent of TANF recipients obtaining employment	C,D	43.0%	48.5%	41.5%	46.5%	45.6%	46.5%	46.5%	45.2%
2. Percent of TANF recipients who retain employment in the quarter following employment	D	84.2%	75.3%	73.0%	73.0%	78.0%	78.0%	78.0%	75.4%
Output Measures									

Department for Children and Families

*TANF Employment Services Field Staff*

TANF Employment Services Field Staff								
Funding Source	Funding							
	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est	FY 2024 Est	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 45	\$ 46	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	3,726,148	4,325,141	4,802,942	4,616,829	4,103,158	4,514,538	4,425,860	4,410,414
Total	\$ 3,726,193	\$ 4,325,187	\$ 4,802,942	\$ 4,616,829	\$ 4,103,158	\$ 4,514,538	\$ 4,425,860	\$ 4,410,429
FTE	67.0	64.0	87.0	83.0	83.0	80.0	80.8	78.0

## Client Service Delivery

### Vocational Rehabilitation Field Staff

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Fewer people with disabilities would become gainfully employed and self-reliant. Rehabilitation Services state plan would not be approved.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 39-708c( c) 29 USC 721	Discretionary	Y	1	4

#### Program Goals

- A. Accurately assess the safety and needs of children and adults during abuse investigations
- B. Perform accurate and timely service assessments and eligibility determinations
- C. Provide case management and services appropriate to client needs
- D. Provide services resulting in gainful employment and self-sufficiency

#### Program History

Rehabilitation field staff help people with disabilities to achieve competitive, integrated employment and live independently. Counselors interview individuals and evaluate their work skills and capacities, and work with clients to plan services leading to employment. Services may include vocational training, assistive technology, job coaching, job tryouts, restoration services and job placement. After a client secures employment, counselors continue to provide guidance for at least 90 days to ensure stability on the job, as well as client and employer satisfaction.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Number of Kansans with disabilities achieving competitive integrated employment	C,D	1,201	1,225	933	1,225	1,113	1,225	1,230	1,090
2. Percent of persons employed as a result of vocational rehabilitation services who report their own earnings as the largest source of support at case closure	D	75.7%	79.0%	80.0%	76.0%	79.0%	82.0%	80.0%	79.3%

Department for Children and Families

Vocational Rehabilitation Field Staff

<i>Output Measures</i>								
<b>Funding</b>								
<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,304,787	\$ 1,354,005	\$ 1,449,702	\$ 1,523,844	\$ 1,364,904	\$ 1,691,922	\$ 1,548,944	\$ 1,389,537
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	14,259	-
Federal Funds	4,821,021	5,002,658	5,356,359	5,630,349	5,043,052	6,251,370	5,775,790	5,134,023
<b>Total</b>	\$ 6,125,808	\$ 6,356,663	\$ 6,806,061	\$ 7,154,193	\$ 6,407,956	\$ 7,943,292	\$ 7,338,993	\$ 6,523,560
<b>FTE</b>	129.0	129.0	128.0	128.0	128.0	128.0	128.0	128.3

## Client Service Delivery

### Pre-Employment Transition Services Field Staff

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Loss of early attachment to employment, resulting in greater lifelong reliance on public benefits. Reduced employment among Kansas youth with disabilities.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 39-708c(c) 29 USC 733	Discretionary	Y	1	5

#### Program Goals

- A. Accurately assess the safety and needs of children and adults during abuse investigations
- B. Perform accurate and timely service assessments and eligibility determinations
- C. Provide case management and services appropriate to client needs
- D. Provide services resulting in gainful employment and self-sufficiency

#### Program History

Pre-Employment Transition Services specialists facilitate the transition of students with disabilities from high school to post-secondary education and employment. Services are designed to help young people with disabilities prepare for self-sufficiency, rather than dependence on public benefits. The specialists provide or arrange for job exploration counseling, work-based learning experience, counseling on post-secondary opportunities, work-place readiness training, and self-advocacy training.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of students with disabilities who received pre-employment transition services	C	1,288	1,495	1,421	1,430	1,541	1,700	1,900	1,486

#### Funding

Department for Children and Families

<i>Pre-Employment Transition Services Field Staff</i>								
<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 191,008	\$ 207,929	\$ 200,802	\$ 219,203	\$ 224,299	\$ 384,003	\$ 358,417	\$ 211,010
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	705,086	767,960	741,934	809,925	828,719	1,418,832	1,324,296	779,538
<b>Total</b>	\$ 896,094	\$ 975,889	\$ 942,736	\$ 1,029,128	\$ 1,053,018	\$ 1,802,835	\$ 1,682,713	\$ 990,548
<b>FTE</b>	20.0	20.0	21.0	21.0	21.0	34.0	34.0	20.7

## Client Service Delivery

### Region Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Client service delivery would not be viable without local direction and administrative support.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 75-5316a KSA 39-709c(d)	Mandatory	Y	1	na

### Program Goals

- A. Accurately assess the safety and needs of children and adults during abuse investigations
- B. Perform accurate and timely service assessments and eligibility determinations
- C. Provide case management and services appropriate to client needs
- D. Provide services resulting in gainful employment and self-sufficiency

### Program History

The Region Administration Program supports the delivery of human services through the following functions: fiscal, personnel, legal, fraud investigations, information technology, and facilities (including records and vehicles). Other Operating Expenditures are consolidated in the Administration Program, except for travel. Salaries and travel are budgeted separately in each region program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
No performance indicators - administration program									
Output Measures									

Department for Children and Families

*Region Administration*  
**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 18,741,016	\$ 18,405,396	\$ 18,969,090	\$ 18,865,328	\$ 18,874,225	\$ 19,340,692	\$ 19,058,597	\$ 18,749,570
Non-SGF State Funds	27,266	155,957	24,592	-	5,000	-	-	61,850
Federal Funds	10,775,044	10,032,517	9,757,184	10,330,797	10,729,848	10,377,516	10,253,258	10,173,183
<b>Total</b>	\$ 29,543,326	\$ 28,593,870	\$ 28,750,866	\$ 29,196,125	\$ 29,609,073	\$ 29,718,208	\$ 29,311,855	\$ 28,984,603
<b>FTE</b>	243.9	243.9	225.9	225.9	225.9	214.9	214.9	231.9

## Prevention and Protection Services

### *Protection Report Center*

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Victims would experience continued abuse. Calls would be rechanneled to law enforcement.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm Subpgm
KSA 38-2226 KSA 39-1433	Mandatory	N	2 1

#### Program Goals

- A. Provide temporary placements for children who cannot remain safely in their homes.
- B. Secure permanency for children in care by reuniting them with their families or finding permanent families for children who cannot safely return home.
- C. Assist youth leaving foster care without permanent families to live independently and become self-sufficient.
- D. Provide assessments and interventions directed towards safeguarding the well-being and general welfare of children and vulnerable adults who are in need of protection.
- E. Provide prevention services to families based on each family's individual needs, eligibility and available resources.

#### Program History

The Kansas Protection Report Center (KPRC) receives statewide reports of child abuse/neglect and adult abuse/neglect or exploitative situations via a toll-free number, online submission, or fax. The three centers are located in Wichita, Kansas City and Topeka. Supervision of all locations is done by PPS Administration, allowing for more consistent operation and oversight. The Topeka location receives reports 24-hours-per-day/seven days per week, including holidays. The Wichita location receives reports from 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., seven days per week. The Kansas City location receives reports from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., seven days per week.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Percent of initial assessment decisions completed within the timeframe established in policy	D	69.4%	78.5%	95.2%	96.0%	90.9%	93.4%	95.6%	88.2%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
2. Total cost per report received	D	\$57	\$62	\$65	\$66	\$61	\$67	\$63	\$63

Department for Children and Families

*Protection Report Center*  
**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 5,217,934	\$ 5,246,740	\$ 5,487,553	\$ 5,551,397	\$ 5,424,455	\$ 6,069,564	\$ 5,847,754	\$ 5,386,249
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 5,217,934	\$ 5,246,740	\$ 5,487,553	\$ 5,551,397	\$ 5,424,455	\$ 6,069,564	\$ 5,847,754	\$ 5,386,249
<b>FTE</b>	92.0	96.0	96.0	96.0	96.0	96.0	96.0	96.0

## Prevention and Protection Services

### *Foster Care Grants for Children Receiving Out-of-Home Services*

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

It is assumed that children who were abused or neglected would be cared for by local governments or non-profit agencies. In addition, the State would fail to gain approval for the Title IV-E and TANF Block Grant state plans.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm Subpgm
KSA 39-708c(r) KSA 38-2201 et seq. 42 USC 670-678 42 USC 620-628 42 USC 677 42 USC 604(a)(2)	Mandatory	Y	2                      2
<h4>Program Goals</h4>			
A. Provide temporary placements for children who cannot remain safely in their homes. B. Secure permanency for children in care by reuniting them with their families or finding permanent families for children who cannot safely return home. C. Assist youth leaving foster care without permanent families to live independently and become self-sufficient. D. Provide assessments and interventions directed towards safeguarding the well-being and general welfare of children and vulnerable adults who are in need of protection. E. Provide prevention services to families based on each family's individual needs, eligibility and available resources.			
<h4>Program History</h4>			
Foster care services are provided to children and families when the court has found the child to be in need of care, and the parents are not able to meet the safety and care needs of the child. Most children who require foster care have been abused or neglected and have significant developmental, physical and emotional needs, which require an array of services and care options. However, some children who are not abused or neglected may be placed in foster care for reasons such as out-of-control behavior, overwhelmed parents and running away from home. Four Child Welfare Case Management Providers are responsible for providing direct service to the child and family including case planning, placement, service delivery, reporting to the court, and collaboration with community resources to ensure appropriate services are available in close proximity to the child's home.			

**Foster Care Grants for Children Receiving Out-of-Home Services  
Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percent of children who reached permanency within 12 months of entering foster care	B	36.4%	35.8%	34.0%	35.8%	33.3%	36.9%	40.5%	34.4%
2. Percent of children who re-entered foster care within 12 months of their discharge to reunification, living with relative, or permanent custodianship/guardianship	B	9.4%	10.1%	10.1%	9.4%	8.9%	8.4%	8.0%	9.7%
3. Percent of children in out-of-home placements less than 12 months with two or fewer placements	B	70.2%	75.7%	79.3%	83.3%	78.7%	81.0%	83.3%	77.9%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
Average monthly cost per child	B	\$2,417	\$2,961	\$2,994	\$3,237	\$3,237	\$3,438	\$3,438	\$3,064

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 149,702,398	\$ 186,920,401	\$ 171,336,559	\$ 167,400,000	\$ 159,282,384	\$ 187,600,000	\$ 187,600,000	\$ 172,513,115
Non-SGF State Funds	5,463,186	7,176,316	6,500,000	13,594,015	13,594,015	10,500,000	10,500,000	9,090,110
Federal Funds	59,871,734	66,049,988	68,129,226	73,905,985	72,828,311	73,900,000	73,900,000	69,002,508
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 215,037,318</b>	<b>\$ 260,146,705</b>	<b>\$ 245,965,785</b>	<b>\$ 254,900,000</b>	<b>\$ 245,704,710</b>	<b>\$ 272,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 272,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 250,605,733</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>

Note: FY 2022 removes a \$10,013,441 SGF reappropriation in order to maintain the FY 2022 consensus caseload estimate.

## Prevention and Protection Services

### Adult Protective Services

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Victims would experience continued abuse and exploitation.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 39-1433	Mandatory	N	2	3

#### Program Goals

- A. Provide temporary placements for children who cannot remain safely in their homes.  
 B. Secure permanency for children in care by reuniting them with their families or finding permanent families for children who cannot safely return home.  
 C. Assist youth leaving foster care without permanent families to live independently and become self-sufficient.  
 D. Provide assessments and interventions directed towards safeguarding the well-being and general welfare of children and vulnerable adults who are in need of protection.  
 E. Provide prevention services to families based on each family's individual needs, eligibility and available resources.

#### Program History

Adult Protective Services (APS) provides interventions directed toward safeguarding the well-being and general welfare of adults who are unable to protect themselves. The intent of APS is to protect vulnerable adults from abuse, neglect, and financial exploitation while safeguarding their civil liberties. APS protection specialists investigate reports and provide protective services to adults aged 18 and older residing in the community and to adults residing in facilities licensed/certified by the Kansas Department for Aging and Disabilities.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Percent of Adult Protective Service investigations completed timely	D	82.8%	84.6%	84.2%	84.4%	77.0%	81.0%	85.0%	81.9%
Output Measures									
2. Total cost per investigation	D	\$69	\$75	\$81	\$213	\$110	\$162	\$103	\$89

Department for Children and Families

*Adult Protective Services*  
**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 720,613	\$ 764,923	\$ 748,481	\$ 756,052	\$ 789,091	\$ 768,492	\$ 755,590	\$ 767,498
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	55,948	1,417,499	335,255	1,522,619	1,021,704	130,401
<b>Total</b>	\$ 720,613	\$ 764,923	\$ 804,429	\$ 2,173,551	\$ 1,124,346	\$ 2,291,111	\$ 1,777,294	\$ 897,899
<b>FTE</b>	5.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	12.0	12.0	6.0

## Prevention and Protection Services

### *Licensing Foster Care Homes*

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The health and safety in child care facilities would decline.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 65-501 et seq. KSA 65-516 KSA 75-53,105	Mandatory	Y	2	4

#### Program Goals

- A. Provide temporary placements for children who cannot remain safely in their homes.  
 B. Secure permanency for children in care by reuniting them with their families or finding permanent families for children who cannot safely return home.  
 C. Assist youth leaving foster care without permanent families to live independently and become self-sufficient.  
 D. Provide assessments and interventions directed towards safeguarding the well-being and general welfare of children and vulnerable adults who are in need of protection.  
 E. Provide prevention services to families based on each family's individual needs, eligibility and available resources.

#### Program History

Foster Care Licensing is responsible for licensure and regulatory compliance for all 24-hour-per-day, seven-day-per-week childcare facilities, and for agencies that provide placement services in Kansas. They conduct initial and ongoing compliance inspection.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of foster care and residential facilities licensed	A	2,930	3,034	2,850	3,189	2,567	3,256	3,396	2,817
2. Number of enforcement actions issued	A	203	394	305	325	111	213	250	270

Department for Children and Families

*Licensing Foster Care Homes*  
**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,748,532	\$ 2,671,912	\$ 1,962,246	\$ 1,976,968	\$ 1,967,494	\$ 1,846,578	\$ 1,781,566	\$ 2,200,551
Non-SGF State Funds	9,642	5,800	7,454	-	6,640	-	-	6,631
Federal Funds	474,993	603,859	320,176	238,570	230,119	381,309	367,889	384,718
<b>Total</b>	\$ 2,233,167	\$ 3,281,571	\$ 2,289,876	\$ 2,215,538	\$ 2,204,253	\$ 2,227,887	\$ 2,149,455	\$ 2,591,900
<b>FTE</b>	-	-	39.0	38.0	38.0	38.0	38.0	25.7

## Prevention and Protection Services

### Families First Program

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

A significant opportunity to expand child welfare prevention services and to reduce the number of children in foster care would be missed.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
42 USC 711( e)(5)	Discretionary	Y	2	5

#### Program Goals

- A. Provide temporary placements for children who cannot remain safely in their homes.  
 B. Secure permanency for children in care by reuniting them with their families or finding permanent families for children who cannot safely return home.  
 C. Assist youth leaving foster care without permanent families to live independently and become self-sufficient.  
 D. Provide assessments and interventions directed towards safeguarding the well-being and general welfare of children and vulnerable adults who are in need of protection.  
 E. Provide prevention services to families based on each family's individual needs, eligibility and available resources.

#### Program History

The Families First Program provides prevention services to keep children and youth from entering out-of-home placement through approved evidence-based or emerging programs in mental health, substance use, parent skill building, and kinship navigation. This program has been developed based on the federal Family First Prevention Services Act (FFPSA) requirements which allow states to access Title IV-E funding for prevention services. Grants have been awarded to twelve community partners and stakeholders who provide approved evidence based or emerging programs in counties and communities statewide.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Percent of families referred to Families First grantees shall be engaged timely in services	E	--	--	73.0%	83.0%	71.0%	95.0%	95.0%	72.0%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
2. Percent of children who are not removed into foster care during Families First Services or within one year of service referral	E	--	--	89.0%	90.0%	89.0%	91.0%	95.0%	89.0%

Department for Children and Families

*Families First Program*

<i>Funding Source</i>	<b>Funding</b>							
	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ 4,172,283	\$ 2,076,876	\$ 10,603,838	\$ 6,445,279	\$ 11,191,831	\$ 11,189,715	\$ 4,231,479
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	160,605	2,947,211	11,354,493	7,619,785	7,399,708	9,656,371	9,115,584	7,233,804
<b>Total</b>	\$ 160,605	\$ 7,119,494	\$ 13,431,369	\$ 18,223,623	\$ 13,844,987	\$ 20,848,202	\$ 20,305,299	\$ 11,465,283
<b>FTE</b>	-	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0

## Prevention and Protection Services

### Family Preservation Services

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Children would experience continued abuse and neglect. More children would enter foster care.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 39-708c(r) KSA 38-2201(b)(8) 42 USC 622(b)(8)(A)(iv) 42 USC 629a-f 42 USC 601(a)	Discretionary	Y	2	6
<b>Program Goals</b>				

- A. Provide temporary placements for children who cannot remain safely in their homes.  
 B. Secure permanency for children in care by reuniting them with their families or finding permanent families for children who cannot safely return home.  
 C. Assist youth leaving foster care without permanent families to live independently and become self-sufficient.  
 D. Provide assessments and interventions directed towards safeguarding the well-being and general welfare of children and vulnerable adults who are in need of protection.  
 E. Provide prevention services to families based on each family's individual needs, eligibility and available resources.

#### Program History

Family preservation grants are intensive, in-home and case management services offered to families who are at imminent risk of having a child removed from their home and placed in DCF custody. The services are family-centered, supportive, culturally competent and address the entire family as well as individual members. The program is designed as a two-tiered system, with the duration of the intensive services dependent on the tier to which the family is referred.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Families referred shall not have a child removed into foster care during the service period or within 30 days of case closure.	E	--	92.6%	87.7%	91.4%	89.4%	92.6%	95.0%	89.9%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Direct services cost per referral	E	\$4,507	\$5,297	\$5,577	\$5,877	\$6,002	\$5,935	\$5,935	\$5,625

Department for Children and Families

*Family Preservation Services*

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 926,037	\$ 760,310	\$ 619,840	\$ 820,545	\$ 614,830	\$ 983,398	\$ 983,398	\$ 664,993
Non-SGF State Funds	2,154,357	3,241,062	3,241,062	3,241,062	3,241,062	3,241,062	3,241,062	3,241,062
Federal Funds	8,940,988	6,020,015	6,367,244	7,938,393	6,503,212	7,775,540	7,775,540	6,296,824
<b>Total</b>	\$ 12,021,382	\$ 10,021,387	\$ 10,228,146	\$ 12,000,000	\$ 10,359,104	\$ 12,000,000	\$ 12,000,000	\$ 10,202,879
<b>FTE</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Prevention and Protection Services

### Adoption Support

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Greatly extend the stay of approximately one-third of children in foster care whose appropriate permanency goal is adoption. In addition, the State would fail to gain approval for the Title IV-E and TANF Block Grant state plans.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Priority Level Subpgm
KSA 39-708c(r) KSA 38-321 42 USC 670-678 42 USC 620-628.	Discretionary	Y	2	7

#### Program Goals

- A. Provide temporary placements for children who cannot remain safely in their homes.  
 B. Secure permanency for children in care by reuniting them with their families or finding permanent families for children who cannot safely return home.  
 C. Assist youth leaving foster care without permanent families to live independently and become self-sufficient.  
 D. Provide assessments and interventions directed towards safeguarding the well-being and general welfare of children and vulnerable adults who are in need of protection.  
 E. Provide prevention services to families based on each family's individual needs, eligibility and available resources.

#### Program History

Adoption Support is designed to remove barriers to the adoption of children with special needs, who otherwise could not be adopted and to assist the adoptive family in meeting the special and ordinary needs of a child. The types of assistance the child receives are determined by negotiation with the Prevention and Protection Services staff. Assistance may include a special one-time payment, non-recurring expenses to provide for legal fees, an ongoing monthly financial subsidy, a medical card or a combination of these items.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Percent of adoptions within 24 months of the removal from home	B	17.0%	18.6%	14.9%	16.6%	12.8%	19.8%	26.8%	15.4%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
2. Number of children adopted	B	1,210	999	846	896	948	983	1,019	931
3. Direct services average monthly cost per child	B	\$446	\$455	\$458	\$463	\$466	\$477	\$463	\$460

Department for Children and Families

*Adoption Support*

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 21,252,877	\$ 20,592,146	\$ 19,668,403	\$ 22,990,647	\$ 19,928,150	\$ 23,960,420	\$ 24,680,525	\$ 20,062,900
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	858,935	-
Federal Funds	19,794,475	23,765,889	26,194,758	25,085,996	27,886,972	26,552,265	27,495,737	25,949,206
<b>Total</b>	\$ 41,047,352	\$ 44,358,035	\$ 45,863,161	\$ 48,076,643	\$ 47,815,122	\$ 50,512,685	\$ 53,035,197	\$ 46,012,106
<b>FTE</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Prevention and Protection Services

### *Permanent Custodianship*

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Some children would remain in foster care.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 39-708c(r)	Discretionary	N	2	8

#### Program Goals

- A. Provide temporary placements for children who cannot remain safely in their homes.  
 B. Secure permanency for children in care by reuniting them with their families or finding permanent families for children who cannot safely return home.  
 C. Assist youth leaving foster care without permanent families to live independently and become self-sufficient.  
 D. Provide assessments and interventions directed towards safeguarding the well-being and general welfare of children and vulnerable adults who are in need of  
 E. Provide prevention services to families based on each family's individual needs, eligibility and available resources.

#### Program History

Permanent Custodianship is an option that is explored when there are compelling reasons for reintegration and adoption not being the preferred permanency option. This option may be more appropriate for older children, those with strong family bonds, or when cultural traditions influence the permanency decision. When custodianship is established, a subsidy may be provided to assist families willing to assume the responsibility of establishing a permanent home for older children and their siblings.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Percent of permanent custodianships within 18 months of the removal from home	B	58.0%	59.2%	48.4%	49.9%	43.8%	51.9%	60.0%	50.5%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
Average monthly cost per child	B	\$302	\$317	\$303	\$300	\$304	\$301	\$302	\$308

Department for Children and Families

*Permanent Custodianship*  
**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 552,556	\$ 572,671	\$ 528,193	\$ 474,725	\$ 462,927	\$ 415,315	\$ 435,208	\$ 521,264
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 552,556	\$ 572,671	\$ 528,193	\$ 474,725	\$ 462,927	\$ 415,315	\$ 435,208	\$ 521,264
<b>FTE</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Prevention and Protection Services

### *Adoption Services*

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Greatly extend the stay of approximately one-third of children in foster care whose appropriate permanency goal is adoption. In addition, the State would fail to gain approval for the Title IV-E and TANF Block Grant state plans.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Priority Level Subpgm
KSA 38-321 42 USC 671	Discretionary	Y	2	9

#### Program Goals

- A. Provide temporary placements for children who cannot remain safely in their homes.  
 B. Secure permanency for children in care by reuniting them with their families or finding permanent families for children who cannot safely return home.  
 C. Assist youth leaving foster care without permanent families to live independently and become self-sufficient.  
 D. Provide assessments and interventions directed towards safeguarding the well-being and general welfare of children and vulnerable adults who are in need of protection.  
 E. Provide prevention services to families based on each family's individual needs, eligibility and available resources.

#### Program History

This program is comprised of the adoption facilitation contract and expenditures required to fulfill Adoption Support maintenance of effort requirements related to the Fostering Connections Act. This Act allowed qualified state-funded adoption support clients to be converted to Title IV-E eligible status, resulting in state fund savings, and established a state maintenance of effort requirement. The state-fund savings must be spent on new Title IV-E or Title IV-B activities.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Percentage of children served through the state adoption facilitation contract who have been adopted	B	8.9%	19.4%	18.4%	19.4%	25.0%	28.6%	30.4%	20.9%
<i>Output Measures</i>									

Department for Children and Families

Adoption Services

Funding								
<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 970,989	\$ 934,855	\$ 932,653	\$ 779,503	\$ 784,124	\$ 2,056,707	\$ 1,306,707	\$ 883,877
Non-SGF State Funds	128,055	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Federal Funds	170,021	175,389	177,592	187,589	187,968	181,597	181,597	180,316
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,269,065	\$ 1,260,244	\$ 1,260,245	\$ 1,117,092	\$ 1,122,092	\$ 2,388,304	\$ 1,638,304	\$ 1,214,194
<b>FTE</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Prevention and Protection Services

### *Independent Living*

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Eliminate a significant transitional support to children formerly in foster care who are pursuing independence and their life goals.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
42 USC 677 PL 116-260. Div X	Discretionary	Y	2	10

#### Program Goals

- A. Provide temporary placements for children who cannot remain safely in their homes.  
 B. Secure permanency for children in care by reuniting them with their families or finding permanent families for children who cannot safely return home.  
 C. Assist youth leaving foster care without permanent families to live independently and become self-sufficient.  
 D. Provide assessments and interventions directed towards safeguarding the well-being and general welfare of children and vulnerable adults who are in need of protection.  
 E. Provide prevention services to families based on each family's individual needs, eligibility and available resources.

#### Program History

Independent Living services are available to young people between the ages of 14 and 21, who were in DCF custody and in out-of-home placement for any length of time on or after their 14th birthday. The purpose of the program is to ensure that youth have a smooth and successful transition from foster care to independence. Available services include assistance with completing secondary and post-secondary education, monthly cash subsidies, life-skills training and leadership opportunities.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of youth served in the Independent Living Program	C	902	858	966	1,001	973	950	901	932
2. Direct services cost per person	C	\$1,951	\$2,418	\$3,700	\$9,261	\$9,080	\$4,748	\$4,280	\$5,066

Department for Children and Families

*Independent Living  
Funding*

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 451,821	\$ 534,658	\$ 756,708	\$ 694,132	\$ 638,959	\$ 1,479,781	\$ 1,478,522	\$ 643,442
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	1,927,569	2,371,415	3,311,072	9,829,621	9,289,523	4,094,109	3,196,286	4,990,670
<b>Total</b>	\$ 2,379,390	\$ 2,906,073	\$ 4,067,780	\$ 10,523,753	\$ 9,928,482	\$ 5,573,890	\$ 4,674,808	\$ 5,634,112
<b>FTE</b>	3.0	3.0	3.0	11.0	11.0	11.0	3.0	5.7

## Prevention and Protection Services

### *Family Crisis Support Services*

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Families would either not receive supports, or their children would be placed in restrictive or institutional interventions to receive needed supports.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 38-2201(b)(8) 42 USC 621(2)	Discretionary	N	2	11

#### Program Goals

- A. Provide temporary placements for children who cannot remain safely in their homes.  
 B. Secure permanency for children in care by reuniting them with their families or finding permanent families for children who cannot safely return home.  
 C. Assist youth leaving foster care without permanent families to live independently and become self-sufficient.  
 D. Provide assessments and interventions directed towards safeguarding the well-being and general welfare of children and vulnerable adults who are in need of protection.  
 E. Provide prevention services to families based on each family's individual needs, eligibility and available resources.

#### Program History

The Family Crisis Support Services program serves families and caregivers whose children are experiencing an increase in behavioral health symptoms. This program aspires to a crisis continuum of care that deescalates and ameliorates a crisis before more restrictive or institutional intervention becomes necessary. The agency contracts for the management of a centralized behavioral health crisis hotline, screening and mobile response stabilization services.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Families will not require another contact to the crisis hotline for 12 months after initial crisis call	D	--	--	--	75.0%	91.5%	93.6%	95.2%	91.5%
<i>Output Measures</i>									

#### Funding

Department for Children and Families

Funding Source	Family Crisis Support Services							
	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est	FY 2024 Est	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 1,755,232	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 585,077
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 1,755,232	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 585,077
FTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Prevention and Protection Services

### Family Services

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Children would experience continued abuse and neglect. More children would enter foster care.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 38-2201(b)(8) 42 USC 621(2)	Discretionary	Y	2	12

#### Program Goals

- A. Provide temporary placements for children who cannot remain safely in their homes.  
 B. Secure permanency for children in care by reuniting them with their families or finding permanent families for children who cannot safely return home.  
 C. Assist youth leaving foster care without permanent families to live independently and become self-sufficient.  
 D. Provide assessments and interventions directed towards safeguarding the well-being and general welfare of children and vulnerable adults who are in need of protection.  
 E. Provide prevention services to families based on each family's individual needs, eligibility and available resources.

#### Program History

The purpose of the Family Services Program is to maintain children safely in their own homes by mitigating the risk factors that signal the likelihood of out-of-home placement. Services are provided to families in crisis resulting from a sudden onset of urgent circumstances which may endanger a child or children resulting in the risk of removal from their home. The services provided are based on a protection specialist's assessment of risk and safety at the time a report is received. Services are provided directly by DCF staff and/or other community agencies and organizations.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of persons served in the Family Services Program	E	5,889	5,163	4,587	5,213	5,249	5,433	5,623	5,000

Department for Children and Families

*Family Services*  
**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 731,619	\$ 661,646	\$ 782,219	\$ 1,125,526	\$ 1,293,513	\$ 1,125,526	\$ 1,125,526	\$ 912,459
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	876,534	853,430	876,565	876,467	1,271,639	876,467	876,467	1,000,545
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,608,153	\$ 1,515,076	\$ 1,658,784	\$ 2,001,993	\$ 2,565,152	\$ 2,001,993	\$ 2,001,993	\$ 1,913,004
<b>FTE</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Prevention and Protection Services

### Human Trafficking

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

A safe placement solely for victims of human trafficking would be unavailable. Fewer victims would be reunited with their families.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level	
			Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 38-2202(d)(14) KSA 38-2242(c)(1)(E) KSA 38-2243(g)(1)(E) 2021 HB 159 §44	Mandatory	N	2	13

#### Program Goals

- A. Provide temporary placements for children who cannot remain safely in their homes.
- B. Secure permanency for children in care by reuniting them with their families or finding permanent families for children who cannot safely return home.
- C. Assist youth leaving foster care without permanent families to live independently and become self-sufficient.
- D. Provide assessments and interventions directed towards safeguarding the well-being and general welfare of children and vulnerable adults who are in need of protection.
- E. Provide prevention services to families based on each family's individual needs, eligibility and available resources.

#### Program History

The purpose of the Human Trafficking program is to provide a safe placement for alleged victims of human trafficking in Kansas and refer them to the appropriate services. In previous years, assessments for alleged victims of human trafficking were paid from this subprogram; however, in FY 2021 that portion was incorporated into the foster care case management provider grants. Funding continues to pay for placement costs. Additionally, the budget includes \$300,000 SGF appropriated by the 2021 Legislature to specifically fund services provided by Hope Ranch in Wichita.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of human trafficking victims served at Hope Ranch	A,D	--	--	--	40	30	40	50	30

Department for Children and Families

*Human Trafficking*  
**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 91,983	\$ 25,030	\$ 7,500	\$ 340,000	\$ 306,500	\$ 340,000	\$ 340,000	\$ 113,010
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	2,445	-	-	-	-	-	815
<b>Total</b>	\$ 91,983	\$ 27,475	\$ 7,500	\$ 340,000	\$ 306,500	\$ 340,000	\$ 340,000	\$ 113,825
<b>FTE</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Prevention and Protection Services

### Child Protective Services Grants

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Child protective service training would be limited or unavailable. Promising strategies on combating child abuse would not be deployed. Available federal funding sources would not be utilized to support and enhance child welfare related efforts.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
42 USC 5106a 42 USC 5106c 42 USC 673b 42 USC 629g(b)(4) HP 718 CARES Act	Discretionary	N	2	14

#### Program Goals

- A. Provide temporary placements for children who cannot remain safely in their homes.  
 B. Secure permanency for children in care by reuniting them with their families or finding permanent families for children who cannot safely return home.  
 C. Assist youth leaving foster care without permanent families to live independently and become self-sufficient.  
 D. Provide assessments and interventions directed towards safeguarding the well-being and general welfare of children and vulnerable adults who are in need of protection.  
 E. Provide prevention services to families based on each family's individual needs, eligibility and available resources.

#### Program History

This subprogram is comprised of the following federal grants: Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act Grant, the Children's Justice Act Grant, Adoption Incentive Grant, National Electronic Interstate Compact Enterprise (NEICE) Grant, Coronavirus Aid, Relief and Economic Security (CARES) Child Welfare Grant, Consolidated Appropriations Act (CAA) Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) Pandemic Grant, and American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) CAPTA Pandemic Grant.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Citizen Review Panel Annual Reports are completed with recommendations for DCF	A, B, C, D, E	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Department for Children and Families

*Child Protective Services Grants*  
**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 201	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 67
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	610,683	1,688,207	1,543,056	3,486,243	3,062,752	4,457,893	2,032,090	2,098,005
<b>Total</b>	\$ 610,683	\$ 1,688,207	\$ 1,543,056	\$ 3,486,243	\$ 3,062,953	\$ 4,457,893	\$ 2,032,090	\$ 2,098,072
<b>FTE</b>	1.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.3

## Prevention and Protection Services

### Prevention and Protection Services - Other Grants

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Families would not receive valuable services which could result in children being removed from the home.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
42 USC 674 (a)(3) 42 USC 621(2)	Discretionary	N	2	15
<b>Program Goals</b>				

- A. Provide temporary placements for children who cannot remain safely in their homes.
- B. Secure permanency for children in care by reuniting them with their families or finding permanent families for children who cannot safely return home.
- C. Assist youth leaving foster care without permanent families to live independently and become self-sufficient.
- D. Provide assessments and interventions directed towards safeguarding the well-being and general welfare of children and vulnerable adults who are in need of protection.
- E. Provide prevention services to families based on each family's individual needs, eligibility and available resources.

#### Program History

High-Quality Legal Assistance Services: Provides legal service to parents with children ages 0 to 17 who have been the subject of a report received by the Kansas Reporting Center which has been assigned for assessment or who have come to the attention of the agency.

Behavioral Intervention Services: Provides intensive one-on-one services, within the family home, to children who are not in foster care but struggle with behavioral and emotional management.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Families served by a High Quality Legal Services grantee shall have no children removed into foster care	D, E	--	--	--	--	--	80.0%	82.0%	

#### Funding

Department for Children and Families

<i>Prevention and Protection Services - Other Grants</i>									
<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>	
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 292,363	\$ 1,570,090	\$ 1,570,090	\$ 97,454	
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	2,953	10,809	10,809	984	
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 295,316	\$ 1,580,899	\$ 1,580,899	\$ 98,439	
<b>FTE</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

## Prevention and Protection Services

### *Foster Care Federal Disability Advocacy*

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Approximately \$5.8 million in federal disability reimbursements would have to be replaced by state funds.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 39-708c( r)	Discretionary	N	2	16

#### Program Goals

- A. Provide temporary placements for children who cannot remain safely in their homes.  
 B. Secure permanency for children in care by reuniting them with their families or finding permanent families for children who cannot safely return home.  
 C. Assist youth leaving foster care without permanent families to live independently and become self-sufficient.  
 D. Provide assessments and interventions directed towards safeguarding the well-being and general welfare of children and vulnerable adults who are in need of protection.  
 E. Provide prevention services to families based on each family's individual needs, eligibility and available resources.

#### Program History

The Foster Care Federal Disability Advocacy contract provides statewide disability determination, intensive case management, and legal representation for children in foster care with disabilities. The contractor screens referrals to determine if the child meets the Social Security Administration's standard of disability. The contractor is responsible for pursuing each case through the Social Security Administration application and appeals process to either a successful or non-successful claim. The funding is 100 percent State General Funds.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of children obtaining federal disability benefits	D	240	166	178	190	211	234	260	185

#### Funding

Department for Children and Families

*Foster Care Federal Disability Advocacy*

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 248,656	\$ 274,870	\$ 235,000	\$ 265,000	\$ 216,440	\$ 265,000	\$ 265,000	\$ 242,103
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 248,656	\$ 274,870	\$ 235,000	\$ 265,000	\$ 216,440	\$ 265,000	\$ 265,000	\$ 242,103
<b>FTE</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Prevention and Protection Services

### *Tribal Grants*

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

DCF would assume responsibility for children in need of care.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level	
			Pgm	Subpgm
25 USC 1902	Discretionary	N	2	17

### Program Goals

- A. Provide temporary placements for children who cannot remain safely in their homes.
- B. Secure permanency for children in care by reuniting them with their families or finding permanent families for children who cannot safely return home.
- C. Assist youth leaving foster care without permanent families to live independently and become self-sufficient.
- D. Provide assessments and interventions directed towards safeguarding the well-being and general welfare of children and vulnerable adults who are in need of protection.
- E. Provide prevention services to families based on each family's individual needs, eligibility and available resources.

### Program History

Child Welfare Grants to Native American Tribes provide funding to the tribes in Kansas. It is the purpose and intent of the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 to protect the best interests of Native American children by preserving tribal integrity and reducing the removal of children from homes and tribal environments. The grants are to be used for prevention and foster care services.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Percent of youth, age 14 and over, in out-of-home placement, who receive life skills services which are individualized based upon the youth's needs and abilities to meet the goals necessary for self-reliance	C	24.5%	92.3%	90.0%	100.0%	96.0%	100.0%	100.0%	92.8%

Department for Children and Families

*Tribal Grants*

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 350,573	\$ 350,573	\$ 350,573	\$ 350,573	\$ 338,276	\$ 392,000	\$ 392,000	\$ 346,474
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 350,573	\$ 350,573	\$ 350,573	\$ 350,573	\$ 338,276	\$ 392,000	\$ 392,000	\$ 346,474
<b>FTE</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Prevention and Protection Services

### Prevention and Protection Services Administration

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The absence of management would impair the execution of agency initiatives and policies, as well as the operation of federal programs.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 39-708c(r) KSA 38-2201 et seq,	Mandatory	Y	2	na

#### Program Goals

- A. Provide temporary placements for children who cannot remain safely in their homes.  
 B. Secure permanency for children in care by reuniting them with their families or finding permanent families for children who cannot safely return home.  
 C. Assist youth leaving foster care without permanent families to live independently and become self-sufficient.  
 D. Provide assessments and interventions directed towards safeguarding the well-being and general welfare of children and vulnerable adults who are in need of protection.  
 E. Provide prevention services to families based on each family's individual needs, eligibility and available resources.

#### Program History

The Prevention and Protection Services Administration Program (PPS) establishes policy and provides direction, oversight and support to regional offices for several programs including child abuse investigations, prevention, reintegration/foster care, adoption services, independent living transitional services, and foster home and residential licensing.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
No performance indicators - administration program									
Output Measures									

#### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est	FY 2024 Est	3-yr. Avg.
----------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	---------------------	--------------------	----------------	----------------	------------

Department for Children and Families

Prevention and Protection Services Administration																
State General Fund	\$	3,717,289	\$	4,226,489	\$	5,237,001	\$	5,746,146	\$	6,307,338	\$	5,326,250	\$	5,220,947	\$	5,256,943
Non-SGF State Funds		52,449		20,419		16,954		78,934		98,738		1,304,134		1,212,000		45,370
Federal Funds		329,298		468,429		347,691		418,012		374,338		412,805		406,762		396,819
Total	\$	4,099,036	\$	4,715,337	\$	5,601,646	\$	6,243,092	\$	6,780,414	\$	7,043,189	\$	6,839,709	\$	5,699,132
FTE		33.0		36.0		44.0		46.0		46.0		46.0		46.0		42.0

## Economic and Employment Services

### TANF Cash Assistance

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Low income parents may be unable to meet basic needs and to care for their children.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 39-708c( c) KSA 39-709(b) 42 USC 601(a)	Discretionary	Y	3	1

#### Program Goals

- A. Assist low-income families and individuals in obtaining training and education to encourage personal responsibility.  
B. Provide appropriate support services to assist clients in gaining or retaining employment and becoming self-sufficient

#### Program History

The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Cash Assistance program provides monthly benefits to low-income families for basic needs such as clothing, housing, utilities and transportation. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996 removed the entitlement to welfare, established time limits and work requirements for welfare recipients, and instituted block grants to states. The lifetime limit for assistance is 24 months, with 12 additional months of assistance if the family meets hardship criteria. Almost all families with an adult must participate in work activities and seek employment through the TANF Employment Services program. Work participants must be engaged in one of eight employment activities for generally 30 hours per week. In response to the COVID pandemic, federal funds were authorized in Federal Fiscal Year 2021 to provide short-term non-recurrent benefits.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Percent of families losing TANF due to employment who continue to receive food assistance, transitional assistance, and child care	B	94.0%	88.0%	70.8%	75.0%	82.0%	85.0%	85.0%	80.3%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
2. Direct services average monthly cost per person	B	\$114	\$114	\$114	\$112	\$115	\$115	\$115	\$114

Department for Children and Families

*TANF Cash Assistance*

TANF Cash Assistance								
Funding Source	Funding							
	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est	FY 2024 Est	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	12,086,745	12,761,625	11,164,239	15,642,203	15,080,035	10,885,289	10,700,000	13,001,966
Total	\$ 12,086,745	\$ 12,761,625	\$ 11,164,239	\$ 15,642,203	\$ 15,080,035	\$ 10,885,289	\$ 10,700,000	\$ 13,001,966
FTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Economic and Employment Services

### Child Care Assistance

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

A penalty would be incurred for failing to meet a TANF provision requiring child care to be provided to the children of TANF recipients in work activities. In addition, low-income, employed parents who rely on child care would either be unable to continue working or would be compelled to leave their children in unsafe care arrangements.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 39-708c(c) KSA 39-709(b)(16) 42 USC 618 42 USC 9857 et seq.	Discretionary	Y	3	2

#### Program Goals

- A. Assist low-income families and individuals in obtaining training and education to encourage personal responsibility.  
B. Provide appropriate support services to assist clients in gaining or retaining employment and becoming self-sufficient

#### Program History

Child Care Assistance provides low-income, working families with access to affordable, quality child care that allows them to continue working, attend training, or continue their education. It is also provided to families whose children are receiving protective services. Child care benefits vary depending on the family's income, the number of children in care, hours of care, the age of the child, and the type and location of child care setting. The first major federal child care program originated in 1990. Beginning in FY 2021, the method of paying for child care was changed from authorizing funds for a specific number of hours based on the parent's work schedule to authorizing child care in part-time or full-time blocks. In response to the pandemic in the spring of 2020, additional federal child care funding was made available.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Employed families receiving Child Care Assistance whose earnings increase at the next review	B	63.7%	74.0%	66.2%	66.7%	66.7%	70.0%	70.0%	69.0%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
2. Direct services average monthly cost per child	B	\$377	\$427	\$424	\$499	\$452	\$528	\$536	\$434

Department for Children and Families

*Child Care Assistance*

<i>Funding Source</i>	<b>Funding</b>							
	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 10,429,862	\$ 10,429,859	\$ 10,429,859	\$ 7,429,859	\$ 7,429,859	\$ 10,429,859	\$ 10,429,859	\$ 9,429,859
Non-SGF State Funds	5,033,679	5,033,679	5,033,679	5,033,679	5,033,679	5,033,679	5,033,679	5,033,679
Federal Funds	24,490,049	36,351,499	40,940,952	60,294,133	51,184,042	52,697,584	52,810,822	42,825,498
<b>Total</b>	\$ 39,953,590	\$ 51,815,037	\$ 56,404,490	\$ 72,757,671	\$ 63,647,580	\$ 68,161,122	\$ 68,274,360	\$ 57,289,036
<b>FTE</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Economic and Employment Services

### TANF Employment Services

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Job skills and training would be unavailable to TANF cash assistance recipients. The State may incur a penalty for failing to meet the TANF work participation requirements.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 39-708c(c) KSA 39-709(b)(4) 42 USC 601(a)	Mandatory	Y	3	3

#### Program Goals

- A. Assist low-income families and individuals in obtaining training and education to encourage personal responsibility.  
B. Provide appropriate support services to assist clients in gaining or retaining employment and becoming self-sufficient

#### Program History

The TANF Employment Services program promotes employment and self-sufficiency by providing job search, education and training related to employment, and job retention services to TANF recipients. The program recognizes that some recipients or family members have barriers that must be addressed before they can succeed in the workplace. Employment services are tailored to meet individual and family needs and are coordinated through intensive case management. Adults receiving cash assistance receive help with child care, alcohol or drug abuse, domestic violence and other factors that affect family stability. They must participate in work activities to remain eligible for cash assistance. Twelve months of transitional services, including periodic job retention payments, are available to families leaving cash assistance due to employment

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Percent of TANF recipients obtaining employment	B	43.0%	48.5%	41.5%	46.5%	45.6%	46.5%	46.5%	45.2%
2. Percent of TANF recipients who retain employment in the quarter following employment	B	84.2%	75.3%	73.0%	73.0%	78.0%	78.0%	78.0%	75.4%

Department for Children and Families

TANF Employment Services									
Output Measures									
3. TANF All Families work participation rate	B	36.2%	31.1%	38.4%	40.0%	38.8%	40.0%	40.0%	36.1%
4. Direct services average monthly cost per adult	B	\$96	\$70	\$97	\$135	\$97	\$107	\$117	\$88
Funding									
Funding Source		FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est	FY 2024 Est	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 143,600	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 47,867
Non-SGF State Funds		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds		2,680,959	2,335,452	2,748,500	3,056,220	2,228,028	2,833,140	3,181,267	2,437,327
<b>Total</b>		\$ 2,680,959	\$ 2,335,452	\$ 2,748,500	\$ 3,056,220	\$ 2,371,628	\$ 2,833,140	\$ 3,181,267	\$ 2,485,193
<b>FTE</b>		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Economic and Employment Services

### Child Care Stabilization

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Parents may not be able to maintain employment due to lack of available child care.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 39-708c(c) 42 USC 9857(b)(3) and (b)(5) American Rescue Plan Act (PL117-2)	Discretionary	N	3	4
<b>Program Goals</b>				

- A. Assist low-income families and individuals in obtaining training and education to encourage personal responsibility.  
B. Provide appropriate support services to assist clients in gaining or retaining employment and becoming self-sufficient

#### Program History

In response to the COVID pandemic, Child Care Stabilization Grants were appropriated in the American Rescue Plan (ARP) Act. These funds are to support the stability of the child care sector during and after the public health emergency. At least 90% of the funds are to be spent as subgrants to qualified child care providers. Providers may spend these funds on a variety of operating expenses including wages and benefits, rent and utilities, cleaning and sanitation supplies and services and other goods and services necessary to maintain or resume child care services.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of child care providers receiving stabilization grants	B	--	--	--	3,132	3,755	5,000	--	

#### Funding

Department for Children and Families

*Child Care Stabilization*

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	106,948,703	210,180,556	2,802,266	-	70,060,185
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 106,948,703	\$ 210,180,556	\$ 2,802,266	\$ -	\$ 70,060,185
<b>FTE</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Economic and Employment Services

### Food Distribution

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Fewer low-income persons would have safe, nutritious, and balanced meals.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 39-708c( c) KSA 39-708c(h) 7 USC 2036	Discretionary	Y	3	5
<b>Program Goals</b>				

- A. Assist low-income families and individuals in obtaining training and education to encourage personal responsibility.  
B. Provide appropriate support services to assist clients in gaining or retaining employment and becoming self-sufficient

#### Program History

The Food Distribution program distributes food to low income households. Food products shipped to Kansas by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) are warehoused and shipped to local sites by a contractor. The food is delivered to central sites with the assistance of a network of local non-profits. The Nutrition Program for the Elderly and the Commodity Supplemental Food Program were established in 1965 and 1977, respectively, the Emergency Food Assistance Program followed in 1981, and the Soup Kitchen/Food Banks Program in 1988. The value of food commodities is not included in the budget.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. CSFP - Number of households served	B	6,056	5,722	4,970	5,885	4,428	5,000	5,000	5,040

#### Funding

Department for Children and Families

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Food Distribution</i>							
	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 72,853	\$ 79,082	\$ 91,300	\$ 89,044	\$ 69,288	\$ 80,797	\$ 78,654	\$ 79,890
Non-SGF State Funds	5,576	24,309	27,290	20,062	21,426	-	-	24,342
Federal Funds	1,334,351	2,304,913	2,524,589	2,004,133	1,745,224	2,248,865	1,764,224	2,191,575
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,412,780	\$ 2,408,304	\$ 2,643,179	\$ 2,113,239	\$ 1,835,938	\$ 2,329,662	\$ 1,842,878	\$ 2,295,807
<b>FTE</b>	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

## Economic and Employment Services

### Utility Assistance

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

A household's utilities could be disconnected.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 39-708c(c) 42 USC 8621-8630	Discretionary	N	3	6
<b>Program Goals</b>				

- A. Assist low-income families and individuals in obtaining training and education to encourage personal responsibility.  
B. Provide appropriate support services to assist clients in gaining or retaining employment and becoming self-sufficient

#### Program History

The Low-Income Energy Assistance Program (LIEAP) provides an annual benefit to low income households for home energy bills. To qualify for benefits, families must be at or below 150 percent of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL). Benefits are based on income, household size, and the type and cost of fuel. Funding for weatherization is transferred to the Kansas Housing Resources Corporation. The federal funding for this program occurs as a block grant. The federal Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program originated in 1980, in response to rising energy prices and Arab oil embargoes in the 1970s. In response to the COVID pandemic, the federally funded Low-Income Water Assistance Program (LIWAP) was established.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of households served	B	32,665	34,234	38,747	40,000	25,802	40,000	40,000	32,928
2. Direct services cost per household	B	\$780	\$817	\$634	\$1,964	\$2,365	\$1,103	711	\$1,272

#### Funding

Department for Children and Families

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Utility Assistance</i>							
	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	26,880,611	29,253,350	26,099,005	84,227,186	63,777,241	51,380,179	27,121,464	39,709,865
<b>Total</b>	\$ 26,880,611	\$ 29,253,350	\$ 26,099,005	\$ 84,227,186	\$ 63,777,241	\$ 51,380,179	\$ 27,121,464	\$ 39,709,865
<b>FTE</b>	7.0	7.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	18.0	17.3	5.3

## Economic and Employment Services

### Child Care Quality

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

DCF would incur a penalty for failing to meet Child Care and Development Fund spending targets for both child care quality and infants and toddlers. Parents would receive less information on child care resources. The qualifications of the child care workforce would decline.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Priority Level Subpgm
KSA 39-708c(c) 42 USC 9857(b)(3) and (b)(5)	Discretionary	N	3	7
<b>Program Goals</b>				

- A. Assist low-income families and individuals in obtaining training and education to encourage personal responsibility.  
B. Provide appropriate support services to assist clients in gaining or retaining employment and becoming self-sufficient

<b>Program History</b>									
The core role of this program is to provide information to parents about child care available in their communities and referrals to other programs in response to family needs. This is accomplished by maintaining a database on child care programs, building the supply of child care by providing training and technical assistance to new and existing providers, and providing technical assistance to improve the quality of child care in Kansas. In response to the pandemic, several rounds of additional federal funds were made available to assist impacted families and child care providers.									

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Percentage increase of child care providers accessing professional development	B	14.0%	2.4%	-6.0%	2.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	0.1%

#### Funding

Department for Children and Families

*Child Care Quality*

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	4,573,844	16,660,648	7,602,213	154,732,531	64,066,930	116,307,220	10,078,377	29,443,264
<b>Total</b>	\$ 4,573,844	\$ 16,660,648	\$ 7,602,213	\$ 154,732,531	\$ 64,066,930	\$ 116,307,220	\$ 10,078,377	\$ 29,443,264
<b>FTE</b>	-	2.0	2.0	6.0	6.0	6.3	8.0	3.3

## Economic and Employment Services

### *SNAP Employment and Training*

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Job readiness services would not be available for SNAP recipients. The State would not obtain state plan approval for the SNAP Program.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level						
			Pgm	Subpgm					
KSA 39-708c( c) 7 USC 2015(d)(4) 7 USC 2026(b) 2002 HB 2448	Discretionary	Y	3	8					
Program Goals									
A. Assist low-income families and individuals in obtaining training and education to encourage personal responsibility. B. Provide appropriate support services to assist clients in gaining or retaining employment and becoming self-sufficient									
Program History									
SNAP Employment & Training (SNAP E&T): Promotes employment and self-sufficiency by providing job search, education and training related to employment, and job retention services to SNAP recipients who do not receive TANF. The program was first established by the Food Security Act of 1987. Able-Bodied Adults without Dependents (ABAWDS) between the ages of 18 and 49 who not working at least 30 hours per week must be assigned to employment and training services. SNAP Work Program: Provides employment services to SNAP recipients with children and is funded with TANF. Technical Application Project for SNAP Success: design, implement and evaluate a mobile-enabled website to improve communication between SNAP work registrants and DCF.									
Performance Measures									
Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Percent of SNAP E&T (ABAWD) clients entering employment	B	14.0%	8.3%	9.9%	11.1%	13.2%	13.5%	13.5%	10.5%
2. Percent of GOALS clients entering employment	B	14.0%	7.0%	11.2%	11.5%	14.1%	14.3%	14.3%	10.8%

Department for Children and Families

*SNAP Employment and Training*

3. Percent of GOALS clients who retain employment in the quarter following employment	B	--	67.1%	69.8%	70.5%	71.0%	71.0%	71.0%	69.3%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Direct services average monthly cost per adult	B	\$28	\$38	\$64	\$71	\$65	\$83	\$89	\$56

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 28,723	\$ 41,143	\$ 72,797	\$ 78,108	\$ 71,549	\$ 399,000	\$ 78,582	\$ 61,830
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	1,555	-	-	518
Federal Funds	2,770,671	2,396,337	2,693,967	2,502,767	2,739,267	3,137,523	2,940,212	2,609,857
<b>Total</b>	\$ 2,799,394	\$ 2,437,480	\$ 2,766,764	\$ 2,580,875	\$ 2,812,371	\$ 3,536,523	\$ 3,018,794	\$ 2,672,205
<b>FTE</b>	38.0	41.0	17.0	29.0	29.0	35.0	35.0	29.0

## Economic and Employment Services

### Domestic Violence and Substance Abuse Services

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Parents and relative caregivers who use controlled substances would remain in the home with their children potentially putting children at risk. Adults needing domestic violence services would be required to seek local assistance.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Priority Level Subpgm
KSA 39-708c(c) KSA 39-709(l)(3) 42 USC 601-617	Discretionary	Y	3	9
<b>Program Goals</b>				

- A. Assist low-income families and individuals in obtaining training and education to encourage personal responsibility.  
B. Provide appropriate support services to assist clients in gaining or retaining employment and becoming self-sufficient

<b>Program History</b>									
Domestic Violence Services provide adults who have been victimized by domestic violence and/or sexual abuse with safety planning, mentoring services, healthy relationship training, conflict resolution training, financial literacy training and responsible parenting skills training. The Substance Abuse Case Management Services program includes expenditures for screening, assessment, multi-disciplinary care management and individualized care coordination for TANF participants with substance abuse issues. This program is designed to assist those with substance abuse issues to maintain sobriety and reduce barriers to employment and increase family stability.									

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Percent of TANF recipients referred to substance abuse disorder services with a successful discharge from services	B	65.0%	77.0%	71.0%	72.0%	70.0%	72.0%	72.0%	72.7%
<i>Output Measures</i>									

Department for Children and Families

*Domestic Violence and Substance Abuse Services*

Funding									
Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est	FY 2024 Est	3-yr. Avg.	
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Federal Funds	3,474,188	3,237,505	3,407,212	3,407,212	3,120,680	3,475,617	3,475,617	3,255,132	
Total	\$ 3,474,188	\$ 3,237,505	\$ 3,407,212	\$ 3,407,212	\$ 3,120,680	\$ 3,475,617	\$ 3,475,617	\$ 3,255,132	
FTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

## Economic and Employment Services

### *Head Start Collaboration*

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Collaboration activities would be transferred to a non-state entity.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
42 USC 9837(b)	Discretionary	Y	3	10
<b>Program Goals</b>				

- A. Assist low-income families and individuals in obtaining training and education to encourage personal responsibility.  
 B. Provide appropriate support services to assist clients in gaining or retaining employment and becoming self-sufficient

#### Program History

The purpose of the Head Start Collaboration grant is to assist in building early childhood systems, provide low-income children access to comprehensive services, and increase collaboration between the Federal Head Start program and State services. The collaboration grant was first received in FY 2004.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of collaborative activities and resources made available to Head Start and Early Head Start grantees and communities to enhance services to children and families	A	24	25	49	50	48	50	50	41

Department for Children and Families

*Head Start Collaboration*

<i>Funding Source</i>	<b>Funding</b>							
	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 19,985	\$ 21,519	\$ 20,596	\$ 26,174	\$ 22,539	\$ 26,653	\$ 26,158	\$ 21,551
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	59,945	64,551	61,789	78,530	67,615	79,961	78,479	64,652
<b>Total</b>	\$ 79,930	\$ 86,070	\$ 82,385	\$ 104,704	\$ 90,154	\$ 106,614	\$ 104,637	\$ 86,203
<b>FTE</b>	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

## Economic and Employment Services

### TANF Youth Services

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Children receiving services from these targeted grants would experience less favorable future outcomes.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 39-708c( c) 42 USC 601(a)	Discretionary	Y	3	11
<b>Program Goals</b>				

- A. Assist low-income families and individuals in obtaining training and education to encourage personal responsibility.  
 B. Provide appropriate support services to assist clients in gaining or retaining employment and becoming self-sufficient

#### Program History

TANF Youth Services provide grant funding for a range of services to reduce poverty by providing primary prevention and early intervention services to reduce the likelihood at-risk youth will engage in high-risk behaviors and to help families achieve and maintain stability. Program services include assisting families so that children can be cared for in their own home, reducing dependency by promoting job preparation and economically beneficial employment, prevention of unplanned pregnancies, and encouraging the sustainability of healthy family relationships.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Percent of participants that met specific grant outcomes	A	91.0%	96.5%	73.0%	75.0%	84.0%	85.0%	85.0%	84.5%
Output Measures									

Department for Children and Families

*TANF Youth Services*  
**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	1,156,354	1,156,854	10,616,215	10,985,519	11,124,176	10,950,354	10,954,663	7,632,415
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,156,354	\$ 1,156,854	\$ 10,616,215	\$ 10,985,519	\$ 11,124,176	\$ 10,950,354	\$ 10,954,663	\$ 7,632,415
<b>FTE</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Economic and Employment Services

### Kansas Early Head Start

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Fewer children would be adequately prepared to enter school, resulting in negative long-term consequences.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 39-708c( c) 42 USC 601(a) 42 USC 9857 et seq.	Discretionary	Y	3	12
<b>Program Goals</b>				

- A. Assist low-income families and individuals in obtaining training and education to encourage personal responsibility.  
B. Provide appropriate support services to assist clients in gaining or retaining employment and becoming self-sufficient

#### Program History

Kansas Early Head Start (KEHS) serves low-income pregnant women and families with infants and toddlers, and children with disabilities. The KEHS program is a comprehensive program designed to meet the individual needs of each child and family. Program services include quality early education, parent education and other family support services. KEHS has two models: Home Visitation (TANF funded) and Child Care Partnership (CCDF funded).

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Percent of KEHS child care partnerships that provide quality early learning environments based on a recorded score of 5 or higher on the Thelma Harms Rating Scale	A	96.0%	96.6%	95.0%	97.0%	80.0%	85.0%	85.0%	90.5%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
2. Direct services cost per child	A	\$11,144	\$11,068	\$12,366	\$12,734	\$12,734	\$13,013	\$13,013	\$12,056

Department for Children and Families

*Kansas Early Head Start*

<i>Funding Source</i>	<b>Funding</b>							
	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	10,531,268	10,569,991	11,240,506	12,797,436	12,628,650	12,740,124	12,740,124	11,479,716
<b>Total</b>	\$ 10,531,268	\$ 10,569,991	\$ 11,240,506	\$ 12,797,436	\$ 12,628,650	\$ 12,740,124	\$ 12,740,124	\$ 11,479,716
<b>FTE</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Economic and Employment Services

### TANF Home Visits

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Children would be less prepared for school.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 39-708c( c) 2017 S Sub HB 2002 §102(g) and §103(g) 42 USC 601(a)	Mandatory	Y	3	13

#### Program Goals

- A. Assist low-income families and individuals in obtaining training and education to encourage personal responsibility.  
B. Provide appropriate support services to assist clients in gaining or retaining employment and becoming self-sufficient

#### Program History

The purpose of the home visitation program is to promote child well-being and maintenance of families. These visits build and sustain community partnerships by engaging families prenatally or at birth, cultivate and strengthen parent-child relationships, promote healthy childhood development and growth, and enhance family functioning.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Percentage of Families providing supportive and nurturing environments as evidenced by scores on Home Observation Measurement of the Environment.	A	86.0%	77.0%	93.0%	93.0%	80.0%	87.0%	87.0%	83.3%
Output Measures									

Department for Children and Families

*TANF Home Visits*  
**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	2,999,963	2,999,834	2,699,947	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	2,899,927
<b>Total</b>	\$ 2,999,963	\$ 2,999,834	\$ 2,699,947	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 2,899,927
<b>FTE</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Economic and Employment Services

### Two-Parent Family Initiatives

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Families receiving services from these targeted grants would experience less favorable future outcomes.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 39-708c( c) 42 USC 601(a)	Discretionary	Y	3	14
<b>Program Goals</b>				

- A. Assist low-income families and individuals in obtaining training and education to encourage personal responsibility.  
B. Provide appropriate support services to assist clients in gaining or retaining employment and becoming self-sufficient

#### Program History

The purpose of the Two-Parent Family Initiatives Program is to provide programming and services to at-risk youth and families across Kansas. Programming includes personal and professional development, education and training designed to enhance family development and overall family stability. Services include one-on-one case management services and referrals to resources for participants needing additional supports for healthy relationships and self-sufficiency.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Percent of participants that met specific grant outcomes	A,B	--	--	37.0%	65.0%	81.0%	82.0%	82.0%	59.0%
Output Measures									

Department for Children and Families

*Two-Parent Family Initiatives*  
**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	1,415,356	1,417,276	2,124,454	3,139,158	2,678,130	2,646,634	2,639,083	2,073,287
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,415,356	\$ 1,417,276	\$ 2,124,454	\$ 3,139,158	\$ 2,678,130	\$ 2,646,634	\$ 2,639,083	\$ 2,073,287
<b>FTE</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Economic and Employment Services

### *Electronic Benefits Transfer (EBT) and Eligibility Determination*

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The SNAP state plan would not be approved, as USDA mandates EBT. The fraudulent use of benefits would increase. Benefit accuracy would decline.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 39-709(c)(1) 42 USC 602(a)(1)(A)(viii) 7 USC 2016 7 USC 2015 42 USC 9858c(c)(2)	Mandatory	Y	3	15

#### Program Goals

- A. Assist low-income families and individuals in obtaining training and education to encourage personal responsibility.  
B. Provide appropriate support services to assist clients in gaining or retaining employment and becoming self-sufficient

#### Program History

EBT: TANF, SNAP, and child care assistance are delivered by electronic benefit transfers . Federal law requires SNAP benefits to be issued via EBT. DCF contracts with a financial services company to provide electronic benefits processing. The EBT contract was initiated in FY 1997.

Eligibility Verification: This subprogram includes contracts to verify the identity and income of applicants, and the cost of conducting a suspicion-based drug testing program. In response to the pandemic, addition federal funding was provided for food benefits to children.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Percent of customer calls answered in less than 24 seconds	B	98.4%	99.0%	99.2%	99.3%	99.4%	99.4%	99.4%	99.2%

*Electronic Benefits Transfer (EBT) and Eligibility Determination*

<i>Funding Source</i>	<b>Funding</b>							
	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 726,092	\$ 758,557	\$ 728,126	\$ 810,333	\$ 788,235	\$ 795,095	\$ 669,704	\$ 758,306
Non-SGF State Funds	43,469	43,450	43,008	63,050	28,742	34,181	34,181	38,400
Federal Funds	971,662	987,065	988,529	1,708,408	1,276,738	2,515,217	1,074,642	1,084,111
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,741,223	\$ 1,789,072	\$ 1,759,663	\$ 2,581,791	\$ 2,093,715	\$ 3,344,493	\$ 1,778,527	\$ 1,880,817
<b>FTE</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Economic and Employment Services

### *Economic and Employment Services (EES) Administration*

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The absence of management would impair the execution of agency initiatives and policies, as well as the operation of federal programs.

#### Statutory Basis

KSA 39-708c( c)  
KSA 75-5316a

#### Mandatory vs. Discretionary

Discretionary

#### MOE/Match Rqt.

Y

#### Priority Level Pgm Subpgm

3

na

#### Program Goals

- A. Assist low-income families and individuals in obtaining training and education to encourage personal responsibility.  
B. Provide appropriate support services to assist clients in gaining or retaining employment and becoming self-sufficient

#### Program History

The EES Administration Program develops policies and implements federal requirements for several assistance programs including cash assistance, employment services, food assistance, utility assistance, and child care. The policies issued by EES Administration are executed by staff in the department's six regions. This subprogram also manages grants and contracts that address case management for at-risk families, child care quality initiatives, domestic violence services and nutrition education, among others.

#### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
No performance indicators - administration program									
<i>Output Measures</i>									

#### Funding

Department for Children and Families

<i>Economic and Employment Services (EES) Administration</i>								
<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,348,440	\$ 1,237,810	\$ 1,342,151	\$ 1,641,205	\$ 1,552,412	\$ 3,189,042	\$ 1,656,490	\$ 1,377,458
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	300,000	110,562	189,438	-	36,854
Federal Funds	3,870,917	3,767,440	4,198,256	4,741,064	4,498,680	5,083,322	4,789,069	4,154,792
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 5,219,357</b>	<b>\$ 5,005,250</b>	<b>\$ 5,540,407</b>	<b>\$ 6,682,269</b>	<b>\$ 6,161,654</b>	<b>\$ 8,461,802</b>	<b>\$ 6,445,559</b>	<b>\$ 5,569,104</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>44.0</b>	<b>41.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>46.0</b>	<b>46.0</b>	<b>49.0</b>	<b>54.0</b>	<b>42.3</b>

## Child Support Services

### *Child Support Administration*

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The lack of financial support for a child's basic needs may force parents to seek public assistance. Children receive a long-term solution by the establishment of a court order for parentage and child and medical support, as well as enforcement of existing support orders through the CSS program. Failure to meet federal performance measures would put CSS federal funds in jeopardy and the State would be unable to gain State Plan approval for the TANF Block Grant.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
42 U.S.C. 651-669(b) KSA 39-708c( c) KSA 39-753	Mandatory	Y	4	1

#### Program Goals

- A. Improve the financial stability of children by establishing parentage and appropriately sized child and medical support orders for each family unit.
- B. Recognize that each family unit is different but that children need financial stability which is a reliable, regular, and consistent source of financial support from a parent who has a court order to provide it.
- C. Ensure timely, reliable and consistent collection and distribution of payments to families.
- D. Remove barriers identified by entities which CSS comes into contact with that have a direct impact on the establishment, collection or distribution of child or medical support.

#### Program History

Child Support Services was established in 1975 under Title IV-D of the Social Security Act. Since its inception, the CSS IV-D program has evolved into a full-service family support program. The Child Support Services program provides a variety of services including parent location; establishment of legal parentage; the establishment, enforcement and modification of child and medical support court orders; and the collection and distribution of child support payments. Although mandatory cooperation with the CSS Program is required for cash, food, and child care assistance, CSS services are available to anyone who enrolls for services. Kansas uses both judicial and administrative methods to enforce court orders.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Percent of current child support collected	A,B	56.2%	57.6%	56.6%	56.7%	55.7%	55.8%	56.0%	56.6%
2. Percent of cases with child support orders	A,B	89.3%	89.1%	86.6%	86.8%	83.8%	84.0%	84.2%	86.5%

Department for Children and Families

*Child Support Administration*

3. Percentage of cases paying on support arrears	C	58.4%	66.7%	62.3%	61.9%	61.9%	62.0%	62.1%	63.6%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Support collections to cost ratio	C	5.72	6.73	6.05	6.00	5.95	5.97	6.00	6.24
<b>Funding</b>									
<i>Funding Source</i>		<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund		\$ 800,000	\$ 800,001	\$ 2,147,441	\$ 1,529,090	\$ 1,253,595	\$ 2,066,793	\$ 1,531,633	\$ 1,400,346
Non-SGF State Funds		9,331,060	9,521,461	9,749,765	10,351,155	9,726,090	8,699,435	8,384,880	9,665,772
Federal Funds		24,505,430	23,097,586	28,466,940	26,560,317	24,403,747	23,579,278	23,139,602	25,322,758
<b>Total</b>		\$ 34,636,490	\$ 33,419,048	\$ 40,364,146	\$ 38,440,562	\$ 35,383,432	\$ 34,345,506	\$ 33,056,115	\$ 36,388,875
<b>FTE</b>		34.0	34.0	34.0	33.0	33.0	35.0	35.0	33.7

## Rehabilitation Services

### Rehabilitation Services Case Services

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Inability to provide services to prepare Kansans with disabilities for competitive integrated employment. Fewer individuals with disabilities employed, resulting in greater reliance on public benefits.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
29 USC 720-733	Discretionary	Y	5	1

#### Program Goals

- A. Assist individuals with disabilities to gain or regain their independence through employment
- B. Provide independent living services to facilitate community inclusion and integration for Kansans with disabilities
- C. Perform timely and accurate disability decisions
- D. Assure access to qualified sign language interpreters
- E. Prepare youth with disabilities to achieve employment and self-sufficiency as adults

#### Program History

The Rehabilitation Case Services and Client Services programs assist persons with physical or mental disabilities to obtain competitive, integrated employment and live more independently. The Rehabilitation Act is presently included as Title IV of the 2014 Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). WIOA affirmed the emphasis on competitive, integrated employment outcomes, and made several significant changes including: the addition of Pre-Employment Transition Services for youth with disabilities, the addition of career counseling and information/referral services for individuals with disabilities employed in subminimum wage jobs, and a new emphasis on creating closer connections with employers.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Number of Kansans with disabilities achieving competitive integrated employment	A	1,201	1,225	933	1,225	1,113	1,225	1,230	1,090
2. Percent of persons employed as a result of vocational rehabilitation services who report their own earnings as the largest source of support at case closure	A	75.7%	79.0%	80.0%	76.0%	79.0%	82.0%	80.0%	79.3%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Direct services average monthly cost per person	A	\$108	\$112	\$118	\$126	\$147	\$145	\$147	\$126

Department for Children and Families

Rehabilitation Services Case Services

Funding Source	Funding							3-yr. Avg.
	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est	FY 2024 Est	
State General Fund	\$ 2,080,715	\$ 2,147,615	\$ 1,920,316	\$ 672,583	\$ 808,504	\$ 2,345,234	\$ 2,345,234	\$ 1,625,478
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	1,500,000	1,499,977	-	-	499,992
Federal Funds	7,687,822	7,996,891	7,095,203	8,265,756	8,529,410	8,903,675	8,903,675	7,873,835
<b>Total</b>	\$ 9,768,537	\$ 10,144,506	\$ 9,015,519	\$ 10,438,339	\$ 10,837,891	\$ 11,248,909	\$ 11,248,909	\$ 9,999,305
<b>FTE</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Rehabilitation Services

### *Rehabilitation Services Independent Living*

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Kansans with disabilities would be without supports for independence, employment and self-sufficiency resulting in an increased in the use of public assistance, SSA benefits and other poverty programs.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
29 USC 720-733 29 USC 796	Discretionary	Y	5	2

#### Program Goals

- A. Assist individuals with disabilities to gain or regain their independence through employment
- B. Provide independent living services to facilitate community inclusion and integration for Kansans with disabilities
- C. Perform timely and accurate disability decisions
- D. Assure access to qualified sign language interpreters
- E. Prepare youth with disabilities to achieve employment and self-sufficiency as adults

#### Program History

Independent Living maximizes the leadership, empowerment, independence and productivity of individuals with disabilities, and furthers their integration and full inclusion into mainstream society. This mission is carried out through a statewide network of ten Centers for Independent Living (CILs) and several other community partners. CILs are not residential facilities. Instead, they offer the following core services: information and referral, individual and systems advocacy, peer support, independent living skills training, youth transition, and services to support deinstitutionalization. The first Kansas CIL was established in Hays in 1980.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Persons served by Centers for Independent Living receiving state funds (does not include information and referral services)	B	6,287	8,414	8,821	9,086	9,202	9,400	9,450	8,812

Department for Children and Families

*Rehabilitation Services Independent Living*  
**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,836,240	\$ 1,757,637	\$ 1,877,009	\$ 1,836,240	\$ 1,836,240	\$ 1,850,790	\$ 1,850,790	\$ 1,823,629
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	1,294,226	1,614,105	1,505,041	1,562,498	1,531,908	1,623,038	1,616,396	1,550,351
<b>Total</b>	\$ 3,130,466	\$ 3,371,742	\$ 3,382,050	\$ 3,398,738	\$ 3,368,148	\$ 3,473,828	\$ 3,467,186	\$ 3,373,980
<b>FTE</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Rehabilitation Services

### *Disability Determination Services*

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Disability determinations and reviews for federal disability would be performed by another entity, such as an adjacent state.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
42 U.S.C. 421	Discretionary	Y	5	3

#### Program Goals

- A. Assist individuals with disabilities to gain or regain their independence through employment
- B. Provide independent living services to facilitate community inclusion and integration for Kansans with disabilities
- C. Perform timely and accurate disability decisions
- D. Assure access to qualified sign language interpreters
- E. Prepare youth with disabilities to achieve employment and self-sufficiency as adults

#### Program History

Disability Determination Services performs medical disability determinations for the U.S. Social Security Administration on most Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) claims filed or reviewed in Kansas. The program's inception dates to 1937, when the Kansas Board of Social Welfare was authorized to enter into an agreement with the former U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare to make disability determinations.

#### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percent of DDS claims processed accurately	C	97.0%	97.0%	97.2%	97.0%	96.5%	97.0%	97.0%	96.9%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
2. Adjudications processed by Kansas DDS	C	17,702	13,719	14,711	15,700	18,254	23,760	24,760	15,561
3. Cost per adjudication	C	\$625	\$592	\$621	\$841	\$574	\$559	\$529	\$596

#### Funding

Department for Children and Families

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Disability Determination Services</i>							
	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 19,389	\$ 23,031	\$ 46,085	\$ 86,632	\$ 64,148	\$ 60,051	\$ 59,016	\$ 44,421
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	10,393,479	8,929,824	9,091,855	13,123,761	10,407,132	13,228,925	13,048,584	9,476,270
<b>Total</b>	\$ 10,412,868	\$ 8,952,855	\$ 9,137,940	\$ 13,210,393	\$ 10,471,280	\$ 13,288,976	\$ 13,107,600	\$ 9,520,692
<b>FTE</b>	108.8	108.8	109.3	111.3	111.3	111.3	111.3	109.8

## Rehabilitation Services

### *Services for the Blind*

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Loss of employment for blind vendors. Reduced ability to provide timely accommodations.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm Subpgm
KSA 39-708c(q) KSA 75-3339 KSA 75-3343 29 USC 720-733	Mandatory	Y	5 4
<b>Program Goals</b>			

- A. Assist individuals with disabilities to gain or regain their independence through employment  
 B. Provide independent living services to facilitate community inclusion and integration for Kansans with disabilities  
 C. Perform timely and accurate disability decisions  
 D. Assure access to qualified sign language interpreters  
 E. Prepare youth with disabilities to achieve employment and self-sufficiency as adults

#### Program History

The Blind Services subprogram supports individuals who are legally blind in pursuing entrepreneurial opportunities and becoming self-reliant under the Business Enterprise Program (BEP). The origin of BEP was the Randolph-Sheppard Act of 1936, which authorized persons who are legally blind to operate vending stands in federal buildings. The Department for the Blind was established in the Kansas Board of Social Welfare in 1939. In 1974, the Blind Services Program was established within the Rehabilitation Services Program.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Average annual earnings of blind vendors in the Business Enterprise Program (excludes military bases)	A	50,568	22,019	13,760	15,889	22,640	27,947	30,247	19,473
<i>Output Measures</i>									

#### Funding

Department for Children and Families

*Services for the Blind*

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 10,775	\$ 11,138	\$ 10,993	\$ 10,389	\$ 11,071	\$ 10,736	\$ 10,445	\$ 11,067
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	658,603	567,112	546,865	778,762	697,858	659,831	656,732	603,945
<b>Total</b>	\$ 669,378	\$ 578,250	\$ 557,858	\$ 789,151	\$ 708,929	\$ 670,567	\$ 667,177	\$ 615,012
<b>FTE</b>	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0

## Rehabilitation Services

### *Deaf and Hard of Hearing Services*

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Loss of advocacy role; no registry to verify qualifications of interpreters, failure to comply with Language Assessment Program requirements.

#### Statutory Basis

KSA 75-5391 et seq.

#### Mandatory vs. Discretionary

Mandatory

#### MOE/Match Rqt.

N

#### Priority Level Pgm Subpgm

5

5

#### Program Goals

- A. Assist individuals with disabilities to gain or regain their independence through employment
- B. Provide independent living services to facilitate community inclusion and integration for Kansans with disabilities
- C. Perform timely and accurate disability decisions
- D. Assure access to qualified sign language interpreters
- E. Prepare youth with disabilities to achieve employment and self-sufficiency as adults

#### Program History

The Kansas Commission for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (KCDHH) develops and implements a program of information and referral, advocacy, public education and sign language interpreter registration. It also works with other organizations throughout Kansas to ensure the coordination and availability of services for people who are deaf and hard of hearing. A key function of the commission is the registry of sign language interpreters and ensuring those interpreters meet or exceed minimum skill levels and certification.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of new sign language interpreter registrations with the Kansas Commission for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing	D	105	104	83	100	40	110	110	76

#### Funding

Department for Children and Families

*Deaf and Hard of Hearing Services*

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 173,410	\$ 191,469	\$ 188,831	\$ 275,684	\$ 204,620	\$ 344,922	\$ 336,829	\$ 194,973
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	18,200	9,130	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 173,410	\$ 191,469	\$ 188,831	\$ 275,684	\$ 204,620	\$ 363,122	\$ 345,959	\$ 194,973
<b>FTE</b>	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	4.0	2.0

## Rehabilitation Services

### *Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act Requirements*

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Failure to secure State Plan approval and consequently federal VR funds. Inability to provide required career counseling and information and referral services.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
29 USC 721(a)(8)(B)	Discretionary	Y	5	6
<b>Program Goals</b>				

- A. Assist individuals with disabilities to gain or regain their independence through employment  
 B. Provide independent living services to facilitate community inclusion and integration for Kansans with disabilities  
 C. Perform timely and accurate disability decisions  
 D. Assure access to qualified sign language interpreters  
 E. Prepare youth with disabilities to achieve employment and self-sufficiency as adults

#### Program History

The 2014 Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) amended the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Under WIOA, the Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) program is now a core partner with other workforce services operated by the Kansas Department of Commerce and the Kansas Board of Regents. As a result, VR services and resources are required to support the broader workforce system and maximize the opportunities for Kansans with disabilities to obtain, maintain and regain employment. An additional requirement under WIOA includes the provision of career counseling and information and referral (CCIR) services to workers employed at sub-minimum wage.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of individuals with disabilities in subminimum wage jobs who receive career counseling about opportunities for competitive integrated employment	A	2,284	565	1,644	1,808	1,484	1,400	1,400	1,231

Department for Children and Families

*Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act Requirements*

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 19,571	\$ 12,165	\$ 50,974	\$ 94,020	\$ 26,292	\$ 85,499	\$ 85,499	\$ 29,810
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	72,313	44,950	188,337	347,384	97,145	315,905	315,905	110,144
<b>Total</b>	\$ 91,884	\$ 57,115	\$ 239,311	\$ 441,404	\$ 123,437	\$ 401,404	\$ 401,404	\$ 139,954
<b>FTE</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Rehabilitation Services

### Rehabilitation Services Administration

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The absence in management of these programs would impair the execution of agency initiatives and policies, as well as the operation of federal programs. Lack of support for the State Rehabilitation Council would result in the failure to secure State Plan approval, and therefore federal VR funds.

#### Statutory Basis

KSA 39-708c( c)  
29 USC 721(a)(21)

#### Mandatory vs. Discretionary

Discretionary

#### MOE/Match Rqt.

Y

#### Priority Level Pgm Subpgm

5

na

#### Program Goals

- A. Assist individuals with disabilities to gain or regain their independence through employment
- B. Provide independent living services to facilitate community inclusion and integration for Kansans with disabilities
- C. Perform timely and accurate disability decisions
- D. Assure access to qualified sign language interpreters
- E. Prepare youth with disabilities to achieve employment and self-sufficiency as adults

#### Program History

Rehabilitation Services represents the cornerstone of the agency's efforts to help people with disabilities become gainfully employed and self-sufficient. VR services are delivered via local offices through the six DCF regions. VR counselors assist people with disabilities in determining eligibility, assessing their skills and interests, developing individualized plans for employment, and arranging for the services they need to become employed. The VR program is a core partner with other workforce development programs as mandated by the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). VR must set aside 15 percent of the VR program federal funds to provide Pre-Employment Transition Services.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
No performance indicators - administration program									
Output Measures									

Department for Children and Families

*Rehabilitation Services Administration*  
**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 408,525	\$ 324,317	\$ 602,471	\$ 568,971	\$ 487,418	\$ 497,120	\$ 482,851	\$ 471,402
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	914,135	850,794	1,501,167	1,433,747	1,140,842	1,165,486	1,119,049	1,164,268
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,322,660	\$ 1,175,111	\$ 2,103,638	\$ 2,002,718	\$ 1,628,260	\$ 1,662,606	\$ 1,601,900	\$ 1,635,670
<b>FTE</b>	16.0	16.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	16.0	16.0	15.3

## Developmental Disability Council

### *Developmental Disability Council*

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Advocacy for persons with developmental disabilities would be diminished. This reduction in advocacy efforts would make it less likely that individuals could achieve their potential abilities and goals.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
42 USC 15021-15045 KSA 39-708( c) KSA 74-5501	Mandatory	N	6	1

#### Program Goals

A. Build capacity and advocate for services supporting individuals with disabilities.

#### Program History

The Council on Developmental Disabilities is composed of 18 members (at a minimum) appointed by the Governor. The council advocates for improvements in the Kansas system with the goal of providing people with disabilities and their families the services and support they need. The council is responsible for a five-year plan, which assesses the external (economic, political, technological, demographic and social) factors affecting persons with developmental disabilities in Kansas. The plan is updated annually.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of people with developmental disabilities and families who participated in council-supported activities	A	2,650	1,850	1,859	2,275	1,920	1,970	2,020	1,876

Department for Children and Families

*Developmental Disability Council*  
**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 5,890	\$ 4,215	\$ 6,506	\$ 7,264	\$ 7,264	\$ 3,520	\$ 3,520	\$ 5,995
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	949,606	658,697	619,345	735,569	673,349	791,441	794,349	650,464
<b>Total</b>	\$ 955,496	\$ 662,912	\$ 625,851	\$ 742,833	\$ 680,613	\$ 794,961	\$ 797,869	\$ 656,459
<b>FTE</b>	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.3

**Administration***Executive and Administrative Services***Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

Essential executive functions and financial operations basic to the functioning of the agency would not be performed.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level Pgm</b>	<b>Subpgm</b>
KSA 75-5301 KSA 39-708c(f) KSA 75-5316a	Mandatory	Y	na	na
<b>Program Goals</b>				

na

**Program History**

This subprogram includes expenditures for the Office of the Secretary and Administrative Services.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
No performance indicators - administration program									
<i>Output Measures</i>									

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 6,688,074	\$ 6,525,466	\$ 8,309,482	\$ 9,219,214	\$ 7,840,686	\$ 10,235,522	\$ 8,169,948	\$ 7,558,545
Non-SGF State Funds	432,017	267,188	20,240	268,000	267,403	18,000	18,000	184,944
Federal Funds	3,763,984	3,329,761	3,257,628	3,617,949	3,386,870	3,968,204	3,810,999	3,324,753
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 10,884,075</b>	<b>\$ 10,122,415</b>	<b>\$ 11,587,350</b>	<b>\$ 13,105,163</b>	<b>\$ 11,494,959</b>	<b>\$ 14,221,726</b>	<b>\$ 11,998,947</b>	<b>\$ 11,068,241</b>

Department for Children and Families

*Executive and Administrative Services*

**FTE**

74.5

74.8

80.8

85.8

85.8

87.3

87.0

80.4

**Administration***Legal Services***Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

DCF would lack legal representation and advice in a broad range of matters.

**Statutory Basis****Mandatory vs.  
Discretionary****MOE/Match  
Rqt.****Priority Level  
Pgm Subpgm**

KSA 75-5310

Discretionary

Y

na

na

**Program Goals**

na

**Program History**

The Kansas Department for Children and Families' (DCF) Legal Services provides legal counsel and representation to the program areas. DCF Legal Services defends against litigation filed against the agency. The Fraud Investigations Unit is responsible for coordinating all DCF efforts to combat fraud in every program area of the agency.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
No performance indicators - administration program									
<i>Output Measures</i>									

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 832,796	\$ 790,481	\$ 847,832	\$ 1,114,682	\$ 969,581	\$ 1,287,325	\$ 1,121,537	\$ 869,298
Non-SGF State Funds	101,701	158,870	109,572	347,975	355,000	339,323	339,323	207,814
Federal Funds	515,190	498,897	521,141	599,643	514,816	614,420	554,584	511,618
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,449,687</b>	<b>\$ 1,448,248</b>	<b>\$ 1,478,545</b>	<b>\$ 2,062,300</b>	<b>\$ 1,839,397</b>	<b>\$ 2,241,068</b>	<b>\$ 2,015,444</b>	<b>\$ 1,588,730</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>12.7</b>

**Administration***Audit Services***Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

DCF would lose resources to monitor and evaluate operations.

**Statutory Basis****Mandatory vs.  
Discretionary****MOE/Match  
Rqt.****Priority Level  
Pgm Subpgm**

KSA 75-5316a

Discretionary

Y

na

na

**Program Goals**

na

**Program History**

Audit Services provides an independent appraisal, examination and evaluation function within DCF. It is responsible for providing all levels of agency management with independent and objective financial, compliance and performance audits, reviews, evaluations and consulting.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
No performance indicators - administration program									
<i>Output Measures</i>									

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 874,333	\$ 723,788	\$ 724,767	\$ 818,498	\$ 604,027	\$ 927,092	\$ 900,515	\$ 684,194
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	336,497	278,554	338,880	495,724	365,243	427,315	415,065	327,559
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,210,830	\$ 1,002,342	\$ 1,063,647	\$ 1,314,222	\$ 969,270	\$ 1,354,407	\$ 1,315,580	\$ 1,011,753
<b>FTE</b>	20.0	19.0	19.0	18.0	18.0	18.0	18.0	18.7

**Administration***Organizational Health and Development***Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

The capacity to provide staff development opportunities and training on critical topics would be eliminated. This, in turn, would reduce services and/or increase risks to our clients while potentially jeopardizing federal funding sources.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level Pgm</b>	<b>Subpgm</b>
KSA 75-5316a	Discretionary	Y	na	na
<b>Program Goals</b>				

na

**Program History**

Organizational Health & Development (OHD) supports and strengthens the capacity of each DCF employee and the culture that supports them. The essential elements of safety, effectiveness and compliance are the starting point of OHD efforts. These trainings provide employees with a needed understanding of required policies, procedures and regulatory standards.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
No performance indicators - administration program									
<i>Output Measures</i>									

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 881,173	\$ 804,644	\$ 470,196	\$ 893,844	\$ 413,764	\$ 979,485	\$ 964,805	\$ 562,868
Non-SGF State Funds	-	8,073	-	-	-	-	-	2,691
Federal Funds	404,859	369,742	271,217	529,474	242,977	597,783	588,827	294,645
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,286,032	\$ 1,182,459	\$ 741,413	\$ 1,423,318	\$ 656,741	\$ 1,577,268	\$ 1,553,632	\$ 860,204
<b>FTE</b>	12.0	12.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	8.3

**Administration***Information Technology Services***Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

The elimination of ITS would debilitate agency operations. All major agency programs rely on state-wide automated systems. Most of the agency's communication relies on electronic connectivity.

**Statutory Basis****Mandatory vs.  
Discretionary****MOE/Match  
Rqt.****Priority Level  
Pgm Subpgm**

KSA 75-7205

Mandatory

Y

na

na

**Program Goals**

na

**Program History**

Information Technology Services (ITS) is responsible for managing agency-wide information technology systems, which includes: 1) reporting on required projects to the Kansas Information Technology Office, 2) aligning processes with internal customers, 3) providing strategic planning of information technology to ensure alignment with the agency business units, 4) developing and maintaining the core information systems that support the agency's business units and programs, 5) supporting business users by implementing and maintaining the core network infrastructure for the agency, and 6) providing security for all information technology resources

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
No performance indicators - administration program									
<i>Output Measures</i>									

Department for Children and Families

*Information Technology Services*  
**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 14,457,699	\$ 17,868,309	\$ 18,451,231	\$ 21,698,712	\$ 19,746,469	\$ 29,778,606	\$ 22,850,660	\$ 18,688,670
Non-SGF State Funds	254,503	1,147,713	626,735	199,999	-	200,000	200,000	591,483
Federal Funds	18,147,498	19,798,141	23,889,022	19,644,874	18,981,097	29,618,032	20,674,071	20,889,420
<b>Total</b>	\$ 32,859,700	\$ 38,814,163	\$ 42,966,988	\$ 41,543,585	\$ 38,727,566	\$ 59,596,638	\$ 43,724,731	\$ 40,169,572
<b>FTE</b>	91.0	90.0	89.0	90.0	90.0	90.0	90.0	89.7

**Administration***Personnel Services***Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

Basic personnel functions could not be performed.

**Statutory Basis****Mandatory vs.  
Discretionary****MOE/Match  
Rqt.****Priority Level  
Pgm Subpgm**KSA 39-708( c)  
KSA 75-3702j

Mandatory

Y

na

na

**Program Goals**

na

**Program History**

Personnel Services provides traditional personnel support to all Kansas Department for Children and Families (DCF) staff. The program places priority on quality employee service and enhancing recruitment, retention, and engagement of staff. Effective March 3, 2011, by Executive Order No. 11-04, the duties of Personnel Services transferred to the Kansas Department of Administration. Funding for this program remains with DCF.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
No performance indicators - administration program									
<i>Output Measures</i>									

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 266,463	\$ 311,572	\$ 355,093	\$ 361,414	\$ 300,383	\$ 361,955	\$ 352,004	\$ 322,349
Non-SGF State Funds	-	102,756	80,234	162,750	91,780	162,150	162,150	91,590
Federal Funds	176,315	197,868	219,369	301,794	227,834	308,756	302,681	215,024
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 442,778</b>	<b>\$ 612,196</b>	<b>\$ 654,696</b>	<b>\$ 825,958</b>	<b>\$ 619,997</b>	<b>\$ 832,861</b>	<b>\$ 816,835</b>	<b>\$ 628,963</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>9.9</b>	<b>9.9</b>	<b>8.9</b>

## Administration

*Reserve Pool and Insurance*

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

na

**Statutory Basis**

**Mandatory vs.  
Discretionary**

**MOE/Match  
Rqt.**

**Priority Level  
Pgm Subpgm**

na

Discretionary

na

na

na

### Program Goals

na

### Program History

This program was established to budget positions for which the agency lacks funding.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
No performance indicators - administration program									
<i>Output Measures</i>									

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>FTE</b>	16.8	13.0	13.1	43.1	43.1	25.1	1.1	23.1

**COVID-19 Expenditures***COVID-19 Expenditures***Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

The effects of the pandemic on clients and DCF operations would be more severe.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level Pgm</b>	<b>Subpgm</b>
Public Law 116-136, Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act, PL 116-136, Division A, Title V, Section 5004	Discretionary	na	na	na
<b>Program Goals</b>				

na

**Program History**

The expenditures in this program include expenditures of Coronavirus Relief Fund allocations to DCF from the Office of Recovery, and agency expenditures to mitigate the effects of the COVID-19 virus, mainly protective supplies. DCF has also received pandemic grants associated with federal programs operated by the agency. These grants were included in the major pandemic acts passed by Congress and included funding for food assistance, child care, utility assistance, TANF, and child welfare services. The expenditures from federal pandemic grants received directly by DCF are spent in the agency's programs and are not included in this program.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
No performance indicators - temporary subprogram									
<i>Output Measures</i>									

Department for Children and Families

**COVID-19 Expenditures  
Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ 315,444	\$ 31,697	\$ -	\$ 4,685	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 117,275
Non-SGF State Funds	-	6,253	(6,253)	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	279,466	20,075,454	1,000,000	1,306,094	-	-	7,220,338
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ 601,163	\$ 20,100,898	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,310,779	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,337,613
<b>FTE</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Transfers to Other State Agencies

### Transfers to Other State Agencies

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Several federal requirements would not be met and program goals would not be achieved.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm Subpgm
42 USC 601-617 42 USC 9857-9858 7 USC 2036a 42 USC 1397	Discretionary	Y	na 1
<b>Program Goals</b>			

na

#### Program History

Provides federal funding to other state agencies for a range of services.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
No performance indicators - transfers to other agencies									
Output Measures									

#### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est	FY 2024 Est	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	16,151,108	15,247,499	23,566,057	15,647,317	24,225,369	36,372,317	15,572,317	21,012,975
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 16,151,108</b>	<b>\$ 15,247,499</b>	<b>\$ 23,566,057</b>	<b>\$ 15,647,317</b>	<b>\$ 24,225,369</b>	<b>\$ 36,372,317</b>	<b>\$ 15,572,317</b>	<b>\$ 21,012,975</b>
<b>FTE</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Disaster Relief

*Disaster Relief*

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

COVID emergency shelters would not have been staffed.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 39-708c	Discretionary	Y	na	na

### Program Goals

na

### Program History

Provided staffing for COVID emergency shelters.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
No performance indicators - temporary subprogram									
Output Measures									

Department for Children and Families

*Disaster Relief*

Disaster Relief

Funding Source	Funding							
	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est	FY 2024 Est	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	21,877	713,333	-	5,152	-	-	246,787
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$ -	\$ 21,877	\$ 713,333	\$ -	\$ 5,152	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 246,787
FTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Capital Improvements

### Capital Improvements

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Safety risk for clients and DCF agency staff. In addition, the terms of the lease agreement would not be met which would put possession of the building in jeopardy.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level Pgm	Subpgm
KSA 39-708d	Discretionary	N	na	1
<b>Program Goals</b>				

na

#### Program History

The Capital Improvements program represents capital improvement costs of the Topeka Service Center, which DCF is responsible for. The Topeka Service Center is currently being leased from the Department of Administration on a lease-to-buy agreement and will be owned by the agency in 2030.

#### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
No performance indicators - capital improvements									
Output Measures									

#### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est	FY 2024 Est	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	353,825	204,515	950,000	-	68,172
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 353,825	\$ 204,515	\$ 950,000	\$ -	\$ 68,172
<b>FTE</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

If administration is not funded, the agency would not be able to maintain a Director, Chief Fiscal Officer or Director of Human Resources. Not funding these positions and other requisite expenditures, the agency would not maintain central oversight of all other agency programs.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General K.S.A. 73-1208e K.S.A. 73-1209	Discretionary	No	4

### Program Goals

- A. Maintain statewide costs per case while maintaining quality service to clients.
- B. Provide fiscal, human resources, and IT services to other program areas.

### Program History

The agency was detached from Department of Human Resources and established as an independent state agency in 1986. In 2014, the previous Kansas Commission on Veterans Affairs was abolished and powers, duties and functions were transferred to the Kansas Commission on Veterans Affairs Office (K.S.A. 73-1208d). There was no major change in agency operations, goals or programs. The major change came by establishing the agency within the executive branch of government, with direction and supervision coming from a Director appointed by the Governor and subject confirmation by the Kansas Senate (K.S.A. 73-1208e). K.S.A. 73-1209 lays the general framework for the agency.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
N/A									
Output Measures									
N/A									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 549,515	\$ 553,681	\$ 729,929	\$ 878,861	\$ 849,691	\$ 982,668	\$ 979,012	\$ 711,100
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 549,515</b>	<b>\$ 553,681</b>	<b>\$ 729,929</b>	<b>\$ 878,861</b>	<b>\$ 849,691</b>	<b>\$ 982,668</b>	<b>\$ 979,012</b>	<b>\$ 711,100</b>

Kansas Commission on Veterans Affairs Office

<b>FTE</b>	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.3
------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

## Veterans Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

If administration is not funded, the agency would not be able to maintain a Director, Chief Fiscal Officer or Director of Human Resources. Not funding these positions and other requisite expenditures, the agency would not maintain central oversight of all other agency programs.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 73-1208f; K.S.A. 73-1209; K.S.A. 73-1234; K.S.A. 74-8724; K.S.A. 73-1238	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Provide information and advocacy to Kansas Veterans and eligible family members by assisting them in obtaining all federal and state benefits they have earned.

### Program History

The Service Agency was established in 1937 as a Division of Social Welfare to assist Veterans and survivors in obtaining federal benefits. The Approval Agency was established in 1945 to implement the G.I. Bill. On January 20, 1946, the responsibility of accrediting institutions and business establishments was transferred to the Office of Veterans' Affairs, as the State Approving Agency (SAA). On April 20, 1946, SB 396 created the Veterans' Claims Assistance Program (VCAP). K.S.A. 73-1234 is the modern embodiment of the VCAP. K.S.A. 74-8724 established the Veterans' Enhanced Service Delivery Program. In 2011, this program started receiving funds from lottery scratch ticket sales. In 2009, K.S.A. 73-1238 established the Vietnam Era Veterans' Medallion Program, which provides for application from Veterans for a medal, medallion and certificate of appreciation for Kansas Vietnam Era Veterans.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Monetary Value of Claims Awarded (in Millions)	A	\$168.1	\$199.4	\$202.4	\$200.0	\$295.5	\$300.0	\$315.0	\$232.4
2. New Claims Submitted	A	10,773	6,310	6,062	6,250	10,522	10,250	11,000	7,631
3. Veterans in Database	A	80,328	100,505	106,098	107,500	110,654	115,000	120,000	105,752
<b>Output Measures</b>									
4. Number of outreach briefings/events	A	533	376	27	215	375	400	425	259

Kansas Commission on Veterans Affairs Office

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 2,174,996	\$2,055,980	\$ 2,113,001	\$ 2,029,387	\$ 1,878,214	\$ 2,458,010	\$ 2,306,833	\$ 2,015,732
Non-SGF State Funds	525,213	564,269	274,073	525,224	635,694	557,063	742,828	491,345
Federal Funds	157,702	174,915	175,068	175,583	208,493	256,688	259,952	186,159
<b>Total</b>	\$ 2,857,911	\$ 2,795,164	\$ 2,562,142	\$ 2,730,194	\$ 2,722,401	\$ 3,271,761	\$ 3,309,613	\$ 2,693,236
<b>FTE</b>	34.0	34.0	34.0	34.0	34.0	34.0	34.0	34.0

## Veterans Cemeteries

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

If administration is not funded, the agency would not be able to maintain a Director, Chief Fiscal Officer or Director of Human Resources. Not funding these positions and other requisite expenditures, the agency would not maintain central oversight of all other agency programs.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 73-1232	Mandatory	No	3

### Program Goals

A. Provide Veterans and their eligible family members with interment opportunities for burial with dignity and honor in a Kansas Veterans' Cemetery.

### Program History

On April 22, 1999 K.S.A. 73-1232 authorized the establishment and maintenance of a state system of Veterans' cemeteries.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of burials per year	A	399	361	391	377	456	405	445	403
2. Number of pre-certifications received per year	A	374	411	426	400	332	390	400	390
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Number of funeral homes visited/contacted per year to update/promote the cemeteries	A	24	18	0	25	25	25	25	14
4. Number of events (speaking/handout information) attended locally and statewide	A	19	8	3	10	10	10	10	7

Kansas Commission on Veterans Affairs Office

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 598,218	\$ 610,456	\$ 667,593	\$ 603,040	\$ 586,115	\$ 642,539	\$ 625,608	\$ 621,388
Non-SGF State Funds	200,601	19,055	141,219	224,206	197,469	432,935	411,053	119,248
Federal Funds	281,197	379,442	215,949	257,690	333,892	295,160	240,504	309,761
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,080,016	\$ 1,008,953	\$ 1,024,761	\$ 1,084,936	\$ 1,117,476	\$ 1,370,634	\$ 1,277,165	\$ 1,050,397
<b>FTE</b>	17.0	17.0	17.0	17.0	17.0	17.0	17.0	17.0

## Kansas Soldiers Home and Kansas Veterans Home

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

If administration is not funded, the agency would not be able to maintain a Director, Chief Fiscal Officer or Director of Human Resources. Not funding these positions and other requisite expenditures, means the agency would not maintain central oversight of all other agency programs.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 76-1901 through 76-1941; K.S.A. 76-1951 through 76-1958	Mandatory	No	2

### Program Goals

A. Provide quality long term healthcare services to eligible Kansas Veterans through services provided by the Kansas Veterans' Home and Kansas Soldiers' Home.  
 B. Kansas Veterans' Home and Kansas Soldiers Home will maintain fiscal integrity and good relations with other state agencies, vendors, and contractors.  
 C. Maintain and encourage facilities' connections with the local community area media outlets, and local and national service organizations.

### Program History

In 1889, Fort Dodge became the Kansas Soldiers Home and operated as its own state agency until 1976. In 1976, the Kansas Soldiers Home was operated by the Kansas Veterans' Commission under the Department of Human Resources. In 1986, the Kansas Veterans' Commission was abolished and the Kansas Commission on Veterans Affairs and the Commission, along with the Soldiers' Home, became its own independent agency with the Commission maintaining supervisory control of the Soldiers' Home. In 1997, the former Winfield State Hospital and Training Center was converted to the Kansas Veterans' Home under the supervisory control of the Kansas Commission on Veterans Affairs.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Average Daily Census (KVH)	A	128	104	94	94	89	98	105	96
2. Average Daily Census (KSH)	A	112	96	81	76	78	91	97	85
3. Hours Per Resident Day (KVH)	A	4.25	4.58	4.99	4.70	4.46	4.45	4.45	4.68
4. Hours Per Resident Day (KSH)	A	4.25	4.27	4.52	4.52	4.52	4.25	4.25	4.44
5. VA/CMS Deficiencies in Business Practices (KVH)	B	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. VA/CMS Deficiencies in Business Practices (KSH)	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7. Volunteer Hours Logged (KVH)	C	3,472	1,663	568	1,000	234	480	900	822
8. Volunteer Hours Logged (KSH)	C	4,298	3,250	-	2,500	2,500	4,500	4,500	1,917
9. Outcome Measure Comparing Outcomes to Dollars		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Output Measures									
10. LTC Residents on Medicaid (KVH)	B	26%	29%	30%	30%	28%	29%	30%	29%
11. LTC Residents on Medicaid (KSH)	B	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%

Kansas Commission on Veterans Affairs Office

12. Outreach/Speaking engagements promoting the home (KVH)	C	10	3	2	5	9	10	10	5
13. Outreach/Speaking engagements promoting the home (KSH)	C	8	12	3	10	10	10	10	8

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 2,392,459	\$ 3,453,609	\$ 2,393,138	\$ 2,896,034	\$ 2,825,207	\$ 7,921,946	\$ 9,142,858	\$ 2,890,651
Non-SGF State Funds	9,679,343	8,274,597	6,167,367	6,337,637	6,458,388	6,960,608	7,485,670	6,966,784
Federal Funds	10,766,400	10,098,964	12,849,176	8,642,405	8,922,571	11,497,560	11,510,191	10,623,570
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 22,838,202</b>	<b>\$ 21,827,170</b>	<b>\$ 21,409,681</b>	<b>\$ 17,876,076</b>	<b>\$ 18,206,166</b>	<b>\$ 26,380,114</b>	<b>\$ 28,138,719</b>	<b>\$ 20,481,006</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>315.0</b>	<b>315.0</b>	<b>315.0</b>	<b>315.0</b>	<b>315.0</b>	<b>313.0</b>	<b>313.0</b>	<b>315.0</b>

## KDADS Operations

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Essential executive functions and financial operations basic to the functioning of the agency would not be performed to effectively provide services to vulnerable Kansans. Essential functions include Legal, Human Resources, Fiscal, Public Affairs, and IT.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General    KSA 75-5901 et seq.; KSA 75-59-45; KSA 75- 5321a; KSA 39-925	Discretionary	No	6

### Program Goals

- A. Planning, policy development, administration, coordination, prioritization, and evaluation of all state activities related to older Kansans and Kansans with disabilities.
- B. Promote healthy aging with personal and financial independence and high quality service and supports at all levels of individuals needs.
- C. Analyze consumer focused quality data (timely and accurately) across all service settings to improve the service quality.

### Program History

The Kansas Department for Aging and Disability Services was created by the 1977 Legislature as the Kansas Department on Aging. In FY 2013, the Governor implemented a reorganization of the state's social services agencies to include the transfer of mental health services, substance abuse disorder services, and Home and Community-Based Services Waivers from the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS) to the newly named Kansas Department for Aging and Disability Services. It is a cabinet-level agency that administers federal and state programs to assist elderly citizens as well as individuals in need of disability, mental health, and addiction services.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Specific measures not defined	n/a								n/a

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 5,956,259	\$ 8,693,158	\$ 4,401,494	\$ 13,630,401	\$ 8,164,525	\$ 9,005,127	\$ 9,681,763	\$ 7,086,392
Non-SGF State Funds	447,488	2,770,267	2,038,431	3,367,857	388,224	5,099,149	5,110,062	1,732,307
Federal Funds	5,250,232	4,585,890	4,716,772	5,274,997	5,066,013	3,523,530	3,913,524	4,789,558
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 11,653,979</b>	<b>\$ 16,049,315</b>	<b>\$ 11,156,697</b>	<b>\$ 22,273,255</b>	<b>\$ 13,618,762</b>	<b>\$ 17,627,806</b>	<b>\$ 18,705,349</b>	<b>\$ 13,608,258</b>
<b>FTE</b>	72.0	93.1	112.0	109.5	111.0	106.5	116.5	105.4

## Medicaid

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Medicaid Home- and Community-Based Services (HCBS) are types of person-centered supports and services that address the needs of people with functional limitations who need assistance with ADLs, IADLs, and rehabilitation specifically designed to enable people to stay in their homes, rather than moving to a facility for care. Not funding Medicaid Home- and Community-Based Services (HCBS) would result in thousands of Kansas becoming institutionalized in already over-burdened long term care facilities in the state. Inadequate funding will lead to increase in waiting list for services for Kansans with Intellectual and Developmental Disability; Physical Disability; and could complicate service-delivery for children with autism spectrum disorder, and persons with acquired or traumatic brain injury.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specif 75-5945 & 39-1801 et seq. HCBS (FE) KS.0303.R05.00; HCBS (IDD) KS.0224.R06.00; HCBS (AU) KS.0476.R02.00; HCBS (PD) KS.0304.R05.00; HCBS (TA):KS.4165.R06.00; HCBS (BI) KS.4164.R06.02; HCBS (SED):KS.0320.R04.00	Mandatory	Yes CMS	2

### Program Goals

- A. To ensure that Kansas with high level of care (ADL and IADL) needs, and at imminent risk of institutionalization are served and supported while remaining in the homes and communities.
- B. To deliver equitable services and supports to Kansans with different forms of disabilities by encouraging competitive and integrated employment alternatives and opportunities, incentivizing positive movement towards greater independence through competitive employment, and creating a path for disability employment and empowerment in the state of Kansas
- C. To divert psychiatric hospitalization by providing intensive Home and Community Based Support Services (HCBS) to children and youth in their homes and communities; provide short-term rehabilitation to individuals with brain injury; support parents of children with autism spectrum disorder; support children and youth chronically ill or medically fragile and dependent upon a ventilator or medical device to compensate for the loss of vital bodily function; and support frail and elderly Kansans above 65 years of age.
- D. Provide sub acute psychiatric services for SED youths in crisis

### Program History

In 1981, Congress authorized Home and Community Based Service (HCBS) waiver under section 1915(c) amendment of the Social Security Act, created as a part of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981. Section 1915(c) allowed states to provide home and community-based services for individuals who preferred to receive their services at home rather than in an institution. In 1982, Kansas was among the first states to apply for a waiver. Designed to provide services in the community for the elderly, and persons with intellectual/developmental and physical disabilities, this HCBS program was referred to as the Nursing Facility (NF) Waiver. In 1991, CMS approved the Mental Retardation/Developmental Disability Waiver (MR/DD) Waiver now referred to as the Intellectual/Developmental Disability Waiver (I/DD) which alongside the Nursing Facility (NF) Waiver continued to provide community services people who were elderly and those with significant physical disabilities.

Prior to the Olmstead decision, three additional waivers were approved and implemented, including the Head Injury (HI) Waiver in 1986, the Technology Assisted (TA) Waiver for children in 1995, and the Serious Emotional Disturbance Waiver (SED) for children in 1997. In 1997 advocacy efforts resulted in the NF Waiver being divided into two waivers, the Frail Elderly (FE) and the Physical Disability (PD), to better meet the needs of each population. By the year 2000, SRS had implemented and was administering six HCBS waivers. A seventh waiver, the Autism Waiver designed to provide early intervention services for young children, was added in 2007.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	CY 2019 Actuals	CY 2020 Actuals	CY 2021 Actuals	CY 2022 Previous Est.	CY 2022 Est.	CY 2023 Est.	CY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
------------------	------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	-------------

Kansas Department for Aging and Disability Services

HCBS Management	Number of Participants Eligible to Receive HCBS I/DD Services (Monthly Average)	n/a	9,053	9,115	9,074	9,155	9,111	9,111	9,111	9,100
	Number of Participants Eligible to Receive HCBS PD Services (Monthly Average)	n/a	5,828	6,128	6,033	6,221	6,147	6,208	6,208	6,103
	Number of Participants Eligible to Receive HCBS Autism Services (Monthly Average)	n/a	50	53	51	65	65	65	65	56
	Number of Participants Eligible to Receive HCBS SED Services (Monthly Average)	n/a	3,389	3,239	3,312	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,284
	Number of Participants Eligible to Receive HCBS FE Services (Monthly Average)	n/a	4,662	5,244	5,807	6,552	7,000	6,868	7,000	6,017
	Number of Participants Eligible to Receive HCBS TA Services (Monthly Average)	n/a	569	591	627	654	654	689	700	624
	Number of Participants Eligible to Receive HCBS BI Services (Monthly Average)	n/a	409	560	761	1,078	1,015	1,015	1,015	779
	Number of Participants Enrolled In PACE Program (Monthly Average)	n/a	584	676	739	822	850	899	899	755
	Number of Individuals on Waitlist to Receive HCBS I/DD Services*	n/a	4,086	4,464	4,640	4,768	4,768	4,943	5,100	4,624
	Number of Individuals on Waitlist to Receive HCBS PD Services*	n/a	1,504	2,027	2,142	2,427	2,427	2,627	2,827	2,199
	Number of Individuals on Autism Proposed Recipient List*	n/a	328	356	381	412	412	440	440	383

Outcome Measures		Goal	SFY 2019 Actuals	SFY 2020 Actuals	SFY 2021 Actuals	SFY 2022 Previous Est.	SFY 2022 Actuals	SFY 2023 Est.	SFY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
PRTF	Number of KanCare Children Receiving PRTF Services (Monthly Average)	n/a	240	252	297	280	272	285	295	274
	Number of KanCare Children on the PRTF Waitlist	n/a	207	155	151	147	130	115	100	145

**Funding**

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 685,982,563	\$ 666,457,104	\$ 578,841,764	\$ 705,159,549	\$ 597,435,832	\$ 956,116,582	\$ 944,407,912	\$ 614,244,900
Non-SGF State Funds	34,100,000	34,634,715	66,054,538	36,564,400	36,379,389	34,000,000	34,000,000	45,689,547
Federal Funds	918,081,547	1,106,001,834	1,210,893,078	1,324,340,484	1,397,605,808	1,336,380,227	1,482,892,641	1,238,166,907
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,638,164,110</b>	<b>\$ 1,807,093,653</b>	<b>\$ 1,855,789,380</b>	<b>\$ 2,066,064,433</b>	<b>\$ 2,031,421,029</b>	<b>\$ 2,326,496,809</b>	<b>\$ 2,461,300,553</b>	<b>\$ 1,898,101,354</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## Behavioral Health

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

When services are reduced or not available, there is an increased chance of homelessness, substance use, overdoses, suicide, and incarceration. Decreasing funding for behavioral health will shift burden of costs to local law enforcement, hospitals, and jails. It will also diminish the chances of full recovery and will mean a greater fiscal impact to the state.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific 65-4001,75-5375,65-4007, 75-3307b, 79-4805,39-1601-39-1604	Mandatory	Yes      Block grant	4

### Program Goals

A. Address and treat people who are in immediate crisis  
B. Increase availability of diagnosis and treatment of SMI/SUD  
C. Stabilize patients so that they can return to the community

### Program History

KDADS has served as the single state agency for behavioral health services for SAMHSA since the agency was formed during the reorganization of SRS. KDADS manages the federal block grant programs for mental health and substance abuse prevention and treatment. KDADS also manages state funding for behavioral health services and creates policy and procedures for implementing programs as well as providing oversight and quality assurance of state funded programs.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures		Goal	SFY 2019 Actuals	SFY 2020 Actuals	SFY 2021 Actuals	SFY 2022 Previous Est.	SFY 2022 Actuals	SFY 2023 Est.	SFY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Mental Health Treatment	Number of Persons with Severe and Persistent Mental Illness Receiving Outpatient Services	n/a	19,738	17,116	15,691	16,404	14,997	17,260	17,260	15,935
Substance Use Disorder (SUD) Treatment	Number of Individuals Receiving SUD treatment	n/a	9,253	9,206	9,876	10,500	8,648	10,500	10,500	9,243
	Number of Individuals Receiving Community-Based Alcohol and Drug Treatment Services	n/a	6,826	5,933	6,092	6,500	4,750	6,500	6,500	5,592
Problem Gambling	Number of Individuals Receiving Problem Gambling Treatment	n/a	179	193	203	234	213	228	244	203
Crisis Centers	Number of Individuals Served in a KDADS-Funded Crisis Program	n/a	23,796	13,094	13,260	14,586	8,904	10,240	10,240	11,753
	Number of Individuals Receiving Social Detox Through a Crisis Program	n/a	1,837	1,071	798	1,000	869	1,000	1,000	913
	Number of Individuals Referred to MH and/or SUD Treatment From a Crisis Program	n/a	4,315	7,586	6,114	7,000	6,052	6,960	6,960	6,584
	Number of CARE Level I Assessments	n/a	12,720	10,999	10,090	13,500	10,179	10,179	10,179	10,423

Kansas Department for Aging and Disability Services

Client Assessment, Referral, and Evaluation (CARE)	Number of CARE Level II Assessments	n/a	636	600	602	650	356	560	560	519
--	-------------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 46,758,656	\$ 53,713,236	\$ 43,720,029	\$ 85,010,493	\$ 76,375,947	\$ 129,786,408	\$ 131,639,281	\$ 57,936,404
Non-SGF State Funds	21,801,547	25,268,628	42,606,075	33,624,122	26,971,586	32,460,363	32,462,690	31,615,430
Federal Funds	26,062,074	27,118,591	37,814,696	28,430,151	32,611,936	24,176,838	19,344,772	32,515,074
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 94,622,277</b>	<b>\$ 106,100,455</b>	<b>\$ 124,140,800</b>	<b>\$ 147,064,766</b>	<b>\$ 135,959,469</b>	<b>\$ 186,423,609</b>	<b>\$ 183,446,743</b>	<b>\$ 122,066,908</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>43.0</b>	<b>24.0</b>	<b>32.0</b>	<b>42.4</b>	<b>41.0</b>	<b>40.8</b>	<b>51.8</b>	<b>32.3</b>

## Capital Improvements

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Without funding for capital improvement projects at the state hospitals, buildings used to house patients and the infrastructure to support the staff and patient care will deteriorate over time. Providing routine rehabilitation and repair of facilities and infrastructure, as well as allowing for major remodeling of facilities to meet changing needs, is critical to maintaining certification and accreditation. Capital improvement funding also pays to redeem bonds issued to remodel and maintain buildings at the state hospitals. Not appropriating SIBF funds for debt service risks violating the terms of the bond.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific    KSA 76-6b05	Discretionary	No	7

### Program Goals

A. To provide state funding for capital projects identified and prioritized across the 4 state hospitals.

### Program History

In 1953, the Legislature approved SB 26 creating the an Institutional Building Fund to pay for repairing and equipping of buildings at the state institutions. The funds are collected from an annual state tax of one-half mill on all the property subject to Ad Valorem taxation under the general tax laws of Kansas. The 1990 Session, HB 2607, Sec. 24, established the Institutional Rehabilitation and Repair Fund. The purpose of the fund was to consolidate the central funds that were setup over the years into one fund titled Institutional Rehabilitation and Repair Fund. The fund is now called the State Institutions Building Fund for use at the state hospitals, Juvenile correctional facilities, and Veterans or Soldiers Homes.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Prioritize capital projects in the fiscal year budget before "end of life cycle" to prevent interference with patient care and patient programming.	95% of the time before a system or building failure								

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 3,960	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,320
Non-SGF State Funds	8,541,869	8,917,188	9,530,803	16,986,277	3,710,037	27,592,699	11,471,800	7,386,009
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 8,541,869</b>	<b>\$ 8,917,188</b>	<b>\$ 9,530,803</b>	<b>\$ 16,986,277</b>	<b>\$ 3,713,997</b>	<b>\$ 27,592,699</b>	<b>\$ 11,471,800</b>	<b>\$ 7,387,329</b>
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Long Term Support and Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Failure to fund this program would result in the cessation of community based services to seniors who can contribute to the cost of their care through the Area Agencies on Aging and would force those seniors to spend down their financial resources quicker making them eligible for Medicaid sooner than they would have been otherwise. Further, both congregate meals and home-delivered meals would no longer be able to be provided, risking the nutrition and health of the seniors who rely on these services.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	K.S.A. 65-5101 et seq. and K.S.A. 65-6201, K.S.A 39-1801, 65-4411, KSA 75-5903, KSA 75-5926, KSA 75-5903, KSA 65-441 1 et seq., and KSA 39-1801 et seq	Mandatory	Yes OAA	5

### Program Goals

A. Assist older Kansans who are at risk of institutionalization with services to help them remain in their homes.  
 Provide quality meal services to older Kansans in order to improve or maintain their health and nutritional status.  
 C. Implement person-centered, self-determined services that allow individuals to live successfully in their home and community.

### Program History

The Program provides financial support to the 11 area agencies on aging. Support is provided through both federal and state funds. The federal funds include monies awarded under the federal Older Americans Act. The funds finance inhome services for frail individuals, supportive services delivered at the senior centers, case management services, elderly abuse and disease prevention, and health promotion services. The LTSS Commission administers grant programs, including the Senior Care Act and Nutrition Grants, as well as the Client Assessment, Referral, and Evaluation Program. This program screens all nursing home applications and inquiries to determine whether institutionalization could be delayed or prevented through less expensive community services. State support is provided through the senior Care Act, which finances in-home services for the elderly so that they can remain in their homes. The Department also provides funding to community providers and the state's 11 area agencies on aging, so they can provide congregate and home-delivered meals to the elderly under the Congregate Meals Program at centralized meal sites. At these sites, the elderly can gather, socialize, and receive other services. The program is financed by federal funds that are matched with monies from the State General Fund, county mill levies, and local contributions. Home-delivered meals are provided through the federal Older Americans Act. The program targets individuals unable to reach the congregate meal sites. Both congregate and home delivered meal programs are eligible for grant support by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which partially reimburses the programs on a per-meal basis.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures		Goal	FFY 2019 Actuals	FFY 2020 Actuals	FFY 2021 Actuals	FFY 2022 Previous Est.	FFY 2022 Est.	FFY 2023 Est.	FFY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Older Americans Act (OAA)	Number Served for Registered Services	n/a	32,957	30,605	27,867	34,001	34,001	34,001	34,001	30,824
	Percentage of Customers that have Contacted their Provider in the Last 2-3 Months	n/a	61%	64%	60%	65%	55%	65%	65%	60%
	Percentage of Customers That Would Recommend the OAA Program to a Friend or Relative	n/a	99%	96%	100%	99%	100%	99%	99%	99%
	Percentage of Attendants that Work the Amount of Time Authorized on the Plan of Care	n/a	98%	98%	97%	99%	95%	99%	99%	97%
	Number Served Annually	n/a	3,993	3,873	3,348	3,801	3,666	3,801	3,801	3,629
	SCA -Percentage of Customers that have Contacted their Provider in the Last 2-3 Months	n/a	67%	71%	62%	70%	61%	70%	70%	65%

Kansas Department for Aging and Disability Services

Senior Care Act (SCA)	Percentage of Customers that Would Recommend the SCA Program to a Friend or Relative	n/a	100%	97%	98%	100%	98%	100%	100%	98%
	Percentage of Attendants that Work the Amount of Time Authorized on the Plan of Care	n/a	99%	97%	97%	100%	94%	100%	100%	96%
Aging and Disability Resource Centers (ADRC)	Number of Assessments	n/a	13,451	11,449	11,549	14,000	11,953	14,000	14,000	11,650
	Average Number of ADRC Call Center Contacts per Week	n/a	513	625	487	550	522	550	565	545
OAA-Nutrition Program	Number of Congregate Meals Served	n/a	1,224,322	1,210,292	1,005,651	1,145,500	1,145,500	1,145,500	1,145,500	1,120,481
	Number of Home Delivered Meals	n/a	1,879,709	1,478,154	2,079,332	1,984,500	1,984,500	1,984,500	1,984,500	1,847,329
	Number of Customers Receiving Support Services	n/a	33,678	32,564	28,459	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	32,008
Customer Reviews	Number of Older Americans Act customers reviewed	n/a	212	233	219	222	233	222	222	228
	Number of Senior Care Act customers reviewed	n/a	430	398	317	358	310	358	358	342
SHIP (SHICK)	Number Served	n/a	29,142	29,246	23,673	24,619	22,615	23,067	24,220	25,178
	Number of Contacts	n/a	29,142	29,246	23,673	24,619	22,615	23,067	24,220	25,178
	Number of Events	n/a	662	309	218	226	229	233	244	252
MIPPA	Number Served	n/a	7,551	9,624	8,898	10,307	8,858	9,300	9,765	9,127
	Number of Contacts	n/a	7,551	9,624	8,898	10,307	8,858	9,300	9,765	9,127
	Number of Events	n/a	532	264	193	196	160	176	193	206

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 18,485,934	\$ 18,923,950	\$ 19,502,847	\$ 26,183,879	\$ 21,795,673	\$ 27,781,852	\$ 28,015,444	\$ 20,074,157
Non-SGF State Funds	83,066	275,707	149,864	120,684	83,706	380,000	290,000	169,759
Federal Funds	28,304,598	31,677,742	32,855,536	33,310,645	33,850,161	31,870,720	34,203,273	32,794,480
<b>Total</b>	\$ 46,873,598	\$ 50,877,399	\$ 52,508,247	\$ 59,615,208	\$ 55,729,540	\$ 60,032,572	\$ 62,508,717	\$ 53,038,395
<b>FTE</b>	38.0	44.0	44.0	48.0	47.0	47.0	53.0	45.0

## Survey, Certification, and Credentialing Commission

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Failure to fund these programs could result in no regulatory oversight of adult care homes in Kansas putting the elder residents they serve at risk for abuse, neglect and exploitation. Failure to fund background checks would impact the population previously mentioned as well as all of those individuals who are receiving intellectual, developmental or behavioral health services in the home and community.

	<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific	42 CFR Parts 405, 431, 447, 482, 483, 485, 488, and 489. KSA Chapter 39 Article 9 Adult Care Home Statutes. KAR Chapter 26	Mandatory	Yes CMS	3

### Program Goals

- A. Provide enforcement and oversight to ensure the requirements that Long-Term Care facilities must meet to participate in the Medicare and Medicaid program.
- B. Ensure compliance with statutory requirements for licensure of adult care homes and ongoing inspections/investigations of complaints related to allegations of Abuse Neglect and Exploitation
- C. Ensure compliance with statutory requirements for Criminal Record Check program and Nurse Aide registry as well as several health occupations curriculum, course approval and licensure/certification of these occupations

### Program History

The Survey and Certification Division reviews for compliance nursing facilities and providers for state licensure and federal certification. These responsibilities are accomplished through the administrative review of initial qualifications and ongoing surveys conducted by teams of registered nurses or limited practical nurses that ensure ongoing compliance with state regulations and federal certification requirements. There are currently approximately 330 nursing facilities in Kansas that must be surveyed or inspected no less than every 15.9 months with a monthly average of 12 months. The Survey and Certification Division also enforces and implements the Complaint Program for healthcare facilities. The Enforcement Coordinator assures that corrective actions are imposed accurately and in a timely way when facilities fail to meet conditions of participation, licensure and certification standards. The Complaint Program performs complaint intake activities through the complaint hotline, triages complaints for severity, coordinates with other state agencies including the Department of Children and Families and the Department of Health and Environment that handle complaints for other types of facilities and assures that onsite investigations are coordinated for complaint intakes according to state and federal requirements. The State Licensed Adult Care Home Division approves assisted living, residential health care facilities, home plus, adult day care and boarding care homes for licensure under state law, regulation and rule. These responsibilities are accomplished through administrative review of initial qualifications and ongoing surveys conducted by registered nurse surveyors to ensure ongoing compliance with state regulations. There are approximately 350 free standing facilities and approximately 100 state licensed facilities attached to nursing facilities. The State of Kansas began requiring operators of adult care homes, home health agencies and staffing agencies to conduct criminal background checks of staff to ensure that no one worked in those settings who had a criminal history of a prescribed list of crimes. This legislation went into effect July 1, 1997, and the enforcement of "prohibited" criminal histories began in 1998. In a partnership between KDADS and the Kansas Bureau of Investigation (KBI), operators submit information on each person that is a candidate for employment to the HOC Criminal Record Check program. HOC is linked to the KBI through a telecommunications system which provides initial data on each person for whom there is a record check requested. The information from KBI is shared with the facility operators to determine a person's eligibility to work in that setting. HOC enters the data for these requests, processes the information received back from the KBI and notifies the operators when a criminal record indicates a person should not be employed. In 2016, legislation expanded the criminal record check requirements to include individuals employed in all facilities licensed by KDADS.

### Performance Measures

Kansas Department for Aging and Disability Services

Outcome Measures		Goal	FFY 2019 Actuals	FFY 2020 Actuals	FFY 2021 Actuals	FFY 2022 Previous Est.	FFY 2022 Est.	FFY 2023 Est.	FFY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
SCCC Skilled Nursing Facility/NF	Average Number of months between surveys	n/a	13	13	20	16	20	16	14	18
HOC Background Checks	Number of Background Checks Processed	n/a	70,000	75,000	91,995	174,000	115,000	120,000	125,000	93,998
ACH State Licensed & Survey	Number of Surveys Exited	n/a	288	290	342	350	216	280	300	283

Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 3,533,797	\$ 2,623,877	\$ 3,053,397	\$ 3,974,907	\$ 2,795,736	\$ 3,919,913	\$ 5,286,881	\$ 2,824,337
Non-SGF State Funds	1,260,132	1,232,513	1,128,535	1,833,578	1,035,902	2,375,635	2,386,132	1,132,317
Federal Funds	8,308,717	6,202,356	5,507,186	6,479,890	4,554,457	6,342,599	6,357,577	5,421,333
<b>Total</b>	\$ 13,102,646	\$ 10,058,746	\$ 9,689,118	\$ 12,288,375	\$ 8,386,095	\$ 12,638,147	\$ 14,030,590	\$ 9,377,986
<b>FTE</b>	103.0	113.4	121.0	118.7	111.0	129.0	141.0	115.1

## State Hospital Commission

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The State Hospital Commission provides general administrative support to the 4 state hospitals including joint purchasing efforts and risk management oversight. The SHC is leading efforts to implement a new Electronic Health Record system across the hospitals, overseeing implementation of regional hospital beds to serve adults in mental health crisis, and a pharmacy system. These significant efforts would not be successful without the coordinating role of the SHC commission team to liaison among KDADS, Department of Administration, and the individual state hospital staff.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific      KSA 76-12a01	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Ensure state hospital budget submissions are integrated into the KDADS budget priorities and goals.
- B. Standardize risk management reporting across the state hospitals to inform the Governing Body about patient safety and care practices.
- C. Lead projects to modernize processes and implement technology solutions to improve and enhance critical processes, patient safety and clinical outcomes.

### Program History

The State Hospital Commission was created on June 2, 2019 by the Secretary of the Kansas Department of Aging and Disability Services. The State Hospital Commission is responsible for providing leadership, guidance, direction, oversight, training and support to the five State Hospitals: Kansas Neurological Institute, Parsons State Hospital and Training Center, Larned State Hospital, Osawatomie State Hospital and Adair Acute Care on Osawatomie State Hospital's campus. The Commission provides day to day management and collaboration with Superintendents and executive staff at the State Hospitals, ensuring compliance with conditions of participation for certification with Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services (CMS) and accreditation with the Joint Commission. Key programs administered by the Hospital commission include Medical liability insurance for physicians, Cost report preparation services, implementation and support of a pharmaceutical dispensing system, leading contract services and procurement for food service operations and contract nursing staff, project management related to implementing the state learning management system, and procuring a system wide electronic medical record system.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Specific measures not defined. Refer to Individual State Hospitals for specific measures.									

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ 1,438,352	\$ 588,254	\$ 9,763,795	\$ 3,600,374	\$ 26,218,719	\$ 20,809,028	\$ 1,875,660
Non-SGF State Funds	-	132,295	2,457,362	906,415	833,647	161,865	161,891	1,141,101
Federal Funds	-	129,755	72,219	9,645,690	119,276	5,736	5,742	107,083
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ 1,700,402	\$ 3,117,835	\$ 20,315,900	\$ 4,553,297	\$ 26,386,320	\$ 20,976,661	\$ 3,123,845
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	7.5	7.0	7.0	7.0	9.0	9.0	7.2

## Medicaid

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Would not be able to purchase medically necessary services for eligible consumers and provide access to treatment programs and preventative services. Also, many children would be without health insurance if the CHIP program was not funded.

	Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	Social Security Act Title XIX and Title	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

- A. Improve the quality of care for all Kansans
- B. Control program costs
- C. Implementing long-lasting reforms that improve the quality of health and wellness of Kansans

### Program History

Medicaid was formed as a result of the Social Security Act and was originally administered by the Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services (SRS). Later it was administered by the Kansas Health Policy Authority (KHPA). It is currently administered by the Division of Health Care Finance within the Kansas Department of Health and Environment. The 2011 Legislature approved the Governor's Executive Reorganization Order 38 to merge the Kansas Health Policy Authority into the Kansas Department of Health and Environment. Nearly all health care services purchased by KanCare are financed through a combination of State and federal matching dollars either through Title XIX (Medicaid) or Title XXI, the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP). Title XXI was created by Congress as part of the Balanced Budget Act to address the growing problem of children without health insurance. It was designed to expand health insurance to children whose families do not qualify for Medicaid. Coverage through CHIP is provided to "targeted low-income children," specifically those who reside in families with income below 200 percent of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) or those whose families have an income 50 percent higher than the State's Medicaid eligibility threshold. Recent legislation includes the passage in 2015 of Senate Sub for HB 2149 that amends the procedures regarding restrictions of patients' access to any new prescription-only drug under the Kansas Medicaid Program and establishes meeting requirements for the Medicaid Drug Utilization Review Board. The bill also allows prior authorization or other restrictions on medications used to treat mental illness to be imposed on Medicaid recipients subject to guidelines developed by the Board. The legislation creates a Mental Health Medication Advisory Committee to look at restrictions and authorizations for Medicaid recipients.

The 2016 Legislature approved a recommendation made in the Kansas Statewide Efficiency Review by the consulting firm of Alvarez and Marsal to consolidate Medicaid expenditures in one agency. Beginning in FY 2018, the majority of Medicaid expenditures are found in the Division of Health Care Finance, except for certain management and administrative expenditures which remain in the Kansas Department for Aging and Disability Services (KDADS) budget. The 2017 Legislature reversed this decision and transferred \$634.2 million from the State General Fund and \$1.4 billion all other funds from the Kansas Department of Health and Environment to the Kansas Department for Aging and Disability Services.

The 2018 Legislature approved \$6.0 million of additional funding from the State General Fund for Evidence Based Juvenile Programs to fund three youth crisis intervention centers across the state for FY 2019. The Legislature also approved \$5.9 million from all funding sources and \$4.3 million from the State General Fund for Graduate Medical Education for FY 2019.

The 2019 Legislature did not concur with the Governor's recommendation to expand Medicaid. The bill, HB 2066, as amended by the House Committee of the Whole, would have established the KanCare Bridge to a Healthy Kansas Program. The bill would have expanded Medicaid services under certain eligibility limitations to adult applicants under 65 years of age, who are not pregnant and whose income did not exceed 133.0 percent of the federal poverty level. Passage of the bill would have provided Medicaid benefits to an additional 150,000 individuals. The House Committee of the Whole passed HB 2066, but the Senate Committee on Public Health and Welfare chose not to have a hearing on the bill. The 2020 Legislature did not approve the Governor's second initiative to expand Medicaid. The Governor's budget included \$17.5 million from the State General Fund and \$562.5 million from all funding sources in FY 2021 to expand Medicaid. The amounts assumed expansion would begin January 1, 2021, or halfway through the fiscal year. The Legislature introduced SB 252 which would have expanded Medicaid and implemented a health insurance plan reinsurance program. However, the bill was never passed out of the Senate Committee on Public Health and Welfare.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Healthcare Effectiveness Data and Information Set (HEDIS) 50th percentile for HbA1c testing for comprehensive Diabetes care	A	Above 50th percentile	Above 50th percentile	Above 50th percentile	Meet or exceed the 50th percentile of NCQA's* Quality Compass or meet or exceed by 5 percentage points.	Above 50th percentile	Above 50th percentile	Above 50th percentile	Above 50th percentile
2. HEDIS 50th percentile for Annual Dental Visit Total Ages 2-21	A	Above 50th percentile	Above 50th percentile	Above 50th percentile	Meet or exceed the 50th percentile of NCQA's Quality Compass or meet or exceed by 5 percentage points.	Above 50th percentile	Above 50th percentile	Above 50th percentile	Above 50th percentile
3. HEDIS 50th percentile for Weight Assessment /BMI for Children & Adolescents	A	Above 50th percentile	Above 50th percentile	Above 50th percentile	Meet or exceed the 50th percentile of NCQA's Quality Compass or meet or exceed by 5 percentage points.	Below 50th percentile	Above 50th percentile	Above 50th percentile	Above 50th percentile

\*National Committee for Quality Assurance

### Funding

<i>Funding Source (in thousands)</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 731,765	\$ 568,248	\$ 501,318	\$ 636,649	\$ 614,660	\$ 625,000	\$ 700,000	\$ 561,409
Non-SGF State Funds	268,562	330,957	342,764	388,366	388,366	523,264	513,464	\$ 354,029
Federal Funds	2,148,993	2,500,556	2,778,411	1,694,018	1,739,454	1,951,736	1,786,536	\$ 2,339,474
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 3,149,320</b>	<b>\$ 3,399,761</b>	<b>\$ 3,622,493</b>	<b>\$ 2,719,033</b>	<b>\$ 2,742,480</b>	<b>\$ 3,100,000</b>	<b>\$ 3,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 3,254,911</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>\$ -</b>

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Will not be able to supply administrative support and financial services to all of DHCF's program areas. Will not be able to compute the fiscal impact of proposed policies, forecast caseloads, provide analytical support to program managers, and will not be able to respond to requests from stakeholders within or outside DHCF. Will not be able to oversee numerous programs and activities which spend Medicaid and CHIP funds and ensure adherence to state and federal regulations.

	Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	Social Security Act Title XIX and Title XXI	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

- A. Improve the health of the people of Kansas by increasing the quality, efficiency and effectiveness of health services.
- B. Increase coordination with public health programs.

### Program History

--

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Stakeholder Medicaid Training: Classroom hours provided	A	3,028	2,022	3,660	3,000	2,530	2,540	2,540	2,737

### Funding

Funding Source (in thousands)	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 9,700	\$ 32,156	\$ 32,924	\$ 24,656	\$ 20,793	\$ 20,875	\$ 20,875	\$ 28,624
Non-SGF State Funds	45,271	38,943	51,948	50,059	42,217	42,383	42,383	\$ 44,369
Federal Funds	265,521	318,511	279,736	224,144	189,028	189,775	189,775	\$ 262,425
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 320,492</b>	<b>\$ 389,610</b>	<b>\$ 364,608</b>	<b>\$ 298,859</b>	<b>\$ 252,038</b>	<b>\$ 253,033</b>	<b>\$ 253,033</b>	<b>\$ 335,419</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>\$ -</b>

## Bureau of Disease Control and Prevention

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Without public health intervention, disease transmission rates will increase dramatically resulting in significant morbidity and mortality (including infant) from these infections. As a result, the cost of treating outbreaks of these diseases will also dramatically increase. Thousands of parents statewide would be unable to afford the costs associated with vaccine acquisition, resulting in a significant drop in immunization coverage rates. Decreases in immunization coverage rates will ultimately result in increased outbreaks of vaccine-preventable diseases, resulting in significant morbidity and mortality.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A 65-118, K.S.A 65-116, K.S.A 75-6102(f)(1)(2)(3)	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To intervene in the spread of STIs, including HIV, and reduce the complications occurring from these infections  
 B. Prevent morbidity and mortality due to tuberculosis and contain the incidence of multi-drug resistant tuberculosis.  
 C. Reduce the incidence of vaccine preventable disease (VPD)

### Program History

The Bureau of Disease Control and Prevention (BDGP) is the operating unit principally responsible for programs designed to prevent and control

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. % of early syphilis cases treated appropriately	A	98.4%	82.2%	87.0%	90.0%	87.3%	90.0%	90.0%	85.5%
2. % of identified close contacts of new active TB cases receiving evaluations	B	94.2%	93.3%	79.0%	95.0%	94.4%	98.0%	98.0%	88.9%

Kansas Department of Health and Environment - Public Health

3. % of children entering kindergarten up to date with required DTaP5 – Polio4 – MMR2 - HepB3– Varicella2 vaccines	C	84.4%	88.0%	85.5%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	87.8%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. # of contacts elicited for testing/treatment per case of early syphilis interviewed	A	3	1.8	1.58	2	1.96	2.0	2.5	1.78
5. # of contacts per infectious case identified	B	17	12	12	12	13	15	15	12.3
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
6. # of active Vaccines For Children program providers	C	294	305	310	320	320	325	360	311.7

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,214,234	\$ 765,206	\$ 937,653	\$ 1,880,025	\$ 1,220,665	\$ 1,870,055	\$ 1,267,873	\$ 974,508
Non-SGF State Funds	179,470	227,688	242,632	-	-	-	-	\$ 156,773
Federal Funds	14,913,718	11,676,900	27,335,670	35,885,794	67,187,955	29,526,556	29,506,432	\$ 35,400,175
<b>Total</b>	\$ 16,307,422	\$ 12,669,794	\$ 28,515,955	\$ 37,765,819	\$ 68,408,620	\$ 31,396,611	\$ 30,774,305	\$ 36,531,456
<b>FTE</b>	41.0	44.0	45.0	62.0	62.0	93.0	93.0	50.3

## Epidemiology and Public Health Informatics (BEPHI)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Consequences of not performing the tasks would result in Kansas citizens not having identities established; death records for reconciliation of estates would not be available and fraud prevention activities for benefits paying agencies would cease. Surveillance and epidemiology is a core public health function for Kansas and the nation. Consequences of not funding these activities at the State level could result in additional outbreaks of or larger impacts of outbreaks of infectious disease. Investigations regarding impacts of environmental concerns could not be conducted, leading to increased concerns among the public and continued health risks. Preparedness activities for prevention and control of high consequence pathogens would go unaddressed, resulting in unnecessary morbidity and mortality for Kansas citizens.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
KSA 65-101	Mandatory	No	1
KSA 65-102	Mandatory	No	1
KSA 65-118	Mandatory	No	1
KSA 65-119	Mandatory	No	1
KSA 65-128	Mandatory	No	1
KSA 65-177	Mandatory	No	1
KSA 65-1,202	Mandatory	No	1
KSA 65-1,241 et seq.	Mandatory	No	1
KSA 75-5661	Mandatory	No	1
KSA 65-2401-2438	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Protect Kansans from public health hazards.
- B. Protect Kansans from identity theft.
- C. Collect, analyze and disseminate public health data.

### Program History

The Bureau of Epidemiology and Public Health Informatics (BEPHI) consists of three core functions of public health activities that comprise 1) infectious disease and disease condition identification and management; 2) vital records registration, issuance, and statistical analysis; and 3) health assessment and information dissemination. Funding sources for these programs include federal cooperative agreements, state fees, and administrative contracts. These core public health functions were begun when the Kansas State Board of Health was established in the early 1920s. KDHE was established in 1974 to bring together health and environmental perspectives in assuring the public's health. The Epidemiology and Public Health Informatics programs were merged in 2010 to form BEPHI to meet a growing need to coordinate and streamline several key public health information systems for Kansas. BEPHI's core functions provide direct service to the citizens of Kansas and heavily utilize health information systems to deliver these services. Real time, web-based systems provide capacity to identify and contain infectious disease outbreaks, register and issue vital event records, monitor blood lead levels in children and adults and standardize epidemiologic applications within programs in KDHE. BEPHI is responsible for collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data that provide information on a variety of conditions of public health importance and on the health status of the population. The Bureau conducts, in partnership with local health departments and other state and federal agencies, timely investigations of and surveillance related to infectious and zoonotic diseases, environmental health, maternal and child health, trauma, and other public health hazards.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Reportable disease sent to CDC	A	5,640	20,373	458,212	6,000	303,408	16,000	16,000	260664.3
2. Certified Vital Records Produced	B	376,028	373,191	402,632	394,579	412,111	412,000	408,000	395978.0
3. Datasets made available, data requests fulfilled, educational trainings/presentations, articles & summaries published	C	522	33	566	230	3,334	370	370	1311.0

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 58,562	\$ 77,840	\$ 66,289	\$ 196,845	\$ 162,760	\$ 197,715	\$ 198,012	\$ 102,296
Non-SGF State Funds	5,346,434	5,110,043	5,040,232	5,362,679	5,460,202	6,699,582	9,031,847	5,203,492
Federal Funds	5,314,632	5,544,820	41,376,080	97,361,964	83,047,988	27,499,216	22,581,762	43,322,963
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 10,719,628</b>	<b>\$ 10,732,703</b>	<b>\$ 46,482,601</b>	<b>\$ 102,921,488</b>	<b>\$ 88,670,950</b>	<b>\$ 34,396,513</b>	<b>\$ 31,811,621</b>	<b>\$ 48,628,751</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>68.50</b>	<b>78.50</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>120.0</b>	<b>120.0</b>	<b>123.50</b>	<b>123.50</b>	<b>99.50</b>

## Bureau of Family Health

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Family Health programming encompasses a wide variety of critical public health programs impacting health and outcomes across the lifecycle (birth to adulthood). Without funding, infants born in Kansas would not be screened for 34 genetic/metabolic conditions, 16 of which are time-sensitive/critical. Lack of funding would hamper early diagnosis and treatment, leading to severe illness, delays/disabilities or even death. Regular on-site facility inspections for nearly 4,600 facilities serving children 2 weeks to 11 years of age would not be conducted. Inspections are a safeguard to ensuring the health, safety and wellbeing of children in out of home care. Parents would not have access to quality child care. Child care facilities would not be licensed, increasing preventable risk to children in care as well as negatively impacting the economy and parents' ability to work away from the home. Without WIC funding all program services would cease, infant outcomes will be negatively impacted, and childhood nutrition will suffer. In 2021, the WIC program served a monthly average of 45,124 participants in 29,342 households. Part C early intervention programs across the state (33) would not receive funding necessary to maintain and implement a system of coordinated, comprehensive, multidisciplinary early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities (birth through 2 years) and their families. Consequently, over 10,000 children would not receive services. Maternal and Child Health (MCH) services that support healthy pregnancies, postpartum mothers, breastfeeding mothers, and their children and families (over 79,000 Kansans) would not be available. MCH serves as a gap-filling program that ensures access to care for individuals without the financial means or healthcare coverage to obtain services otherwise. Support for preventative health services (annual well visits) including reproductive health services would not be provided statewide through more than 42 local agencies with 53 service sites. Reproductive health and family planning clinical care constitutes primary care (and in some cases, the only clinical care) for many of the low-income clients served. Services that would be significantly impacted and/or no longer provided at these clinical sites include: health assessments; cancer screenings; pregnancy testing and appropriate counseling; information regarding early and continuous prenatal care in cases of a positive pregnancy test and/or exam; FDA-approved contraceptive methods and counseling (effectiveness, proper use, indications/precautions, risks, benefits, possible minor side effects, and potential life threatening complications); screening and treatment for HIV and sexually transmitted diseases; and immunization education/referrals. There would be negative impact on an additional 1,500 - 3,000 individuals birth to 22 years who attend special health care needs clinics and receive diagnostic evaluations. Over 250 children with special health care needs would not have access to care coordination services and financial support for medically necessary services and treatments through Direct Assistance Programs.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A 65-501 : 65-535; K.S.A 65-180; K.S.A. 65-180 : K.S.A. 65-183; K.S.A. 65-5a01 : 65-5a16; K.S.A. 65-1,124 : K.S.A. 65-1,1133; K.S.A. 75-3,504; K.S.A. 75-7,429; K.S.A. 75-5,648; K.S.A. 75-5,649; K.S.A. 65-1,159a; K.S.A. 65-101; K.S.A. 65-1,241 : 65-1,246; K.S.A. 72-1,421; K.S.A. 72-3,239; K.S.A. 3,239	Mandatory	Yes	1

*\*CFRs not included \*both*

*\*both*

### Program Goals

- A. Facilitate access to comprehensive and coordinated clinical and public health services; improve access to comprehensive screening including health, social, developmental, and behavioral; promote policies, systems, and resources to meet the needs of Kansas women, men, children, and families.
- B. Protect and promote public health and the optimal development of children in out of home care through the inspection and licensing of child care facilities; provide a basic level of consumer protection for parents and guardians selecting child care.
- C. Strengthen Maternal and Child Health infrastructure and systems to eliminate barriers to health care and disparities for individuals birth through adulthood, especially those with special health care needs.
- D. Improve access to comprehensive and quality nutritional services for women, mothers, and children.

### Program History

As of SFY2023, the Bureau of Family Health (BFH) is comprised of four large sections and two support units which include comprehensive, complex programs and broad activities: Children & Families, Screening and Surveillance, Nutrition & WIC Services, Early Care & Youth Programs (Child Care Licensing), Administration & Policy (support unit) and Systems of Support (support unit). A number of statewide programs in the Bureau are authorized and/or mandated by State and/or Federal Laws. Programs and projects administered through the Bureau meet the needs of infants, children, adolescents, women, pregnant women, men, individuals with special health care needs, and families birth to 44 years of age. Programs are targeted to the highest risk populations accessing and receiving care and services throughout the lifespan. Programming integrates social determinants of health and health equity in an effort to address and eliminate ethnic/racial and socioeconomic health disparities. The Bureau organization has been impacted by an Executive Reorganization Order (ERO) twice and multiple internal agency changes since 2012. Prior to 2012, BFH programming did not include the Child Care Licensing or Foster Care Licensing programs. These programs were previously organized as part of the Bureau of Child Care and Health Facilities (BCCHF) which also included the Health Occupations Credentialing Program. ERO 41 (effective July 2012) included reassignment of the Health Occupations Credentialing (HOC) Program, licensure and certification of long term care personnel and the criminal record check program, to the Kansas Department of Aging & Disability Services (KDADS). With the reassignment of the HOC Program to KDADS, some internal reorganization at KDHE was needed. The decision was made to pair the remaining BCCHF regulatory programs (Child Care Licensing, Foster Care Licensing, and Health Facilities [hospital and medical facility licensing]) with like services in other bureaus. The Health Facilities Program joined the Bureau of Community Health Systems. The Child Care and Foster Care Programs joined the Bureau of Family Health due to the strong alignment with other Family Health programs. Merging BCCHF programs with BFH, resulted in Bureau-level changes for Family Health effective in July 2012 (reorganized programs within sections to improve alignment and coordination/collaboration across programs serving similar populations). Additional agency changes occurred in February 2015. The Bureau of Environmental Health (BEH) was dissolved and programs were integrated into existing Bureaus. The Lead Hazard Prevention Program (LHPP) became part of the BFH. ERO 43 was issued in 2015 (effective July 1, 2015) which, among other things, moved the Foster Care Licensing Program from KDHE to the Department for Children and Families. Effective October 2019, the Lead Hazard Prevention Program was moved from BFH to the Division of Environment's Bureau of Air.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. % of children receiving services from Part C who substantially increased their growth in positive social-emotional skills by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	A	69.0%	67.3%	65.0%	67.0%	64.80%	66.00%	67.00%	65.7%
2. % of mothers who breastfed their infants at 6 months of age	A, C, D	58.2%	53.0%	58.7%	60.0%	60.2%	62.0%	62.0%	57.3%

Kansas Department of Health and Environment - Public Health

3. Cost of WIC food package per person (total cost of food/total WIC participants)	D	\$383.36	\$390.33	\$381.81	\$394.37	\$391.16	\$395.00	\$395.00	\$387.77
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Average # of child care facility permits and licenses issued monthly	B	485	472	440	450	439	450	450	450.33
5. # of children (age 0 to 3/through 2 years) with disabilities receiving services from Part C	A	10,800	10,579	9,994	10,794	10233	10350	10350	10,269
6. # of pregnant and postpartum women, breastfeeding mothers, infants, and children to age 5 served by the WIC program	D	87,519	81,529	76,424	71,000	73,659	74,300	75,300	77,204
7. % of children lost to follow-up/documentation regarding newborn hearing follow-up)	A, C	8.6%	5.8%	7.8%	7.8%	11.60%	7.00%	7.00%	11.6%
8. % of children, ages 9 through 35 months, receiving a developmental screening using a parent-completed screening tool	A, C	3.8%	3.5%	3.7%	3.8%	44.3%	45.0%	45.0%	17.2%
9. # of individuals served (unduplicated) through the Special Health Care Needs program	C	2,200	1,670	1,167	1,500	1,229	2,662	1,745	1,355
10. % of child care inspections conducted within 90 days	B	98.0%	89.3%	Data not reliable: COVID-19	90.0%	59.3%	90.0%	90.0%	74.3%

Kansas Department of Health and Environment - Public Health

**Funding**

<b><i>Funding Source</i></b>	<b><i>FY 2019 Actuals</i></b>	<b><i>FY 2020 Actuals</i></b>	<b><i>FY 2021 Actuals</i></b>	<b><i>FY 2022 Approved</i></b>	<b><i>FY 2022 Actuals</i></b>	<b><i>FY 2023 Est.</i></b>	<b><i>FY 2024 Est.</i></b>	<b><i>3-yr. Avg.</i></b>
State General Fund	\$ 6,256,135	\$ 6,372,279	\$ 8,204,298	\$ 8,620,517	\$ 8,423,759	\$ 11,319,583	\$ 11,163,027	\$ 7,666,779
Non-SGF State Funds	7,589,872	8,054,208	8,003,840	7,767,271	6,945,996	8,598,420	9,341,923	\$ 7,668,015
Federal Funds	78,302,680	75,008,042	81,626,545	83,757,188	91,814,288	139,054,879	72,679,313	\$ 82,816,292
<b>Total</b>	\$ 92,148,687	\$ 89,434,529	\$ 97,834,683	\$ 100,144,976	\$ 107,184,043	\$ 158,972,882	\$ 93,184,263	\$ 98,151,085
<b>FTE</b>	64.0	73.0	79.0	88.0	88.0	97.0	97.0	80.0

## Bureau of Oral Health

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Consequences of Not Funding this program causes the Bureau of Oral Health to lose the ability to conduct, collect, analyze and disseminate the oral health status of KS children would be greatly diminished. The school sealant program, community water fluoridation projects, technical assistance and support from dental director and program managers would be adversely affected. State wide data collection, analysis and dissemination of oral health status of children, elderly, workforce assessments, community water fluoridation reporting, KS data to national agencies, organizations, funders, policy makers and surveillance systems would be eliminated. The state agency conducts scientific, evidence- based surveillance on oral health and disease issues that are credible and accountable in their accuracy and objectivity.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

- A. Outreach  
B. Data/Surveillance

### Program History

History: In 2003, KDHE worked with KS legislature to secure support for a dental health officer. Funding for a state dental officer was provided through the legislature and United Methodist Health Ministry Fund(no longer funding). In 2019 the Bureau of Oral Health experienced 100% turnover, resulting in the hiring of a third Bureau director who continues to serve in that role.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Decrease the % of Kansas Children with Untreated Dental Decay	A	10%	4%	0%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%
2. Increase the % of Kansas 3rd Graders with Sealants Placed	A	12%	0%	0%	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%

Kansas Department of Health and Environment - Public Health

3. Average Cost of Kansas school screening program @\$5.00 per screening	A	794,200	747,175	328,275	500,000	708,935	850,000	950,000	594,795
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
4. Number of Kansas Schools that have a Sealant Program funded by BOH	A	262	82 (Covid)	260	275	244	250	260	252
5. Kansas Children Screened for Dental Disease through a State Uniform School Screening Process	A	158,840	149,435	65,655	100,000	141,787	170,000	190,000	118,959
6. Risk Factor Surveillance System Oral Health Questions Funded	B	3	0	0	3	3	3	3	1
7. Publically Released Reports, Presentations, Dental Education Events produced by BOH	B	20	25	20	15	10	15	15	18

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 141,810	\$ 164,989	\$ 206,851	\$ 575,511	\$ 339,226	\$ 863,761	\$ 629,082	\$ 237,022
Non-SGF State Funds	29,666	116,699	27,142	24,813	16,512	34,448	100	\$ 53,451
Federal Funds	334,015	329,131	498,004	449,922	388,117	483,889	484,320	\$ 405,084
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 505,491</b>	<b>\$ 610,819</b>	<b>\$ 731,997</b>	<b>\$ 1,050,246</b>	<b>\$ 743,855</b>	<b>\$ 1,382,098</b>	<b>\$ 1,113,502</b>	<b>\$ 695,557</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>4.75</b>	<b>4.75</b>	<b>3.50</b>

## Bureau of Community Health Systems

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Should the initiatives within the Bureau of Community Health Systems not be funded, there would ultimately be a decrease of services available in Kansas. Safety Net Clinics who provide primary, dental, prescription and preventative health care to uninsured and underinsured populations would be affected and further increase health disparities for at risk populations. Trauma centers in Kansas would no longer be designated which is the only guarantee a hospital is abiding by the standards in medical care for injured patients. Some health facilities in Kansas would not be surveyed which would potentially decrease access to healthcare and increase the risk in those facilities. Local health departments would not have access to funding and assistance to enable them to provide adequate public health services to all inhabitants of Kansas as required by statute.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General	SB 66	Mandatory	No	1
Specific	KSA 65-1668 through 1675	Mandatory	No	1
General	HB 2208	Mandatory	No	1
Specific	SB 175 Rural Hospital Licensure	Mandatory	No	1
Specific	KSA 75-5666	Mandatory	No	1
Specific	KSA 65-241 through 65-246	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

- A. Enhance the health and safety of Kansas communities
- B. Strengthen the public health system through collaboration, support, and monitoring
- C. Partner with the state and local public health community to coordinate programs

### Program History

The Bureau of Community Health Systems (BCHS) provides programmatic alignment for improved coordination of programs and services continues to grow with in this bureau. BCHS is a merge of multiple offices and bureaus over the years and currently made up of seven sections: Administration, Community Health Access, Health Facilities, Local Public Health, Public Health Preparedness, Radiation Control, and Trauma Systems. The bureau provides programmatic leadership for the agency in public health and hospital preparedness program, which coordinates response to all public health and radiation emergency situations, whether caused by natural events or acts of terrorism. There is close collaboration with other federal, state, and local partners, including the Wolf Creek nuclear generating station. BCHS staff work regularly with local public health departments, hospitals, clinics, associations, universities, and other partners to further public health in Kansas.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of Acute & Continuing Care Critical Care Access Hospitals	B	85	83	82	83	82	80	78	82.33
2. Access to primary health care services: # of unduplicated patients served by state-funded primary care clinics (data reported reflects totals reported from Jan. 1st to Dec. 31st for previous calendar year)	A	296,053	311,054	289,037	295,000	336,235	345,000	350,000	312,109
3. # of instances of individualized technical assistance for local health departments (# of LHDs supported with individualized technical assistance--could be additional)	C				225	1,247	1,500	1,750	NA
4. Number of cases submitted to the trauma registry by hospitals within 60 days of patient discharge.	B	14,009	14,782	12,311	15,000	8,988	10,706	11,027	12,027

### Funding

Kansas Department of Health and Environment - Public Health

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 11,602,251	\$ 13,168,766	\$ 13,827,671	\$ 19,345,869	\$ 17,994,453	\$ 20,333,965	\$ 19,200,451	\$ 14,996,963
Non-SGF State Funds	2,624,435	3,240,187	3,071,052	3,303,630	2,697,190	2,929,473	2,945,060	\$ 3,002,810
Federal Funds	13,278,945	12,856,659	68,374,919	42,501,539	43,002,153	20,028,553	19,487,229	\$ 41,411,244
<b>Total</b>	\$ 27,505,631	\$ 29,265,612	\$ 85,273,642	\$ 65,151,038	\$ 63,693,796	\$ 43,291,991	\$ 41,632,740	\$ 59,411,017
<b>FTE</b>	68.0	75.0	78.0	96.0	96.0	100.0	100.0	83.0

## Bureau of Health Promotion

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Chronic Disease and Injury Risk Reduction: 6,300 Seniors would not receive vouchers for fruits and vegetables through the Senior Farmers Market Nutrition Program and 250 farmers would lose sales. Over 10,000 Kansans annually would not have enrolled in proven lifestyle change programs and behavior change trainings such as the Diabetes Prevention Program, Diabetes Self-Management Education, Tobacco Quitline, Zero Suicide, Stepping On and would be at increased risk of severe illness or death. Over 3,500 unintentional injury prevention interventions (smoke alarms, carbon monoxide detectors, bicycle helmets, child safety seats) would not have been received which would increase the number of childhood injuries and deaths.

Health Systems Approaches to Chronic Disease and Injury Control Programs: Over 10,000 fewer cancer screenings for low income, uninsured men and women annually. This would result in breast, cervical, and colorectal cancer diagnoses at later stages of the disease when treatment is more costly and less effective. Fewer providers would refer patients to tobacco cessation programs. Reductions in opioid prescriptions would not be maintained.

Societal, Policy, and Surveillance to reduce Chronic Disease and Injury Program: If chronic disease, injury, and violence data systems were not funded, Kansas decision-makers and program directors at the local and state levels would not have current information for planning, implementation, and evaluation of programs designed to improve the health of Kansans.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General	Surveillance KSA 65-101 K.S.A. 68-6803	Discretionary		2

Specific	Health systems (tobacco/alcohol/ drugs, cancer registry, cancer screening, diabetes, palliative care) K.S.A. 65-1160 K.S.A. 65-1,168 through K.S.A.. 65-1,174 K.S.A. 65-1,174a K.S.A. 65-1,122 K.S.A. 65-1,260 through K.S.A. 65-1,261	Mandatory	Match and MOE required for Kansas Cancer Registry	1
----------	---	-----------	--	---

### Program Goals

- A. Chronic disease and injury risk reduction program: Decrease the prevalence of health risk behaviors which contribute to the leading preventable chronic diseases and injury in the Kansas population.
- B. Health systems program: Increase access to preventive health services and reduce the health impact of chronic disease and injury among Kansans.
- C. Societal, Policy, and Surveillance Program: Assess the burden, monitor progress, and make recommendations towards achieving state health objectives that address chronic disease and injury in Kansas.

### Program History

History: The Bureau of Health Promotion was established in 1989. State FY1990 was the first year BHP was shown in the budget. The state health promotion "office" started with about \$250,000 of PHHSBG and has grown to a Bureau with over \$20 million being invested in Kansas for prevention and control of chronic disease, injury and violence, drug overdose, and associated risk factors. The vast majority of funds are from federal and private sources such as foundations. Work is accomplished through partnerships with the people of Kansas to promote healthy behaviors, policies, and environmental changes within communities and health systems that improve the quality of life and prevent chronic disease, injury, and premature death. Support for proven strategies such as community health workers and new initiatives such as suicide prevention and palliative care have been incorporated over time to address emerging needs.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. % of adults reporting behaviors related to physical activity, cigarette smoking, nutrition & seatbelt use. (Kansas BRFSS) a. Not participating in leisure time physical Activity b. Currently smoke cigarettes c. Who are fruit < 1 time/day d. who ate vegetables <1 time/day	A	a. 27.9% b.17.4% c.37.5% d.17.3% e.16.6%	a. 22.5% b. 17.3% c. no data d. no data e. 19.1%	a. 27.1% b. 16.2% c. 41.4% d. 19.9% e. no data	a. 25% b. 16% c. 41% d. 19% e. 17%	a. 22% b. 17% c. 41% d. 20% e. 17%	a. 21% b. 16% c. 38% d. 18% e. 15%	a. 20% b. 15% c. 36% d. 16% e. 14%	a. 24% b. 17% c. 41% d. 20% e. 18%
2. Use of electronic vapor products a. Adults currently use e-cigarettes. (KS BRFSS) b. Students currently use at least 1 day during last 30 (YRBS)	A	Data not available	Data not available	a. 7% b. 22%	a. 6% b. 18%	a. 7% b. 22%	5% 15%	4% 14%	a. 7% b. 22%
3. Estimated % of children always restrained in automobile child restraints. ( a. 0-4 years of age b. 5-9 years of age c. 10-14 years of age d. 15-17 years of age	A	a. 98 % b. 88 % c. 87 % d. 87 %	Survey not conducted due to Covid-19	Survey not conducted due to Covid-19	a. 98 % b. 88 % c. 87 % d. 87 %	a. 98% b. 88% c. 87% d. 87%	a. 98% b. 88% c. 87% d. 87%	a. 98% b. 88% c. 87% d. 87%	a. 98% b. 88% c. 87% d. 87%
4. Number of provider referrals to proven programs for the prevention and management of tobacco use, cancer, and suicide.	B	5,686	6,814	8,434	8,000	7082	8000	8500	7,443
5. Number of prescriptions with 90+ Daily MME of opioids.	B	202,056	179,310	150,000	145,000	125,000	100,000	100,000	143,103

Kansas Department of Health and Environment - Public Health

6. # of cancer screenings provided (breast, cervical, colorectal).	B	11,166	13,671	14,300	15,500	13049	13450	14175	13,673
7. Average cost per cancer screening (colonoscopies added in FY21)	B	\$58.42	\$58.39	\$107.25	\$99.03	\$107.88	\$105.05	\$100.34	\$91.17
8. % state health objectives (HK2020, HK2030) related to chronic disease and injury. (Healthy Kansans report) a. Met (out of total) b. Showing progress (out of those not met)	C	a. 47% b. 60%	a. 47% b. 60%	a. 0 b. 0 New baseline (Healthy Kansans 2030)	a. 0 Met b. 20% improved	New baseline pending completion of Healthy Kansans 2030	0.0 20%	0.0 40%	New baseline pending
9. Suicide rate per 100,000 population a. Ages 10-17 b. Ages 18-64 c. Ages 65+	C	a. 5.3 b. 23.8 c. 16.7	a. 9.1 b. 23.5 c. 19.6	a. 12.4 b. 25.7 c. 23.7	a. 6 b. 22 c. 16	a. 6 b. 22 c. 16	a. 5 b. 21 c. 15	a. 4 b. 20 c. 14	a. 9% b. 24% c. 20%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
10. # of youth receiving training and education in health promotion or leadership related to tobacco use prevention, sexual violence prevention, and other chronic disease and injury topics.	A	58,057	32,861	32,320	30,855	30,701	26,877	27,000	31961
11. Number of worksites actively involved with bureau initiatives to improve and maintain physical and mental health and well-being of employees.	A	5	9	299	300	294	297	297	201

Kansas Department of Health and Environment - Public Health

12. Number of enrollments in CDC-recognized lifestyle change programs and behavior change trainings (Tobacco Quitline, Diabetes Prevention Program, Diabetes Self-Management Education, Zero Suicide, Stepping On).	A	1,848	1,466	1,072	1,500	10,643	15,250	15,750	4394
13. Unintentional injury prevention interventions distributed/installed (smoke alarms, carbon monoxide detectors, bicycle helmets, child safety seats).	A	10,177	8,057	2,867	4,000	3500	4050	4050	4808
14. Number of health systems supported by BHP to make internal policy changes to implement protocols for identifying or referring patients to preventive services.	B	21	27	30	30	38	52	57	32
15. Extent of reach of Palliative Care Education Program	B	-	-	662	1565	1500	2000	2000	1081
16. # of active health coalitions/chapters in Kansas that address nutrition/physical activity, tobacco use, injury prevention and other chronic disease/injury topics.	C	123	132	134	139	139	145	150	135
17. # of data systems maintaining or showing demonstrable improvement in scope, quality or use.	C	5	6	9	9	10	14	14	9

Kansas Department of Health and Environment - Public Health

18. # of state and local media events/coverage for health promotion interventions.

C	929	262	273	279	191	200	210	242
---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 360,051	\$ 388,323	\$ 478,214	\$ 792,925	\$ 518,069	\$ 2,456,707	\$ 1,433,118	\$ 461,535
Non-SGF State Funds	1,228,704	1,376,029	1,630,757	1,403,664	1,445,626	1,400,920	1,400,734	1,484,137
Federal Funds	13,854,218	13,539,617	15,999,287	21,027,667	69,892,872	20,129,657	19,869,298	33,143,925
<b>Total</b>	\$ 15,442,973	\$ 15,303,969	\$ 18,108,258	\$ 23,224,256	\$ 71,856,567	\$ 23,987,284	\$ 22,703,150	\$ 35,089,598
<b>FTE</b>	35.0	35.0	41.0	47.0	47.0	53.0	53.0	41.0

## Unemployment Insurance

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Lack of supervision of the unemployment insurance program could result in fraud, waste and abuse of the program. The new hires database would not be up to date. Unemployment insurance documents would not be processed. Claimant unemployment applications would not be processed. Unemployment Insurance would not be adequately funded.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rgt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific K.S.A. 44-701 et seq.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To continue to improve and enhance the levels of customer service provided to Kansas employers and workers who interact with the agency
- B. To continue to build upon recent successes in meeting and exceeding federally mandated program performance standards.
- C. To continue to work with the Office of Information Technology Services to make incremental improvement in the existing technology platforms that support the unemployment system in Kansas.

### Program History

The Kansas Department of Labor was created by Executive Order No. 31 of 2004. The Legislature enacted the change to implement the order and it became effective on July 1, 2004. The order renamed the Department of Human Resources to the Kansas Department of Labor and transferred the Division of Employment and Training to the Department of Commerce and transferred the Kansas Advisory Commission on Hispanic/Latino Affairs and the Kansas African American Affairs Commission to the Department of Administration. In July 2005, America's Job Link Alliance - Technical Services (AJLA-TS) was also transferred to the Department of Commerce to be more in line with workforce development and the Employment and Training programs.

# Kansas Department of Labor

The law establishing the agency is sections 75-5701 through 75-5740 of Kansas Statutes Annotated. The Department administers the Kansas Employment Security Law, K.S.A. 44-701, et seq.; the Workers Compensation Act, K.S.A. 44-501, et seq.; the Wage Payment Act K.S.A. 44-313, et seq.; Minimum Wage and Maximum Hours Act, K.S.A. 44-1201, et seq.; Child Labor Act, K.S.A. 38-601, et seq.; private employment agencies, K.S.A. 44-401, et seq.; labor relations, K.S.A. 44-801, et seq.; Public Employer-Employee Relations Act, K.S.A. 75-4321, et seq.; Professional Negotiations Act, K.S.A. 72-5413, et seq.; Kansas Amusement Ride Act, K.S.A. 44-1601, et seq.; several statutes concerning inspections and safety at work sites including K.S.A. 44-631, 44-634, 44-636 through 44-638; providing consultation to further 2012 Senate Bill 155; and the human trafficking advisory board, K.S.A. 75-757.

The Department receives a large amount of federal funding, and must comply with federal laws, including Titles III and IX of the Social Security Act and the Federal Unemployment Tax Act (FUTA). The Department also receives federal funds from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to administer the federal 21(d) workplace safety consultation program and from USDOL to fund certain Bureau of Labor Statistics programs.

The Division of Unemployment Insurance ("UI") is tasked with administering the Kansas Employment Security Law, K.S.A. 44-701 et seq. The stated public policy of the employment security law is to help alleviate the impact of economic insecurity for those Kansas workers who find themselves involuntarily unemployed. The UI program is based upon federal law, but administered by state employees under state law. Because of this structure, the program is unique among the country's social insurance programs. UI is also unique in that it is almost totally funded by employer taxes, either federal or state.

Federal law defines certain requirements for the program. The Social Security Act ("SSA") and the Federal Unemployment Tax Act ("FUTA") set forth broad coverage provisions, some benefit provisions, the federal tax base and rate, and administrative requirements.

## Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2022							
		FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percent of intrastate claimants to be issued first payments within 14 days		88.7	79.3	72.8	80	64.4	80	87	72.2
2. Percent of intrastate non-separation nonmonetary determinations issued within 21 days from the date that benefit eligibility issues are first detected.		86.2	61.7	68.0	75.0	77.8	80.0	80.0	69.2
3. Percent of all employers audited within the year		1.4	0.9	0.4	1	1.1	1.2	1.2	0.8
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Hourly cost per initial claim filed for benefits.		\$ 16.45	\$ 14.96	\$ 15.03	\$ 111.46	\$ 7.39	\$ 8.34	\$ 6.62	\$ 12.46
5. Number of weeks claimed filed for benefits.		470,492	1,670,382	2,294,740	731,326	475,135	537,033	532,845	1,480,086
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
6. Number of weekly claims		465,787	1,653,678	2,271,793	724,013	470,384	531,663	527,517	1,465,285

Kansas Department of Labor

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 5,748	\$ 3,233,055	\$ 10,211,224	\$ 1,916
Non-SGF State Funds	1,697,108	1,458,180	270,063	5,233,749	9,169	14,675,000	2,837,425	579,137
Federal Funds	18,273,852	17,810,394	70,504,928	57,494,911	50,771,505	35,573,907	18,689,796	46,362,276
<b>Total</b>	\$ 19,970,960	\$ 19,268,574	\$ 70,774,991	\$ 62,728,660	\$ 50,786,422	\$ 53,481,962	\$ 31,738,445	\$ 46,943,329
<b>FTE</b>	168.8	201.1	250.8	262.8	216.1	235.1	235.1	222.6

## Worker's Compensation

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Lack of funding would result in fraud, waste and abuse of the program. Worker's Compensation Professionals would have to find other educational services.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 44-501 et seq	Mandatory	No	2

### Program Goals

- A. Provide a statewide judicial sytem for workers compensation claims that operates in a fair and efficient manner.
- B. Establishment and publication of a medical fee schedule for care involving injured workers.
- C. Regulatory oversight, including employer compliance with mandatory workers compensation insurance coverage, self-insurance permitting, and insurer accident prevention programs.

### Program History

The Kansas Department of Labor was created by Executive Order No. 31 of 2004. The Legislature enacted the change to implement the order and it became effective on July 1, 2004. The order renamed the Department of Human Resources to the Kansas Department of Labor and transferred the Division of Employment and Training to the Department of Commerce and transferred the Kansas Advisory Commission on Hispanic/Latino Affairs and the Kansas African American Affairs Commission to the Department of Administration. In July 2005, America's Job Link Alliance - Technical Services (AJLA-TS) was also transferred to the Department of Commerce to be more in line with workforce development and the Employment and Training programs.

The law establishing the agency is sections 75-5701 through 75-5740 of Kansas Statutes Annotated. The Department administers the Kansas Employment Security Law, K.S.A. 44-701, et seq.; the Workers Compensation Act, K.S.A. 44-501, et seq.; the Wage Payment Act K.S.A. 44-313, et seq.; Minimum Wage and Maximum Hours Act, K.S.A. 44-1201, et seq.; Child Labor Act, K.S.A. 38-601, et seq.; private employment agencies, K.S.A. 44-401, et seq.; labor relations, K.S.A. 44-801, et seq.; Public Employer-Employee Relations Act, K.S.A. 75-4321, et seq.; Professional Negotiations Act, K.S.A. 72-5413, et seq.; Kansas Amusement Ride Act, K.S.A. 44-1601, et seq.; several statutes concerning inspections and safety at work sites including K.S.A. 44-631, 44-634, 44-636 through 44-638; providing consultation to further 2012 Senate Bill 155; and the human trafficking advisory board, K.S.A. 75-757. The Department receives a large amount of federal funding, and must comply with federal laws, including Titles III and IX of the Social Security Act and the Federal Unemployment Tax Act (FUTA). The Department also receives federal funds from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to administer the federal 21(d) workplace safety consultation program and from USDOL to fund certain Bureau of Labor Statistics programs.

The role of the Division of Workers Compensation (hereafter, the Division) in the overall operations of the Kansas Department of Labor is to administer and enforce the provisions of the Kansas Workers Compensation Act, K.S.A. 44-501 et seq. The Division of Workers Compensation's primary functions under the Act include:

- 1) Administration of a statewide administrative judicial system for adjudication of workers compensation claims;
- 2) Regulatory oversight, including employer compliance with mandatory workers compensation insurance coverage, self-insurance permitting, and insurer accident prevention programs;
- 3) Maintenance of records and statistics for the Division's units and courts;
- 4) Establishment and publication of a medical fee schedule for care involving injured workers; and
- 5) The investigation and prosecution of fraudulent and abusive conduct.

The Division has offices in Topeka, Wichita, Lenexa, Salina and Garden City. In 2013 the Division moved to new court offices in Wichita and Overland Park. These new offices include hearing rooms for the workers compensation appeals board to hear appeals in those locations in addition to hearing appeals in Topeka.

The Kansas Workers Compensation Act, K.S.A. 44 501 et. Seq. is self contained, no fault legislation which requires most employers operating in Kansas to provide benefits in the form of wage replacement, medical treatment and compensation for permanent injury to employees who suffer injury or occupational disease arising out of and in the course of employment. Workers compensation laws grew in the United States as a result of the Industrial Revolution and the subsequent movement of society from rural agrarian to urban industrial. In the first part of the twentieth century, individual state legislatures began adopting different workers compensation programs with different coverage and benefit requirements. Workers compensation laws remain products of state legislatures. The first Kansas Workers Compensation Act was passed in 1911 and withstood immediate constitutional challenge. Originally, the law applied only to hazardous types of employment which were specifically listed in the law. Any employer or employee affected by the law could elect not to be covered under the law. The maximum weekly benefits were specifically set and could only change through legislative amendment. Medical compensation was limited to a certain dollar amount. Major changes to the Workers Compensation Act were made July 1, 1974. Generally, all employments with an annual payroll of \$10,000 or more in any calendar year were now covered by the Act. Employers could not elect out of coverage. Only employees owning 10 percent or more of the corporate stock of their corporate employer could elect out of coverage. Those employers not covered by the Act could elect to come under the Act and self-employed individuals could elect to cover themselves as employees. Agricultural pursuits were specifically exempted from coverage under the Act.

In addition to greatly broadening coverage in 1974, the legislature provided for a fluctuating maximum weekly benefit tied to the state's average weekly wage. The maximum weekly benefit equaled two thirds of the state's average weekly wage and would be recalculated annually on July 1. Once the injury occurred, the maximum weekly benefit would not fluctuate but would be set at the rate in effect at the time of injury. The total amount of money to be paid for any disability under the Act was \$50,000. The dollar limit on medical compensation was removed and injured workers were entitled to unlimited medical treatment to cure and relieve the worker from the effects of the injury. In 1976, the Division of Workers Compensation became a Division of the Kansas Department of Human Resources (K.S.A. 75-5708). On July 1, 1979, the maximum weekly benefit was increased to 75 percent of the state's average weekly wage and the maximum salary indemnity for temporary total and permanent partial whole body disabilities was increased to \$75,000. The maximum caps for permanent total disabilities and death benefits were amended to \$100,000. On July 1, 1987, the Kansas Workers Compensation Act was amended to encourage the greater utilization of vocational rehabilitation. A successful return to employment and the earning of comparable wages would limit claimant's recovery for permanent partial disability to the actual percentage of physical functional loss. The maximum caps for temporary total and permanent partial whole body disabilities increased to \$100,000; permanent total disability increased to \$125,000; and, death benefits increased to \$200,000. Businesses with payroll generally under \$20,000 were exempted from workers compensation.

On July 1, 1990, the Act was amended mandating the Director prepare and adopt rules and regulations which establish a fee schedule, establishing the maximum fees for medical service, including vocational rehabilitation and any other treatment or services provided or ordered by health care providers to employers under the Act. The law provides for an eight member advisory panel to assist the Director in establishing the schedule or schedules and providing a bi-annual review of the fee schedule. On July 1, 1993, the Act underwent major reform mandating implementation of new programs, including establishment of an ombudsmen program; a benefit review program; a workers compensation appeals board to review decisions of the administrative law judges; an accident prevention and safety services program; as well as a system to monitor, report and investigate fraud or abuse; to prosecute and hold hearings on claims of fraud or abuse; to actively distribute educational and informational material about the Act; and to compile and maintain a database of information on claim characteristics and costs related to open and closed claims (1993 Session Laws, Chapter 286). On July 1, 2000, the death benefit in the workers compensation act was increased from \$200,000 to \$250,000 with an initial \$40,000 immediate lump sum payment and the surviving spouse remarriage provisions were amended so that such spouse receives benefits until the maximum payout limit is reached. A minimum weekly payment provision was also inserted into the death benefit statute. Effective July 1, 2000 a new post-award medical treatment procedure was implemented. In addition, the medical bill dispute provisions of the workers compensation act were amended to streamline and simplify the procedure while at the same time incorporating the existing utilization and peer review procedures into the process.

## Kansas Department of Labor

The 2006 legislative changes included a change in the way administrative law judges are hired and evaluated. The change created an Administrative Law Judge Nominating and Review Committee made up of one representative each from the AFL/CIO and Chamber of Commerce. Newly appointed judges are in the "unclassified" state civil service and judges are appointed for four year terms with the possibility of reappointment if recommended by the Nominating Review Committee and approved by the Secretary of Labor. In 2013, further legislation did away with the equal representation by labor and the chamber and created a seven member Workers Compensation and Employment Security Boards Nominating Committee to submit candidates for open ALJ positions and open Workers Compensation Appeals Board positions. The Secretary of Labor may appoint the Committee's nominee or reject the nominee and request the Committee send a new name. The Committee also considers requests for reappointment to these positions. The Workers Compensation Act was changed significantly by the 2011 legislature and the legislation went into effect on May 15, 2011. The changes were comprehensive and made it more difficult for injured workers to meet the burden of proof to show a compensable injury. The changes included a 'prevailing factor' test to make an injury compensable and established a minimum threshold requirement to obtain a work disability. The changes also created a rebuttable presumption that, upon a positive drug or alcohol test, the injured worker would be considered impaired and that the impairment contributed to the injury. Other changes made it easier to get a case dismissed and to terminate future medical treatment. The changes did eliminate the requirement for a worker to give written claim to the employer, but shortened notice requirements and made them firm cutoff dates.

Prior to the 2011 changes an injured worker was entitled to benefits if he could show the work related accident caused his/her injury, or aggravated, accelerated or intensified a preexisting condition. Now an injured worker must prove an accident was the 'prevailing factor' (primary factor above all others) in causing an injury in order to have a compensable claim. This new test makes it much more difficult to prove causation, especially for any type of injury, aggravation or acceleration of a preexisting condition. To qualify for work disability, which is an enhanced disability benefit based on the average of a wage loss and task loss, an injured worker must now have to show in excess of a 7.5% functional impairment to the body as a whole (10% if there is a preexisting impairment) and that they sustained a minimum 10% wage loss. The calculation for wage loss was changed as a result of a 2009 decision in the Bergstrom case which interpreted the prior language of the statute literally and looked strictly at the preinjury wage and the post injury wage. If the injured worker had no post injury wage, the wage loss was 100%. The new law said you now look at the preinjury wage and the wage the injured worker is capable of earning post injury. The new changes did clarify that injuries to the same bilateral extremities (i.e. both arms or both legs) would be considered body as a whole injuries. This change occurred as a result of the Supreme Court's decision in Casco which found injuries to bilateral extremities were separate scheduled injuries.

In 2007 a provision was added to the law to allow employers to seek dismissal of a case for lack of prosecution if the case was not settled or had not gone to regular hearing within five years. In the 2011 changes the time for seeking dismissal decreased to three years. An injured worker must file a motion requesting an extension before the three year time from filing an application for hearing runs. The Supreme Court found in Glazier that the ALJ has no discretion but to dismiss the case. Prior to 2011, medical benefits for injured workers could be left open indefinitely unless the injured worker gave up that right. Now in order for the worker to receive future medical benefits, they have to show that it is more probable than not that future medical treatment will be required as a result of the work injury. Additionally, if future medical benefits are left open, the employer can request they be terminated if not used within two years.

Prior to 2011, the Fourth Edition of the AMA Guides to the Evaluation of Permanent Impairment was being used. In 2011, when the major changes were made, the legislature kept the Fourth Edition. However, in 2013, the legislature changed the Act to require ratings be based on the Sixth Edition of the guides for accidents occurring on or after January 1, 2015. The Sixth Edition of the guides approached impairment ratings differently than the Fourth Edition. In the recent case of Johnson v. U. S. Foods the constitutionality of the use of the Sixth Edition of the guides was challenged as ratings generally seemed to be lower than in the Fourth Edition. The Supreme Court determined, at least for non-scheduled injuries, that the key language in the statute referenced 'competent medical evidence' and the language 'based on the Sixth Edition of the American Medical Association Guides to Evaluation of Permanent Impairment' did not mean the use of the Sixth Edition was mandatory, just that it was a guide to be used as a starting point to determine a rating.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2020		FY 2022		FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
		FY 2019 Actuals	Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.				
1. Average number of days from initial report of fraud or abuse to investigation completion		343	411	181	274	342	342	342	311

Kansas Department of Labor

2. Hourly cost per case investigated for fraudulent or abusive acts that closed within the fiscal year	\$ 139.20	\$ 229.88	\$ 390.46	\$ 222.75	\$ 91.87	\$ 91.87	\$ 91.87	\$ 237.40
3. Number of employers contact about missing workers compensation insurance coverage during the fiscal year	86	76	438	228	451	451	451	322
<i>Output Measures</i>								
4. Average number of days between the time an application for benefits is filed and the time an award is issued (for all claims issued an award during the fiscal year).	1,281	1,027	940	1,024	1,134	1,134	1,134	1,034
5. Number of preliminary hearings held during the fiscal year	1,062	973	1,113	1,003	1,194	1,194	1,194	1,093

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund								-
Non-SGF State Funds	10,954,805	8,248,460	7,998,117	7,977,916	7,666,770	8,080,029	8,379,966	7,971,116
Federal Funds								-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 10,954,805	\$ 8,248,460	\$ 7,998,117	\$ 7,977,916	\$ 7,666,770	\$ 8,080,029	\$ 8,379,966	\$ 7,971,116
<b>FTE</b>	67.5	70.5	65.5	67.5	64.5	66.0	68.0	66.8

## OSHA

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The private industry would not have OSHA consultation services and would result in increased work related injuries. Educational information supplied by the department would not be up to date. Investigations would not be completed and inspections would not take place.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	21(d) Consultation	Mandatory	Yes	3
Specific	K.S.A. 44-1601 et seq.	Mandatory	No	3

### Program Goals

- A. To assist and encourage employers in their efforts to assure safe and healthful workplaces in Kansas.
- B. To maintain the availability of on-site consultation services pursuant to the federal contract.
- C. To encourage employers to develop, use and maintain workplace safety and health plans related to the nature of the employment.
- D. To review maintenance, operations, and qualifications of inspections conducted by a third party in accordance with the Kansas Amusement Ride Act, K.S.A. 44-1601 et seq.

### Program History

The Kansas Department of Labor was created by Executive Order No. 31 of 2004. The Legislature enacted the change to implement the order and it became effective on July 1, 2004. The order renamed the Department of Human Resources to the Kansas Department of Labor and transferred the Division of Employment and Training to the Department of Commerce and transferred the Kansas Advisory Commission on Hispanic/Latino Affairs and the Kansas African American Affairs Commission to the Department of Administration. In July 2005, America's Job Link Alliance - Technical Services (AJLA-TS) was also transferred to the Department of Commerce to be more in line with workforce development and the Employment and Training programs.

# Kansas Department of Labor

The law establishing the agency is sections 75-5701 through 75-5740 of Kansas Statutes Annotated. The Department administers the Kansas Employment Security Law, K.S.A. 44-701, et seq.; the Workers Compensation Act, K.S.A. 44-501, et seq.; the Wage Payment Act K.S.A. 44-313, et seq.; Minimum Wage and Maximum Hours Act, K.S.A. 44-1201, et seq.; Child Labor Act, K.S.A. 38-601, et seq.; private employment agencies, K.S.A. 44-401, et seq.; labor relations, K.S.A. 44-801, et seq.; Public Employer-Employee Relations Act, K.S.A. 75-4321, et seq.; Professional Negotiations Act, K.S.A. 72-5413, et seq.; Kansas Amusement Ride Act, K.S.A. 44-1601, et seq.; several statutes concerning inspections and safety at work sites including K.S.A. 44-631, 44-634, 44-636 through 44-638; providing consultation to further 2012 Senate Bill 155; and the human trafficking advisory board, K.S.A. 75-757. The Department receives a large amount of federal funding, and must comply with federal laws, including Titles III and IX of the Social Security Act and the Federal Unemployment Tax Act (FUTA). The Department also receives federal funds from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to administer the federal 21(d) workplace safety consultation program and from USDOL to fund certain Bureau of Labor Statistics programs. The Kansas 21(d) Consultation Program is partially funded by a federal grant. During FY 2021, 304 safety and health consultations were conducted for businesses in Kansas, identifying 657 serious, 5 other-than-serious safety and health hazards, and 274 hazards abated on-site by the employers with the consultant's recommendations. Hazards identified are in a variety of industries including construction, oil and gas, manufacturing facilities, and grain handling facilities. The consultation visits are complex in nature and require the consultants to identify and classify safety and health hazards and give clients appropriate abatement assistance to eliminate the hazards. In addition to the consultations, 28 presentations and training sessions were provided to employers throughout the year. House Sub SB70 was signed in to law on April 24, 2017. Portions were repealed and replaced with House Sub SB86. The Amusement Ride Safety unit is responsible for registering amusement ride entities, issuing amusement ride permits, and conducting compliance audits. In FY 2021 the amusement ride unit conducted 76 compliance audits of amusement ride entities operating in Kansas.

## Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percent of Consultation Requests		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
2. Percent of Serious Hazards		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
3. Percent of serious hazards		100%	90%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	97%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Cost per Consultation Performed		\$ 3,961.34	\$ 3,702.84	\$ 3,437.76	\$ 3,581.76	\$ 2,871.66	\$ 3,744.81	\$ 3,780.90	\$ 3,337.42
5. Number of Serious or Imminent Hazards Identified (Federal).		639	560	657	600	1342	1200	1200	853.0
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
6. Number of Educational Seminars, Program Assistance & Presentations Performed.		44	36	28	30	36	30	30	33.3
7. Number of Projected Permits Issued.		128	112	129	125	129	125	125	123.3
8. Number of Project Amusement Ride Audits Conducted.		68	76	87	80	123	100	100	95.3

Kansas Department of Labor

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 249,511	\$ 257,985	\$ 267,828	\$ 270,731	\$ 265,148	\$ 270,731	\$ 270,730	\$ 263,654
Non-SGF State Funds	876,870	770,154	782,128	782,128	989,543	979,836	996,548	847,275
Federal Funds	867,020	702,549	745,079	678,948	678,704	796,688	810,271	708,777
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,993,401	\$1,730,688	\$ 1,795,035	\$ 1,731,807	\$1,933,395	\$2,047,255	\$2,077,549	\$1,819,706
<b>FTE</b>	22.0	21.0	21.0	18.3	20.0	19.2	19.2	20.7

## Labor Market Information

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

No data would be available regarding the status of the labor force and economy.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Matc h Rgt.	Priority Level
General	Discretionary	No	4

### Program Goals

A. provide accurate and timely labor market information in response to user requests, and disseminate data using appropriate media.

### Program History

The Kansas Department of Labor was created by Executive Order No. 31 of 2004. The Legislature enacted the change to implement the order and it became effective on July 1, 2004. The order renamed the Department of Human Resources to the Kansas Department of Labor and transferred the Division of Employment and Training to the Department of Commerce and transferred the Kansas Advisory Commission on Hispanic/Latino Affairs and the Kansas African American Affairs Commission to the Department of Administration. In July 2005, America's Job Link Alliance - Technical Services (AJLA-TS) was also transferred to the Department of Commerce to be more in line with workforce development and the Employment and Training programs. The law establishing the agency is sections 75-5701 through 75-5740 of Kansas Statutes Annotated. The Department administers the Kansas Employment Security Law, K.S.A. 44-701, et seq.; the Workers Compensation Act, K.S.A. 44-501, et seq.; the Wage Payment Act K.S.A. 44-313, et seq.; Minimum Wage and Maximum Hours Act, K.S.A. 44-1201, et seq.; Child Labor Act, K.S.A. 38-601, et seq.; private employment agencies, K.S.A. 44-401, et seq.; labor relations, K.S.A. 44-801, et seq.; Public Employer-Employee Relations Act, K.S.A. 75-4321, et seq.; Professional Negotiations Act, K.S.A. 72-5413, et seq.; Kansas Amusement Ride Act, K.S.A. 44-1601, et seq.; several statutes concerning inspections and safety at work sites including K.S.A. 44-631, 44-634, 44-636 through 44-638; providing consultation to further 2012 Senate Bill 155; and the human trafficking advisory board, K.S.A. 75-757.

The Department receives a large amount of federal funding, and must comply with federal laws, including Titles III and IX of the Social Security Act and the Federal Unemployment Tax Act (FUTA). The Department also receives federal funds from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to administer the federal 21(d) workplace safety consultation program and from USDOL to fund certain Bureau of Labor Statistics

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percent of requests processed within three days		94.1	95.3	86.9	95.0	95.3	95.0	95.0	92.5
2. Percent of requests processed in more than three		5.9	4.7	13.1	5.0	4.7	5.0	5.0	7.5

Kansas Department of Labor

3. Percent of requests submitted timely	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100.0
<i>Output Measures</i>								
4. Number of requests	255	236	609	450	577	500	500	474.0

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	2,519,462	1,054,713	949,706	1,148,454	1,186,836	2,514,539	2,533,285	1,063,752
<b>Total</b>	\$ 2,519,462	\$ 1,054,713	\$ 949,706	\$ 1,148,454	\$ 1,186,836	\$ 2,514,539	\$ -	\$ 1,063,752
<b>FTE</b>	14.0	14.0	15.0	16.5	15.0	15.0	15.0	14.7

## Labor Relations

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

KDOL would not be able to fulfill the statutes governing employment standards and labor relations. Employees would have no outlet for restitution. Hearings would not be conducted

<u>Statutory Basis</u>		<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Matc h Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	K.S.A. 75-4321 et seq., K.S.A. 22-5413 et seq.	Mandatory	No	5

### Program Goals

- A. To to continue to administer both the PNA and the PEERA in a timely, effective and unbiased manner consistent with the legislative intent for enacting these laws.
- B. To promote harmonious and cooperative employer/employee relationships and enforce laws providing protection to the Kansas work force through due process of administrative proceedings as provided by the following statutes:
- 1) K.S.A. 44-801 et seq. - Collective Bargaining - Private Sector
  - 2) K.S.A. 44-818 et seq. - Agricultural Labor Relations Act
  - 3) K.S.A. 75-4321 et seq. - Public Employer-Employee Relations Act
  - 4) K.S.A. 22-5413 et seq. - Professional Negotiations Act
  - 5) K.S.A. 77-501 et seq. - Kansas Administrative Procedure Act

### Program History

The Kansas Department of Labor was created by Executive Order No. 31 of 2004. The Legislature enacted the change to implement the order and it became effective on July 1, 2004. The order renamed the Department of Human Resources to the Kansas Department of Labor and transferred the Division of Employment and Training to the Department of Commerce and transferred the Kansas Advisory Commission on Hispanic/Latino Affairs and the Kansas African American Affairs Commission to the Department of Administration. In July 2005, America's Job Link Alliance - Technical Services (AJLA-TS) was also transferred to the Department of Commerce to be more in line with workforce development and the

## Kansas Department of Labor

The law establishing the agency is sections 75-5701 through 75-5740 of Kansas Statutes Annotated. The Department administers the Kansas Employment Security Law, K.S.A. 44-701, et seq.; the Workers Compensation Act, K.S.A. 44-501, et seq.; the Wage Payment Act K.S.A. 44-313, et seq.; Minimum Wage and Maximum Hours Act, K.S.A. 44-1201, et seq.; Child Labor Act, K.S.A. 38-601, et seq.; private employment agencies, K.S.A. 44-401, et seq.; labor relations, K.S.A. 44-801, et seq.; Public Employer-Employee Relations Act, K.S.A. 75-4321, et seq.; Professional Negotiations Act, K.S.A. 72-5413, et seq.; Kansas Amusement Ride Act, K.S.A. 44-1601, et seq.; several statutes concerning inspections and safety at work sites including K.S.A. 44-631, 44-634, 44-636 through 44-638; providing consultation to further 2012 Senate Bill 155; and the human trafficking advisory board, K.S.A. 75-757.

The Department receives a large amount of federal funding, and must comply with federal laws, including Titles III and IX of the Social Security Act and the Federal Unemployment Tax Act (FUTA). The Department also receives federal funds from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to administer the federal 21(d) workplace safety consultation program and from USDOL to fund certain Bureau of Labor Statistics programs.

The Labor Relations Unit administers Kansas' labor relations statutes, providing a framework for the labor relations activities of public sector employees and employers. These statutes are the Kansas Public Employer-Employee Relations Act (PEERA), found at K.S.A. 75-4321 et seq., and the Kansas Professional Negotiations Act (PNA), at K.S.A. 22-5413 et seq. PNA governs labor relations activities between Kansas' public school teachers and other professional employees in public schools and their employers while PEERA governs labor relations between other state of Kansas public sector employees and their employers, as well as those of local governmental units whose governing bodies opt-in to coverage by PEERA. The Labor Relations Unit conducts unit determination hearings, representation elections, decertification elections and prohibited practice (unfair labor practice) hearings as well as performing a role in the administration of the statutory impasse process, to assist public sector employers and public sector employee bargaining representatives to bring labor contract negotiations concerning public sector employees' terms and

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of days after service of petition to hold mediation conference in all disputed determination cases.		45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
2. Number of months after the date of the service of petition to conduct unit determination hearings.		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
3. Percent of unit certification and representation elections held within 45 days of the verification of the showing of interest.		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Number of unit determination, certification and representation cases processed.		5	3	11	12	6	8	8	6.7
5. Number of unit certification and representation elections conducted.		5	3	2	4	3	5	5	2.7

Kansas Department of Labor

*Additional Measures as Necessary*

6. Hourly cost of claims served

\$ 330.16	\$ 476.51	\$ 626.74	\$ 784.60	\$ 354.63	\$ 373.33	\$ 376.46	\$ 485.96

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 301,700	\$379,387	\$381,793	\$ 496,916	\$245,908	\$274,533	\$277,888	\$ 335,696
Non-SGF State Funds	52,184	-	-		15,863	15,000	15,000	5,288
Federal Funds								-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 353,885	\$379,387	\$381,793	\$ 496,916	\$261,771	\$289,533	\$292,888	\$ 340,984
<b>FTE</b>	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.2	3.0	3.2	3.2	3.0

## Administrative and Support Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Lack of oversight for the Kansas Department of Labor. May create a loss of revenue from unemployment insurance and workers compensation assessments or mismanagement of funds, lack of clarity and inadequate information processing systems.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	K.S.A. 75-5701 through 75-5740	Discretionary	No	6

### Program Goals

A. The Administrative and support services are responsible for providing support to program staff to ensure KDOL fulfills its mission.  
 B. The Kansas Department of Labor provides workers and employers with information and services that are accurate and timely, efficient and effective, fair and impartial. Administered by employees that understand the value and importance of public service to their fellow Kansans.

### Program History

The Kansas Department of Labor was created by Executive Order No. 31 of 2004. The Legislature enacted the change to implement the order and it became effective on July 1, 2004. The order renamed the Department of Human Resources to the Kansas Department of Labor and transferred the Division of Employment and Training to the Department of Commerce and transferred the Kansas Advisory Commission on Hispanic/Latino Affairs and the Kansas African American Affairs Commission to the Department of Administration. In July 2005, America's Job Link Alliance - Technical Services (AJLA-TS) was also transferred to the Department of Commerce to be more in line with workforce development and the Employment and Training programs.

The law establishing the agency is sections 75-5701 through 75-5740 of Kansas Statutes Annotated. The Department administers the Kansas Employment Security Law, K.S.A. 44-701, et seq.; the Workers Compensation Act, K.S.A. 44-501, et seq.; the Wage Payment Act K.S.A. 44-313, et seq.; Minimum Wage and Maximum Hours Act, K.S.A. 44-1201, et seq.; Child Labor Act, K.S.A. 38-601, et seq.; private employment agencies, K.S.A. 44-401, et seq.; labor relations, K.S.A. 44-801, et seq.; Public Employer-Employee Relations Act, K.S.A. 75-4321, et seq.; Professional Negotiations Act, K.S.A. 72-5413, et seq.; Kansas Amusement Ride Act, K.S.A. 44-1601, et seq.; several statutes concerning inspections and safety at work sites including K.S.A. 44-631, 44-634, 44-636 through 44-638; providing consultation to further 2012 Senate Bill 155; and the human trafficking advisory board, K.S.A. 75-757.

The Department receives a large amount of federal funding, and must comply with federal laws, including Titles III and IX of the Social Security Act, the Federal Unemployment Tax Act (FUTA), Families First Coronavirus Response Act, specifically Division D, the Emergency Unemployment Insurance Stabilization and Access Act of 2020, and Title II, Subtitle A of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act of 2020, as amended. The Department also receives federal funds from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to administer the federal 21(d) workplace safety consultation program and from USDOL to fund certain Bureau of Labor Statistics programs.

### Funding

Kansas Department of Labor

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 129,696	\$ 382,173	\$ 911,267	\$ 10,294,191	\$ 1,028,628	\$ 6,634,522	\$ 13,638,662	\$ 774,023
Non-SGF State Funds	6,418,172	6,535,038	5,002,980	10,540,206	10,093,158	20,575,043	8,504,038	7,210,392
Federal Funds	4,640,705	5,186,421	46,079,471	22,469,660	20,331,002	14,581,989	2,822,146	23,865,631
<b>Total</b>	\$ 11,188,573	\$ 12,103,632	\$ 51,993,718	\$ 43,304,057	\$ 31,452,788	\$ 41,791,554	\$ 24,964,846	\$ 31,850,046
<b>FTE</b>	76.0	83.0	92.0	117.7	84.9	103.8	102.8	86.6

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Kansas is unique in the country in that, on a statewide basis, citizen volunteers are appointed guardians or conservators for those program eligible persons adjudicated by the court and in need of this level of protection and advocacy. This volunteer-based model of providing guardianship or conservatorship services involves a collaborative working relationship with the Department of Children and Families (DCF) and the Kansas Department for Aging and Disability Services (KDADS). Persons served by the KGP are identified by DCF Adult Protective Services and State hospital social workers who then make formal requests to the KGP for an approved volunteer who may be nominated to the court for appointment as guardian or conservator. The individuals served are dependent upon public support.

Individuals Served: During FY 2022, the program provided guardianship or conservatorship services to 1346 different individuals through the efforts of more than 737 Kansas citizens (KGP volunteers) appointed by the court as the guardian or conservator. A monthly stipend is made available to volunteers to off-set out-of-pocket expenses. The agency funding provides for the operational budget for salaries and wages, contractual services, commodities, and capital outlay. This volunteer-based program model provides a cost-effective guardianship or conservatorship service for vulnerable at-risk adults who do not have willing and able family members available or appropriate to be appointed by the court.

The consequences of not funding this program would result in the agency discontinuing all services and supports.

1. The current case load of individuals receiving guardianship or conservatorship services would no longer have agency staff to provide support and assistance to the volunteers serving as guardians or conservators. Volunteers accept this responsibility with the understanding staff support and technical assistance will be available to assist in navigating the complexities of supports and services for vulnerable individuals served. Volunteers wishing to resign/discontinue serving as guardian or conservator would have no available mechanism to identify a successor guardian nominee.
2. The stipend funding would no longer be available to volunteers for out-of-pocket expenses.
3. Referrals Discontinued - No new referrals may be made for a guardian nominee available to provide guardianship or conservatorship services.
4. Ten agency staff would no longer be available to provide support and assistance to existing volunteer, recruit new volunteers and manage new referrals for guardian or conservator nominee.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
K.S.A. 74-9601 et seq. as amended	Mandatory		1

### Program Goals

A.To provide that qualified, caring, and trained persons are available throughout the State who will volunteer to serve in the capacity of court appointed guardians or conservators for those program eligible persons in need of this level of protection and advocacy, and who do not have family members capable or willing to assume such responsibilities. All such persons are identified by DCF adult protective services or KDADS state hospital social workers and referred to the KGP after all other alternatives have been exhausted. Legal services are provided through the State to petition to the court for the trial to determine impairment. Individuals served may be considered the adult wards of the State.

## Kansas Guardianship Program

### Program History

The Kansas Guardianship Program was initiated in 1979 under the administration of Kansas Advocacy and Protective Services, Inc. In 1995, the Kansas Legislature established the program as a public instrumentality through passage of K.S.A. 74-9601 et seq., as amended. The KGP is governed by a seven-member board of directors, six of whom are appointed by the Governor and one by the Chief Justice. The purpose of the program is to recruit volunteers to serve as court appointed guardians or conservators for those eligible persons adjudicated by the court in need of this level of protection and advocacy. KSA 59-3069 (g) provides that State serves as surety on the bond of any conservator serving in the Kansas Guardianship Program. KSA 75-6101(d)(4) added court-appointed guardians and conservators who contract with the Kansas Guardianship Program to the definition of “employee” in the Kansas Tort Claims Act. This allows the program volunteers to be protected in cases of negligence or acts of omission.

The 2006 Kansas Legislature approved additional funding for the KGP to increase the stipend paid to volunteers serving as guardians and conservators from \$20 to \$30 per month. The 2019 Kansas Legislature approved additional funding for the KGP to increase the stipend paid to volunteers serving as guardians and conservators from \$30 to \$40 per month.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percentage of adults identified in need of a court-appointed guardian or conservator who receive guardianship or conservatorship services in the fiscal year	A	91%	91%	91%	91%	97%	93%	93%	93.0%
2. Number of volunteers providing guardianship or conservatorship services in fiscal year	A	768	775	771	775	737	748	755	761.0
3. Average cost per day per all adults served within fiscal year	A	\$ 2.28	\$ 2.30	\$ 2.58	\$ 2.77	2.8	2.92	2.92	\$ 2.6

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,164,023	\$ 1,320,953	\$ 1,314,717	\$ 1,375,960	\$ 1,375,960	\$ 1,403,875	\$ 1,403,875	\$ 1,337,210
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,164,023</b>	<b>\$ 1,320,953</b>	<b>\$ 1,314,717</b>	<b>\$ 1,375,960</b>	<b>\$ 1,375,960</b>	<b>\$ 1,403,875</b>	<b>\$ 1,403,875</b>	<b>\$ 1,337,210</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>

## General Administration - 01031

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

KNI would have to close, which would place a burden on the community to place them in another facility that would be able to meet their medical and physical needs. It would also eliminate 437.5 FTE positions and lay off staff.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific 76-17c01 to 76-17c06	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Maintain adequate staffing levels to be in compliance with ICF-MR rules and regulations

### Program History

KNI is certified by the federal government as an Intermediate Care Facility for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities (ICF/IID) under Title XIX of the Social Security Act.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Vacancy Rate for Direct Care	A	9.2%	10.4%	24.1%	10.0%	25.0%	10.0%	10.0%	19.8%
2. Vacancy Rate for Non-Direct	A	9.0%	10.0%	8.7%	6.0%	12.9%	6.0%	6.0%	10.5%

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 977,789	\$ 993,148	\$ 746,523	\$ 351,769	\$ 795,904	\$1,000,308	\$ 957,242	\$ 845,192
Non-SGF State Funds	25,568	52,095	26,822	98,731	28,454	42,151	42,345	35,790
Federal Funds	482,352	579,403	651,738	942,617	632,240	459,761	457,533	621,127
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,485,709</b>	<b>\$ 1,624,646</b>	<b>\$ 1,425,083</b>	<b>\$ 1,393,117</b>	<b>\$ 1,456,598</b>	<b>\$ 1,502,220</b>	<b>\$ 1,457,120</b>	<b>1,502,109</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>13.7</b>

## Staff Education and Research - 01071

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

KNI would have to close, which would place a burden on the community to place them in another facility that would be able to meet their medical and physical needs. It would also eliminate 437.5 FTE positions and lay off staff.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs.</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific 76-17c01 to 76-17c06	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Provide training to KNI staff to ensure they develop and maintain the skills necessary to provide high quality person-centered services to people who live at KNI. KNI hired a new Director of Training, and the Director is editing the curriculum and modifying the classes required for new employees. This performance measure for Staff Education and Research are being revised.

B. Provide training to community agency staff to ensure agency staff develop and maintain the skills necessary to provide quality person-centered services to people in the community.

### Program History

KNI is certified by the federal government as an Intermediate Care Facility for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities (ICF/IID) under Title XIX of the Social Security Act.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of Hours new employees receive in basic developmental disability training	A	4,210	4,668	3,858	5,000	N/A	N/A	N/A	4,263
2. Number of hours providing training to community groups	B	70	-	-	80	-	-	-	-

Kansas Neurological Institute

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 256,380	\$ 277,443	\$ 215,396	\$ 269,931	\$ 237,842	\$ 325,723	\$ 328,213	\$ 243,560
Non-SGF State Funds	23,657	22,651	20,470	35,130	18,743	27,820	28,068	20,621
Federal Funds	426,818	391,371	426,519	389,815	377,268	330,231	329,360	398,386
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 706,855</b>	<b>\$ 691,465</b>	<b>\$ 662,385</b>	<b>\$ 694,876</b>	<b>\$ 633,853</b>	<b>\$ 683,774</b>	<b>\$ 685,641</b>	<b>662,568</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>

## Program and Supported Living - 37910

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

KNI would have to close, which would place a burden on the community to place them in another facility that would be able to meet their medical and physical needs. It would also eliminate 437.5 FTE positions and lay off staff.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific 76-17c01 to 76-17c06	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. To Provide quality supports for the people living at KNI in daily needs and decision-making.

### Program History

KNI is certified by the federal government as an Intermediate Care Facility for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities (ICF/IID) under Title XIX of the Social Security Act.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percent of people whose guardians agree KNI treats individuals with respect and dignity.	A	97%	94%	99%	100%	94.0%	100.0%	100.0%	95.7%
2. Percent of people whose guardian agree KNI provides a comprehensive array of services that meet the needs of the individual living at KNI.	A	98%	95%	99%	100%	96.0%	100.0%	100.0%	96.7%
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
4. Percent of people whose guardians agree the person is supported to learn new things of importance at KNI.	A	84%	84%	92%	100%	92.0%	100.0%	100.0%	89.3%

Kansas Neurological Institute

5. Percent of people whose guardians agree the person is supported by staff to participate in the life of the community to a satisfactory degree.	A	87%	81%	95%	100%	94.0%	100.0%	100.0%	90.0%
---	---	-----	-----	-----	------	-------	--------	--------	-------

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 4,416,883	\$ 4,907,931	\$ 3,689,457	\$ 6,118,736	\$ 3,316,971	\$ 7,121,179	\$ 7,172,248	\$ 3,971,453
Non-SGF State Funds	854,965	489,455	650,557	796,317	718,434	664,113	669,171	619,482
Federal Funds	8,163,234	8,478,374	8,014,645	8,154,644	8,979,642	7,935,472	7,908,234	8,490,887
<b>Total</b>	\$ 13,435,082	\$ 13,875,760	\$ 12,354,659	\$ 15,069,697	\$ 13,015,047	\$ 15,720,764	\$ 15,749,653	13,081,822
<b>FTE</b>	273.0	249.0	209.0	295.0	230.5	299.0	299.0	229.5

## Ancillary Services - 80000

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

KNI would have to close, which would place a burden on the community to place them in another facility that would be able to meet their medical and physical needs. It would also eliminate 437.5 FTE positions and lay off staff.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific 76-17c01 to 76-17c06	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To provide clinical and therapeutic staff for all the people who live at KNI.
- B. Provide support for residents in all aspects of finding, securing, and retaining individualized and meaningful employment.
- C. Engaging community people, to provide a high quality volunteer experience that will enrich the lives of the volunteers and people with intellectual disabilities.

### Program History

KNI is certified by the federal government as an Intermediate Care Facility for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities (ICF/IID) under Title XIX of the Social Security Act.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of volunteers serving at KNI.	C	196	177	6	200	109	200	200	97
2. Number of volunteers hours.	C	5,386	3,760	74	5,500	336	5,500	5,500	1,390
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
4. Number of hours Foster Grandparents served in the community of Northeast Kansas.	C	51,955	45,967	16,288	63,000	35,714	69,948	69,948	32,656

Kansas Neurological Institute

5. Total number of residence participating in Supported Employment jobs.	B	98	87	77	90	74	88	88	79
6. Percent of residents in employment jobs.	B	73	65	60	71	1	1	1	42
7. Number of people with challenging behaviors and medical needs provided consultation and support.	A	137	110	130	100	128	127	127	123
8. Number of KNI work requests for assistive technology services.	A	1,852	1,396	1,268	1,350	1,942	1,350	1,350	1,535
9. Number of residents who received physical therapy treatment services.	A	62	101	62	50	153	150	150	105
10. Number of residents provided with dental consultation and services.	A	137	132	128	137	128	127	127	129
11. Percent of residents with dental consultation and services.	A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 879,350	\$ 737,934	\$ 640,924	\$ 506,842	\$ 624,758	\$ 756,076	\$ 758,541	\$ 667,872
Non-SGF State Funds	111,860	92,298	87,933	103,776	96,897	128,536	128,828	92,376
Federal Funds	986,997	1,047,937	1,113,917	1,220,843	1,006,583	1,033,439	1,028,527	1,056,146
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,978,207</b>	<b>\$ 1,878,169</b>	<b>\$ 1,842,774</b>	<b>\$ 1,831,461</b>	<b>\$ 1,728,238</b>	<b>\$ 1,918,051</b>	<b>\$ 1,915,896</b>	<b>1,816,394</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>18.5</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>18.8</b>

## Medical and Surgical Services - 83000

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

KNI would have to close, which would place a burden on the community to place them in another facility that would be able to meet their medical and physical needs. It would also eliminate 437.5 FTE positions and lay off staff.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific 76-17c01 to 76-17c06	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Provide health care for people who live at KNI with various types of acute and chronic conditions and to provide intermediate health care 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

### Program History

KNI is certified by the federal government as an Intermediate Care Facility for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities (ICF/IID) under Title XIX of the Social Security Act.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percent of parents and guardians who feel their loved ones receives the health care services he/she needs.	A	99.0%	97.0%	100.0%	100.0%	94%	100%	100%	97%
2. Number of on-site medical clinic visit.	A	284	426	335	300	120	500	500	294
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
3. Number of on-site medical unit admissions.	A	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	4
4. Number of days in medical unit.	A	108	61	0	0	0	0	0	20

Kansas Neurological Institute

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,185,677	\$1,418,666	\$2,018,785	\$ 1,553,309	\$2,051,824	\$3,188,220	\$3,192,011	\$ 1,829,758
Non-SGF State Funds	700,135	57,612	477,603	202,154	423,729	162,953	163,329	319,648
Federal Funds	1,387,926	1,918,601	1,845,804	3,364,282	2,259,595	1,831,693	1,807,405	2,008,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 3,273,738</b>	<b>\$3,394,879</b>	<b>\$4,342,192</b>	<b>\$ 5,119,745</b>	<b>\$4,735,148</b>	<b>\$5,182,866</b>	<b>\$5,162,745</b>	<b>\$ 4,157,406</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>32.5</b>	<b>34.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>42.0</b>	<b>37.5</b>	<b>38.5</b>	<b>38.5</b>	<b>37.2</b>

## Physical Plant and Central Services - 96000

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

KNI would have to close, which would place a burden on the community to place them in another facility that would be able to meet their medical and physical needs. It would also eliminate 437.5 FTE positions and lay off staff.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific 76-17c01 to 76-17c06	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Maintains the facilities and vehicle fleet.
- B. Procure, store, and issue all commodities and equipment at the facility
- C. Provides 24/7 security services,

### Program History

KNI is certified by the federal government as an Intermediate Care Facility for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities (ICF/IID) under Title XIX of the Social Security Act.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percent of parents and guardians who feel the home their loved one lives in is clean.	A, B	97.0%	96.0%	98.0%	100.0%	94%	100%	100%	96.0%
2. Percent of parents and guardians who feel the home their loved ones lives in is in good repair.	A,B	90.0%	91.0%	98.0%	100.0%	94%	100%	100%	94.3%
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
3. Percents of parents and guardians who feel their loved on is safe at KNI.	C	94%	97%	97%	100%	94%	100%	100%	96.0%

Kansas Neurological Institute

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 3,215,172	\$3,164,119	\$3,567,812	\$ 1,294,788	\$3,067,607	\$1,625,982	\$2,615,706	\$3,266,513
Non-SGF State Funds	98,085	113,457	99,330	128,583	87,522	372,652	366,577	100,103
Federal Funds	1,549,056	1,435,026	1,561,421	3,104,447	1,492,647	2,925,771	1,933,330	1,496,365
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 4,862,313</b>	<b>\$4,712,602</b>	<b>\$5,228,563</b>	<b>\$ 4,527,818</b>	<b>\$4,647,776</b>	<b>\$4,924,405</b>	<b>\$4,915,613</b>	<b>\$4,862,980</b>
<b>FTE</b>	53.0	49.0	49.0	52.0	49.0	53.0	53.0	49.0

## 01031 Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Without the funding of this program, LSH would not be able to ensure that patients and residents receive high quality services that meet the standard of care expectation and are provided by staff members that fulfill the qualifications of their specific job titles and specialty work.

**Statutory Basis**

**Mandatory  
vs.**

**MOE/Match  
Rqt.**

**Priority  
Level**

### Program Goals

- A. Effectively process and manage documentation associated with the patient/resident's medical record.
- B. Identify and pursue opportunities for quality improvement across the services provided to patients and residents at LSH.
- C. Effectively assess reports of suspected reportable incidents to ensure proper Standard of Care is met for patients and residents.
- D. Maintain accreditation, licensure and certification.

### Program History

The Administrative Program service includes key support areas that were established upon the creation of Larned State Hospital and provide the continuous oversight in the level of service quality, care, and effectiveness for the mental health needs of the patients and residents at LSH.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Obtain KDHE licensure annually and maintain TJC accreditation and CMS certification.	D	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Larned State Hospital

2. Percent of valid releases in compliance with departmental guidelines in accordance with authorizations, subpoenas, court orders, as evidenced by performing validity reviews prior to release and meeting departmental release deadlines.	A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
3. Number of campus wide performance improvement projects completed, per fiscal year.	B	5	6	5	6	7	7	7	6
4. Percent of Risk Management incidents that are logged and prepared for initial review within 24 hours of receipt by Risk Manager.	C	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 6,681,065	\$ 6,607,184	\$ 7,704,191	\$ 2,202,720	\$ 3,371,700	\$ 4,532,248	\$ 4,051,434	\$ 5,894,358
Non-SGF State Funds	167,395	135,202	282,611	302,365	135,915	41,299	42,126	184,576
Federal Funds	481,575	495,858	438,094	551,387	448,111	280,789	359,536	460,688
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 7,330,035</b>	<b>\$ 7,238,244</b>	<b>\$ 8,424,896</b>	<b>\$ 3,056,472</b>	<b>\$ 3,955,726</b>	<b>\$ 4,854,336</b>	<b>\$ 4,453,096</b>	<b>\$ 6,539,622</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>41.0</b>	<b>35.0</b>	<b>35.0</b>	<b>37.0</b>	<b>37.0</b>	<b>65.0</b>	<b>65.0</b>	<b>35.7</b>

## 01071 Staff Education and Research

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Without the funding of this program, LSH would not be able to provide the necessary education to meet Joint Commission and CMS requirements. Consequently, staff would not have the necessary skills to provide a safe and secure environment for patient treatment needs.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
-----------------	------------------	-------------------	-------------------

### Program Goals

- A. Provide Staff Education and Educational opportunities to staff.
- B. Ensure Staff are prepared for safe management of disruptive and assaultive Patient behavior.

### Program History

Staff Education and Research areas of focus are to provide educational opportunities to assist LSH employees in enhancing competent performance through facilitating training opportunities for staff intended for the purpose of developing and maintaining professional performance as well as personal development.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percent of new employees completing on board training within established timeframes.	A	94%	93%	96%	94%	91%	94%	94%	93%
2. Percent of employees completing Crisis Intervention Institute (CPI) re-certification to maintain competency per regulatory expectations.	B	99%	99%	97%	99%	100%	99%	99%	99%

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 184,070	\$ 206,035	\$ 182,306	\$ 204,525	\$ 786,932	\$ 369,922	\$ 378,499	\$391,758
Non-SGF State Funds	18,938	10,567	7,106	151	252,860	-	-	90,178
Federal Funds	417	10,633	20,821	14,342	24,088	17,886	18,244	18,514
<b>Total</b>	\$ 203,425	\$ 227,235	\$ 210,233	\$ 219,018	\$ 1,063,880	\$ 387,808	\$ 396,743	\$500,449

Larned State Hospital

<b>FTE</b>	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0
------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

## 32751 Psychiatric Services Program (PSP)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Psychiatric Services Program (PSP) at LSH serves patients from a 61 county catchment area whom have been deemed a danger to themselves, others, or are a self-care failure. Without this program, the citizens of Kansas would not have a safety net for the community and the individuals whom are served on PSP to provide treatment, community re-integration services, and programing focused on long term treatment needs.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific  KSA 59-2945 through KSA 59-2984 Care and Treatment for Mentally Ill Person; KSA 22-3303 Competency Evaluation and Treatment; KSA 22- 3428 Not Guilty By Reason of Mental Disease or Defect; KSA 22-3301 Competency Evaluation	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Assessment by medical staff completed within 24 hours of admission to determine treatment needs for the patients.
- B. Prepare patients for community re-integration and to manage their mental illness in a less restrictive community-based setting.
- C. Provide treatment and skills to reduce an individual's need for long term treatment and/or re-admission allowing them an opportunity for independent living.

### Program History

The Psychiatric Services Program (PSP) was authorized in 1914. PSP provides psychiatric treatment to Kansas citizens 18 years of age or older. Those receiving PSP services are admitted from 61 western Kansas counties. PSP has a budgeted bed capacity of 90 but due to current acquity and staffing shortages the avaiable beds are currently 74. Service units include a 30 bed Crisis Stabilization Unit (CSU) for acute stabilization and treatment and two Adult Treatment Units for patients with chronic conditions budgeted for 30 beds each. Patients are admitted to PSP for both evaluation and inpatient treatment. Preadmission screening is completed by the Community Mental Health Center (CMHC). A CMHC screening is required by law to authorize admission to the PSP. Adults may be admitted either on a voluntary basis or by civil commitment. Patients may have a variety of symptoms due to mental illnesses, such as, but not limited to, schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, traumatic brain injury, major depression and post-traumatic stress disorder. Symptoms are often severe and may include hallucinations, delusions, suicidal ideation and other behavioral problems. Adult psychiatric patients are admitted through a triage area and a determination is made regarding treatment options and unit placement. Social detoxification services are provided for up to 72 hours within the PSP at LSH for persons referred by law enforcement agencies or by a district court.

LSH received \$430,000 in SIBF funds to install a Video Surveillance system in FY 2022 on the ATC building which houses the PSP patients.

Upon admission, a comprehensive evaluation is performed. An individualized treatment plan is subsequently developed for each patient. The treatment plan may include group and individual therapy, medication, rehabilitative skills development and other activity therapies. PSP currently employs a Treatment Mall approach in which patients are assigned an individualized number of active treatment hours each week based on the patient's current level of functioning/stability. Patients attend programming away from the living unit as functioning improves to decrease distractions, improve motivation and begin the process of reintegration to assist with recovery. This approach increases responsibility, provides choices and promotes independence, and skills needed for successful community reintegration. The Treatment Mall includes a series of rehabilitative skill-building activities provided by a range of treatment disciplines. It brings together, in one location, contemporary treatment and rehabilitation programs created to build daily life skills, indoor and outdoor activities, hobbies and patient services. During the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic, services have required modification due to the need for social distancing and limitations on group's size and location as well as required quarantine for newly admitted patients.

### Performance Measures

Larned State Hospital

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percent of completed admission intake assessment by medical within 24 hours of admission	A	93%	95%	95%	95%	96%	97%	97%	95%
2. Percent of completed social work patient discharge instructions prior to discharge.	B	100%	100%	87%	100%	100%	100%	100%	96%
3. Offer a minimum of 4 hours of active treatment per week to all patients.	C	71%	90%	89%	90%	80%	90%	90%	86%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 6,020,410	\$ 6,425,717	\$ 6,404,377	\$ 5,840,829	\$ 4,944,290	\$ 3,677,186	\$ 3,699,121	\$ 5,924,795
Non-SGF State Funds	2,300,303	2,304,385	2,748,639	3,419,817	3,106,115	3,251,668	3,352,171	2,719,713
Federal Funds	2,024,458	1,927,554	1,629,588	2,501,968	4,390,676	1,866,958	1,966,837	2,649,273
<b>Total</b>	\$ 10,345,171	\$ 10,657,656	\$ 10,782,604	\$ 11,762,614	\$ 12,441,081	\$ 8,795,812	\$ 9,018,129	\$ 11,293,780
<b>FTE</b>	130.0	128.0	128.0	132.0	132.0	125.0	125.0	129.3

## 32810 State Security Program (SSP)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Reducing or eliminating district court beds in the State Security Program would result in a substantial impact for the criminal court system across Kansas as well as the Mental Health Centers and law enforcement agencies. Individuals with felony crimes would go unserved for competency restoration, evaluation, and care and treatment for increasingly longer periods of time. The pending admission list would increase for these individuals, resulting in longer wait times in county jails or inability to properly serve specific individuals with mental illness.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>		<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	KSA 22-3302 Competency Evaluation; KSA 22-3303 Competency Evaluation and Treatment; KSA 22- 3219 Mental Status Evaluation; KSA 22- 3429 Presentence Evaluation; KSA 22- 3428 Not Guilty by Reason of Mental Disease or Defect; KSA 22-3430 Treatment in Lieu of Imprisonment; KSA 59-29a05 Sexual Predator Evaluation; KSA 75-5209 Inmate Transfer to Larned State Security Hospital; KSA 76-1306 Transfer of persons...to State Security Hospital	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To fulfill obligations to the District Courts of Kansas regarding forensic evaluations.
- B. To provide active treatment to patients ordered to the SSP.
- C. Maintain compliance with agency documentation policies.

**Program History**

The State Security Program (SSP), originally opened March 27, 1939, to house the criminally insane, opened on the Dillon building, with the transfer of 100 patients from Lansing State Prison.

The State Security Program (also known in Kansas Statutes as the State Security Hospital) serves male and female adult mentally ill forensic populations from the entire state of Kansas, which are admitted through specific forensic statutes or transferred from the Kansas Department of Corrections (KDOC) for treatment.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
1. Complete court reports (including forensic evaluations) by internal due date.	A	95%	47%	82%	90%	83%	90%	90%	71%
2. Provide a minimum of 2 active treatment hours per week for individuals ordered to SSP on treatment statutes.	B	67%	52%	90%	90%	87%	90%	90%	76%
3. Complete psychosocial assessments within policy timeframes.	C	98%	95%	99%	95%	100%	95%	95%	98%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 14,397,147	\$ 13,095,072	\$ 11,469,949	\$ 12,677,427	\$ 13,307,901	\$ 12,409,492	\$ 13,870,933	\$ 12,624,307
Non-SGF State Funds	732,044	591,876	712,753	610,481	230,716	330,926	-	511,782
Federal Funds	597,116	512,929	611,472	4,979	405,869	171,094	174,196	510,090
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 15,726,307</b>	<b>\$ 14,199,877</b>	<b>\$ 12,794,174</b>	<b>\$ 13,292,887</b>	<b>\$ 13,944,486</b>	<b>\$ 12,911,512</b>	<b>\$ 14,045,129</b>	<b>\$ 13,646,179</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>267.0</b>	<b>228.0</b>	<b>228.0</b>	<b>219.0</b>	<b>219.0</b>	<b>204.5</b>	<b>204.5</b>	<b>225.0</b>

## 32910 Sexual Predator Treatment Program (SPTP)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

To not fund the SPTP program would be to violate K.S.A 59-29a the Sexually Violent Predator Statute as we could no longer house and treat the residents civilly committed here without funding for this program.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 59-29a Commitment of Sexually Violent Predators	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To house and treat residents civilly committed as sexually violent predators to the LSH SPTP program
- B. To provide a safe and secure environment for the treatment of sexually violent predators committed by the courts to SPTP.
- C. To provide effective treatment consistent with RNR model, in multi level programming designed to help residents progress to independent living

### Program History

The Sexual Predator Treatment Program (SPTP) was established in 1994 and provides for the civil commitment of persons determined by a Court to be Sexually Violent Predators (residents) as defined by statute. The program provides treatment in a secure environment with the goal of educating the residents to identify and manage risk and to returning Residents to the community where they can function as contributing, productive citizens.

Treatment at SPTP follows the Risk-Needs-Responsivity Model, which utilizes evidence-based methods and focuses on self-regulation and relapse prevention strategies, as well as addressing associated problems such as substance abuse, early trauma, anger management and mental health issues. This model combines (1) assessment and monitoring of risk and needs (through diagnostic evaluations, polygraphs, and risk measurements), (2) individual and group psychotherapy, (3) adjunct treatment, including supplemental and psychoeducational classes, (4) vocational and leisure activity opportunities, and, as the residents progress, (5) supervised community outings to develops the skills, necessary which would allow those who complete treatment to safely return to society. This model combines assessment and monitoring of risk and needs (through diagnostic evaluations, polygraphs, and risk measurements) with individual and group psychotherapy, adjunct treatment including supplemental and psychoeducational classes, vocational and leisure activity opportunities, and, as the residents progress, supervised community outings. This therapeutic approach utilizes evidence-based methods and focuses on self-regulation and relapse prevention strategies, as well as addressing associated problems such as substance abuse, early trauma, anger management and mental health issues.

SPTP residents progress through two inpatient Tiers on the LSH Campus (Tier 1 - Skill Acquisition and Tier 2 - Skill Demonstration) with supervised community outings beginning on Tier 2. Advancement to Tier 3 involves placement at one of the Reintegration Facilities located at Larned State Hospital (Meyer House East), Osawatomie State Hospital (MiCo House), and Parsons State Hospital and Training Center (Maple and Willow Houses) for increasing community involvement including employment and planning for independent living. When the resident has demonstrated the ability to live more independently, abide by the resident's treatment plan, and continually display the skills acquired through inpatient treatment, maintain the requirements above, the resident, with the Court's approval, advances to Transitional Release. The last step is Conditional Release, also ordered by the Court, in which the Resident resides in his own residence with periodic monitoring and ongoing therapy and support from SPTP. After a minimum of five years on Conditional Release and of continued compliance with the resident's treatment plan, the resident is eligible to petition the Court for final discharge from the program.

Larned State Hospital

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percent of scheduled treatment groups held.	A	57%	92%	79%	94%	80%	94%	94%	84%
2. Percent of time CITP is posted in the medical record by end of day following the staffing.	C	100%	100%	100%	100%	95%	100%	100%	98%
3. Reintegration: Resident progress will be monitored and reviewed every quarter.	A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Percent of time that Activity Therapy is offered 5 hours per week.	C	61%	90%	100%	90%	73%	90%	90%	88%
5. Percent of staff who receive annual CPI training to ensure a safe environment for patients and staff.	B	99%	99%	97%	99%	100%	99%	99%	99%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 21,481,377	\$ 22,668,385	\$ 22,212,060	\$ 25,292,080	\$ 26,064,554	\$ 22,802,825	\$ 23,542,318	\$ 23,648,333
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	541,439	412,991	60,763	62,109	63,348	200,734
Federal Funds	-	-	59,947	42,123	1,683,019	770,099	785,495	580,989
<b>Total</b>	\$ 21,481,377	\$ 22,668,385	\$ 22,813,446	\$ 25,747,194	\$ 27,808,336	\$ 23,635,033	\$ 24,391,161	\$ 24,430,056
<b>FTE</b>	317.5	330.5	330.5	318.5	318.5	289.5	289.5	326.5

## 80830 Ancillary Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Ancillary Services Program entails a large amount of support provided to patients and residents in efforts to support their physical, mental, and emotional well-being. All of the services within the program assist with providing a wholesome approach to patient and resident care. Without funding of this program, the quality of service to patients and residents will be largely hindered and place LSH in violation of regulation and guidelines that must be met for entities such as TJC, KDHE, CMS, etc.

#### Statutory Basis

#### Mandatory vs. Discretionary

#### MOE/Match Rqt.

#### Priority Level

### Program Goals

- A. To properly assess, provide, and refer patients/residents for proper medical treatment of acute, chronic and emergent needs while in the care of LSH.
- B. Ensure thorough and high quality assessments are completed to verify treatment approaches are appropriate and suitable for each patient/resident.
- C. To provide a wholesome approach of treatment services that aid in improving mental and emotional well-being through the use of psychology approaches, activity therapy, social services, spiritual, etc.

### Program History

The Ancillary Services have been a cornerstone of Larned State Hospital in its efforts to properly address the various mental, emotional, and physical needs of the patients and residents. These services assist in providing for the overall well-being through proper care and treatment from the medical team, interventions through psychotropic medications and psychotherapy, focuses on activity therapy services, spiritual support, and access to additional community based services as they may be needed. These services greatly assist in the recovery and coping approaches with mental health challenges.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Pharmacy - Weekly Controlled Substance Safe Cycle Count Completed.	B	N/A	N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Larned State Hospital

2. Medical - Rational for Suicide Risk Level Documented in Patient Record (New Measurement).	A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	99%	100%	100%	99%
3. Medical - Admission Intake Assessment (AIA) and Columbia-Suicide Severity Rating Scale Completed Timely (All 3 programs combined).	A	90%	91%	93%	90%	93%	95%	95%	92%
4. Nursing - Admission Intake Assessment (AIA) Completed Timely (All 3 programs combined).	A	94%	96%	95%	90%	97%	98%	98%	96%
5. Social Services - Psychosocial Assessment Completed Timely (All 3 programs combined).	B	97%	97%	99%	90%	100%	90%	90%	99%
6. Activity Therapy - Minimum AT Hours are Offered Weekly to patients/residents (All 3 programs combined).	C	N/A	99%	100%	90%	89%	90%	90%	96%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 6,598,966	\$ 8,060,577	\$ 8,849,216	\$ 8,231,602	\$ 10,690,199	\$ 8,600,060	\$ 7,917,090	\$ 9,199,997
Non-SGF State Funds	373,602	442,589	444,985	256,939	639,712	401,823	490,192	509,095
Federal Funds	452,597	587,348	465,884	1,013,264	1,391,433	1,008,674	825,485	814,888
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 7,425,165</b>	<b>\$ 9,090,514</b>	<b>\$ 9,760,085</b>	<b>\$ 9,501,805</b>	<b>\$ 12,721,344</b>	<b>\$ 10,010,557</b>	<b>\$ 9,232,767</b>	<b>\$ 10,523,981</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>64.0</b>	<b>66.0</b>	<b>66.0</b>	<b>62.0</b>	<b>62.0</b>	<b>67.5</b>	<b>67.5</b>	<b>64.7</b>

## 96000 Physical Plant - Central Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Without the funding of this program, LSH would not be able to sustain or provide the basic needs of the patients and residents which includes food, clothing, and shelter. Consequently, needs of greater complexity (medical, mental, emotional) could not be provided and the facility could not serve its purpose to the community members of Kansas.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
-----------------	------------------	-------------------	-------------------

### Program Goals

- A. Sustain the facilities utilized across campus including both patient occupied buildings and support services.
- B. Ensure proper dietary needs are met to sustain physical health.
- C. Provide adequate care of clothing needs to help sustain comfort, cleanliness, and dignity.
- D. Provide daily security surveillance and oversight to ensure safety of patients, residents, and staff.

### Program History

The Physical Plant-Central services includes key support services that are required for effective functioning of the LSH Hospital. The specific departments within this program ensure that patients/residents of LSH remain in a safe and secure environment that is properly maintained and provides for their daily needs of food, clothing, and shelter.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Laundry - Percentage of completing tracking of laundry for all programs (LSH & KDOC) daily and report monthly.	C	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
2. Dietary - Percent of tray audits meeting proper food temperatures.	B	58%	79%	89%	95%	96%	97%	97%	88%

Larned State Hospital

3. Engineering - Percentage of compliance with all utility systems to meet regulatory agency requirements as evidenced by immediate correction of deficiencies within given timelines.	A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
4. Safety and Security - Percentage of fire drills completed that are required by Kansas State Fire Marshall (KSFM).	D	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
5. Environmental Services - Percentage of Environmental Service deficiencies corrected within 30 days of violation.	A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 7,325,802	\$ 6,711,680	\$ 6,951,039	\$ 7,675,248	\$ 7,346,487	\$ 7,668,719	\$ 7,919,797	\$ 7,003,069
Non-SGF State Funds	356,960	651,356	369,976	298,849	374,171	151,973	152,420	465,168
Federal Funds	71,360	309,337	676,185	275,033	347,868	93,725	143,584	444,463
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 7,754,122</b>	<b>\$ 7,672,373</b>	<b>\$ 7,997,200</b>	<b>\$ 8,249,130</b>	<b>\$ 8,068,526</b>	<b>\$ 7,914,417</b>	<b>\$ 8,215,801</b>	<b>\$ 7,912,700</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>150.0</b>	<b>137.0</b>	<b>137.0</b>	<b>129.0</b>	<b>129.0</b>	<b>158.0</b>	<b>158.0</b>	<b>134.3</b>

## Adair Acute Care at OSH Administration - 1031

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The complexity and uniqueness of state hospitals requires professional support staff well trained and well versed in the standards required for continued operation of the facility. Not funding this program would lead to an increase in the utilization of Agency Staffing (where applicable) and a complete breakdown of day to day operations without proper insight on management requirements this program currently provides.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
	Discretionary	No	2

### Program Goals

- A. Track percentage of employees that turnover in a month/year.
- B. Record number of filled and vacant positions in a month/year.
- C. The monthly Physical interventions rate will be below .30 per 1000 patient hours for all physical interventions.

### Program History

This program provides the overarching structure for the hospital and ensures that the activities necessary to manage the facility are completed, and that treatment standards are upheld to ensure that patients receive proper care and treatment, and that the hospital maintains accreditation. General Administration Program provides the overall administration and management of AAC. Included in General Administration is the CEO's office, the Chief Business Operations Director, performance improvement and risk management. All other administration programs are provided through the MOU. These include: accounting, accounts payable, billing and collections, budget, cashier and post office, contract management, credentialing, employee benefits, health information management, human resource management, patient accounts, patient canteen, purchasing, program assistants, information technology services, legal services, and recruitment.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Outcome Measure #1 Number of employees that turnover recorded every month.		73%	68%	52%	46%	34%	30%	30%	51%
2. Outcome measure #2 Number of filled and vacant positions recorded monthly.		23%	25%	36%	35%	42%	38%	35%	34%

Osawatomie State Hospital

3. Outcome measure #3 Months physical intervention rate within one standard deviation of the National Mean.

12	8	9	12	9	9	9	9
----	---	---	----	---	---	---	---

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 510,290	\$ 921,366	\$ 437,090	\$ 1,140,799	\$ 412,271	\$ 991,232	\$ 1,003,416	\$ 590,242
Non-SGF State Funds	236,626	374,865	1,085,442	538,634	1,539,724	1,037,710	999,811	1,000,010
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 746,916	\$ 1,296,231	\$ 1,522,532	\$ 1,679,433	\$ 1,951,995	\$ 2,028,942	\$ 2,003,227	\$ 1,590,253
<b>FTE</b>	11.50	22.30	19.50	21.50	21.50	21.50	21.00	21.10

## OSH Administration Program - 1030

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The complexity and uniqueness of state hospitals requires professional support staff well trained and well versed in the standards required for continued operation of the facility. Not funding this program would lead to an increase in the utilization of Agency Staffing (where applicable) and a complete breakdown of day to day operations without proper insight on management requirements that stem from this program.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
	Discretionary	No	2

### Program Goals

- A. Track Percentage of Employees that turnover in a month
- B. Track percentage of transmission submitted to Insurance/Medicare/Medicaid within 30 days of discharge
- C. Track percentage of requests for Goods and Services on the OSH help Desk answered within 24 hours of submission, per month.

### Program History

This program provides overarching structure for the hospital and ensures that the activities necessary to manage the facility are completed, that treatment standards are upheld to ensure patients receive proper care and treatment, and that the hospital maintains accreditation. The General Administration Program provides overall administration and management of the Osawatomie State Hospital. This includes the Superintendents office, Chief Business Operations Director, performance improvement, risk management, accounts payable, billing and collections, budget, cashier and post office, contract management, credentialing, employee benefits, health information management, human resource management, patient accounts, patient canteen, purchasing, program assistants, information technology services, legal services, and recruitment. The Osawatomie State Hospital also provides administrative services to Adair Acute Care through a Memorandum of Understanding.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Outcome Measure #1 Number of employees that turnover recorded every month.		15%	28%	29%	25%	32%	30%	30%	30%

Osawatomie State Hospital

2. Outcome measure #2 Number of filed and vacant positions recorded monthly.	100%	100%	100%	100%	29%	25%	25%	76%
3. Outcome measure #3 Months physical intervention rate within one standard deviation of the National Mean.	98%	99%	97%	98%	100%	99%	99%	99%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 3,090,150	\$ 2,484,293	\$ 3,217,405	\$ 3,512,849	\$ 3,033,856	\$ 3,201,138	\$ 3,275,725	\$ 2,911,851
Non-SGF State Funds	40,729	(17,684)	487	495	3,582	3,595	3,734	(4,538)
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 3,130,879	\$ 2,466,609	\$ 3,217,892	\$ 3,513,344	\$ 3,037,438	\$ 3,204,733	\$ 3,279,459	\$ 2,907,313
<b>FTE</b>	31.00	33.30	32.50	31.50	31.50	31.50	31.00	32.43

## AAC SD&T Program - 1071

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Staff Development and Training are responsible for initial training and orientation to the hospital as well as ongoing performance adequacy and knowledge checks to ensure best care practices, competency, and knowledge of staff. They also provide opportunities of continuing education on units leading, to continued accreditation. A decrease in staffing education would result in unsafe conditions for both staff and patients. Without the stewardship of this program, staff retention would fall dramatically due to lack of orientation, understanding, accreditation of the individual, as well as, communication.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. <u>Discretionary</u>	MOE/Match <u>Rgt.</u>	Priority <u>Level</u>
	Discretionary	No	2

### Program Goals

A. 100 % of new hires will complete orientation.

### Program History

This program provides high quality, competency-based training and educational opportunities that promote individual performance, facilitate personal growth, and enhance positive patient outcomes. Staff Development and Training Services are provided to Adair Acute Care through a Memorandum of Understanding. In 2020 OSH was selected as the pilot site for Mid-America Addition Technology Transfer Center (ATTC) and Truman Medical Center's pilot program for Trauma Informed Care implementation. The hospital is halfway through a three year project moving towards being a trauma informed care organization.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Outcome Measure #1 Percentage of new hires completing orientation recorded on a monthly basis and then averaged for a yearly outcome.		73%	95%	94%	96%	97%	97%	98%	95%

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 11,453	\$ 3,876	\$ 16,458	\$ 260,223	\$ 11,780	\$ 180,548	\$ 181,809	\$ 10,705
Non-SGF State Funds	520	5,831	113,129	5,881	177,649	12,836	16,848	98,870
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 11,973	\$ 9,707	\$ 129,587	\$ 266,104	\$ 189,429	\$ 193,384	\$ 198,657	\$ 109,574
<b>FTE</b>	0.50	0.00	2.90	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.47

**OSH SD&T Program - 1070****Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

Staff Development and Training are responsible for initial training and orientation to the hospital as well as ongoing performance adequacy and knowledge checks to ensure best care practices, competency, and knowledge of staff. They also provide opportunities of continuing education on units leading, to continued accreditation. A decrease in staffing education would result in unsafe conditions for both staff and patients. Without the stewardship of this program, staff retention would fall dramatically due to lack of orientation, understanding, accreditation of the individual, as well as, communication.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rgt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
	Discretionary	No	2

**Program Goals**

A. 100 % of new hires will complete orientation.

**Program History**

This program provides high quality, competency-based training and educational opportunities that promote individual performance, facilitate personal growth, and enhance positive patient outcomes. Staff Development and Training Services are provided to Adair Acute Care through a Memorandum of Understanding. In 2020 OSH was selected as the pilot site for Mid-America Addition Technology Transfer Center (ATTC) and Truman Medical Center's pilot program for Trauma Informed Care implementation. The hospital is halfway through a three year project moving towards being a trauma informed care organization.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Outcome Measure #1 Percentage of new hires completing orientation recorded on a monthly basis and then averaged for a yearly outcome.	100%	73%	95%	94%	96%	98%	98%	98%	96%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 31,340	\$ 37,325	\$ 439,230	\$ 305,038	\$ 580,710	\$ 580,573	\$ 587,656	\$352,422
Non-SGF State Funds	1,475	2,792	4,150		-	500	500	2,314
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 32,815</b>	<b>\$ 40,117</b>	<b>\$ 443,380</b>	<b>\$ 305,038</b>	<b>\$ 580,710</b>	<b>\$ 581,073</b>	<b>\$ 588,156</b>	<b>\$354,736</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>2.90</b>	<b>2.90</b>	<b>3.93</b>	<b>5.35</b>	<b>5.35</b>	<b>5.35</b>	<b>3.72</b>

## AAC Medical Program - 83001

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Without this program the hospital could not provide psychiatric or medical services of any kind. The staff related to this program are responsible for the continued care and practice standards use to treat patients on a day to day basis. The agency would have to discontinue services to all the counties it supports if this program were to be eliminated.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. At least 95% of patients discharged will have a discharge summary completed within 30 days of discharge.  
B. 100% of patients will have a complete history and physical within 24 hours of admission.

### Program History

All psychiatric and medical services provided to the patients at Adair Acute Care at OSH (AAC) are done under the auspices of the Medical and Surgical Services Program. From the initial evaluation, through day-to-day care, and up to the point of discharge, the medical staff forms the backbone of the medical and medication management for the patients being treated at the hospital. Coverage is provided on a "24/7" basis so that a physician is always available to address the treatment needs of the patients. In addition, ancillary treatment is provided through medical services including the Medical laboratory, pharmacy, podiatry, physical therapy, and other contracted services as appropriate to meet the needs of the patient. The Osawatomie State Hospital Provides some Medical Services to AAC through a Memorandum of Understanding.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Outcome Measure #1 Percentage of patient discharged having a discharge summary completed within 30 days of discharge.	100%	97%	99%	93%	95%	100%	100%	100%	97%
2. Outcome measure #2 Percentage of patients who have a history and physical completed within 24 hours of admission.	100%	99%	100%	99%	100%	97%	98%	99%	99%

Osawatomie State Hospital

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 2,535,320	\$ 1,954,911	\$ 1,085,764	\$ 1,018,449	\$ 1,091,198	\$ 112,899	\$ 83,502	\$ 1,377,291
Non-SGF State Funds	535,611	586,537	1,367,438	1,948,543	2,567,455	3,188,685	3,210,915	1,507,143
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 3,070,931	\$ 2,541,448	\$ 2,453,202	\$ 2,966,992	\$ 3,658,653	\$ 3,301,584	\$ 3,294,417	\$ 2,884,434
<b>FTE</b>	9.00	4.00	12.50	12.50	12.50	12.50	12.50	9.67

## OSH Medical Program

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Without this program the hospital could not provide psychiatric or medical services of any kind. The staff related to this program are responsible for the continued care and practice standards use to treat patients on a day to day basis. The agency would have to discontinue services to all the counties it supports if this program were to be eliminated.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. At Least 95% of patients discharged will have a Discharge Summary Completed within 30 days of discharge.
- B. 100 % of patients will be evaluated and the Psychiatric Evaluation documented within 24 hours of admission.
- C. 100 % of patients will have a complete history and physical within 24 hours of admission.

### Program History

All psychiatric and medical services provided to the patients at Adair Acute Care at OSH (AAC) are done under the auspices of the Medical and Surgical Services Program. From the initial evaluation, through day-to-day care, and up to the point of discharge, the medical staff forms the backbone of the medical and medication management for the patients being treated at the hospital. Coverage is provided on a "24/7" basis so that a physician is always available to address the treatment needs of the patients. In addition, ancillary treatment is provided through medical services including the Medical laboratory, pharmacy, podiatry, physical therapy, and other contracted services as appropriate to meet the needs of the patient. The Osawatomie State Hospital Provides some Medical Services to AAC through a Memorandum of Understanding.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Outcome Measure #1 Percentage of patient discharged having a discharge summary completed within 30 days of discharge.	95%	100%	93%	97%	98%	100%	100%	100%	97%
2. Outcome measure #2 Percentage of patients who have a history and physical completed within 24 hours of admission.	100%	99%	94%	97%	98%	95%	98%	98%	95%

# Osawatomie State Hospital

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 5,168,020	\$ 4,710,342	\$ 5,012,880	\$ 5,618,148	\$ 4,194,985	\$ 4,682,894	\$ 5,307,228	\$ 4,639,402
Non-SGF State Funds	140,059	387	-	300,000	225,245	224,643	224,829	75,211
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 5,308,079	\$ 4,710,729	\$ 5,012,880	\$ 5,918,148	\$ 4,420,230	\$ 4,907,537	\$ 5,532,057	\$ 4,714,613
<b>FTE</b>	19.00	24.50	16.00	16.00	16.50	16.50	16.50	19.00

## AAC Clinical Program - 84001

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This program is the frontline support for patients. This program is integral to the patients treatment plan, as well as, responsible for the day to day patient care and active treatment. The agency would have to discontinue services to all the counties it supports if this program were to be eliminated.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. 100% of patients who are readmitted within 30 days of discharge will be tracked to identify trends.
- B. A comprehensive discharge plan will be developed and implemented. 95% of patients will have discharge criteria that is Realistic, Attainable, and individualized to their treatment on their Master Treatment Plan with a Psychosocial Assessment being completed within 72 hours of admission.
- C. The Hospital Acquired Infection (HAI) infection rate at AAC will remain below the national average of 4%.

### Program History

The Clinical Service Program provides most group and individual psychotherapy for the patients admitted at Adair Acute Care. Service is provided to licensed beds across five distinct treatment programs and therapeutic activities occur seven days a week, 365 days a year. Within each program, the care for the patient is individualized with coordination and oversight being provided by an interdisciplinary team of mental health professionals. The approach used in each program is drawn from evidence-based practices and is regularly reviewed to ensure it remains an accepted and effective standard of care. Clinical Services includes the activity therapies subprogram which provides patients with specialized clinical services in music, vocational, and recreational therapy, as well as more general leisure skills training consistent with their presenting psychiatric concerns.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Outcome Measure #1 Percentage of patients readmitted within 30 days of discharge.	<10%	8%	20%	8%	8%	8%	7%	7%	12%

Osawatomi State Hospital

2. Outcome measure #2 Percentage of discharge criteria is realistic, attainable, and individualized to the patient, % of assessments completed within 72 hours of admission, recorded on a monthly	95%	88%	100%	96%	100%	98%	98%	98%	98%
3. Outcome measure #3 HAI rate of infection recorded on a monthly basis.	<3%	4%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 4,967,546	\$ 4,741,879	\$ 5,583,164	\$ 1,826,945	\$ 3,556,841	\$ 4,323,544	\$ 4,715,495	\$ 4,627,295
Non-SGF State Funds	3,737,400	3,822,720	2,056,182	6,961,127	7,358,530	4,476,883	3,434,889	4,412,477
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 8,704,946</b>	<b>\$ 8,564,599</b>	<b>\$ 7,639,346</b>	<b>\$ 8,788,072</b>	<b>\$ 10,915,371</b>	<b>\$ 8,800,427</b>	<b>\$ 8,150,384</b>	<b>\$ 9,039,772</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>131.00</b>	<b>139.90</b>	<b>120.50</b>	<b>92.50</b>	<b>92.50</b>	<b>92.50</b>	<b>93.50</b>	<b>117.63</b>

## OSH Clinical Program - 8400

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This program is the frontline support for patients. This program is integral to the patients treatment plan, as well as, responsible for the day to day patient care and active treatment. The agency would have to discontinue services to all the counties it supports if this program were to be eliminated.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Number of months the Hospital Associated Infection rate remains below national average of 4%.
- B. Track and trend percentage of discharged patient readmitted within 30 days.
- C. 95% of staff are in compliance with the 5 moments of handwashing.

### Program History

This program provides most group and individual psychotherapy for the patients admitted. Services are provided across five distinct programs and therapeutic activities occur seven days a week 365 days a year. Within each treatment program, care for the patient is individualized according to the patients unique presenting concerns with coordination and oversight being provided by an interdisciplinary team of mental health professionals. The approach used in each program is drawn from evidence-based practices and is regularly reviewed to ensure it remains an accepted and effective standard of care. This program includes activity therapies, vocation, and recreation therapy, as well as more general leisure skills training consistent with their presenting psychiatric concerns.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Outcome Measure #1 Infection rate recorded monthly and averaged for yearly outcome.	<4%	11%	12%	12%	8%	1%	1%	1%	8%
2. Outcome measure #2 Percentage of patients readmitted within 30 days reported monthly then averaged for yearly outcomes.	<5%	6%	3%	1%	100%	4%	5%	5%	2%

Osawatomie State Hospital

3. Outcome measure #3 Percentage of staff in compliance with 5 moments of handwashing reported monthly.	95%	90%	55%	97%	2%	95%	97%	97%	82%
---	-----	-----	-----	-----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 13,088,118	\$ 13,763,059	\$ 13,253,609	\$ 14,066,891	\$ 14,590,408	\$ 16,348,354	\$ 15,533,399	\$ 13,869,025
Non-SGF State Funds	(593,833)	-	-	-	2,039,078	1,137,802	1,183,314	679,693
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 12,494,285	\$ 13,763,059	\$ 13,253,609	\$ 14,066,891	\$ 16,629,486	\$ 17,486,156	\$ 16,716,713	\$ 14,548,718
<b>FTE</b>	162.25	204.60	185.50	241.00	239.00	239.00	239.00	209.70

## AGENCY OVERVIEW

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

PSH&TC would have to close. Approximately 150 individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities would have to be relocated to other living situations. Many of these individuals are dually diagnosed with extreme behavior issues that could create violent and unexpected consequences for the public. This would place a unpredictable burden on the local community who would have to assume responsibility for these individuals, their mental, medical and physical needs. Additionally, Sexual Predator Treatment Program participants would have to be returned to the Department of Corrections and their transition to society plans cancelled. They would be transferred back into incarceration instead of being able to fulfill their quest to re-gain their freedom. Finally, 490.2 FTE positions and 35-40 temporary employee positions would be eliminated, causing extreme unemployment issues in the small rural community of Parsons, KS.

	<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific	76-1406, 76-1407, 76-1409, 76-1409a, and 76-1415. Also applicable are 75-Article 29 K.A.R.'s relating to Civil Service and certain 75-Article 37 K.A.R.'s relating to the Department of Administration and 76-12a01-76-12a34, 76-12b01-12b11, 45-403, and applicable State and Federal Fire Code regulations.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Maintain compliance and certification as required to operate an Intermediate Care Facility for Individuals with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (ICF/IID), according to state and federal regulations, under Title XIX of the Social Security Act.
- B. Provide effective habilitation, rehabilitation, active treatment and care to ICF/IID residents of the facility in a safe, healthy and homelike living environment with consideration for the informed personal lifestyle choices of each resident.
- C. Provide a transition program designed to safely reintegrate Sexual Predator Treatment Program participants into the community as productive members of society, with the intent that they can become independent and live offense free.

### Program History

AGENCY MISSION: To improve lives by connecting people with supports and services.	
AGENCY VISION: People experiencing the highest quality of life regardless of the challenges.	
AGENCY PHILOSOPHY: Full inclusion of citizens with intellectual and developmental disabilities is the ultimate goal. Services exist to enhance the quality of life of individuals while supporting diversity among people with developmental disabilities. Personal preferences for all aspects of life is the benchmark for all services.	
HISTORY: The State's first hospital for the mentally retarded was established in Lawrence in 1881 (L. 1881, Ch. 35, Par. 7). In 1899, the establishment of a state hospital in the southern part of the State to care for and treat the epileptic and insane epileptic of Kansas was authorized. The Parsons State Hospital was opened in 1903 (L. 1903, Ch. 484, Par. 1 & 2) and in 1909 (L. 1909, Ch. 234, Par. 2) the name was changed to the State Hospital for Epileptics. In 1953 (L. 1953, Ch. 391, Par. 11), the program was changed to provide residential services for mentally retarded children and youth, and the name changed to the Parsons State Training School. In 1957 (L. 1957, Ch. 465, Par. 1 and Ch. 408, Par. 1), to more accurately represent the active treatment programs that had been developed at Parsons, the name was changed to Parsons State Hospital and Training Center (PSH&TC). PSH&TC is governed by federal Title XIX Medicaid regulations, with which it must comply to receive federal reimbursements. The special education program is mandated and governed by K.S.A. 72-901 et seq. and federal PL 94-142, the Right to Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975.	
ACCREDITATION AND CERTIFICATION: Annual surveys are conducted by an inspection team from the Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE) to assess the agency's adherence to federal regulations. PSH&TC is certified as an Intermediate Care Facility for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities (ICF/IID) under Title XIX of the Social Security Act. Any deficiencies to certification standards are documented and must be corrected according to a Plan of Correction submitted by PSH&TC. A follow-up survey is made to assure required corrections have been completed and to determine if PSH&TC may continue to be certified. Failure to comply could result in decertification and/or penalization by elimination of Title XIX funds.	
PSH&TC is currently home to 148 individuals who function within the borderline to profound range of intellectual abilities. About 90% are dually diagnosed; meaning that in addition to having an intellectual disability they also have accompanying psychiatric impairments such as Borderline Personality Disorder, Paraphilias (e.g., pedophilia, bestiality, and necrophilia), Psychotic Disorders and Mood Disorders. PSH&TC also provides housing and support for up to 16 additional individuals receiving services in the facility's Sexual Predator Treatment Program (SPTP or Reintegration Program).	

### Programs

01030 - Administration	Oversees the operation and administration of PSH&TC in accordance with applicable state and federal regulations.
01070 - Staff Education and Research	This program provides basic and advanced training for PSH&TC staff. This is done with a full range of staff development services provided to all personnel, promoting outcomes that will contribute to higher quality service and living environments for persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities.
32900 - Sexual Predator Treatment Program Transition	Provides the necessary staffing and supports to safely reintegrate SPTP residents into the community as productive, independent members of society and to provide these residents with the therapeutic skills necessary to live an offense free life.

Parsons State Hospital and Training Center

37900 - Habilitation and Treatment	Provides effective habilitation, rehabilitation, active treatment and care to ICF/IID residents of the facility in a safe, healthy, and homelike living environment and provides for the optimal mental and physical health of each resident with consideration for their informed personal lifestyle choices. Supplements and extends development of community service provisions for developmentally disabled children and adults.
80000 - Ancillary Services	Provides for a variety of resident needs such as vocational work programs, entertainment, education, and religious services, as well as overall physical and mental health and well-being needs. Includes: Activity Therapy, Special Education and Allied Clinical Services.
83000 - Medical and Surgical Services	Ensures optimal physical health of each resident and provides medical and nursing care for each resident. Includes: Lab and Radiology services.
96000 - Physical Plant and Central Services	Responsible for the overall maintenance, safety and security of PSH&TC and provides a sanitary living and work environment for PSH&TC residents and staff while meeting compliance with all state and federal regulations. Includes: Costs for utilities such as natural gas, electricity, water and sanitation services.

**Performance Measures**

<b>Outcome Measures</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>FY 2019 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2020 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2021 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2022 Previous Est.</b>	<b>FY 2022 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2023 Est.</b>	<b>FY 2024 Est.</b>	<b>3- yr. Avg.</b>
1. Total number of ICF/IID certification requirements of relevant state and federal agencies	A	358/358	358/358	358/358	358/358	358/358	358/358	358/358	358/358
2. Number of ICF/IID residents served during the fiscal year.	B	172	169	161	165	159	159	162	163
3. Number of SPTP residents served during the fiscal year.	C	13	12	9	10	10	10	10	10

**Funding**

<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>FY 2019 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2020 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2021 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2022 Approved</b>	<b>FY 2022 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2023 Est.</b>	<b>FY 2024 Est.</b>	<b>3-yr. Avg.</b>
State General Fund	\$ 13,968,210	\$ 14,606,857	\$ 13,723,125	\$ 13,399,194	\$ 12,823,894	\$ 18,359,895	\$ 19,095,205	\$ 13,717,959
Non-SGF State Funds	1,237,373	1,300,338	1,150,001	1,150,000	1,149,999	1,050,000	1,050,000	\$ 1,200,113
Federal Funds	13,606,602	13,678,422	14,488,236	17,314,720	17,873,648	13,692,844	14,355,896	\$ 15,346,769
<b>Total</b>	\$ 28,812,185	\$ 29,585,617	\$ 29,361,362	\$ 31,863,914	\$ 31,847,541	\$ 33,102,739	\$ 34,501,101	\$ 30,264,840
<b>FTE</b>	477.2	477.2	477.2	477.2	477.2	490.2	490.2	

## 01030 - ADMINISTRATION

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

PSH&TC would have to close. Approximately 150 individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities would have to be relocated to other living situations. Many of these individuals are dually diagnosed with extreme behavior issues that could create violent and unexpected consequences for the public. This would place a unpredictable burden on the local community who would have to assume responsibility for these individuals, their mental, medical and physical needs. Additionally, Sexual Predator Treatment Program participants would have to be returned to the Department of Corrections and their transition to society plans cancelled. They would be transferred back into incarceration instead of being able to fulfill their quest to re-gain their freedom. Finally, 490.2 FTE positions and 35-40 temporary employee positions would be eliminated, causing extreme unemployment issues in the small rural community of Parsons, KS.

	Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	76-1406, 76-1407, 76-1409, 76-1409a, and 76-1415. Also applicable are 75-Article 29 K.A.R.'s relating to Civil Service and certain 75-Article 37 K.A.R.'s relating to the Department of Administration and 76-12a01-76-12a34, 76-12b01-12b11, 45-403, and applicable State and Federal Fire Code regulations.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Effectively administer and oversee the PSH&TC programs that provide effective habilitation, rehabilitation, active treatment and care to residents of the facility in a safe, healthy and home like living environment with consideration for the informed personal lifestyle choices of each resident.
- B. Provide budgetary oversight and manage resources within budgetary authority accounting for all expenditures for supplies, equipment and personnel according to State of Kansas statutes, rules and regulations, as well as maintaining compliance with regulatory and certification agency requirements (CMS, ICF/IID, KDHE, SSA, etc.)
- C. Recruit personnel and manage payroll and fringe benefit programs.
- D. Provide information technology services and communications services throughout the facility.

**Program History**

This program provides an administrative structure for the people residing at PSH&TC that enables the Superintendent and PSH&TC's Department Managers to achieve maximum effectiveness and efficiency in PSH&TC's operation. PSH&TC's operation is directed towards implementing supports and services for persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities and at meeting the requirements of rules, regulations, policies, and standards of relevant state and federal agencies.

PSH&TC is currently home to 148 individuals who function within the borderline to profound range of intellectual abilities and receive supports and services within PSH&TC's Habilitation and Treatment Program. About 90% are dually diagnosed; meaning that in addition to having an intellectual disability they also have accompanying psychiatric impairments such as Borderline Personality Disorder, Paraphilias (e.g., pedophilia, bestiality, and necrophilia), Psychotic Disorders and Mood Disorders. The foundation for all services through PSH&TC is within a culture of person directed supports.

Superintendent	Oversees the operation and administration of PSH&TC in accordance with applicable state and federal regulations.
Risk Management	Ensures people living at PSH&TC are treated with dignity and respect and are free from abuse, neglect, and exploitation in accordance with applicable state and federal regulations.
Information Resources	Maintains information technology equipment and infrastructure for daily operations at PSH&TC.
Human Resources	Recruits employees, provides insurance information, and facilitates payroll for the people who work at PSH&TC in accordance with applicable state and federal regulations.
Business & Fiscal Services	Budgets and manages hospital resources, incomes, expenditures, and inventory. Ensures that all financial needs and obligations of all people who live at PSH&TC are met in accordance with applicable state and federal regulations.

**Performance Measures**

<b>Outcome Measures</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>FY 2019 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2020 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2021 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2022 Previous Est.</b>	<b>FY 2022 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2023 Est.</b>	<b>FY 2024 Est.</b>	<b>3- yr. Avg.</b>
1. Number of ICF/IID standards pertaining to Administration.	A	9/9	9/9	9/9	9/9	9/9	9/9	9/9	9/9
2. Percent of compliance to ICF/IID Certification Survey.	A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
3. Number of vouchers processed in SMART within the FY.	B	10,082	12,456	8,159	8,000	8,083	8,000	8,000	9,566
4. Number of resident financial transactions completed in Client Management System (CMS).	B	29,255	24,648	23,477	23,500	26,089	26,000	26,000	24,738
5. Direct Support Staff annual turn-over rate.	C	27.6%	28.5%	32.2%	20.2%	25.0%	27.0%	27.0%	28.6%
6. Total number of new Direct Support Staff hired in the FY.	C	87	66	60	55	81	50	50	55

Parsons State Hospital and Training Center

7. Number of Cisco network switches supported.	D	Data Not Recorded	Data Not Recorded	26	26	26	26	26	26
8. Number of physical or virtual servers supported.	D	Data Not Recorded	Data Not Recorded	13	13	13	13	13	13
9. Number of computer systems supported.	D	Data Not Recorded	Data Not Recorded	220	220	220	220	220	220
10. Number of desk phones and cell phones supported.	D	Data Not Recorded	Data Not Recorded	355	355	355	355	355	355
11. Number of customized software applications supported.	D	Data Not Recorded	Data Not Recorded	15	15	15	15	15	15

**Funding**

<b>Funding Source</b>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 566,170	\$ 1,264,798	\$ 884,437	\$ 1,590,016	\$ 1,754,519	\$ 205,608	\$ 40,841	\$ 1,301,251
Non-SGF State Funds	96,386	13,538	77,217	77,210	105,785	18,325	19,875	\$ 65,513
Federal Funds	672,391	289,897	918,082	257,024	158,514	2,050,059	2,067,307	\$ 455,498
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,334,947	\$ 1,568,233	\$ 1,879,736	\$ 1,924,250	\$ 2,018,818	\$ 2,273,992	\$ 2,128,023	\$ 1,822,262
<b>FTE</b>	15.1	15.4	15.4	18.6	18.6	19.7	19.7	16.5

## 01070 - STAFF EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This program provides basic and advanced training for PSH&TC staff. The people who live at PSH&TC require staff who are trained to deal with their special needs. If staff does not receive the specialized training necessary for supporting individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities, an unsafe living environment with increased risk of injury to individuals and staff results, compliance with ICF/IID regulations would be jeopardized and PSH&TC's certification and license as a special ICF/IID state hospital would be rescinded. Without proper certification and license PSH&TC would be forced to close.

	<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific	76-1406, 76-1407, 76-1409, 76-1409a, and 76-1415. Also applicable are 75-Article 29 K.A.R.'s relating to Civil Service and certain 75-Article 37 K.A.R.'s relating to the Department of Administration and 76-12a01-76-12a34, 76-12b01-12b11, 45-403, and applicable State and Federal Fire Code regulations.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Provide staff training and a full range of staff development services to all PSH&TC personnel and promoting research that will contribute to higher quality service and living environments for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

### Program History

This program was restructured in FY 2022. The new structure provides a better system for tracking the progress of new staff throughout the training process. All staff are required to complete their training prior to reporting to their assigned areas of work. The new training format consists of a 2-day basic orientation for all new employees, followed by an additional 3-week New Employee Orientation (NEO) for all direct care staff. NEO is a series of classes focusing on specialized training designed to educate and train staff in detail regarding the delivery of supports and service, as well as rights and safety for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

### Performance Measures

Parsons State Hospital and Training Center

<b>Outcome Measures</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>FY 2019 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2020 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2021 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2022 Previous Est.</b>	<b>FY 2022 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2023 Est.</b>	<b>FY 2024 Est.</b>	<b>3- yr. Avg.</b>
1. Number of new employees.	A	114	82	79	70	83	60	60	81
2. Number of new employees completing two-day basic orientation.	A	New Program: Data not tracked prior to Aug 2021			70	83	60	60	83
3. Number of new employees completing 3-week intensive orientation for direct care staff.	A	New Program: Data not tracked prior to Aug 2021			65	83	60	60	83

**Funding**

<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>FY 2019 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2020 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2021 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2022 Approved</b>	<b>FY 2022 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2023 Est.</b>	<b>FY 2024 Est.</b>	<b>3-yr. Avg.</b>
State General Fund	\$ 368,743	\$ 313,026	\$ 283,427	\$ 346,749	\$ 329,618	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 308,690
Non-SGF State Funds	160	1,136	420	10,500	351	-	1,500	636
Federal Funds	-	593	83,894	58,156	51,203	392,064	397,850	45,230
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 368,903</b>	<b>\$ 314,755</b>	<b>\$ 367,741</b>	<b>\$ 415,405</b>	<b>\$ 381,172</b>	<b>\$ 427,064</b>	<b>\$ 434,350</b>	<b>\$ 354,556</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>5.2</b>

## 32900 - SEXUAL PREDATOR TREATMENT PROGRAM (SPTP)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This program provides a variety of supports to individuals who are transitioning from a Department of Corrections facility into a community setting. Not funding this program would result in these individuals being transferred back into a correctional facility and their transition programs would be cancelled. Any progress that they had made towards becoming productive members of society would be forfeited. The program would be shut down and the staff would lose their jobs and family income.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	59-29a01 through 59-29a27	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To safely reintegrate residents into the community as productive members of society and to be independent and live offense free.
- B. Residents will utilize resources, transportation, and coaching to aid in obtaining employment.
- C. Residents will utilize program resources and complete program requirements to achieve transitional release.

### Program History

HISTORY: The Sexual Predator Treatment Program (SPTP) serves individuals who have successfully progressed through the residential treatment portion of the Kansas Sexual Predator Treatment Program at Larned State Hospital and have received approval to move to the PSH&TC reintegration facility. SPTP serves upto 16 individuals in two reintegration facilities (Maple House and Willow House). It is expected that residents will spend an average of 4.7 years at the PSH&TC reintegration facility, depending on their compliance with treatment, therapy, and program rules.

The SPTP program provides a variety of supports to each SPTP client such as a monthly stipend; travel to and from job searches and work settings, and professional counseling. All medical needs, including physician visits, hospital treatment services and prescription medications, are supported utilizing community providers and paid for by the program until clients are able to secure employment and health insurance. PSH&TC provides transportation, supervised internet access, job search skill building, and additional resources essential for obtaining employment. Program clients follow a Treatment Plan, Relapse Prevention Plan, program rules and requirements, program Step System and actively participate in the treatment process to advance to Transitional Release.

Parsons State Hospital and Training Center

**Performance Measures**

<b>Outcome Measures</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>FY 2019 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2020 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2021 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2022 Previous Est.</b>	<b>FY 2022 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2023 Est.</b>	<b>FY 2024 Est.</b>	<b>3- yr. Avg.</b>
1. Number of SPTP clients served during the last FY	A	13	12	9	10	10	10	10	10
2. Number of SPTP clients employed in community setting	B	10	12	8	10	8	10	10	9
3. Number of SPTP clients granted court-ordered conditional release	C	4	0	0	4	2	2	2	1
4. Number of SPTP clients meeting transitional release requirements	C	5	1	4	4	4	4	4	3
5. Number of SPTP clients returned to Larned State Hospital due to program violations	C	1	4	1	0	2	0	0	2

**Funding**

<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>FY 2019 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2020 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2021 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2022 Approved</b>	<b>FY 2022 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2023 Est.</b>	<b>FY 2024 Est.</b>	<b>3-yr. Avg.</b>
State General Fund	\$ 1,970,183	\$ 1,807,171	\$ 1,424,359	\$ 2,037,289	\$ 1,458,705	\$ 2,037,289	\$ 2,037,289	\$ 1,563,412
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	(385)	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,970,183</b>	<b>\$ 1,806,786</b>	<b>\$ 1,424,359</b>	<b>\$ 2,037,289</b>	<b>\$ 1,458,705</b>	<b>\$ 2,037,289</b>	<b>\$ 2,037,289</b>	<b>\$ 1,563,412</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>29.4</b>	<b>31.3</b>	<b>31.3</b>	<b>28.5</b>	<b>20.9</b>	<b>27.2</b>	<b>27.2</b>	<b>27.8</b>

## 37900 - HABILITATION & TREATMENT

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

PSH&TC would have to close. Approximately 150 individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities would have to be relocated to other living situations. Many of these individuals are dually diagnosed with extreme behavior issues that could create violent and unexpected consequences for the public. This would place a unpredictable burden on the local community who would have to assume responsibility for these individuals, their mental, medical and physical needs.

	<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	76-1406, 76-1407, 76-1409, 76-1409a, and 76-1415. Also applicable are 75-Article 29 K.A.R.'s relating to Civil Service and certain 75-Article 37 K.A.R.'s relating to the Department of Administration and 76-12a01-76-12a34, 76-12b01-12b11, 45-403, and applicable State and Federal Fire Code regulations.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Provide effective habilitation, rehabilitation, active treatment and care to residents of the facility in a safe, healthy, and homelike living environment with consideration for the informed personal lifestyle choices of each resident.

B. Supplement and extend development of community service provisions for developmentally disabled children and adults through Outreach Services, a statewide program for persons with developmental disabilities and psychiatric impairments.

### Program History

There are currently 148 people with intellectual disabilities and dual diagnosis receiving services at PSH&TC. They live in nine different residential cottages located on PSH&TC's campus, 13-20 individuals per cottage. The cottages serve as the base from which all services to the individuals with intellectual disabilities living at PSH&TC are rendered. Services are provided 24 hours a day, 7 days per week. The primary goal of the Habilitation and Treatment program is to enable the people who live at PSH&TC to make choices based on their own personal preferences for all aspects of their lives.

Parsons State Hospital and Training Center

<p>This program helps each person meet his/her informed personal lifestyle choices and needs for physical, psychological, social, religious, cultural and personal developmental resources by maintaining an individualized, person-centered developmental program for everyone. All programs are certified by the Kansas Department of Health and Environment or the Kansas Department of Education. Programs provide both generic and specialized religious, social, nursing, medical, psychological, educational, therapeutic and developmental activities, vocational, speech, audiology, developmental care, supervision and training, lodging, boarding and other services. Residents are supported in individual training programs which may include adjunctive therapies, education, or special training programs, and all are offered additional leisure-time and recreational activities during evenings and weekends. PSH&amp;TC individuals are afforded the opportunity to attend religious services and events of their choice both on campus and in the community.</p>	
Outreach Services	<p>Outreach Services Teams work with community agencies and providers throughout the state to help them keep at-risk individuals with intellectual disabilities and dual diagnosis from becoming institutionalized. The expertise, and subsequent success, of PSH&amp;TC's Outreach Teams has kept over 97% of the at-risk individuals served living within their own communities and out of state hospitals, saving the State of Kansas millions of dollars.</p>
Trust & Benefit	<p>Expenditures from this fund provide items and services that are not included in the operating budget. The 1974 Legislative Session required that an account be established for a Special Benefit Fund account (Section 7, HB 1059). Withdrawals of less than \$500 are made by supervisors who make written requests for special program or activity expenditures. These requests are reviewed in the Accounting Department to determine propriety.</p>

**Performance Measures**

<b>Outcome Measures</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>FY 2019 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2020 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2021 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2022 Previous Est.</b>	<b>FY 2022 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2023 Est.</b>	<b>FY 2024 Est.</b>	<b>3- yr. Avg.</b>
1. Number of ICF/IID standards pertaining to Habilitation and Treatment Program.	A	Met 28/28	Met 28/28	Met 28/28	Meet 28/28	Meet 28/28	Meet 28/28	Meet 28/28	Meet 28/28
2. Percent compliance to ICF/IID standards pertaining to Habilitation and Treatment Program.	A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
3. Number of Client-Based Behavioral Program Trainings provided to PSHTC Direct Care Staff by PSHTC Psychology Department.	A	224	255	220	235	209	225	225	228
4. Average number of PSHTC residents that require increased supervision due to their self-injurious or aggressive behaviors.	A	138	139	139	139	141	139	139	140
5. Average number of PSHTC residents that require their own bedroom due to their self-injurious or aggressive behaviors.	A	99	94	83	83	82	80	80	86

Parsons State Hospital and Training Center

6. Estimated annual costs for staff to provide 1:1 supervision for residents.	A	\$ 1,376,282	\$ 1,659,190	\$ 1,490,945	\$ 1,930,137	\$ 836,608	\$ 1,659,190	\$ 1,659,190	\$ 1,328,914
7. Number of individuals served by Outreach Services Teams	B	176	127	131	145	138	140	145	132
8. Number of completed referrals for individuals at risk of institutional placement	B	112	76	93	95	113	120	125	94
9. Number of individuals admitted to PSH&TC after receiving referral services	B	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2

**Funding**

<i><b>Funding Source</b></i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 566,170	\$ 1,264,798	\$ 884,437	\$ 681,881	\$ 835,597	\$ 14,389,093	\$ 15,343,087	\$ 994,944
Non-SGF State Funds	96,386	13,538	77,217	69,800	49,258	250	250	46,671
Federal Funds	672,391	289,897	918,082	15,543,376	15,038,918	2,594,912	2,863,076	5,415,632
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,334,947	\$ 1,568,233	\$ 1,879,736	\$ 16,295,057	\$ 15,923,773	\$ 16,984,255	\$ 18,206,413	\$ 6,457,247
<b>FTE</b>	288.5	285.0	285.0	283.0	283.0	300.5	300.5	284.3

## 80000 - ANCILLARY SERVICES

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

PSH&TC would have to close. Approximately 150 individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities would have to be relocated to other living situations. Many of these individuals are dually diagnosed with extreme behavior issues that could create violent and unexpected consequences for the public. This would place a unpredictable burden on the local community who would have to assume responsibility for these individuals, their mental, medical and physical needs.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific 76-1406, 76-1407, 76-1409, 76-1409a, and 76-1415. Also applicable are 75-Article 29 K.A.R.'s relating to Civil Service and certain 75-Article 37 K.A.R.'s relating to the Department of Administration and 76-12a01-76-12a34, 76-12b01-12b11, 45-403, and applicable State and Federal Fire Code regulations.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Provide for the optimal mental, physical and social health of each resident with consideration for the informed personal lifestyle choices of each resident.

### Program History

Ancillary Services provides for a variety of resident needs such as vocational work programs, entertainment, education, and religious services, as well as overall physical and mental health and well-being. The focus is primarily individual resident needs and provides opportunities for a wide variety of social experiences where residents can interact with co-workers, friends, relatives and staff in group settings if they so desire. Each resident is offered a variety of choices for leisure time and social activities, religious services, and work programs. Disciplines of recreation, music, art and therapy based on personal preferences are included. Leisure activities for every resident are coordinated by Activity Specialists and include both individualized and personal outings as well as group outings. These activities explore the interests of everyone to better prepare the resident for vocational placement. Vocational work programs on campus help residents develop work skills. Every 30 days, programs are reviewed and adjusted as needed to ensure each individual's lifestyle needs are met.

Parsons State Hospital and Training Center

Allied Clinical Services (ACS) provide staffing and services for Pharmacy, Dental, PT, Adaptive Equipment Services, Laboratory, Radiology, Speech & Hearing for the people living at PSH&TC. ACS staff help maintain and monitor the mental and physical health of each resident by providing necessary medical laboratory work and additional medical supports and services such as nursing care, pharmacy, psychology, dental, speech, and audiology services. They develop knowledge, techniques, program innovations, and verification data required in the development of more effective habilitation and rehabilitation services through research. PSH&TC staff perform other lab tests and nursing services including EKGs, x-rays, tuberculosis tests, urine analysis, electrolyte tests, lipid panel tests, blood sugar tests, tube feedings, flu shots, insulin injections, allergy injections, tetanus shots, and hepatitis B injections.

Special Education provides required education services to school-age residents of PSH&TC.

**Performance Measures**

<b>Outcome Measures</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>FY 2019 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2020 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2021 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2022 Previous Est.</b>	<b>FY 2022 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2023 Est.</b>	<b>FY 2024 Est.</b>	<b>3- yr. Avg.</b>
1. Approximate number of community-based and recreational/leisure outings participated in by PSHTC residents.	A	22,998	17,714	21,189	22,000	22,250	22,500	22,500	20,384
2. Approximate average number of annual community-based and recreational/leisure outings per resident.	A	143	113	141	150	150	150	150	135
3. Number of PSH&TC residents enrolled and served in the Special Education program.	A	17	20	20	21	20	13	13	20

<b>Output Measures</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>FY 2019 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2020 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2021 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2022 Previous Est.</b>	<b>FY 2022 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2023 Est.</b>	<b>FY 2024 Est.</b>	<b>3- yr. Avg.</b>
1. Total number of tests conducted annually by PSHTC Laboratory Services Dept.	A	25,003	25,161	35,516	36,500	25,384	26,000	27,000	28,687
2. Number of X-Ray(s) performed by the PSHTC Radiology Department.	A	811	699	723	810	666	860	860	696
3. Number of EKG(s) performed by the PSHTC Radiology Department.	A	46	72	183	210	192	235	235	149
4. Number of dental operatives and procedures for residents performed by PSH dentist annually.	A	271	266	292	315	313	330	330	290
5. Number of teeth-cleanings performed for residents by PSH contracted dental hygienist annually.	A	364	318	321	350	350	380	380	330

Parsons State Hospital and Training Center

**Funding**

<b><i>Funding Source</i></b>	<b><i>FY 2019 Actuals</i></b>	<b><i>FY 2020 Actuals</i></b>	<b><i>FY 2021 Actuals</i></b>	<b><i>FY 2022 Approved</i></b>	<b><i>FY 2022 Actuals</i></b>	<b><i>FY 2023 Est.</i></b>	<b><i>FY 2024 Est.</i></b>	<b><i>3-yr. Avg.</i></b>
State General Fund	\$ 965,419	\$ 1,197,064	\$ 1,306,955	\$ 3,114,690	\$ 3,052,473	\$ 393,478	\$ 393,478	\$ 1,852,164
Non-SGF State Funds	93,342	35,497	49,948	51,300	8,650	4,350	4,800	31,365
Federal Funds	1,233,860	1,750,615	1,693,379	183,849	125,392	2,843,281	2,793,667	1,189,795
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,292,621</b>	<b>\$ 2,983,176</b>	<b>\$ 3,050,282</b>	<b>\$ 3,349,839</b>	<b>\$ 3,186,515</b>	<b>\$ 3,241,109</b>	<b>\$ 3,191,945</b>	<b>\$ 3,073,324</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>35.7</b>	<b>43.7</b>	<b>43.7</b>	<b>41.7</b>	<b>41.7</b>	<b>40.7</b>	<b>40.7</b>	<b>43.0</b>

## 83000 - MEDICAL & SURGICAL SERVICES

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

PSH&TC would have to close. Approximately 150 individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities would have to be relocated to other living situations. Many of these individuals are dually diagnosed with extreme behavior issues that could create violent and unexpected consequences for the public. This would place a unpredictable burden on the local community who would have to assume responsibility for these individuals, their mental, medical and physical needs.

	<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	76-1406, 76-1407, 76-1409, 76-1409a, and 76-1415. Also applicable are 75-Article 29 K.A.R.'s relating to Civil Service and certain 75-Article 37 K.A.R.'s relating to the Department of Administration and 76-12a01-76-12a34, 76-12b01-12b11, 45-403, and applicable State and Federal Fire Code regulations.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Provide for the optimal mental and physical health of each resident with consideration for the informed personal lifestyle choices of each resident.

### Program History

Medical & Surgical Services strive to ensure optimal physical health of each resident and provides medical and nursing care for each resident including those with acute and chronic medical conditions. Diagnostic tests play an essential part in this process. Outside consultations from community providers are requested as needed. Additional services include the coordination of any necessary major medical needs and/or treatments for residents through specialized providers outside PSH&TC. Outside provider costs are normally covered by Medicaid under the Title XIX program and are billed by the entity providing the service.

Parsons State Hospital and Training Center

**Performance Measures**

<b>Outcome Measures</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>FY 2019 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2020 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2021 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2022 Previous Est.</b>	<b>FY 2022 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2023 Est.</b>	<b>FY 2024 Est.</b>	<b>3- yr. Avg.</b>
1. Number of medications issued (med passes by medical staff to PSH&TC residents).	A	1,483,150	1,315,195	1,071,095	1,150,000	1,060,052	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,148,781
2. Percent of medication pass errors.	A	0.0080%	0.0100%	0.0074%	0.0065%	0.0109%	0.0056%	0.0056%	0.0094%
3. Number of on-grounds doctor appointments for PSHTC residents.	A	12,090	13,030	13,525	13,900	10,370	14,200	14,200	12,308
4. Number of times PSH residents were referred to outside medical providers for services (specialist required, severe illnesses, surgery, etc.).	A	473	407	471	500	343	375	400	407

**Funding**

<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>FY 2019 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2020 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2021 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2022 Approved</b>	<b>FY 2022 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2023 Est.</b>	<b>FY 2024 Est.</b>	<b>3-yr. Avg.</b>
State General Fund	\$ 925,660	\$ 1,117,192	\$ 1,568,653	\$ 2,228,712	\$ 1,667,945	\$ 1,218,904	\$ 1,234,228	\$ 1,451,263
Non-SGF State Funds	-	155	10,102	6,025	2,048	750	800	4,102
Federal Funds	1,737,286	1,280,805	761,741	352,801	784,678	1,475,646	1,478,676	942,408
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,662,946</b>	<b>\$ 2,398,152</b>	<b>\$ 2,340,496</b>	<b>\$ 2,587,538</b>	<b>\$ 2,454,671</b>	<b>\$ 2,695,300</b>	<b>\$ 2,713,704</b>	<b>\$ 2,397,773</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>31.0</b>	<b>29.0</b>	<b>26.5</b>	<b>26.5</b>	<b>26.5</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>27.3</b>

## 96000 - PHYSICAL PLANT / CENTRAL SERVICES

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Physical Plant and Central Services includes the agency utilities and indirect care services that support the living environment of PSH&TC's residents. If this program is not funded an unsafe living environment results. ICF/IID certifications and licensure as a state hospital would be forfeited. PSH&TC would not be able to continue serving the people who have been placed at the facility for care and treatment. The facility would have to be closed, residents would be without homes and staff would be without income.

	<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rgt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific	76-1406, 76-1407, 76-1409, 76-1409a, and 76-1415. Also applicable are 75-Article 29 K.A.R.'s relating to Civil Service and certain 75-Article 37 K.A.R.'s relating to the Department of Administration and 76-12a01-76-12a34, 76-12b01-12b11, 45-403, and applicable State and Federal Fire Code regulations.	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To provide for a safe, secure and sanitary living and work environment for the residents and staff of PSH&TC while meeting compliance with all state and federal regulations pertaining to the program.
- B. To provide nutrition programs to meet the dietary needs of all PSH&TC residents.
- C. To provide clean living environments and provide laundry services for the people who live at PSH&TC.
- D. To provide safe and secure transportation for residents and staff.

**Program History**

Physical Plant & Central Services is responsible for the overall maintenance, safety and security of PSH&TC. Costs for utilities such as natural gas, electricity, water and sanitation services fall within this overhead program.	
Facilities Maintenance	Responsible for the overall maintenance of PSH&TC in accordance with applicable state and federal regulations. Power Plant personnel operate and maintain the high pressure steam energy system on a 24 x 7 basis; Maintenance Department staff provides services to buildings across the entire campus in the areas of plumbing, welding, electrical, air conditioning, carpentry and painting.
Grounds Maintenance	Maintains the grounds throughout the PSH&TC campus including snow/ice removal, mowing/weedating, tree trimming/removal and planting, storm clean-up, trash hauling, flower bed maintenance, implementation of beautification projects, and maintenance and repair of all power equipment used in these processes.
Custodial Services	Provides a clean, sanitary and safe environments for staff and the people who live at PSH&TC.
Transportation	Schedules use of vehicles and ensures that necessary maintenance is performed so that all fleet vehicles are safe for the people living at PSH&TC and staff.
Safety & Security	Provides 24 hour safety and security to staff and residents at PSH&TC. Serves as first responders to all emergency situations at PSH&TC.
Switchboard	Provides 24 x 7 coverage and in addition to transferring telephone calls, switchboard operators work closely with security personnel and hospital personnel to provide emergency communications regarding dangerous or life-threatening safety and health situations for people living at PSH&TC and staff, severe weather conditions, etc.
Dietary Services	Ensures each person living at PSH&TC is receiving the proper nutrition and that regulations regarding food preparation and sanitation are followed.
Purchasing & Supply Services	Operates a warehouse/storeroom facility that orders, stocks, distributes and keeps inventories of all supplies and equipment necessary for each building and program on campus to ensure quality services to the people living at PSH&TC can be maintained following state procurement policies.
Laundry Services	Provides clean, infection-free laundry, clothing, towels, bed linens, etc., for all residents and areas requiring laundry service.
Capital Improvement	Energy Conservation Projects and major building improvements are funded within this program. Most CIP projects are managed by Central Office and transferred to PSH&TC as an asset upon completion.

Parsons State Hospital and Training Center

**Performance Measures**

<b>Outcome Measures</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>FY 2019 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2020 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2021 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2022 Previous Est.</b>	<b>FY 2022 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2023 Est.</b>	<b>FY 2024 Est.</b>	<b>3- yr. Avg.</b>
1. Number of ICF/IID standards pertaining to Engineering and Protection.	A	Met 10/10	Met 10/10	Met 10/10	Meet 10/10	Met 10/10	Met 10/10	Met 10/10	Met 10/10
2. Percent compliance to ICF/IID Certification Survey for standards pertaining to "Physical Environment".	A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
3. Number of ICF/IID standards met pertaining to "Dietary Services".	B	Met 4/4	Met 4/4	Met 4/4	Meet 4/4	Met 4/4	Meet 4/4	Meet 4/4	Meet 4/4
4. Percent compliance to ICF/IID standards pertaining to "Dietary Services".	B	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

<b>Output Measures</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>FY 2019 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2020 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2021 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2022 Previous Est.</b>	<b>FY 2022 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2023 Est.</b>	<b>FY 2024 Est.</b>	<b>3- yr. Avg.</b>
1. Number of requests for specialized services/repairs issued through the electronic Maintenance Work Order Program by PSH&TC staff.	A	3,751	3,203	2,938	3,000	2,569	2,700	2,700	2,903
2. Total number of support services rendered to PSHTC staff and residents by PSHTC Safety and Security Officers.	A	25,487	25,928	34,817	35,000	54,999	55,500	56,000	38,581
3. Number of incidents when PSH&TC Safety and Security Officers were needed to assist with combative residents.	A	309	350	657	700	1,143	1,200	1,200	717
4. Approximate number of home-cooked meals served to people who live at PSH&TC annually.	B	176,295	172,386	164,250	160,965	162,600	164,000	165,000	166,412
5. Average cost of food per meal served to people living at PSH&TC.	B	\$2.06	\$2.06	\$2.15	\$2.24	\$2.06	\$2.25	\$2.30	\$2.09
6. Average daily pounds of laundry items processed at PSH&TC for the people who live here (This includes clothing, sheets, towels, bedding, curtains, mops, etc.)	C	1,359	1,361	1,309	1,400	1,400	1,420	1,420	1,357

Parsons State Hospital and Training Center

7. Total number of vehicles used and maintained by PSH&TC staff and residents. Includes maintenance vehicles. Does not include tractors and mowers.	D	58	62	67	68	67	67	67	65
---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

**Funding**

<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>FY 2019 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2020 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2021 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2022 Approved</b>	<b>FY 2022 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2023 Est.</b>	<b>FY 2024 Est.</b>	<b>3-yr. Avg.</b>
State General Fund	\$ 3,013,897	\$ 2,866,778	\$ 3,532,397	\$ 3,399,857	\$ 3,725,037	\$ 80,523	\$ 11,282	\$ 3,374,737
Non-SGF State Funds	931,172	1,186,429	661,331	935,165	983,907	1,026,325	1,022,775	943,889
Federal Funds	1,061,247	1,018,804	852,585	919,514	645,574	4,336,882	4,755,320	838,988
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 5,006,316</b>	<b>\$ 5,072,011</b>	<b>\$ 5,046,313</b>	<b>\$ 5,254,536</b>	<b>\$ 5,354,518</b>	<b>\$ 5,443,730</b>	<b>\$ 5,789,377</b>	<b>\$ 5,157,614</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>72.4</b>	<b>70.5</b>	<b>70.5</b>	<b>72.9</b>	<b>72.9</b>	<b>71.0</b>	<b>71.0</b>	<b>71.3</b>

## Administration - 71000

### Agency Goals Supported by Program

**Stewardship:** Continuously improve the quality of the transportation system and surrounding communities through strong partnerships and focused, lower cost and higher value improvements. **Workforce:** Get the best from our workforce by attracting and retaining talent; modeling diversity; supporting professional development; and inspiring action.

### Program Goals

A. Provide the direction, planning, coordination, communication, and administrative support that foster an integrated, multimodal transportation system to meet the needs of Kansas.

### Program History

In 1975, the Kansas Legislature established the Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) and transferred to it all the powers, duties, obligations, and functions of the preceding State Highway Commission. KSA 75-5015 authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to organize the Department in a manner considered most efficient and in accordance with other provisions of law. Prior to 2017, this program was previously referred to as Administration and Transportation Planning and included the subprograms known as Roads, Rail, and Water and Aviation Planning.

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	40,263,480	45,456,869	45,428,441	58,173,311	50,065,370	64,021,542	65,225,951	46,983,560
Federal Funds	-	-	-	3,250,000	372,621	3,024,679	-	124,207
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 40,263,480</b>	<b>\$ 45,456,869</b>	<b>\$ 45,428,441</b>	<b>\$ 61,423,311</b>	<b>\$ 50,437,991</b>	<b>\$ 67,046,221</b>	<b>\$ 65,225,951</b>	<b>\$ 47,107,767</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>360.80</b>	<b>360.80</b>	<b>371.80</b>	<b>396.80</b>	<b>396.80</b>	<b>418.80</b>	<b>418.80</b>	<b>376.47</b>

## Administration - 71100

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Eliminating funding for this Subprogram would cause agency failure. Programs and subprograms would not have the necessary support to operate. This would include important functions such as bills would not be paid; information technology critical to agency operations would not be supported; required accounting, budgeting and auditing functions would not be performed; required human resource functions would not be performed, and public outreach would not exist. There would also be a loss of federal funding, as there would be no federal aid billing.

	<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	K.S.A. 75-5006	Mandatory	No	8
Specific	K.S.A. 75-3717			
Specific	K.S.A. 68-2303 et seq.		* This subprogram plays an important role in the development, support and delivery of the IKE program. As such, eliminating this subprogram would jeopardize program delivery.	
Specific	K.S.A. 68-2320 et seq			
General	K.S.A. 75-3739			
Specific	K.S.A. 68-2315			
General	K.S.A. 75-6401-75-6407			
General	K.S.A. 75-3734			
General	Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations; 23 USC			

### Agency Goals Supported by Program

**Stewardship:** Continuously improve the quality of the transportation system and surrounding communities through strong partnerships and focused, lower cost and higher value improvements. **Workforce:** Get the best from our workforce by attracting and retaining talent; modeling diversity; supporting professional development; and inspiring action.

### Program/Subprogram Goals

A. Provide the direction, planning, coordination, communication, and administrative support that foster an integrated, multimodal transportation system to meet the needs of Kansas.

**Program/Subprogram History**

The Administration Subprogram provides general administrative services, such as financial and human resource management, inventory and procurement support, accounting and financial auditing, information technology support, program auditing, and facility and multimedia support. The Subprogram also coordinates public outreach through media, legislative, and intergovernmental relations. Please see the Administration Program page for related history.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Agency turnover rate	A	18.0%	15.0%	15.0%	13.0%	21.0%	22.0%	22.0%	17.0%
2. Average percentage total agency positions vacant	A	12.0%	18.0%	19.0%	15.0%	26.0%	28.0%	31.0%	21.0%
3. Average number of days to fill a position from	A	106	130	134	120	122	130	135	129
4. Percent of advertised positions filled with a minority	A	9.0%	9.0%	11.0%	18.0%	11.0%	12.0%	13.0%	10.3%
5. Percent of women in senior management	A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	30.0%	30.0%	32.0%	30.0%
6. Percent of minorities in senior management	A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.0%	12.0%	9.0%	15.0%
7. Percent of CITO projects on time and on budget	A	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
8. Percent of IT trouble tickets resolved within 3 days	A	90.0%	82.0%	82.0%	92.0%	94.8%	90.0%	90.0%	86.3%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
9. Number of IT trouble tickets reported	A	9,052	15,454	10,536	5,000	8,888	9,000	9,000	11,626

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	24,228,299	26,083,610	27,013,142	36,342,912	30,700,746	41,248,311	41,797,399	27,932,499
Federal Funds	-	-	-	3,250,000	372,621	3,024,679	-	124,207
<b>Total</b>	\$ 24,228,299	\$ 26,083,610	\$ 27,013,142	\$ 39,592,912	\$ 31,073,367	\$ 44,272,990	\$ 41,797,399	\$ 28,056,706
<b>FTE</b>	175.00	175.00	179.00	189.00	189.00	211.50	211.50	181.00

## Office of the Secretary - 71110

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Eliminating funding would result in a loss of agency-wide direction and vision. Additionally, there would be no legal counsel on staff and no oversight to ensure the agency is managing its programs fairly and equitably.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	K.S.A. 75-5001 et seq.	Mandatory	No	9
Specific	K.S.A. 75-5016	* This subprogram plays an important role in the development, support and delivery of the IKE program. As such, eliminating this subprogram would jeopardize program delivery.		
Specific	K.S.A 68-2301 et seq.			
General	Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations			
General	Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations			

### Agency Goals Supported by Program

**Safety and Security:** Enhance the safety and security of the transportation system for all users and workers. **Transportation System Management:** Maximize performance of the existing system by investing in transportation choices and smart assets. **Asset Preservation:** Address risks and maintain assets through investments that provide high value return and make best use of limited funds. **Economic Vitality:** Improve reliability and increase flexibility for cost-efficient movement of people, goods, and information to bolster the Kansas economy. **Stewardship:** Continuously improve the quality of the transportation system and surrounding communities through strong partnerships and focused, lower cost and higher value improvements. **Workforce:** Get the best from our workforce by attracting and retaining talent; modeling diversity; supporting professional development; and inspiring action.

### Program/Subprogram Goals

A. Provide the direction, planning, coordination, communication, and administrative support that foster an integrated, multimodal transportation system to meet the needs of Kansas.

### Program/Subprogram History

The Office of the Secretary Subprogram establishes the goals and policy direction for the agency. It is also responsible for legal affairs of the agency and assures compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and federal laws pertaining to the Disadvantaged Business Enterprises Program. Please see the Administration Program page for related history.

Kansas Department of Transportation

Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percent of bridges, by deck area, on the State Highway System in "Good" condition	A	72.0%	72.0%	72.0%	69.0%	71.0%	71.0%	71.0%	71.7%
2. Percent of bridges, by deck area, on the State Highway System in "Poor" condition	A	1.2%	1.4%	1.9%	1.5%	2.4%	2.6%	2.4%	1.9%
3. Percent of Interstate State Highway System miles classified as "Good" * for pavement condition using federal method	A	60.0%	58.0%	57.0%	66.0%	58.0%	59.0%	60.0%	57.7%
4. Percent of the person-miles traveled on the Interstate Highway System that are classified as "Poor" using federal method	A	0.4%	0.6%	0.5%	N/A	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%
5. Percent of Non-Interstate State Highway System Miles classified as "Good" * for pavement condition using federal method	A	58.0%	59.0%	59.0%	57.0%	59.0%	60.0%	61.0%	59.0%
6. Percent of the person-miles traveled on the Non-Interstate Highway System that are classified as "Poor" using federal method	A	0.9%	1.1%	1.1%	N/A	1.2%	1.7%	1.7%	1.1%
7. Percent of highway construction projects let within 120 days of the originally scheduled letting date	A	96.0%	88.0%	86.0%	N/A	84.0%	90.0%	90.0%	86.0%
8. National Highway System (NHS) truck travel time Reliability Index	A	1.18	1.18	1.13	1.18	1.13	1.16	1.16	1.15
9. Percent of Disadvantaged Business Enterprise projects contract participation	A	11.2%	11.3%	9.5%	N/A	7.8%	7.8%	7.8%	9.5%

Kansas Department of Transportation

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	2,333,371	4,250,684	3,518,647	4,201,011	3,762,124	4,532,484	4,548,854	3,843,818
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 2,333,371	\$ 4,250,684	\$ 3,518,647	\$ 4,201,011	\$ 3,762,124	\$ 4,532,484	\$ 4,548,854	\$ 3,843,818
<b>FTE</b>	29.80	29.80	28.80	32.80	32.80	33.80	33.80	30.47

## Operations Support - 71300

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Eliminating funding would result in reductions in agency support, including personnel, equipment and facilities. KDOT's ability to create safe work environments for its internal and external partners would be eliminated, as this subprogram includes KDOT safety operations.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	K.S.A. 75-5001 et seq.	Mandatory	No	5
Specific	K.S.A. 68-401	* This subprogram plays an important role in the development, support and delivery of the IKE program. As such, eliminating this subprogram would jeopardize program delivery.		
Specific	K.S.A. 68-404			
Specific	K.S.A. 68-406			
Specific	K.S.A. 68-407			
Specific	K.S.A. 68-412			

### Agency Goals Supported by Program

**Workforce:** Get the best from our workforce by attracting and retaining talent; modeling diversity; supporting professional development; and inspiring action.

### Program/Subprogram Goal

A. Provide the direction, planning, coordination, communication, and administrative support that foster an integrated, multimodal transportation system to meet the needs of Kansas.

### Program/Subprogram History

The Operations Support Subprogram provides support to personnel, equipment, facilities, and agency support required for effective and efficient completion of transportation programs. The Subprogram also includes KDOT's safety operations, which instills a culture of safety throughout the agency's workforce. The Subprogram provides administrative and management support for the Regular Maintenance, Communications System - On Budget, and Construction Inspection subprograms. Please see the Administration Program page for related history.

Kansas Department of Transportation

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Rate of recordable incidents	A	0.87	1.61	1.31	N/A	1.63	1.46	1.32	1.5

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	13,701,810	15,122,575	14,896,652	17,629,388	15,602,500	18,240,747	18,879,698	15,207,242
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 13,701,810	\$ 15,122,575	\$ 14,896,652	\$ 17,629,388	\$ 15,602,500	\$ 18,240,747	\$ 18,879,698	\$ 15,207,242
<b>FTE</b>	156.00	156.00	164.00	175.00	175.00	173.50	173.50	165.00

## Transportation Planning & Modal Support - 72000

### Agency Goals Supported by Program

**Safety and Security:** Enhance the safety and security of the transportation system for all users and workers. **Transportation System Management:** Maximize performance of the existing system by investing in transportation choices and smart assets. **Economic Vitality:** Improve reliability and increase flexibility for cost-efficient movement of people, goods, and information to bolster the Kansas economy. **Stewardship:** Continuously improve the quality of the transportation system and surrounding communities through strong partnerships and focused, lower cost and higher value improvements.

### Program Goals

A. Provide planning, coordination, and assistance to ensure a safe, efficient, and reliable multimodal transportation network on and off the State Highway System

### Program History

This program was created in 2017 and includes subprograms from what was previously known as Administration and Transportation Planning Program and Local Support Program. The Transportation Planning Subprogram was previously a large portion of the Roads, Rail, and Water Subprogram found in the Administration and Transportation Planning Program. Traffic Safety and Transit were previously part of the Local Support Program. The Rail and Freight Subprogram was created from parts previously known as the Roads, Rail, and Water Subprogram; Public Transportation Assistance Subprogram; and the Categorical Aid Subprogram. Aviation includes the subprogram previously referred to as Aviation Planning, which was part of the program previously known as Administration and Transportation Planning, and it includes state and federal aid previously found in the Categorical Aid program. KSA 75-5025 et seq. authorize the Secretary to accept and utilize federal funds for railroad revitalization. KSA 75-5033 makes provision for public transportation for the elderly, the disabled, and the general public. KSA 75-5061 authorizes general aviation funding.

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	49,828,205	59,732,278	87,950,728	102,865,170	68,935,749	146,215,227	124,825,798	72,206,252
Federal Funds	3,920,347	3,198,302	4,684,979	15,424,068	4,611,172	915,000	1,015,000	4,164,818
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 53,748,552</b>	<b>\$ 62,930,580</b>	<b>\$ 92,635,707</b>	<b>\$ 118,289,238</b>	<b>\$ 73,546,921</b>	<b>\$ 147,130,227</b>	<b>\$ 125,840,798</b>	<b>\$ 76,371,069</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>81.00</b>	<b>81.00</b>	<b>80.00</b>	<b>90.00</b>	<b>90.00</b>	<b>108.50</b>	<b>108.50</b>	<b>83.67</b>

## Traffic Safety - 72021

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Eliminating funding would increase the potential for a higher number of crashes, injuries and fatalities in Kansas. KDOT would no longer have the means to use education, enforcement, and engineering to reduce the severity of crashes and reduce the number of travel-related deaths toward zero. Not funding this Subprogram would also result in the loss of federal funds.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>		<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	Federal Highway Safety Act of 1966, 23 USC Chapter 4	Mandatory	Yes	13

\* This subprogram plays an important role in the development, support and delivery of the IKE program. As such, eliminating this subprogram would jeopardize program delivery.

### Agency Goals Supported by Program

**Safety and Security:** Enhance the safety and security of the transportation system for all users and workers.

### Program/Subprogram Goal

A. Provide planning, coordination, and assistance to ensure a safe, efficient, and reliable multimodal transportation network on and off the State Highway System

### Program/Subprogram History

The Traffic Safety Subprogram manages safety programs designed to reduce crashes and serious injuries and fatalities in motor vehicle crashes. Priority areas include increasing seat belt usage, reducing impaired driving, reducing distracted driving, reducing motorcycle fatalities, and improving traffic safety data sharing. Please see the Transportation, Planning and Modal Support Program page for related history.

Kansas Department of Transportation

**Performance Measures**

\* Data currently unavailable. Updated pages will be submitted when data is received and processed.

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Fatality rate per hundred million vehicle miles traveled on all urban roads in Kansas	A	0.65	0.69	0.72	0.76				0.71
2. Fatality rate per hundred million vehicle miles traveled on all rural roads in Kansas	A	1.97	1.99	1.99	1.99				1.99
3. Fatality rate per hundred million vehicle miles traveled on all public roads in Kansas	A	1.26	1.52	1.36	1.38				1.44
4. Suspected serious injury rate per hundred million vehicle miles traveled on all public roads in Kansas	A	4.40	5.71	4.40	5.18				5.06
5. Number of suspected serious injuries	A								
6. Number of Kansas alcohol-related crashes	A	2,160	2,214	2,100	2,050				2,157
7. Percent of all crashes that are alcohol related	A	3.70	3.66	3.60	3.55				3.63
8. Percent of Kansas drivers and passengers using safety belts	A	85.0%	85.0%	86.0%	86.0%				85.5%
9. Percent of all fatalities not wearing seat belts	A	43.0%	47.0%	46.0%	45.0%				46.5%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	5,121,803	6,395,421	7,912,408	7,327,559	10,768,252	12,616,945	12,619,342	8,358,694
Federal Funds	3,466,748	3,198,302	4,640,184	1,015,000	641,057	915,000	1,015,000	2,826,514
<b>Total</b>	\$ 8,588,551	\$ 9,593,723	\$ 12,552,592	\$ 8,342,559	\$ 11,409,309	\$ 13,531,945	\$ 13,634,342	\$ 11,185,208
<b>FTE</b>	19.00	19.00	18.00	21.00	21.00	36.50	36.50	19.33

## Transit - 72024

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Eliminating funding would reduce public transit services provided across the state. This would reduce access to jobs, services and products in existing and emerging economic and social centers. There would also be a loss of federal transit funding.

	<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	K.S.A. 75-5032 through 75-5038	Mandatory	Yes	18
Specific	K.S.A. 75-5051 through 75-5058			
Specific	K.S.A. 68-2314b			
Specific	49 USC 5311(f)			

### Agency Goals Supported by Program

**Transportation System Management:** Maximize performance of the existing system by investing in transportation choices and smart assets.

### Program/Subprogram Goals

A. Provide planning, coordination, and assistance to ensure a safe, efficient, and reliable multimodal transportation network on and off the State Highway System

### Program/Subprogram History

The Transit Subprogram administers state and federal public transit programs to help meet the needs of elderly persons, persons with disabilities, and the general public. Please see the Transportation, Planning and Modal Support Program page for related history.

Kansas Department of Transportation

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percent of counties with transit services available	A	83.0%	83.0%	84.0%	84.0%	90.0%	89.0%	90.0%	85.7%
2. Annual ridership for rural public transit operators in Kansas	A	2,516,503	2,194,746	1,111,907	1,337,784	1,804,527	1,630,009	1,470,400	1,703,727
3. Annual ridership for urban public transit operators in Kansas	A	7,278,444	6,115,467	3,386,886	3,998,358	4,807,272	4,680,472	4,222,952	4,769,875

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	29,271,605	24,566,136	13,349,189	46,358,072	23,221,249	59,211,156	55,644,527	20,378,858
Federal Funds	-	-	-	14,159,068	2,675,918	-	-	891,973
<b>Total</b>	\$ 29,271,605	\$ 24,566,136	\$ 13,349,189	\$ 60,517,140	\$ 25,897,167	\$ 59,211,156	\$ 55,644,527	\$ 21,270,831
<b>FTE</b>	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.33

## Transportation Planning - 72210

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

KDOT would no longer be able to acquire and analyze the information needed to develop long-range transportation programs that are consistent with the needs of the public. Eliminating funding would also result in the loss of federal funds.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>		<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	K.S.A. 75-5009	Mandatory	Yes	19
Specific	K.S.A. 68-2301 et seq			
General	Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations			

### Agency Goals Supported by Program

**Transportation System Management:** Maximize performance of the existing system by investing in transportation choices and smart assets.  
**Stewardship:** Continuously improve the quality of the transportation system and surrounding communities through strong partnerships and focused, lower cost and higher value improvements.

### Program/Subprogram Goals

A. Provide planning, coordination, and assistance to ensure a safe, efficient, and reliable multimodal transportation network on and off the State Highway System

### Program/Subprogram History

The Transportation Planning Subprogram is responsible for collecting, analyzing, modeling and forecasting information for the statewide transportation system. Major areas of responsibility include traffic counting and classification, geometric data, advanced analytics, cartography and geographic information systems. Other important areas include long range planning, metropolitan planning, access management, statewide systems evaluation, public transportation, pedestrian and bicycle transportation, and developing and coordinating state policy on freight and rail transportation issues. The Subprogram also develops, designs, selects, and manages projects and ensures the state is meeting federal requirements. Please see the Transportation, Planning and Modal Support Program page for related history.

Kansas Department of Transportation

Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Average clearance time (in minutes) to clear travel lanes of incidents (Wichita and Kansas City Metro Areas):	A								
Wichita		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33	28	28	33
Kansas City		40	39	39	N/A	38	28	28	39
2. Percent of projects let within 120 days of the originally scheduled letting date	A	96.0%	88.0%	86.0%	N/A	84.0%	90.0%	90.0%	86.0%
3. Percent of federal obligation limitation used per federal fiscal year	A	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	N/A	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
4. Percentage of highway construction projects completed early or on-time	A	99.0%	98.0%	95.0%	98.0%	83.0%	90.0%	98.0%	86.0%
5. Percentage of highway construction projects completed over (+) or under (-) total highway budget	A	2.65%	-0.14%	1.68%	0.00%	1.93%	0.00%	0.00%	1.16%
<b><u>Work Programmed for</u></b>									
<b><u>Construction:</u></b>									
<b><u>Modernization</u></b>									
6. Miles	A	1	40	48	60	66	43	117	51
7. Bridges & Culverts	A	0	2	25	13	9	1	36	12
<b><u>Preservation</u></b>									
8. Miles (CMN/EMR/IRP/SIR/RIP/1RR)	A	1,663	1,885	1,600	1,788	1,821	1,586	1,585	1,769
9. Total Bridges and Culverts	A	104	61	91	104	111	119	103	88

Kansas Department of Transportation

<b>Expansion/Enhancement</b>									
10. Interstate capacity improvement miles	A	0	0	2	0	0	6	0	1
11. Bridges and culverts Interstate capacity improvement	A	0	0	1	0	9	20	0	3
12. Non-Interstate capacity improvement miles	A	2	11	10	44	30	33	14	17
13. Bridges and culverts Non-Interstate capacity improvement	A	3	6	2	72	31	30	12	13

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	8,274,940	7,988,622	22,661,995	18,681,692	13,027,153	32,288,233	32,668,758	14,559,257
Federal Funds	-	-	44,795	-	-	-	-	14,932
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 8,274,940</b>	<b>\$ 7,988,622</b>	<b>\$ 22,706,790</b>	<b>\$ 18,681,692</b>	<b>\$ 13,027,153</b>	<b>\$ 32,288,233</b>	<b>\$ 32,668,758</b>	<b>\$ 14,574,188</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>47.00</b>	<b>47.00</b>	<b>47.00</b>	<b>51.00</b>	<b>51.00</b>	<b>56.00</b>	<b>56.00</b>	<b>48.33</b>

## Aviation - 72220

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

There would be no statewide coordination of growing aviation capacity and capabilities, including unmanned arial vehicle (UAV) development. There would be a loss of federal and state funding for local airports. Eliminating funding for this Subprogram would affect an important segment of the Kansas economy by reducing access to jobs, services and products of existing and emerging economic and social centers.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>		<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	K.S.A. 68-21314b	Mandatory	Yes	17
Specific	K.S.A. 68-5010			
Specific	K.S.A. 75-5011			
Specific	K.S.A. 75-5061			
Specific	K.S.A. 75-5048			

### Agency Goals Supported by Program

**Transportation System Management:** Maximize performance of the existing system by investing in transportation choices and smart assets.

### Program/Subprogram Goals

A. Provide planning, coordination, and assistance to ensure a safe, efficient, and reliable multimodal transportation network on and off the State Highway System

### Program/Subprogram History

The Aviation Subprogram provides funding and technical assistance to local airports; drives economic development and enhances critical services in Kansas through infrastructure improvement; and serves as the state aviation expert, innovator, and resource for the Kansas aviation community. Please see the Transportation, Planning and Modal Support Program page for related history.

Kansas Department of Transportation

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
Percent of Kansas Aviation Airport Improvement Program dollars funded of total dollars requested	A	18.0%	20.0%	18.0%	21.0%	10.0%	20.0%	20.0%	16.0%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
Number of public use airports inspected	A	8	8	7	N/A	43	43	44	19.3

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	6,131,124	7,584,267	8,084,304	11,732,705	11,135,417	15,652,837	18,002,547	8,934,663
Federal Funds	453,599	-	-	250,000	1,294,197	-	-	431,399
<b>Total</b>	\$ 6,584,723	\$ 7,584,267	\$ 8,084,304	\$ 11,982,705	\$ 12,429,614	\$ 15,652,837	\$ 18,002,547	\$ 9,366,062
<b>FTE</b>	8.00	8.00	9.00	12.00	12.00	10.00	10.00	9.67

## Rail & Freight - 72230

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

KDOT would no longer be able to optimize the movement of goods and access to markets, which would affect an important segment of the Kansas economy. There would be a lack of data to make informed decisions on freight system improvements. Additionally, there would be a loss of federal rail and freight funding.

	<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific	K.S.A. 75-5040	Mandatory	Yes	16
Specific	K.S.A. 68-2314b			
Specific	K.S.A. 75-5048			

### Agency Goals Supported by Program

**Economic Vitality:** Improve reliability and increase flexibility for cost-efficient movement of people, goods, and information to bolster the Kansas economy.

### Program/Subprogram Goals

A. Provide planning, coordination, and assistance to ensure a safe, efficient, and reliable multimodal transportation network on and off the State Highway System

### Program/Subprogram History

The Rail and Freight Subprogram collects and analyzes multimodal freight transportation data to make programming recommendations for projects that improve freight flows and create economic development opportunities. In addition, funding is provided for infrastructure improvements to the state rail system. Please see the Transportation, Planning and Modal Support Program page for related history.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
National Highway System Truck Travel Time Reliability Index	A	1.18	1.18	1.13	1.18	1.13	1.16	1.16	1.15
Percent mileage of rail that is 286k pound capable	A	N/A	N/A	30.0%	N/A	58.5%	60.0%	65.0%	44.3%

Kansas Department of Transportation

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	1,028,733	13,197,832	35,942,832	18,765,142	10,783,678	26,446,056	5,890,624	19,974,781
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,028,733	\$ 13,197,832	\$ 35,942,832	\$ 18,765,142	\$ 10,783,678	\$ 26,446,056	\$ 5,890,624	\$ 19,974,781
<b>FTE</b>	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00

## Local Support - 73000

### Agency Goals Supported by Program

**Asset Preservation:** Address risks and maintain assets through investments that provide high value return and make best use of limited funds.

### Program Goals

Assist in providing safe, efficient, and reliable local transportation systems.

### Program History

KSA 68-402b authorizes counties, cities, and other local governments to enter into contracts with the Secretary of Transportation for federal funds and establishes the procedures for their distribution. Distribution of the Special City and County Highway Fund and the County Equalization and Adjustment Fund is provided in KSA 79-3425 and 79-3425(c), respectively. Local Support used to include Traffic Safety, Public Transportation Assistance, and Categorical Aid subprograms in addition to the subprograms included in this section. Traffic Safety and Public Transportation Assistance became part of the Transportation Planning and Modal Support Program. The Categorical Aid subprogram was abolished.

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	182,552,913	184,754,236	180,115,028	187,683,468	178,523,555	185,137,291	185,548,350	181,130,940
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$182,552,913</b>	<b>\$184,754,236</b>	<b>\$180,115,028</b>	<b>\$187,683,468</b>	<b>\$178,523,555</b>	<b>\$185,137,291</b>	<b>\$185,548,350</b>	<b>\$181,130,940</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>18.00</b>	<b>23.00</b>	<b>23.00</b>	<b>23.00</b>	<b>23.00</b>	<b>20.67</b>

## Special City & County Highway Aid - 73000

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Cities and counties would lose state transportation funding, affecting both local and state economies.

	<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific	K.S.A. 79-3425	Mandatory	No	20
Specific	K.S.A 79-3425c			
Specific	K.S.A. 68-2301 et seq			

### Agency Goals Supported by Program

**Asset Preservation:** Address risks and maintain assets through investments that provide high value return and make best use of limited funds.

### Program/Subprogram Goals

A. Assist in providing safe, efficient, and reliable local transportation systems.

### Program/Subprogram History

This subprogram contains expenditures from the Special City and County Highway Fund and County Equalization Adjustment Fund. Distribution of funding is administered by the State Treasurer's Office. Please see the Local Support program page for related history.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
*There are no performance measures for this subprogram									

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	156,595,741	157,987,250	155,789,785	157,408,200	157,097,275	158,247,977	158,913,852	156,958,103
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 156,595,741	\$ 157,987,250	\$ 155,789,785	\$ 157,408,200	\$ 157,097,275	\$ 158,247,977	\$ 158,913,852	\$ 156,958,103
<b>FTE</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

## Local Projects - 73022

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

KDOT would no longer have the means to address community transportation needs and emerging opportunities through partnerships that provide input, collaboration and funding. KDOT would no longer be able to assist local communities in maximizing financial aid. Eliminating funding for this subprogram would result in the loss of federal funds.

	<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	K.S.A. 68-169	Mandatory	Yes	11
Specific	K.S.A. 68-412			
Specific	K.S.A. 68-2301 et seq			
General	Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations		* This subprogram plays an important role in the development, support and delivery of the IKE program. As such, eliminating this subprogram would jeopardize program delivery.	

### Agency Goals Supported by Program

**Asset Preservation:** Address risks and maintain assets through investments that provide high value return and make best use of limited funds.

### Program/Subprogram Goals

A. Assist in providing safe, efficient, and reliable local transportation systems.

### Program/Subprogram History

The Local Projects Subprogram assists cities and counties in the utilization of state and federal transportation dollars that are made available to them. It also administers the Federal Funds Exchange Program, the National Bridge Inspection Program, the Cost-Share Program and the Kansas Local Bridge Improvement Program. Please see the Local Support program page for related history.

Kansas Department of Transportation

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percentage of programmed local road and street projects that are let in the programmed year	A	75.0%	47.0%	46.0%	70.0%	69.0%	60.0%	60.0%	54.0%
2. Total number of projects awarded to local public government authorities	A	85	182	165	150	141	175	175	163
3. Total number of dollars (millions) awarded to local Public Government authorities	A	70.0	142.4	122.4	125.0	118.7	140.0	140.0	127.8
4. Percent of investment awarded through the Economic Development Program	A	N/A	33.0%	49.0%	N/A	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	60.7%
5. Employment opportunities developed through the Economic Development Program	A	N/A	985	1,146	N/A	7,551	1,572	1,572	3,227

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	25,957,172	26,766,986	24,325,243	30,275,268	21,426,280	26,889,314	26,634,498	24,172,836
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 25,957,172	\$ 26,766,986	\$ 24,325,243	\$ 30,275,268	\$ 21,426,280	\$ 26,889,314	\$ 26,634,498	\$ 24,172,836
<b>FTE</b>	21.00	21.00	18.00	23.00	23.00	23.00	23.00	20.67

## Maintenance - 73000

### Agency Goals Supported by Program

**Transportation System Management:** Maximize performance of the existing system by investing in transportation choices and smart assets. **Asset Preservation:** Address risks and maintain assets through investments that provide high value return and make best use of limited funds. **Stewardship:** Continuously improve the quality of the transportation system and surrounding communities through strong partnerships and focused, lower cost and higher value improvements.

### Program Goals

Preserve the State Highway System as-built or in an improved condition providing safe and reliable highway facilities.

### Program History

KSA 68-407 empowers the Secretary of Transportation to perform all work or to contract for the construction, improvement, or maintenance of the state highway system. KSA 68-406a and 68-412 provide for the designation and improvement of city connecting links. KSA 68-416 requires the Secretary to apportion annually and distribute quarterly to cities \$5,000 per lane-mile per year for the maintenance of city connecting links. KSA 68-416a provides for the designation of responsibilities for maintenance of city connecting links. KSA 8-1559 assigns authority to the Secretary of Transportation to set speed limits. KSA 68-404 and 68-415 provide for the Secretary to control entrances on state highways, and KSA 8-1911 provides authority to the Secretary to issue oversize or overweight permits to commercial motor carriers.

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	141,258,137	133,556,185	160,911,270	158,575,781	166,003,223	165,257,880	173,278,583	153,490,226
Federal Funds	75,000	9,500	-	-	-	-	-	3,167
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$141,333,137</b>	<b>\$133,565,685</b>	<b>\$160,911,270</b>	<b>\$158,575,781</b>	<b>\$166,003,223</b>	<b>\$165,257,880</b>	<b>\$173,278,583</b>	<b>\$153,493,393</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>1,244.00</b>	<b>1,244.00</b>	<b>1,166.00</b>	<b>1,142.00</b>	<b>1,142.00</b>	<b>1,110.00</b>	<b>1,110.00</b>	<b>1,184.00</b>

## Regular Maintenance - 77110

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Eliminating funding for this subprogram would result in failure of the roadway system. This would slow or prevent the movement of people and goods throughout Kansas, which would damage the state's economy and reduce the quality of life for citizens. Eliminating funding for this subprogram would also increase long term costs. Poorly maintained roads cost more to rehabilitate and repair compared to well maintained roadways.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	K.S.A. 75-5001 et seq.	Mandatory	No	2
Specific	K.S.A. 68-401 et seq.			

### Agency Goals Supported by Program

**Transportation System Management:** Maximize performance of the existing system by investing in transportation choices and smart assets. **Asset Preservation:** Address risks and maintain assets through investments that provide high value return and make best use of limited funds.

### Program/Subprogram Goals

A. Preserve the State Highway System as-built or in an improved condition providing safe and reliable highway facilities.

### Program/Subprogram History

This subprogram preserves and repairs the state roadway system. System elements include travelway surfaces, shoulders, roadsides, drainage facilities, bridges, signs and pavement markings. Maintenance activities are undertaken to offset the effects of deterioration, damage, and vandalism. Traffic services such as lighting and signal operation, snow and ice removal, and operation of roadside rest areas are also provided. Please see the Maintenance Program page for related history.

Kansas Department of Transportation

Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Total level of service (Traffic Guidance, Drainage, Shoulders, Roadside, and Travelway)	A	88.3	89.6	89.0	89.6	89.5	89.0	89.0	89.4
Percent of shoulder miles on State Highway System worked on by maintenance crews*	A	20.0%	24.0%	31.0%	31.0%	26.0%	30.0%	30.0%	27.0%
Percent of equipment exceeding minimum usage or age in years for replacement consideration	A	50.0%	50.0%	49.0%	48.0%	45.0%	43.0%	43.0%	48.0%
Expenditure per lane mile for maintenance expenditures (state-owned/state-controlled highways)	A	\$4,600	\$4,200	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,300	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,333

Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	136,107,069	128,304,652	153,566,618	152,816,828	158,683,325	158,866,247	166,813,492	146,851,532
Federal Funds	75,000	9,500	-	-	-	-	-	3,167
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$136,182,069</b>	<b>\$128,314,152</b>	<b>\$153,566,618</b>	<b>\$ 152,816,828</b>	<b>\$158,683,325</b>	<b>\$158,866,247</b>	<b>\$166,813,492</b>	<b>\$146,854,698</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>1,232.00</b>	<b>1,232.00</b>	<b>1,153.00</b>	<b>1,128.00</b>	<b>1,128.00</b>	<b>1,096.00</b>	<b>1,096.00</b>	<b>1,171.00</b>

## Communications System-On Budget Subprogram - 77116

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Eliminating funding for this subprogram would cause communication failures between state and local partners, including public safety entities. There would be no maintenance of the system, which would cause it to deteriorate and be more costly to repair.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General	K.S.A. 75-5073 through 75-5076	Mandatory	No	7

### Agency Goals Supported by Program

**Stewardship:** Continuously improve the quality of the transportation system and surrounding communities through strong partnerships and focused, lower cost and higher value improvements.

### Program/Subprogram Goals

A. Maintain an interoperable statewide 800MHz radio system to allow local units of government and other potential users onto the system.

### Program/Subprogram History

The Subprogram is responsible for repairing and servicing radio equipment at the tower sites strategically located across the state. Please see the Maintenance Program page for related history.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Percent of calls completed on first attempt	A	99.98%	99.98%	99.98%	99.98%	99.85%	99.85%	99.85%	99.94%

Kansas Department of Transportation

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	5,151,068	5,251,533	7,344,652	5,758,953	7,319,898	6,391,633	6,465,091	6,638,694
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 5,151,068	\$ 5,251,533	\$ 7,344,652	\$ 5,758,953	\$ 7,319,898	\$ 6,391,633	\$ 6,465,091	\$ 6,638,694
<b>FTE</b>	12.00	12.00	13.00	14.00	14.00	14.00	14.00	13.00

**Construction - 90000****Agency Goals Supported by Program**

**Asset Preservation:** Address risks and maintain assets through investments that provide high value return and make best use of limited funds. **Stewardship:** Continuously improve the quality of the transportation system and surrounding communities through strong partnerships and focused, lower cost and higher value improvements.

**Program Goals**

Develop and construct projects that continue to provide a quality state highway network that effectively meets the needs of the traveling public.

**Program History**

KSA 68-404 et seq. authorize the Secretary of Transportation to investigate all highway conditions and expend funds from the State Highway Fund and other appropriate sources in order to maintain or improve the state highway system. KSA 68-407 gives the Secretary the authority to enter into all contracts necessary for construction, improvement, or maintenance of highways. Selection of qualified consultants and quality control of services are addressed in KSA 75-5801 et seq. KSA 68-412a authorizes acquisition of right-of-way when the land is required for operation of the Department or the improvement of the state transportation system. Authority for the Department to own, construct, or maintain buildings is found in the Kansas Constitution, Article II, and KSA 68-404, 68-413, and 68-416. Prior to T-WORKS, some of the work currently classified as Preservation in this program was considered Substantial Maintenance and included as part of the Maintenance Program.

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	724,158,788	978,369,661	1,286,552,960	1,551,852,524	1,568,481,120	2,264,090,102	1,600,562,121	1,277,801,247
Federal Funds	-	22,088	-	-	-	-	-	7,363
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$724,158,788</b>	<b>\$ 978,391,749</b>	<b>\$ 1,286,552,960</b>	<b>\$ 1,551,852,524</b>	<b>\$ 1,568,481,120</b>	<b>\$ 2,264,090,102</b>	<b>\$ 1,600,562,121</b>	<b>\$ 1,277,808,610</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>644.20</b>	<b>644.20</b>	<b>614.50</b>	<b>645.50</b>	<b>645.50</b>	<b>623.00</b>	<b>623.00</b>	<b>634.73</b>

## Debt Service - 98010

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The State would default on bond payments, increasing future borrowing costs. The State would lose an important source of financing for its transportation programs, which would require reducing the scope of transportation programs or finding other means of funding.

	<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
General	K.S.A. 68-2303 through 68-2319	Mandatory	No	1
General	K.S.A. 68-2320 et seq.			

### Agency Goals Supported by Program

**Asset Preservation:** Address risks and maintain assets through investments that provide high value return and make best use of limited funds.

### Program/Subprogram Goals

A. Develop and construct projects that continue to provide a quality state highway network that effectively meets the needs of the traveling public.

### Program/Subprogram History

The Debt Service Subprogram provides a portion of the necessary funding for the state's transportation programs. Please see the Construction Program page for related history.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
*There are no performance measures for this subprogram									

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	210,246,968	208,029,926	207,668,308	207,780,095	207,521,390	303,665,372	168,385,110	207,739,875
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$210,246,968</b>	<b>\$ 208,029,926</b>	<b>\$ 207,668,308</b>	<b>\$ 207,780,095</b>	<b>\$ 207,521,390</b>	<b>\$ 303,665,372</b>	<b>\$ 168,385,110</b>	<b>\$207,739,875</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

## Design/Right of Way - 99160

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Construction and rehabilitation projects would not be built. This would affect the movement of goods and people throughout Kansas. There would also be a loss of federal funding.

	<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	K.S.A. 75-5006 et seq.	Mandatory	Yes	6
Specific	K.S.A. 68-404	* This subprogram plays an important role in the development, support and delivery of the IKE program. As such, eliminating this subprogram would jeopardize program delivery.		
Specific	K.S.A. 68-407			
Specific	K.S.A. 68-413 et seq.			
General	K.S.A. Chapter 26			
General	49 USC 24			
General	Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations			

### Agency Goals Supported by Program

**Asset Preservation:** Address risks and maintain assets through investments that provide high value return and make best use of limited funds.

### Program/Subprogram Goals

A. Develop and construct projects that continue to provide a quality state highway network that effectively meets the needs of the traveling public.

### Program/Subprogram History

The Design/Right of Way Subprogram develops the specific scope, schedule, and plans for construction and rehabilitation projects. It also provides project management, technical oversight, and coordination of all preconstruction activities for highway project development. Please see the Construction Program page for related history.

Kansas Department of Transportation

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
Percent of bridges, by deck area, on the state highway system in "good" condition	A	72.0%	72.0%	72.0%	69.0%	71.0%	71.0%	70.0%	71.7%
Percent of bridges, by deck area, on the state highway system in "poor" condition	A	1.2%	1.4%	1.9%	N/A	2.4%	2.6%	2.4%	1.9%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	17,639,753	17,736,067	20,599,579	22,068,187	22,600,010	23,382,961	24,648,548	20,311,885
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 17,639,753	\$ 17,736,067	\$ 20,599,579	\$ 22,068,187	\$ 22,600,010	\$ 23,382,961	\$ 24,648,548	\$ 20,311,885
<b>FTE</b>	205.50	205.50	208.50	219.50	219.50	210.00	210.00	211.17

## Construction Inspection - 99170

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Eliminating funding for this Subprogram would cause project delays, cost overruns, and substandard work output by contractors. This would affect the safety of the state's roads and bridges.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	K.S.A. 75-5006 et seq.	Mandatory	No	4
Specific	K.S.A. 68-404			
Specific	K.S.A. 68-407 et seq			
Specific	K.S.A. 68-401			

### Agency Goals Supported by Program

**Asset Preservation:** Address risks and maintain assets through investments that provide high value return and make best use of limited funds.

### Program/Subprogram Goals

A. Develop and construct projects that continue to provide a quality state highway network that effectively meets the needs of the traveling public.

### Program/Subprogram History

The Construction Inspection Subprogram develops the specific scope, schedule, and plans for construction and rehabilitation projects. It also provides project management, technical oversight, and coordination of all preconstruction activities for highway project development. Please see the Construction Program page for related history.

Kansas Department of Transportation

Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of let Modernization projects Including safety related projects	A	5	22	17	30	21	20	30	20
2. Number of let Preservation projects not including safety related projects	A	264	286	198	248	272	249	257	252
3. Number of let Expansion/Enhancement projects	A	1	9	4	10	6	18	2	6
4. Percent of Interstate State Highway System miles classified as "Good" * for pavement condition using federal method	A	60.0%	58.0%	57.0%	66.0%	58.0%	59.0%	60.0%	57.7%
5. Percent of the person-miles traveled on the Interstate Highway System that are classified as "Poor" using federal method	A	0.4%	0.6%	0.5%	N/A	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%
6. Percent of Non-Interstate State Highway System Miles classified as "Good" * for pavement condition using federal method	A	58.0%	59.0%	59.0%	57.0%	59.0%	60.0%	61.0%	59.0%
7. Percent of the person-miles traveled on the Non-Interstate Highway System that are classified as "Poor" using federal method	A	0.9%	1.1%	1.1%	N/A	1.2%	1.7%	1.7%	1.1%
8. Benefit/Cost ratio of K-Trans research funding	A	5 to 1	5 to 1	5 to 1	N/A	4 to 1	4 to 1	4 to 1	4.7 to 1

Kansas Department of Transportation

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	33,612,809	33,677,223	33,698,028	38,956,821	33,467,518	39,967,608	41,644,417	33,614,256
Federal Funds	-	22,088	-	-	-	-	-	7,363
<b>Total</b>	\$ 33,612,809	\$ 33,699,311	\$ 33,698,028	\$ 38,956,821	\$33,467,518	\$ 39,967,608	\$ 41,644,417	\$ 33,621,619
<b>FTE</b>	438.70	438.70	406.00	426.00	426.00	413.00	413.00	423.57

## Expansion - 99180

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Projects of this type would not be constructed. Potential loss of federal funding depending on the number of remaining qualifying projects in other categories.

	<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	K.S.A. 75-5001 et seq.	Mandatory	Yes	14
Specific	K.S.A. 68-404			
Specific	K.S.A. 68-407 et seq.			
Specific	K.S.A. 68-401			

### Agency Goals Supported by Program

**Asset Preservation:** Address risks and maintain assets through investments that provide high value return and make best use of limited funds.

### Program/Subprogram Goals

A. Develop and construct projects that continue to provide a quality state highway network that effectively meets the needs of the traveling public.

### Program/Subprogram History

Expansion projects are designed to improve safety, relieve congestion, improve access, and enhance economic development. Please see the Construction Program page for related history.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
* Please see performance measures for Transportation Planning and Construction Inspection	A								

Kansas Department of Transportation

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	15,702,372	64,283,305	184,750,305	351,911,887	356,294,249	994,154,104	264,785,647	201,775,953
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 15,702,372</b>	<b>\$ 64,283,305</b>	<b>\$ 184,750,305</b>	<b>\$ 351,911,887</b>	<b>\$ 356,294,249</b>	<b>\$ 994,154,104</b>	<b>\$ 264,785,647</b>	<b>\$ 201,775,953</b>
<b>FTE</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

## Modernization - 99190

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Projects of this type would not be constructed. Potential loss of federal funding depending on the number of remaining qualifying projects in other categories.

	<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	K.S.A. 75-5006 et seq.	Mandatory	Yes	10
Specific	K.S.A. 68-404			
Specific	K.S.A. 68-407 et seq.			
Specific	K.S.A. 68-401			

### Agency Goals Supported by Program

**Asset Preservation:** Address risks and maintain assets through investments that provide high value return and make best use of limited funds.

### Program/Subprogram Goals

A. Develop and construct projects that continue to provide a quality state highway network that effectively meets the needs of the traveling public.

### Program/Subprogram History

Modernization projects are designed to bring a roadway or intersection up to current design standards. Examples include rehab/replacement of pavement, eliminating steep hills or sharp curves. Modernization also includes associated bridge work, such as widening narrow bridges or replacing obsolete bridges. Please see the Construction Program page for related history.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
* Please see performance measures for Transportation Planning and Construction Inspection	A								

Kansas Department of Transportation

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	14,884,872	83,723,096	185,073,917	177,676,923	151,253,617	107,416,314	280,729,501	140,016,877
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 14,884,872	\$ 83,723,096	\$ 185,073,917	\$ 177,676,923	\$ 151,253,617	\$ 107,416,314	\$ 280,729,501	\$ 140,016,877
<b>FTE</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

## Buildings - 99400

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

There would be no replacement of outdated or damaged buildings, no modernization of buildings to fit current equipment, and no ongoing maintenance for existing facilities. This would lead to inefficient and degraded road maintenance operations.

	<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
General	Kansas Constitution Article II	Mandatory	No	15
Specific	K.S.A. 75-5001 et seq.			
Specific	K.S.A. 68-401			
Specific	K.S.A. 68-404			
Specific	K.S.A. 68-406			

### Agency Goals Supported by Program

**Stewardship:** Continuously improve the quality of the transportation system and surrounding communities through strong partnerships and focused, lower cost and higher value improvements.

### Program/Subprogram Goals

A. Provide the direction, planning, coordination, communication, and administrative support that foster an integrated, multimodal transportation system to meet the needs of Kansas.

### Program/Subprogram History

The Buildings Subprogram develops and maintains the Capital Improvement Building Program. It provides for the maintenance and preservation of existing facilities, allows for the modernization of existing facilities, and construction of new facilities to meet current needs and improve efficiency and effectiveness of operations. Please see the Construction Program page for related history.

Kansas Department of Transportation

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
* Please see performance measures for Regular Maintenance	A								

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	8,579,991	8,797,773	13,210,872	20,977,012	19,524,762	33,237,535	24,495,392	13,844,469
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 8,579,991	\$ 8,797,773	\$ 13,210,872	\$ 20,977,012	\$ 19,524,762	\$ 33,237,535	\$ 24,495,392	\$ 13,844,469
<b>FTE</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

## Local Construction - 99500

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Cities and Counties would lose funding. In addition, federal funding for the State could be jeopardized.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 75-5006 et seq.	Mandatory	Yes	12
Specific K.S.A. 68-404 et seq.			
Specific K.S.A. 68-407			
Specific K.S.A. 68-401			

### Agency Goals Supported by Program

**Asset Preservation:** Address risks and maintain assets through investments that provide high value return and make best use of limited funds.

### Program/Subprogram Goals

A. Assist in providing safe, efficient, and reliable local transportation systems.

### Program/Subprogram History

This Subprogram provides technical and administrative oversight of cities and counties in the utilization of state and federal dollars made available for the development and construction of transportation projects. Please see the Construction Program page for related history.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Number of locally owned bridges in "poor" condition	A	1,242	1,275	1,230	N/A	1,222	1,215	1,215	1,242

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	83,421,508	121,260,430	126,061,158	228,190,868	159,535,834	159,629,001	170,097,533	135,619,141
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 83,421,508</b>	<b>\$ 121,260,430</b>	<b>\$ 126,061,158</b>	<b>\$ 228,190,868</b>	<b>\$ 159,535,834</b>	<b>\$ 159,629,001</b>	<b>\$ 170,097,533</b>	<b>\$ 135,619,141</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

## Preservation - 99600

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The system without ongoing preservation efforts will deteriorate at an ever increasing rate until it must be replaced at a greater cost than preserving what currently exists. Potential loss of federal funding depending on the number of remaining qualifying projects in other categories.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 75-5006 et seq.	Mandatory	Yes	3
Specific K.S.A. 68-404			
Specific K.S.A. 68-407 et seq			
Specific K.S.A. 68-401			

### Agency Goals Supported by Program

**Asset Preservation:** Address risks and maintain assets through investments that provide high value return and make best use of limited funds.

### Program/Subprogram Goals

A. Preserve the State Highway System as-built or in an improved condition providing safe and reliable highway facilities.

### Program/Subprogram History

This Subprogram preserves the public investment in the State transportation system by maintaining the components, as near as possible, in their as-built condition. Please see the Construction Program page for related history.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Percent of State Highway System miles resurfaced	A	1780.0%	20.1%	17.1%	19.1%	19.0%	17.0%	17.0%	18.7%
Number of miles resurfaced	A	1,662	1,885	1,600	1,788	1,821	1,586	1,585	1,769
Number of set-aside bridges and culverts repaired and repainted	A	71	36	38	43	42	69	44	39

Kansas Department of Transportation

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	340,070,515	440,861,841	515,490,793	504,290,731	618,283,740	602,637,207	625,775,973	524,878,791
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$340,070,515	\$440,861,841	\$515,490,793	\$504,290,731	\$618,283,740	\$602,637,207	\$625,775,973	\$524,878,791
<b>FTE</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Administration program includes the activities of the Secretary of Corrections and other administrative and support personnel responsible for the operation, management, and oversight of the agency. Failure to fund would result in no leadership, oversight, or HR, fiscal, public information, contract management, and legal support for correctional facilities, parole services, juvenile services, and community corrections.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General    KSA 75-5201; 75-5204; 75-5205; 75-5251; 75- 5257; 75-7001; 75-7057	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To provide the leadership, support, and oversight necessary for the correctional system to meets its objectives.
- B. To provide the administrative and staff services required for operation of the Department of Corrections Central Office.

### Program History

The 1973 Penal Reform Act established the Department of Corrections and consolidated all penal institutions under the direction of the Secretary of Corrections. This act also mandated that the purpose of the agency is provide for the proper care and rehabilitation of individuals placed in the custody of the Secretary. Prior to the establishment of the Department of Corrections, management and oversight of the correctional facilities resided with the Board of Administration and later the Board of Penal Institutions from 1861 to 1957. On July 1, 1957, legislation placed this responsibility with the Director of Penal Institutions, where it resided until these duties transitioned to the Department.

### Performance Measures

Output Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of Internal Management Policies and Procedures (IMPP) maintained.	A	Not Reported	334	334	333	325	313	313	331
2. Number of IMPPs reviewed.	A	Not Reported	11	16	89	115	132	100	47
3. Number of IMPPs revised.	A	Not Reported	11	16	89	114	132	100	47
4. Number of general orders	A	Not Reported	641	619	711	215	664	656	492
5. Budget submitted by September	B	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	

Department of Corrections

6. Amount of interest paid for late vendor payments.	B								
		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 4,556,514	\$ 4,377,661	\$ 4,877,417	\$ 4,877,417	\$ 4,606,441	\$ 5,178,345	5,152,675	\$ 4,620,506
Non-SGF State Funds	3,010	512,866	737,056	737,056	32,155	236,004	233,448	427,359
Federal Funds	1,550	438	554	554	959			650
<b>Total</b>	\$ 4,561,074	\$ 4,890,965	\$ 5,615,027	\$ 5,615,027	\$ 4,639,555	\$ 5,414,349	\$ 5,386,123	\$ 5,048,516
<b>FTE</b>	43.6	55.6	53.6	58.6	58.6	57.1	57.1	55.9

## Evasions, Apprehensions, and Investigations

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Enforcements, Apprehensions, & Investigations (EAI) is responsible for conducting investigations, apprehending parole absconders and escapees, and intelligence gathering and analysis. Not funding EAI would place responsibility for apprehending parole absconders and escapees with local law enforcement and eliminate investigative and intelligence capabilities necessary to interdict contraband, monitor gang activity, conduct investigations, among other activities. The director, deputy director, and field agents and their operating expenditures are reported in the Central Office budget, while facility agents are reported in individual facility budgets.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General	None	No	2

### Program Goals

A. None

### Program History

EAI had previously been incorporated in the Community & Field Services program. This program was separated from Community & Field Services starting in FY 2018 to separate costs associated with EAI activities separate from parole services. EAI was originally established to provide a resource to detain parole absconders for the Department; prior to this KDOC relied on local law enforcement, which would oftentimes result in resource strains being placed on those jurisdictions. Oversight of facility investigators was later moved under the EAI director to provide for more consistency and improve coordination across the KDOC system.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
None	None								
Output Measures									
None									

Department of Corrections

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,209,374	\$ 1,024,718	\$ 1,002,666	\$ 910,378	\$ 1,004,369	\$ 1,191,286	\$ 937,065	\$ 1,010,584
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	110,260	-	1,282	-	-	37,181
Federal Funds	155,569	102,080	68,705	129,038	105,963	140,886	141,416	92,249
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,364,943	\$ 1,126,798	\$ 1,181,631	\$ 1,039,416	\$ 1,111,614	\$ 1,332,172	\$ 1,078,481	\$ 1,140,014
<b>FTE</b>	13.0	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0	13.0	13.0	14.0

## Information Technology

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Information Technology program is responsible for planning, operation, and support of all information technology functions including telecommunications. Included in this program are IT support staff for central office and parole (facility techs are in the facility budgets), software licensing, maintenance agreements, support for the agency's offender management information systems, Office of Information Technology fees (Desktop as Service, Data Center as a Service, Office 365, etc.), telecommunications costs, and other expense necessary to operate the Department's IT and communications infrastructure.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General	None	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

A. None

### Program History

None

### Performance Measures

Output Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Amount of time for restoration of services in the event of a failure (hours)		Not Reported	12	12	6	12	10	8	12

Department of Corrections

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 4,835,374	\$ 4,751,879	\$ 8,482,829	\$ 10,414,504	\$ 10,422,817	\$ 10,554,525	\$ 9,388,286	\$ 7,885,842
Non-SGF State Funds	336,642	3,216,283	1,444,325	3,405,000	19,761,950	2,992,837	450,000	8,140,853
Federal Funds	-	-	-	2,000,000	2,040,802	1,652,537	-	680,267
<b>Total</b>	\$ 5,172,016	\$ 7,968,162	\$ 9,927,154	\$ 15,819,504	\$ 32,225,569	\$ 15,199,899	\$ 9,838,286	\$ 16,706,962
<b>FTE</b>	40.0	35.0	36.0	35.0	35.0	33.5	33.5	35.3

## Community & Field Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Community & Field Services Division is responsible for community-based supervision of offenders who have been released from correctional facilities on parole, post-release supervision or conditional release, but who have not been discharged from their sentence. The Community & Field Services Division also includes the Interstate Compact Unit that is responsible for regulating the transfer and movement between states of adult parole and probation offenders under community supervision. Offenders who transfer to Kansas from other states are also supervised by this program. The purpose of post-incarceration supervision is to contribute to public safety and to assist offenders to successfully reintegrate into the community. If eliminated, approximately 5,300 offenders in the community would no longer be supervised. It is expected that some of these offenders will return to prison as a result of the commission of a new crime.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific    KSA 75-5204, 75-5214, 75-5216, 75-5217, 76- 3001 through 76-3003	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Provide offender supervision commensurate with the assessed risk level.
- B. Enhance public safety by increasing offender pro-social behavior.

### Program History

Parole services was established in the 1973 Penal Reform Act, which established the Department of Corrections. The act requires the Secretary to appoint parole officers in a number sufficient to administer the provisions of the act. Specifically, parole officers are required to monitor the conduct of each person under post-release supervision and work to bring about improving in the conduct of each person under supervision and may propose the revocation for violation(s) of the conditions of release. The State of Kansas became a member of the Interstate Corrections Compact with the pass of the 1972 Interstate Corrections Compact Act. The Interstate Corrections Compact governs the transfer and supervision of incarcerated individuals and persons on post-release supervision between member states.

### Performance Measures

Output Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of offenders under parole supervision in Kansas on June 30th	A, B	5,741	6,318	5,653	5,790	5,476	5,735	5,950	5,816

Department of Corrections

2. Number of offenders under parole supervision returned to prison with new sentences for felony offenses	A, B								
		182	131	134	140	101	110	120	122

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 12,340,034	\$ 11,917,220	\$ 12,019,496	\$ 12,494,474	\$ 12,041,773	\$ 13,322,761	\$ 12,797,617	\$ 11,992,830
Non-SGF State Funds	894,818	660,702	742,422	799,500	683,755	776,785	1,208,000	695,626
Federal Funds	-	-	229	-	34,114	-	-	11,448
<b>Total</b>	\$ 13,234,852	\$ 12,577,922	\$ 12,762,147	\$ 13,293,974	\$ 12,759,642	\$ 14,099,546	\$ 14,005,617	\$ 12,699,904
<b>FTE</b>	156.0	155.0	155.0	155.0	155.0	153.0	153.0	155.0

## Community Corrections

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Community Corrections program provides funding for county-operated community corrections programs, to include probation supervision, the operation of adult residential centers in Johnson and Sedgwick Counties, and behavioral health programs. Also included in this program are KDOC staff responsible for providing technical assistance and oversight of the community corrections program. Elimination of community corrections would result in the end of supervision of nearly 9,000 offenders annually. With no other sentencing option, it is likely that many of these individuals will be sentenced to prison.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific KSA 75-5290 et seq, 75-52,111, 75-52,112	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To increase the successful completion rate by 3% annually until a 75% successful completion rate has been achieved and maintained.
- B. Promote probationer accountability and responsibility to the community and to their victims.

### Program History

The Community Corrections Act of 1979 authorizes the development and implementation of correctional programs, services and sanctions that are administered in the community in lieu of prison. KDOC provides state funds to counties operating a community corrections program. The program's premise is that selected probationers can be effectively supervised in the community. The supervision of probationers is accomplished through assessment, development of individualized case plans, rehabilitation and treatment services, monitoring, and crisis intervention. Community corrections was mandated statewide in 1989. Legislation in 2000 specified the population to be supervised, which was further clarified in 2015 to apply the act to offenders assessed as moderate to very high risk through the use of a standardized risk assessment tool. An alternative drug sentencing was established in 2003. In 2013 the Justice Reinvestment Act extended judges the option of 120-day or 180-day prison sentences in lieu of full revocation and the option for local jail sanctions. In 2019 the Justice Reinvestment Act was amended to remove the 120 and 180 day prison sanctions for offenses committed on or after July 1, 2019. Expenditures for 3rd time DUI treatment services were moved from the Community Corrections program to the Reentry & Offender Programs program in FY 2020.

### Performance Measures

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>Goal</u>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
------------------------	-------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------	---------------------	---------------------	--------------------

Department of Corrections

1. To increase the number of probationers who successfully complete their sentence under community corrections supervision and are not revoked to prison.	A								
		4,230	4,373	3,554	3,554	3,554	3,554	3,554	3,827
2. To decrease the number of probationers who are revoked and sent to prison.	A								
		1,636	1,806	1,077	1,077	1,077	1,077	1,077	1,320
3. Increase the amount of victim restitution paid by probationers under community corrections supervision on an annual basis. **									
		\$ 611,688	\$ 506,584	\$ 665,593	\$ 678,970	\$ 248,833	\$ 262,275	\$ 274,338	\$ 473,670

\*Calculation is delayed due to staff resources being diverted to Athena Phase 1. Projected cannot be determined until FY 21 is calculated.

\*\*FY 21 Total Restitution paid as of 4/30/21; end of fiscal year totals not available due to change in KDOC case management system.

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 19,985,391	\$ 20,016,680	\$ 20,217,835	\$ 22,900,162	\$ 21,102,257	\$ 26,038,870	\$ 26,033,430	\$ 20,445,591
Non-SGF State Funds	3,403,180	1,700,000	1,700,000	2,026,123	2,026,123	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,808,708
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 23,388,571</b>	<b>\$ 21,716,680</b>	<b>\$ 21,917,835</b>	<b>\$ 24,926,285</b>	<b>\$ 23,128,380</b>	<b>\$ 27,738,870</b>	<b>\$ 27,733,430</b>	<b>\$ 22,254,298</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>

## Reentry & Offender Programs

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

KDOC provides an array of recidivism reducing and reentry programs and services, including but not limited to, education, substance abuse programming, sex offender treatment, transitional housing, mentoring, mental health services, cognitive skills building, workforce development, and discharge planning. At admission, residents are assessed for risk and need levels and area and a plan for case management and programming is developed to work with residents to reduce their risk of returning to prison after release. As release approaches, reentry plans are developed, again focusing on areas of risk and need, and a stable housing plan, to prepare the resident for release. After release, treatment, skills-building work, and other aftercare and relapse prevention continues, to support residents making successful transitions to the community, to become employed, housed, reintegrated to families when appropriate, and to become law-abiding citizens. The ultimate measure of the success of these programs and services is recidivism. Residents released from 1999-2002 had a 55.1% recidivism rate after 36 months. Residents released from 2004-2007 had a recidivism rate of 42.9% after 36 months. Residents released in 2017 had a 32% recidivism rate after 36 months. Thus, through these programs, services, and strategies, KDOC has reduced recidivism rates by 23%. Elimination of these programs would result in higher recidivism rates and an increase in prison admissions.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5201, 75-5210, 75-5210a, 75-5211, 8- 1567	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Assess residents for risk and need, using validated instruments.
- B. Develop case plans with residents that target risk/need areas.
- C. Enroll residents in evidence-based cognitive-behavioral skills-building classes and programs (e.g., Thinking for a Change, Job Readiness, Improved Family Relations/Parenting, Tenant Responsibility, Substance Abuse Program, Sex Offender Program, etc.).
- D. Increase successful program completions through readiness, responsivity, motivational enhancements, and providing programs in a dose that fits risk level (300+ hours for high risk, lower for moderate and low).
- E. Increase pro-social thinking through staff modeling, mentors, visits during incarceration and volunteer-led activities.
- F. Provide quality release planning services that addresses housing, connections to treatment, identification (driver's license), financial obligations, pending detainers (warrants/legal matters), family needs, and employment.
- G. Increase employability and employment opportunities for resident.
- H. Increase access to safe and affordable housing and tenant-ability of residents.
- I. Work closely with treatment providers to coordinate treatment with supervision and help residents remain connected to treatment (mental health, substance abuse).

### Program History

The Penal Reform Act of 1973 charged the Department of Corrections with providing rehabilitative services so residents may return to the community with "improved work habits, education, mental and physical health and attitudes necessary to become and remain useful and self-reliant citizens. Individual programs have been implemented over time as the needs of the population changes and research on effective programming continues to grow. Expenditures for 3rd time DUI treatment services were moved from the Community Corrections program to the Reentry & Offender Programs program in FY 2020.

### Performance Measures

<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. GED completions	A, B, C, D, G	362	302	275	360	302	350	400	293
2. College courses completed	A, B, C, D, G	78	59	118	309	203	300	350	127
3. Title I/Special Education Completions	A, B, C, D, G	37	29	42	60	187	200	225	86
4. ServeSafe Completions	A, B, C, D, G	92	92	49	51	3	10	10	48
5. KS WorkReady Certificate	A, B, C, D, G	421	264	173	208	28	30	30	155
6. NCCER Basic completions	A, B, C, D, G	99	98	75	100	201	300	400	125
7. Vocational training	A, B, C, D, G	434	467	413	409	50	50	50	310
8. Pre-release	A, B, C, D, G	127	154	77	108	98	100	100	110
9. LCF BIB Programs	A, B, C, D	55	37	5	7	52	50	50	31
10. Work Release	A, B, C, D, G	283	197	19	43	104	150	150	107

Department of Corrections

11. Substance abuse program	A, B, C, D	1,024	969	601	765	817	1,000	1,200	796
12. Substance abuse assessments/care coordination	A, B, C, D	706	721	360	428	334	400	450	472
13. Sex offender treatment completions	A, B, C, D	244	87	147	153	239	350	400	158
14. Cognitive skills building program	A, B, C, D	310	311	213	255	249	250	275	258
15. Cognitive readiness program	A, B, C, D	80	253	56	100	47	50	50	119
16. Moving on program	A, B, C, D	69	91	68	72	90	80	80	83
17. Family program	A, B, C, D	357	360	145	180	222	250	250	242
18. Job readiness program	A, B, C, D, G	621	655	369	405	454	450	450	493
19. Workforce support and career success program	A, B, C, D, G	104	96	19	40	41	50	50	52
20. Batterers intervention program	A, B, C, D	69	25	7	16	8	10	10	13
21. Dialectical behavioral therapy program	A, B, C, D	43	33	35	42	37	40	40	35
22. Discharge planning services provided	I	1,049	446	885	885	1,090	1,090	1,090	807
23. Release plan completed	F	4,704	4,550	4,550	4,550	3,333	3,333	3,333	4,144

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 4,836,028	\$ 5,995,653	\$ 6,109,156	\$ 7,156,485	\$ 7,142,826	\$ 9,015,583	\$ 8,907,146	\$ 6,415,878
Non-SGF State Funds	6,592,060	6,937,335	5,844,036	6,623,670	7,982,422	6,421,354	7,143,696	6,921,264
Federal Funds	214,023	225,910	380,000	309,585	2,135,187	5,811,937	806,655	913,699
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 11,642,111</b>	<b>\$ 13,158,898</b>	<b>\$ 12,333,192</b>	<b>\$ 14,089,740</b>	<b>\$ 17,260,435</b>	<b>\$ 21,248,874</b>	<b>\$ 16,857,497</b>	<b>\$ 14,250,842</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>71.0</b>	<b>105.0</b>	<b>109.0</b>	<b>108.0</b>	<b>108.0</b>	<b>129.0</b>	<b>129.0</b>	<b>107.3</b>

## Inmate Health Care

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The United States Supreme Court, in *Estelle vs. Gamble* (429 US 97), ruled that a prison inmate has the right, under the Eighth Amendment's prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment, to expect that he or she will receive health care of a quality and quantity that is not deliberately indifferent to the inmate's medical needs.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 75-5201, 75-5210, 75-5220, 75-5248; 75- 5249, 429 US 97	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

- A. Provide for the delivery of appropriate medical care services in accordance with accreditation requirements of NCCHC, ACA, and within the clinical guidelines of AAFP and Medicaid.
- B. Provide for the delivery of appropriate dental care services in accordance with accreditation requirements of NCCHC and ACA. Care is also provided within the clinical guidelines of American Dental Association rules and regulations as well as Medicaid rules on dental services.
- C.

### Program History

The Penal Reform Act of 1973 specifically established requirement that the Department employ a chief physician at each correctional facility to direct the operation and management of medical services and to supervise and coordinate the care of residents within the correctional facility. Health care services were privatized in 1988 when the Department awarded a contract for comprehensive medical and mental health services to Correctional Medical Systems, Inc. The contract was rebid in 1991 and awarded to Prison Health Solutions (PHS). PHS held the contract until October 2003, when the contract was assigned to Correct Care Solutions (CCS) after it was determined PHS was unable to meet the terms of the contract. CCS was awarded the contract following a rebid in 2005. In 2013, the Juvenile Justice Authority (JJA) was abolished and the functions and duties of JJA were transferred to KDOC. The contract was put back out for competitive bid later that year and health care services at the juvenile correctional facilities were incorporated into the request for proposals. The contract was ultimately awarded to Corizon, who took over health care services at all adult and juvenile facilities on January 1, 2014. The contract was put back out to bid in 2019 and as a result of the competitive bid process, the contract was awarded to Centurion effective July 1, 2020. Starting in 1995, KDOC began contracting for clinical oversight and compliance monitoring. This contract is currently held by the University of Kansas Medical Center.

Department of Corrections

**Performance Measures**

<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Total Vacancies as of June 30	A, B, C	62.7	74.4	87.5	45.0	48.1	50.0	50.0	70.0
2. Percent of Authorized FTE Vacant as of June 30	A, B, C	15.3%	15.3%	17.3%	10.0%	10.7%	11.0%	11.0%	14.4%
3. Number of inmates treated for hepatitis C	A	110	467	137	301	228	323	323	277
4. Number of suicides	C	3	4	2	3	2	1	0	3

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 72,355,932	\$ 75,963,647	\$ 81,841,684	\$ 85,466,587	\$ 81,976,495	\$ 87,286,111	\$ 87,081,185	\$ 79,927,275
Non-SGF State Funds	259,844	883,156		-	-	302,671	457,724	441,578
Federal Funds	1,122,462	673,634	1,649,724	657,220	726,923	657,220	1,157,220	1,016,760
<b>Total</b>	\$ 73,738,238	\$ 77,520,437	\$ 83,491,408	\$ 86,123,807	\$ 82,703,418	\$ 88,246,002	\$ 88,696,129	\$ 81,238,421
<b>FTE</b>	4.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	20.0	2.7

## Victim Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Statute requires victim notification of offender status, to include release, escape, expiration of sentence, clemency application, and death, among others. Victim services also provides a liaison program, restorative justice programs, and batterer intervention programs. Loss of funding for victim services would prevent the Department from providing required notification services and result in the loss of federal funds for other victim programs.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 22-3727	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

- A. Serve as a liaison and service provider for crime victims  
 B. Provide quality, victim-centered batterer intervention program (BIP) services  
 C.

### Program History

--

### Performance Measures

Output Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of victims who receive services	A	10826	11335	10242	10500	10047	10500	11000	10541
2. Number of victims who registered for services	A	38065	40125	40978	3250	41874	42000	42500	40992
3. Number of victims who were first-time registrants	A	3563	3535	3057	3250	3170	3250	3500	3254
4. Number of victim notification letters sent.	A	15759	18955	15874	16000	15832	16000	16000	16887
5. Number of offenders assessed for BIP.	B	203	185	142	175	128	150	175	152
6. Number of participants served	B	406	430	353	375	161	175	225	315

Department of Corrections

7 Number of participants completing group.	B	38	33	34	40	45	50	55	37
8. Number of victims served.	B	285	306	322	350	509	500	500	379

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 900,113	\$ 878,188	\$ 850,501	\$ 850,501	\$ 921,371	\$ 1,014,583	\$ 982,203	\$ 883,353
Non-SGF State Funds	37,055	98,190	-	956,115	921,408	958,926	966,988	339,866
Federal Funds	601,253	735,801	956,115					845,958
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,538,421	\$ 1,712,179	\$ 1,806,616	\$ 1,806,616	\$ 1,842,779	\$ 1,973,509	\$ 1,949,191	\$ 1,787,191
<b>FTE</b>	23.0	24.0	29.0	29.0	29.0	29.0	29.0	27.3

## Prisoner Review Board

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Functions outlined in statute currently performed by Prisoner Review Board would no longer be performed. This includes, but is not limited to, decisions pertaining to parole revocations, granting parole for off-grid crimes or revocation of post-release supervision, functional incapacitation releases, and review of clemency applications.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific KSA 75-52,153, 22-3701 et seq	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. None  
B.  
C.

### Program History

The 1885 Legislature created the three-member Board of Pardons, whose responsibilities were to review pardon or commutation applications and report their recommendations to the Governor. In 1901 additional early release authority was granted to the Governor with the requirement that releases could only be granted if an adequate amount of time had been served, the inmate could be released without endangering the community, and the inmate could find suitable employment. Conditions of release would be applied, and the release could be revoked if those conditions were not met. In 1903 the Legislature created the Prison Board that consisted of the Board of Pardons and warden of the Kansas State Penitentiary. In 1957 the Prison Board was replaced with Board of Probation and Parole. This five-member panel was appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate. Membership had to include an attorney, a minister, a businessman, and a farmer, and no more than three members could be of the same political party. The board was reduced to three members in 1961. By this time the Board had sole authority to grant or deny parole, while the Governor retained the power to grant pardons and commutations. The Board also had the responsibility of supervising those offenders placed on parole. The supervision requirement changed in 1974 when the Board was replaced with the Kansas Adult Authority and membership increased to five. The board members became full-time state employees in 1979, and in 1983 the board was reduced to three members. In 1986 the name was changed to the Kansas Parole Board. In 2011, Executive Reorganization Order 34 the Board was abolished and the duties and responsibilities of the Kansas Parole Board were transferred to the Prisoner Review Board within the Department of Corrections.

Department of Corrections

**Performance Measures**

<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of meetings attended by the PRB		218	250	275	275	275	275	275	267

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 471,681	\$ 4,977,334	\$ 494,068	\$ 497,106	\$ 504,533	\$ 513,142	\$ 516,407	\$ 1,991,978
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 471,681	\$ 4,977,334	\$ 494,068	\$ 497,106	\$ 504,533	\$ 513,142	\$ -	\$ 1,991,978
<b>FTE</b>	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0

## Juvenile Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Expenditures in this program are for Central Office staff who provide technical assistance, training, and oversight of the juvenile justice system in Kansas. Youth sentenced as juvenile offenders and supervised in the community are done so by community supervision officers funded through grants issued by KDOC to counties. Also funded through this grant process are intake and assessment centers, which are utilized by local law enforcement in suspected juvenile offender or child in need of care cases, and grant programs from the Evidence-Based Programs fund. Juvenile Services also contracts with a variety of residential and foster care providers for placement alternatives when staying at home is not in the best interest of youth or the family. Additionally, programs designed to provide youth and their families the resources and skills to address behavior and further escalation into the criminal justice system are provided through the Evidence-Based Programs fund as well other SGF and special revenue funds. Juvenile Services also oversees the Kansas Juvenile Correctional Complex. Elimination of this program eliminates all funding related to the supervision, treatment, and programming of juvenile offenders.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>		<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	KSA 75-7001 et seq., 76-52,160, 75-52,162, 75-52,163, 75-52,164	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Effective community-based juvenile justice programs are available to all Kansas youth and their families.

### Program History

The Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 1996 consolidated juvenile justice functions that had previously been housed in the Department of Social & Rehabilitative Services, the Judicial Branch, and the Department of Corrections into the Juvenile Justice Authority (JJA). Specific duties and responsibilities of JJA included the operation of the juvenile correctional facilities, evaluation of the effectiveness of juvenile offender rehabilitation efforts, contracting with out-of-home placement providers, providing operating grants, technical assistance, and oversight to community-based juvenile justice agencies, establishing and utilizing a diagnostic evaluation for all juvenile offenders, and monitoring placement trends and minority confinement. In 1998 legislation was passed that provided district court judges more discretion in determining the system under which a dually adjudicated youth would be handled--either as a child in need of care or as a juvenile offender. Legislation passed during the 1999 Session mandated the use of a sentencing placement matrix when a youth is sentenced to a term of incarceration in a juvenile correctional facility. The matrix went into effect on July 1, 1999 and granted authority the courts the authority to determine the length of incarceration in a juvenile correctional facility as well as the term of aftercare or conditional release supervision. Additionally, permanency hearings were implemented for juvenile offenders to reduce the amount of time juveniles spend in foster care by moving them toward a permanent family arrangement. The reforms brought about by the Juvenile Justice Reform Act resulted in a significant decline in the juvenile correctional facility population. This led the closure of facilities in Atchison and Beloit in 2008 and 2009, respectively. Executive Reorganization Order 42 abolished JJA and all duties and responsibilities of the agency were transferred to KDOC effective July 1, 2013. In 2016, the Legislature passed SB 367 which reinvests funds previously allocated for juvenile correctional facility and group home placements into evidence-based programs and practices designed to prevent further offending and youth going deeper into the criminal justice system. Shortly after the passage of SB 367, KDOC closed the Larned Juvenile Correctional Facility.

Department of Corrections

Performance Measures

<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of technical assistance teleconferences provided for juvenile intake & assessment	A	5	8	9	10	11	11	11	9
2. Number of community supervision agency on-site visits	A	58	27	0	62	26	78	78	18
3. Number of new staff trained in Effective Practices in Correctional Supervision	A	107	22	23	40	46	55	55	30
4. Number of residential provider site visits conducted	A	5	0	4	5	0	3	3	1
5. Number of judicial districts participating in JDAI	A	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
6. Number of judicial districts with evidence-based programs	A	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 24,201,575	\$ 29,821,854	\$ 27,199,804	\$ 50,452,301	\$ 21,178,859	\$ 45,306,175	\$ 63,217,054	\$ 26,066,839
Non-SGF State Funds	1,485,407	1,397,926	1,154,579	13,892,175	8,992,350	3,577,490	3,577,490	3,848,285
Federal Funds	1,938,487	868,867	1,230,178	613,839	765,021	545,990	547,433	954,689
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 27,625,469</b>	<b>\$ 32,088,647</b>	<b>\$ 29,584,561</b>	<b>\$ 64,958,315</b>	<b>\$ 30,936,230</b>	<b>\$ 49,429,655</b>	<b>\$ 67,341,977</b>	<b>\$ 30,869,813</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>28.4</b>	<b>22.4</b>	<b>24.5</b>	<b>24.5</b>	<b>24.5</b>	<b>24.5</b>	<b>24.5</b>	<b>23.8</b>

## Facilities Management

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This program provides oversight of the adult correctional facilities, reviews and responds to resident grievances, conducts security audits and training, manages the resident security classification process and determines housing assignments, calculates sentences, manages the five-year capital improvements plan, and responds to constituent inquiries. Also included in this program are lease payments for the Lansing Correctional Facility. Elimination of funding would remove the leadership and centralized functions necessary to operate the Kansas correctional system.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 75-5201; 75-5204; 75-5205; 75-5218; 75- 5219; 75-5220; 75- 5221; 75-5223; 75-5224; 75-5226; 75-5229; 75- 5233; 75-5246; 75-5247; 75-5247a; 75-5248 75- 5250; 75-5251	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Provide the leadership, support, and oversight necessary for safe operation of the correctional facilities.

### Program History

The functions contained in the Facilities Management program were previously included in the Administration program. These functions were established as a separate program in 2018. Starting in FY 2021, food service contract expenditures were moved out of this program and into the food service program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of security audits conducted	A	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
2. Number of fire/safety inspections conducted	A	9	7	15	15	18	18	18	13

### Funding

Department of Corrections

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 21,547,697	\$ 25,842,560	\$ 18,854,679	\$ 25,989,656	\$ 19,828,356	\$ 21,981,044	\$ 17,704,005	\$ 21,508,532
Non-SGF State Funds	1,654,492	2,721,114	1,945,472	5,760	123,114	92,383	63,860	1,596,567
Federal Funds	18,888	815,773	20,581	18,346,106	15,564,012	39,195	88,204	5,466,789
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 23,221,077</b>	<b>\$ 29,379,447</b>	<b>\$ 20,820,732</b>	<b>\$ 44,341,522</b>	<b>\$ 35,515,482</b>	<b>\$ 22,112,622</b>	<b>\$ 17,856,069</b>	<b>\$ 28,571,887</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>19.8</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>19.7</b>

## Food Service

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This program was established to track food service contract expenditures separate from the Facilities Management program. Eliminating this program would eliminate funding required to feed the resident population.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General 75-5210	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Provide appetizing meals to the inmate population which meets nutritional and daily caloric intake requirements as well as special diets necessary to meet individual medical and religious needs.

### Program History

None

### Performance Measures

Output Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Number of kitchen inspections conducted	A	Not tracked	18	19	30	18	18	18	18
2. Number of third-party dietician menu reviews conducted	A	Not tracked	8	4	8	8	8	8	7
3. Number of food service related grievances filed	A	78	62	55	55	89	75	75	69

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,624,039	\$ 15,376,246	\$ 16,357,164	\$ 15,376,246	\$ 15,376,246	\$ 10,327,068
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	354,970	943,578	943,578	1,215,392	1,452,841	432,849
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,979,009	\$ 16,319,824	\$ 17,300,742	\$ 16,591,638	\$ 16,829,087	\$ 10,759,917
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Debt Service

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This program was established solely for the purpose of recording interest and principle payments for separate from the operating budget.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

A. None; this program is for budgetary and accounting purposes only.

### Program History

--

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
None									
Output Measures									
None									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 515,433	\$ 517,328	\$ -		\$ 1,726,147	\$ 3,346,286	\$ 2,704,498	\$ 747,825
Non-SGF State Funds	4,621,602	4,447,276	-					2,223,638
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 5,137,035</b>	<b>\$ 4,964,604</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,726,147</b>	<b>\$ 3,346,286</b>	<b>\$ 2,704,498</b>	<b>\$ 2,230,250</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## Capital Improvements

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The capital improvement program is used solely for budgeting and recording expenditures related to rehabilitation and repair projects as well as new construction and renovation projects. Funds are transferred to the facility as projects are approved. Larger projects are managed at the KDOC Central Office and expenditures are recorded in this program. Eliminating this program would prohibit the Department from making repairs, upgrades, and improvements to the facilities.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5210, 75-52,125	Discretionary	No	2

### Program Goals

A. None; this program is for budgetary and accounting purposes only.

### Program History

--

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
None									
<i>Output Measures</i>									
None									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ 4,275	\$ -	\$ 6,614,588	\$ 4,238,526	\$ 508,865		\$ 1,414,267
Non-SGF State Funds	334,350	664,881	50,755	8,954,631	6,077,270	6,309,797	5,603,274	2,264,302
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 334,350	\$ 669,156	\$ 50,755	\$ 15,569,219	\$ 10,315,796	\$ 6,818,662	\$ 5,603,274	\$ 3,678,569
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Administration program provides for the overall management and operational control of the facility. This program includes the warden, human resources, mailroom, policy and compliance, staff development, and fiscal. Not funding this program would eliminate the leadership and support functions necessary to operate the facility.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General	KSA 75-5201, 75-5202, 75-5206, 75-5246, 75- 5252, 75-5253, 75-5256, 75-52,137	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Operate and maintain a personnel system in accordance with state and departmental regulations, ensuring that positions are classified appropriately and that vacant positions are filled in a timely manner.
- B. Operate programs for existing and new employees that provide the training required by state law and departmental regulations.
- C.

### Program History

As a result of a 1988 class action lawsuit challenging prison conditions, former Governor Hayden recommended and the 1989 Legislature authorized the construction of the El Dorado Correctional Facility. The facility was originally built at a cost of \$58 million dollars with a capacity of 640 offenders. In 1992, the honor camps at El Dorado and Toronto were merged with the Central Unit and renamed the El Dorado - North Unit and El Dorado - East Unit, respectively. A medium custody dormitory was then added to the Central Unit in 1995, creating an additional 115 beds. In 2001, two additional cell houses brought on-line and the reception and diagnostic unit was relocated from Topeka to El Dorado. In 2009, budgetary constraints led to the decision to close the North and East Units. To accommodate the continued growth in the resident population, the former conservation camp at Oswego was reopened in 2013 and designated as the El Dorado - Southeast Unit. During FY 2017, to better serve a growing mental health population, the mental health program at Larned was moved to El Dorado. The following year, the Individualized Reintegration Unit (IRU) was established, consisting of a single-cell housing unit where all services are provided at the unit, and double-cell housing unit where residents slowly reintegrate back into population by accessing services outside the unit. In 2021, U-dorm was temporarily closed as a result of a decline in the resident population and increase in vacancies.

El Dorado Correctional Facility

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Turnover Rates - Uniformed	A	36.5%	29.9%	34.0%	34.0%	33.1%	30.0%	30.0%	32.3%
2. Turnover Rates - Non-Uniformed	A	16.5%	15.8%	18.9%	18.9%	38.2%	34.0%	34.0%	24.3%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Average Daily Population		2,005	1,927	1,650	1,732	1,471	1,319	1,256	1,683
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 2,039,857	\$2,142,466	\$ 1,961,361	\$ 1,751,672	\$ 1,995,218	\$1,794,611	\$1,816,728	\$ 2,033,015
Non-SGF State Funds	1,087	-	(11)		(44)			(18)
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 2,040,944	\$2,142,466	\$ 1,961,350	\$ 1,751,672	\$ 1,995,174	\$1,794,611	\$1,816,728	\$ 2,032,997
<b>FTE</b>	25.0	26.0	28.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	26.3

## Security

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Security program include salaries and wages for all uniformed security officers and operating expenses, such as clothing, drug testing, and security equipment. This program is essential to operating the facility.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5201, 75-5202, 75-5206, 75-5246, 75-5252, 75-5253, 75-5256, 75-5206, 75-52,137	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To maintain an effective posture of physical/perimeter security as measured by the KDOC Security Inspection and accreditation audits.
- B. To effectively control unsanctioned prison groups in the prison population through proper identification, tracking, intelligence gathering techniques, and management strategies.
- C. To maintain a safe environment for incarcerated offenders.

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of inmates involved in escape by facility type	A								
Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Number of escape events and number of inmates involved by security custody level	A								
Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Number of apprehensions	A								
Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

El Dorado Correctional Facility

4. Number of validated security threat group members as identified.	B	400	247	209	240	227	230	230	227.67
5. Number of gang related activities/disruptions based on incident reports and facility activity reports.	B	96	620	221	300	24	26	26	288.33
6. Number of inmate-on-inmate assaults/batteries by custody level (injury/non-injury).	C								
Minimum		0/5	2/0	5/0	3/0	0/1	3/0	3/0	3/0
Medium		0/14	4/0	6/0	5/1	9/0	5/1	5/1	5/0
Maximum		1/23	18/2	15/2	16/2	42/3	16/2	16/2	17/2
Special Management		0/18	22/1	8/1	12/2	33/2	12/2	12/2	23/2
RDU		0/2	1/0	0/0	1/1	3/0	1/1	1/1	1/1
7. Number of inmate-on-staff batteries by custody level, which have been referred for criminal prosecution (injury/non-injury).	C								
Minimum		0/1	1/0	1/0	1/1	2/0	1/1	1/1	1/1
Medium		9/0	13/0	14/7	13/0	10/0	13/0	13/0	13/0
Maximum		59/4	45/1	55/4	50/2	129/10	50/2	50/2	54/2
Special Management		43/1	112/0	124/4	118/2	120/6	118/2	118/2	107/2
RDU		0/0	0/0	2/0	2/1	3/0	2/1	2/1	2/1
8. Number of disruptive events	C	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. Number of substantiated inmate-on-inmate sexual assaults	C	0	19	1	2	2	2	2	7.33
10. Number of substantiated staff-on-inmate sexual assaults	C	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 18,575,719	\$20,750,738	\$12,864,817	\$19,899,161	\$19,028,555	\$24,376,587	\$24,495,173	\$ 17,548,037
Non-SGF State Funds	(126)	(58)	18,628	42,302	(191)			6,126
Federal Funds	-	858	(858)			(2)		-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 18,575,593	\$20,751,538	\$12,882,587	\$19,941,463	\$19,028,364	\$24,376,585	\$24,495,173	\$ 17,554,163
<b>FTE</b>	321.0	319.0	319.0	318.0	318.0	318.0	318.0	318.7

## Classification & Programs

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This program includes Classification and Records and various support functions. Classification and Records are responsible for the reporting and recording of all pertinent information regarding the movement and progress of residents at the facility, to included establishment of legal authority to incarcerate, movement, behavior, progress, disciplinary history, and program participation. Under the coordination of the unit teams, an individualized treatment program is developed, implemented, and maintained for each resident. Each resident, as well as facility staff, is kept aware of the resident's status within the correctional process. This program provides direct case management to the inmates, holding them accountable for their behavior, while identifying and localizing problems within each unit. Also include in this program are chaplain services, library services, and recreation. Not funding this program would eliminate the processes and activities that are critical to appropriate placement, documentation, and treatment plan development and implementation.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 75-5210, 75-5210a, 75-5211	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To provide effective caseload management from reception to release of offenders from confinement.  
 B.  
 C.

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<b>Output Measures</b>									
1. Percentage of inmates available for work who are employed; percent of inmates unemployed due to no jobs available.	A								
Inmates employed		87.0%	90.0%	93.0%	90.0%	93.0%	90.0%	90.0%	92.0%
Inmates unemployed - no jobs available		13.0%	10.0%	7.0%	10.0%	7.0%	10.0%	10.0%	8.0%

El Dorado Correctional Facility

Additional Measures as Necessary


**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 3,956,679	\$3,453,382	\$ 3,837,427	\$ 4,028,435	\$ 4,082,793	\$3,835,382	\$3,876,011	\$ 3,791,201
Non-SGF State Funds	-	(16)	-		(2)	2		(6)
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 3,956,679	\$3,453,366	\$ 3,837,427	\$ 4,028,435	\$ 4,082,791	\$3,835,384	\$3,876,011	\$ 3,791,195
<b>FTE</b>	55.0	55.0	55.0	57.0	57.0	57.0	57.0	55.7

## Southeast Unit

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

All expenditures for the Southeast Unit, located in Oswego, are recorded separately from expenses related to the operation of the Central Unit. Included in this program are the salaries and wages for unit staff, the deputy warden, support staff, unit team, and maintenance staff, as well as utilities, clothing, and other operating expenditures. Not funding for this program would result in the unit's closure.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5201, 75-5202, 75-5206, 75-5246, 75- 5252, 75-5253, 75-5256, 75-52,137	Mandatory	No	2

### Program Goals

- A. None; measures are included in administration, security, and classification & programs
- B.
- C.

### Program History

The Southeast Unit was opened in January 2013, adding 262 medium and minimum security beds to the systemwide capacity. The unit was previously operated as a conservation camp separate from El Dorado and was closed in 2009 due to budgetary constraints.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Output Measures									
Additional Measures as Necessary									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 3,404,103	\$3,855,642	\$2,681,812	\$ 3,402,773	\$ 3,416,817	\$3,386,752	\$3,386,752	\$ 3,318,090
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 3,404,103	\$3,855,642	\$2,681,812	\$ 3,402,773	\$ 3,416,817	\$3,386,752	\$3,386,752	\$ 3,318,090
<b>FTE</b>	54.0	55.0	53.0	55.0	55.0	55.0	55.0	54.3

## Support Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Functions included in this program consist of maintenance, laundry, warehouse operations. Also included in this program are utility expenditures. Not funding the support services program would eliminate funding necessary for the operation and maintenance of the facility.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5201; 75-52,125	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

A. None
B.
C.

### Program History

See the Administration program.
---------------------------------

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Output Measures									
Additional Measures as Necessary									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 3,866,364	\$5,446,669	\$ 5,257,557	\$ 5,052,589	\$ 4,727,208	\$4,657,596	\$4,733,835	\$ 5,143,811
Non-SGF State Funds	(1,583)	-	440	42,302	(26,773)	86,058	5,000	(8,778)
Federal Funds	-	3,983	-	-	-	-	-	1,992
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 3,864,781</b>	<b>\$5,450,652</b>	<b>\$ 5,257,997</b>	<b>\$ 5,094,891</b>	<b>\$ 4,700,435</b>	<b>\$4,743,654</b>	<b>\$4,738,835</b>	<b>\$ 5,136,361</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>31.0</b>	<b>31.0</b>	<b>33.0</b>	<b>31.0</b>	<b>31.0</b>	<b>26.0</b>	<b>26.0</b>	<b>31.7</b>

## Capital Improvements

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The capital improvement program is used solely for budgeting and recording expenditures related to rehabilitation and repair projects. KDOC central office is appropriated \$4,920,000 from the Correctional Institutions Building Fund annually for rehabilitation and repair projects throughout the KDOC system. Funds are transferred to the facility as projects are approved. Eliminating this program would prohibit the Department from making repairs, upgrades, and improvements to the facilities.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5210, 75-52,125	Discretionary	No	2

### Program Goals

A. None; this program is for budgetary and accounting purposes only.  
B.  
C.

### Program History

None

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Output Measures									
Additional Measures as Necessary									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	418,401	195,196	776,671	675,269	514,409	178,461		495,425
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 418,401</b>	<b>\$ 195,196</b>	<b>\$ 776,671</b>	<b>\$ 675,269</b>	<b>\$ 514,409</b>	<b>\$ 178,461</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 495,425</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## ARPA - 24/7 Pay Plan

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

N/A

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
-----------------	------------------	-------------------	-------------------

### Program Goals

A. None; this program is for budgetary and accounting purposes only.  
B.  
C.

### Program History

None

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Output Measures									
Additional Measures as Necessary									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-		-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	3,023,568				-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,023,568	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Administration program provides for the overall management and operational control of the facility. This program includes the warden, human resources, mailroom, policy and compliance, staff development, and fiscal. Not funding this program would eliminate the leadership and support functions necessary to operate the facility.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5201, 75-5202, 75-5206, 75-5246, 75- 5252, 75-5253, 75-5256, 75-52,122	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Operate and maintain a personnel system in accordance with state and departmental regulations, ensuring that positions are classified appropriately and that vacant positions are filled in a timely manner.
- B. Operate programs for existing and new employees that provide the training required by state law and departmental regulations.
- C.

### Program History

The Ellsworth Correctional Facility (ECF) was established by KSA 75-52,122 in response to a rapidly increasing resident population and the need for additional bed space. Originally conceived as 96-bed minimum-security facility, the rapid population growth prompted a scope change in 1986 to add medium-security beds to the design. The facility received its first residents on August 8, 1988. In December 1995, forty-eight additional minimum-security beds were added to the minimum housing unit. Starting on February 14, 1994, ECF began housing all condition violators. The theory behind this change was that residents who have returned as technical violators were perceived to have needs that are somewhat different from the rest of the prison population, and rather than focusing on integrating this group into the prison system, the focus should be on reintegration back into the community. In December 1995, forty-eight additional minimum-security beds were added to the minimum housing unit and in January 1996, ECF assumed its original role of housing multi-custody level residents. The 2000 Legislature approved funding for the construction of a 100-bed maximum security housing unit at ECF. This was later changed to a 200-bed medium-security unit. This housing unit was constructed utilizing federal Violent Offender Incarceration/Truth in Sentencing funds with a 10% state match. Also included in this project was the construction of a new staff development building outside the secure perimeter of ECF, as well as expansion of the existing warehouse and construction of an industrial building inside the secure perimeter. Construction on this project began in November 2000 and all work was completed by November 2002. In July 2012, KDOC purchased the St. Francis Boy's Home for use as a minimum-security unit. Designated the ECF - East Unit, this unit provides 95 minimum-security beds. This purchase allowed ECF to move minimum custody residents outside the Central Unit, filling those minimum beds with medium custody residents previously housed in county jails. The East Unit was temporarily closed in 2021 due to the inability to hire enough staff to operate it.

Ellsworth Correctional Facility

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Turnover Rates - Uniformed	A	24.2%	25.5%	31.1%	25.0%	21.7%	25.0%	25.0%	26.1%
2. Turnover Rates - Non-Uniformed	A	16.2%	17.8%	11.0%	7.0%	17.8%	13.5%	13.5%	15.5%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Average Daily Population		913	901	825	897	782	698	658	836
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,466,144	\$1,449,571	\$ 1,418,096	\$ 1,451,314	\$ 1,406,969	\$2,019,107	\$2,002,144	\$ 1,424,879
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-		194,000			64,667
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,466,144	\$1,449,571	\$ 1,418,096	\$ 1,451,314	\$ 1,600,969	\$2,019,107	\$2,002,144	\$ 1,489,545
<b>FTE</b>	20.0	19.0	19.0	18.0	18.0	21.0	21.0	18.7

## Security

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Security program include salaries and wages for all uniformed security officers and operating expenses, such as clothing, drug testing, and security equipment. This program is essential to operating the facility.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5201, 75-5202, 75-5206, 75-5246, 75-5252, 75-5253, 75-5256, 75-5206, 75-52,131	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To maintain an effective posture of physical/perimeter security as measured by the KDOC Security Inspection and accreditation audits.
- B. To effectively control unsanctioned prison groups in the prison population through proper identification, tracking, intelligence gathering techniques, and management strategies.
- C. To maintain a safe environment for incarcerated offenders.

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of inmates involved in escape by facility type	A								
Secure		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.33
Non-Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Number of escape events and number of inmates involved by security custody level	A								
Secure		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.33
Non-Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Number of apprehensions	A								
Secure		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.33

Ellsworth Correctional Facility

Non-Secure								
4. Number of validated security threat group members as identified.	B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. Number of gang related activities/disruptions based on incident reports and facility activity reports.	B	80	53	46	50	39	39	46
6. Number of inmate-on-inmate assaults/batteries by custody level (injury/non-injury).	C	3	6	5	5	1	1	4
Minimum		0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
Medium		8/0	4/7	0/2	0/2	0/0	0/1	0/3
Maximum		0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
Special Management		0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
7. Number of inmate-on-staff batteries by custody level, which have been referred for criminal prosecution (injury/non-injury).	C							
Minimum		1/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
Medium		6/0	6/1	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
Maximum		0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
Special Management		0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
8. Number of disruptive events	C	2	2	0	0	0	0	0.67
9. Number of substantiated inmate-on-inmate sexual assaults	C	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.33
10. Number of substantiated staff-on-inmate sexual assaults	C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>								

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 8,732,604	\$ 10,206,182	\$ 6,064,320	\$ 10,582,085	\$ 8,776,875	\$ 12,204,583	\$ 11,792,886	\$ 8,349,126
Non-SGF State Funds	1	13,327	-		1,144			4,824
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 8,732,605	\$ 10,219,509	\$ 6,064,320	\$ 10,582,085	\$ 8,778,019	\$ 12,204,583	\$ 11,792,886	\$ 8,353,949
<b>FTE</b>	164.0	164.0	163.0	165.0	165.0	162.0	162.0	164.0

## Classification & Programs

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This program includes Classification and Records and various support functions. Classification and Records are responsible for the reporting and recording of all pertinent information regarding the movement and progress of residents at the facility, to included establishment of legal authority to incarcerate, movement, behavior, progress, disciplinary history, and program participation. Under the coordination of the unit teams, an individualized treatment program is developed, implemented, and maintained for each resident. Each resident, as well as facility staff, is kept aware of the resident's status within the correctional process. This program provides direct case management to the inmates, holding them accountable for their behavior, while identifying and localizing problems within each unit. Also include in this program are chaplain services, library services, and recreation. Not funding this program would eliminate the processes and activities that are critical to appropriate placement, documentation, and treatment plan development and implementation.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific KSA 75-5210, 75-5210a, 75-5211	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To provide effective caseload management from reception to release of offenders from confinement.  
 B.  
 C.

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
<i>Output Measures</i>									

Ellsworth Correctional Facility

1. Percentage of inmates available for work who are employed; number of inmates unemployed due to no jobs available.

Inmates employed  
Inmates unemployed -  
no jobs available

A

85.8%	85.5%	79.0%	89.0%	83.4%	85.9%	85.9%	82.6%
129	109	128	100	129	128	128	122.0

*Additional Measures as Necessary*

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 2,174,785	\$2,283,614	\$ 2,253,733	\$ 2,342,511	\$ 2,365,532	\$2,605,776	\$2,566,320	\$ 2,300,960
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,174,785</b>	<b>\$2,283,614</b>	<b>\$ 2,253,733</b>	<b>\$ 2,342,511</b>	<b>\$ 2,365,532</b>	<b>\$2,605,776</b>	<b>\$2,566,320</b>	<b>\$ 2,300,960</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>33.0</b>	<b>33.0</b>	<b>33.0</b>	<b>33.0</b>	<b>33.0</b>	<b>33.0</b>	<b>33.0</b>	<b>33.0</b>

## Support Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Functions included in this program consist of maintenance, laundry, warehouse operations. Also included in this program are utility expenditures. Not funding the support services program would eliminate funding necessary for the operation and maintenance of the facility.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5201; 75-52,125	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

A. None

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Output Measures									
Additional Measures as Necessary									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 3,130,650	\$3,124,921	\$ 3,201,218	\$ 3,072,266	\$ 3,712,317	\$3,621,009	\$ 3,653,222	\$ 3,346,152
Non-SGF State Funds	-	54,179	118,373	15,853	299,914	15,853	8,500	157,489
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 3,130,650</b>	<b>\$3,179,100</b>	<b>\$ 3,319,591</b>	<b>\$ 3,088,119</b>	<b>\$ 4,012,231</b>	<b>\$3,636,862</b>	<b>\$ 3,661,722</b>	<b>\$ 3,503,641</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>18.0</b>

## Capital Improvements

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The capital improvement program is used solely for budgeting and recording expenditures related to rehabilitation and repair projects. KDOC central office is appropriated \$4,920,000 from the Correctional Institutions Building Fund annually for rehabilitation and repair projects throughout the KDOC system. Funds are transferred to the facility as projects are approved. Eliminating this program would prohibit the Department from making repairs, upgrades, and improvements to the facilities.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5210, 75-52,125	Discretionary	No	2

### Program Goals

A. None; this program is for budgetary and accounting purposes only.

### Program History

None

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	\$ 382,128	\$ 267,135	\$ 265,962	379,377	193,872			242,323
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 382,128	\$ 267,135	\$ 265,962	\$ 379,377	\$ 193,872	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 242,323
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## ARPA - 24/7 Pay Plan

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

N/A

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
-----------------	------------------	-------------------	-------------------

### Program Goals

A. None; this program is for budgetary and accounting purposes only.

### Program History

None

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1.									
<i>Output Measures</i>									
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	-	-			-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	1,232,647				-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,232,647	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	-
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Administration program provides for the overall management and operational control of the facility. This program includes the warden, human resources, mailroom, policy and compliance, staff development, and fiscal. Not funding this program would eliminate the leadership and support functions necessary to operate the facility.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>		<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
General	KSA 75-5201, 75-5202, 75-5206, 75-5246, 75- 5252, 75-5253, 75-5256, 75-52,131, 75-52,131a	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Operate and maintain a personnel system in accordance with state and departmental regulations, ensuring that positions are classified appropriately and that vacant positions are filled in a timely manner.
- B. Operate programs for existing and new employees that provide the training required by state law and departmental regulations.
- C.

### Program History

## Hutchinson Correctional Facility

In 1885, the Kansas Legislature appropriated \$1.0 million for the construction of The Kansas State Industrial Reformatory. The Reformatory was originally intended to serve as a reform school for first time youthful offenders. The Reformatory consisted of four cell houses, which opened between 1895 and 1927. The cell houses remained unchanged until 1978 when funds were appropriated for renovations. The renovations divided each of the large four-tier cellblocks into two separate, more manageable units. All renovations were completed by 1986. In 1995, an expansion project added 100 medium-security beds into the north side of the D cell house basement. The capacity was reduced during FY 1996 reduced to 76 to lessen the crowded condition. In 1971 the Legislature passed enabling statutes authorizing the establishment of work release programs. This led to the establishment of the Hutchinson Work Release Facility in January 1972. The program's purpose was placing inmates in a free community job placement to facilitate their transitional adjustment from the facility to society. In September 1978, the work release program moved from individual cellhouses inside the Reformatory to the former Warden's residence. In 1983, the Legislature appropriated money for a 96-bed, minimum-security facility. Construction of the facility began in September of 1984 and completed in May 1985. In 1986, the unit expanded to house an additional 64 inmates. In 1997, a 32-bed expansion for the work release population was approved by the Legislature and was constructed during FY 1998. The minimum custody residents housed in this unit are employed by private industries and in community work projects such as the State Fairgrounds, maintenance services, and grounds keeping duties for the correctional complex. In 1988 the Legislature authorized the creation of the Hutchinson Correctional Work Facility. A vacated mobile home manufacturing plant on 36 acres of land was purchased and KDOC staff and residents renovated 133,000 square feet of existing buildings. The medium custody facility was completed in January 1989 and the first of 400 medium and minimum custody residents were received on January 23, 1989. In 1990, the Kansas State Industrial Reformatory was renamed the Hutchinson Correctional Facility. In 1991, the Hutchinson Correctional Work Facility was merged into the Hutchinson Correctional Facility.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Turnover Rates - Uniformed	A	23.2%	23.5%	28.7%	25.0%	24.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.4%
2. Turnover Rates - Non-Uniformed	A	12.4%	13.1%	13.1%	10.0%	17.9%	20.0%	20.0%	14.7%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Average Daily Population		1,875	1,662	1,759	1,944	1,642	1,585	1,585	1,688
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 206,706	\$2,329,282	\$ 2,182,943	\$ 2,222,641	\$ 2,243,686	\$2,615,879	\$2,703,948	\$ 2,251,970
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	(8,219)					(4,110)
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 206,706</b>	<b>\$2,329,282</b>	<b>\$ 2,174,724</b>	<b>\$ 2,222,641</b>	<b>\$ 2,243,686</b>	<b>\$2,615,879</b>	<b>\$2,703,948</b>	<b>\$ 2,249,231</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>27.0</b>	<b>27.0</b>	<b>27.0</b>	<b>27.0</b>	<b>27.0</b>	<b>28.0</b>	<b>28.0</b>	<b>27.0</b>

## Security

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Security program include salaries and wages for all uniformed security officers and operating expenses, such as clothing, drug testing, and security equipment. This program is essential to operating the facility.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5201, 75-5202, 75-5206, 75-5246, 75- 5252, 75-5253, 75-5256, 75-52,131, 75-52,131a	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To maintain an effective posture of physical/perimeter security as measured by the KDOC Security Inspection and accreditation audits.
- B. To effectively control unsanctioned prison groups in the prison population through proper identification, tracking, intelligence gathering techniques, and management strategies.
- C. To maintain a safe environment for incarcerated offenders.

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of inmates involved in escape by facility type	A								
Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Secure		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.33
2. Number of escape events and number of inmates involved by security custody level	A								
Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Secure		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.33
3. Number of apprehensions	A								
Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Secure		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.33

Hutchinson Correctional Facility

4. Number of validated security threat group members as identified.	B	341	320	225	300	291	300	250	278.67
5. Number of gang related activities/disruptions based on incident reports and facility activity reports.	B								
		29	15	0	5	85	45	30	33.33
6. Number of inmate-on-inmate assaults/batteries by custody level (injury/non-injury).	C								
Minimum		0/15	0/27	1/9	0/10	2/2	0/10	0/10	0/10
Medium		0/47	0/58	4/26	5/30	6/7	5/30	5/30	5/30
Maximum		0/34	0/105	8/26	1/50	10/34	1/50	1/50	1/50
Special Management		4/136	0/227	12/12	10/20	1/2	10/20	10/20	10/20
7. Number of inmate-on-staff batteries by custody level, which have been referred for criminal prosecution (injury/non-injury).	C								
Minimum		0/5	0/3	0/0	0/5	0/1	0/2	0/2	0/2
Medium		0/14	0/4	1/5	1/15	1/3	1/10	1/10	1/9
Maximum		0/28	0/32	8/3	1/20	0/6	1/5	1/5	2/14
Special Management		2/111	0/65	15/11	10/50	1/6	0/0	0/0	7/34
8. Number of disruptive events	C	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.33
9. Number of substantiated inmate-on-inmate sexual assaults	C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. Number of substantiated staff-on-inmate sexual assaults	C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 20,384,830	\$24,228,174	\$ 23,894,656	\$23,087,412	\$ 22,802,607	\$27,385,866	\$ 27,254,686	\$ 23,641,812
Non-SGF State Funds	111,747	-	120,126	140,862	124,120	149,559	152,055	81,415
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 20,496,577</b>	<b>\$24,228,174</b>	<b>\$ 24,014,782</b>	<b>\$23,228,274</b>	<b>\$ 22,926,727</b>	<b>\$27,535,425</b>	<b>\$ 27,406,741</b>	<b>\$ 23,723,228</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>343.0</b>	<b>343.0</b>	<b>343.0</b>	<b>346.0</b>	<b>346.0</b>	<b>343.0</b>	<b>343.0</b>	<b>344.0</b>

## Inmate Transportation

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Transportation between correctional facilities, to and from other jurisdictions in the state, and out-of-state is coordinated through Central Transportation Coordinator at the Hutchinson Correctional Facility. Transportation hubs are also located at the Lansing and Norton Correctional Facilities. Elimination of this program would result in a decentralized system operated by individual facilities.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5206	Discretionary	No	2

### Program Goals

A. To provide for the safe and secure transportation of inmates during inter-facility transfers and of those inmates being returned for parole violations.

### Program History

The Transportation Unit began operation in March 1989 to provide for the orderly and secure movement of inmates utilizing a regularly scheduled program of transportation, while employing needed security measures to prevent escape and ensure the safety of escort personnel and the public. The unit was originally divided into two hub operations; one hub was located at the Lansing Correctional Facility and the other at the Hutchinson Correctional Facility. Early in 1998, a third hub was established at Norton Correctional Facility.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of inmates transported	A	5,665	4,604	3,974	5,696	3,974	2,568	5,696	4,184.00
2. Total number of miles traveled	A	141,382	129,884	175,038	150,000	149,852	150,000	150,000	151,591.33
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 1,171,584	\$ 1,226,671	\$ 1,116,123	\$ 1,081,611	\$ 1,107,342	\$1,240,997	\$1,258,942	\$ 1,150,045
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,171,584	\$ 1,226,671	\$ 1,116,123	\$ 1,081,611	\$ 1,107,342	\$1,240,997	\$1,258,942	\$ 1,150,045
<b>FTE</b>	17.0	17.0	17.0	17.0	17.0	16.0	16.0	17.0

## Classification & Programs

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This program includes Classification and Records and various support functions. Classification and Records are responsible for the reporting and recording of all pertinent information regarding the movement and progress of residents at the facility, to included establishment of legal authority to incarcerate, movement, behavior, progress, disciplinary history, and program participation. Under the coordination of the unit teams, an individualized treatment program is developed, implemented, and maintained for each resident. Each resident, as well as facility staff, is kept aware of the resident's status within the correctional process. This program provides direct case management to the inmates, holding them accountable for their behavior, while identifying and localizing problems within each unit. Also include in this program are chaplain services, library services, and recreation. Not funding this program would eliminate the processes and activities that are critical to appropriate placement, documentation, and treatment plan development and implementation.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 75-5210, 75-5210a, 75-5211	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. To provide effective caseload management from reception to release of offenders from confinement.

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Percentage of inmates available for work who are employed; percent of inmates unemployed due to no jobs available.	A								
Inmates employed		82.0%	79.0%	85.0%	80.0%	85.0%	84.0%	85.0%	83.0%
Inmates unemployed - no jobs available		18.0%	21.0%	15.0%	20.0%	15.0%	16.0%	15.0%	17.0%
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 4,822,350	\$5,009,906	\$ 5,125,923	\$ 4,961,020	\$ 5,172,401	\$5,416,121	\$5,597,316	\$ 5,102,743
Non-SGF State Funds	18,264	16,666	18,027	20,813	10,733	24,211	24,303	15,142
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 4,840,614	\$5,026,572	\$ 5,143,950	\$ 4,981,833	\$ 5,183,134	\$5,440,332	\$5,621,619	\$ 5,117,885
<b>FTE</b>	72.0	72.0	72.0	73.0	73.0	70.0	70.0	72.3

## Support Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Functions included in this program consist of maintenance, laundry, warehouse operations. Also included in this program are utility expenditures. Not funding the support services program would eliminate funding necessary for the operation and maintenance of the facility.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5201; 75-52,125	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

A. None  
B.  
C.

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 6,376,180	\$6,566,078	\$ 7,746,711	\$ 6,677,406	\$ 7,252,070	\$7,581,191	\$7,851,423	\$ 7,188,286
Non-SGF State Funds	5,275	16,865	3,632	-	201,123			73,873
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 6,381,455</b>	<b>\$6,582,943</b>	<b>\$ 7,750,343</b>	<b>\$ 6,677,406</b>	<b>\$ 7,453,193</b>	<b>\$7,581,191</b>	<b>\$7,851,423</b>	<b>\$ 7,262,160</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>48.0</b>	<b>48.0</b>	<b>48.0</b>	<b>47.0</b>	<b>47.0</b>	<b>47.0</b>	<b>47.0</b>	<b>47.7</b>

## Capital Improvements

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The capital improvement program is used solely for budgeting and recording expenditures related to rehabilitation and repair projects. KDOC central office is appropriated \$4,920,000 from the Correctional Institutions Building Fund annually for rehabilitation and repair projects throughout the KDOC system. Funds are transferred to the facility as projects are approved. Eliminating this program would prohibit the Department from making repairs, upgrades, and improvements to the facilities.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5210, 75-52,125	Discretionary	No	2

### Program Goals

A. None; this program is for budgetary and accounting purposes only.  
B.  
C.

### Program History

None

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,210	\$ 398,613		\$ 2,737
Non-SGF State Funds	955,446	1,305,637	779,542	1,058,754	833,008	-		972,729
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 955,446	\$ 1,305,637	\$ 779,542	\$ 1,058,754	\$ 841,218	\$ 398,613	\$ -	\$ 975,466
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Administration program provides for the overall management and operational control of the facility. This program includes the superintendent, human resources, mailroom, policy and compliance, staff development, and fiscal. Not funding this program would eliminate the leadership and support functions necessary to operate the facility.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>		<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
General	KSA 76-2101, KSA 76-2102, KSA 76-2112, KSA 76-2125, KSA 76-3205, 75-7059	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Operate and maintain a personnel system in accordance with state and departmental regulations, ensuring that positions are classified appropriately and that vacant positions are filled in a timely manner.
- B. Operate programs for existing and new employees that provide the training required by state law and departmental regulations.
- C.

### Program History

# Kansas Juvenile Correctional Complex

In 1879, the Legislature provided for the selection of a site for a state reform school under control of State Charitable Institutions. The school received its first two residents on June 6, 1881. In 1901, the name of the school was changed to The State Industrial School for Boys and on July 1, 1974, the name was changed again to the Youth Center at Topeka. The Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 1996 created the Juvenile Justice Authority (JJA) and on July 1, 1997, JJA assumed responsibility for the operation of the four juvenile correctional facilities. At this time the was changed to Topeka Juvenile Correctional Facility (TJCF). On July 1, 1999, a sentencing matrix went into effect defining minimum and maximum sentence based on the offense. Prior to this, facility superintendents had the authority to determine when a juvenile could be released. The matrix included mandatory aftercare for all youth following their release. In 2000, the Legislature approved the construction of the Kansas Juvenile Correctional Complex (KJCC), which is composed of a reception and diagnostic center, a maximum-security facility, central program areas, and administrative/support areas. Construction began in April 2001. The original intent was for KJCC and TJCF to be operated as separate facilities. However, the sentencing reforms that went into effect in 1999 caused the juvenile offender population to sharply decline. When construction was complete, it was decided to shift operations from TJCF to KJCC in the spring of 2005 and close TJCF. The continued decline in the juvenile offender population coupled with budgetary constraints led to the closure of the Atchison Juvenile Correctional Facility in 2008 and the Beloit Juvenile Correctional Facility in 2009. The male population from Atchison was integrated into the main facility at KJCC while the female population from Beloit was moved to two units on the former TJCF campus. This area of the facility was referred to as KJCC - West. In September 2011, the female population was moved into the stand-alone Q/R/S/T building on the KJCC campus. On July 1, 2013, JJA was merged into the Kansas Department of Corrections in accordance with Executive Reorganization Order 42. In 2017, the Larned Juvenile Correctional Facility closed, leaving KJCC as the sole juvenile correctional facility in the state.

## Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Turnover Rates - Uniformed	A	19.80%	36.50%	41.60%	20.00%	30.34%	25.00%	25.00%	36.15%
2. Turnover Rates - Non-Uniformed	A	13.30%	17.00%	22.30%	5.00%	15.00%	10.00%	10.00%	18.10%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Average Daily Population		164	162	135	140	143	145	145	146.67
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,874,686	\$1,972,771	\$ 1,583,874	\$ 1,933,652	\$ 1,622,848	\$2,636,956	\$ 2,374,104	\$ 1,726,498
Non-SGF State Funds								
Federal Funds								
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,874,686</b>	<b>\$1,972,771</b>	<b>\$ 1,583,874</b>	<b>\$ 1,933,652</b>	<b>\$ 1,622,848</b>	<b>\$2,636,956</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,726,498</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>35.0</b>	<b>27.0</b>	<b>27.0</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>26.0</b>	<b>26.0</b>	<b>26.3</b>

## Education

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The education program consists of several different components designed to meet the needs of all students at the facility. The academic program consists of high school coursework and remedial coursework geared toward helping a student earn a high school diploma or the GED. The program is required to meet all the Quality Performance Accreditation requirements set for schools by the Kansas State Department of Education. Also included is an institution-wide Title I program designed to help students struggling in reading, writing, and math to improve their academic skills. Special education services are offered for all exceptional students with a current individual education plan (IEP). Not funding this program would eliminate education services and place youth who are already behind academically even further behind their peers when they release.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 76-3203	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Provide juvenile offenders with the life and competency skills necessary to function in society.  
 B.  
 C.

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Percent of offenders who showed increased scores on standardized academic instruments.	A	24.00%	46.00%	65.00%	70.00%	53.00%	70.00%	70.00%	54.67%
2. Provide post-secondary HOURS to increase employability	A	2,650	1,553	816	2,000	699	2,000	2,000	1,022.67

Kansas Juvenile Correctional Complex

3. Provide post-secondary  
CERTIFICATIONS to increase  
employability

A

*Additional Measures as Necessary*

405	150	62	200	115	200	200	109

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 2,510,090	\$2,599,596	\$ 2,732,279	\$ 2,696,959	\$ 2,696,959	\$2,700,000	\$ 2,700,000	\$ 2,676,278
Non-SGF State Funds	166,602	152,012	163,252	-	-	-	-	105,088
Federal Funds	-	-	-	163,252	165,979	163,252	163,252	55,326
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,676,692</b>	<b>\$2,751,608</b>	<b>\$ 2,895,531</b>	<b>\$ 2,860,211</b>	<b>\$ 2,862,938</b>	<b>\$2,863,252</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 2,836,692</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## Security

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Security program include salaries and wages for all uniformed security officers. This program is essential to operating the facility.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General KSA 76-2101, KSA 76-2102, KSA 76-2112, KSA 76-2125, KSA 76-3205, 75-7059	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Provide a safe and security environment for staff and juvenile offenders within the facility.  
 B.  
 C.

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Reduce the number of juvenile on juvenile batteries with injuries. MALES	A	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0.7
2. Reduce the number of juvenile on juvenile batteries with injuries. FEMALES	A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
3. Reduce the number of juvenile on juvenile batteries without injuries. MALES	A	163	140	43	150	60	60	60	81.0

Kansas Juvenile Correctional Complex

4. Reduce the number of juvenile on juvenile batteries without injuries. FEMALES	A	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.3
5. Reduce the number of juveniles on staff batteries with injuries. MALES	A	1	6	4	0	5	0	0	5.0
6. Reduce the number of juveniles on staff batteries with injuries. FEMALES	A	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.7
7. Reduce the number of juveniles on staff batteries without injuries. MALES	A	35	3	33	10	30	10	5	22.0
8. Reduce the number of juveniles on staff batteries without injuries. FEMALES	A	4	2	0	2	0	2	0	0.7
9. Number of disruptive events	A	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.3
10. Number of substantiated offender-on-offender sexual assaults.	A	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
11. Number of substantiated offender-on-staff sexual assaults.	A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
12. Number of substantiated staff-on-offender sexual assaults.	A	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.3
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 8,581,988	\$ 10,099,372	\$ 9,670,175	\$ 10,853,295	\$ 8,305,902	\$ 11,956,249	\$ 12,391,005	\$ 9,358,483
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 8,581,988</b>	<b>\$ 10,099,372</b>	<b>\$ 9,670,175</b>	<b>\$ 10,853,295</b>	<b>\$ 8,305,902</b>	<b>\$ 11,956,249</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 9,358,483</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>251.0</b>	<b>253.0</b>	<b>253.0</b>	<b>176.0</b>	<b>176.0</b>	<b>177.0</b>	<b>177.0</b>	<b>227.3</b>

## Ancillary Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

A corrections counselor is assigned to each youth during his or her commitment. Counselors provide program planning, case management, individual behavior modification work, reintegration/re-entry programming, and life skills classes. In conjunction with Community Supervision Agencies and the family, counselors assist in developing aftercare plans with each youth. Youth are offered large-muscle activities daily by activity therapy. During activities, youth are afforded the opportunity to learn the rules and fundamentals of several socially acceptable sporting events and leisure time activities. A part-time chaplain is available to all youth for individual pastoral counseling, weekly worship, and bible study. Special religious events are conducted as well as services recognizing religious holidays and seasons. Participation by the offenders in any religious service or activity is voluntary. Many volunteers also assist the agency's religious programs and conduct several groups. Not funding this program would eliminate services that critical to a youth's rehabilitation and return to the community.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-7024, KSA 76-2101	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Develop and continuously evaluate programs.  
B.  
C.

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Successful completion of ART		60.0%	81.0%	79.0%	85.0%	88.0%	85.0%	90.0%	82.7%
2. Successful completion of T4C		80.0%	71.0%	73.0%	85.0%	88.0%	85.0%	80.0%	77.3%

Kansas Juvenile Correctional Complex

3. Successful completion of Sex Offender treatment	94.0%	81.0%	97.0%	90.0%	54.0%	90.0%	90.0%	77.3%
4. Successful completion of Substance Abuse treatment	69.0%	56.0%	95.0%	70.0%	62.0%	70.0%	70.0%	71.0%
Additional Measures as Necessary								

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 2,162,977	\$2,336,750	\$ 2,121,885	\$ 2,164,834	\$ 2,185,989	\$2,411,914	\$2,448,564	\$ 2,214,875
Non-SGF State Funds	-	10,152	-					5,076
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,162,977</b>	<b>\$2,346,902</b>	<b>\$ 2,121,885</b>	<b>\$ 2,164,834</b>	<b>\$ 2,185,989</b>	<b>\$2,411,914</b>	<b>\$2,448,564</b>	<b>\$ 2,218,259</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>46.0</b>	<b>35.0</b>	<b>35.0</b>	<b>31.5</b>	<b>31.5</b>	<b>31.5</b>	<b>31.5</b>	<b>33.8</b>

## Central Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Functions included in this program consist of maintenance, laundry, warehouse operations, and food service. Also included in this program are utility expenditures. Not funding the support services program would eliminate funding necessary for the operation and maintenance of the facility.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General    KSA 75-7024, KSA 76-2101	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

A. None

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
Output Measures									
Additional Measures as Necessary									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 3,724,384	\$3,530,819	\$ 4,442,844	\$ 3,393,605	\$ 5,800,739	\$3,885,917	\$3,903,367	\$ 4,591,467
Non-SGF State Funds	-	96	-	8,275	344,337	110,517	-	114,811
Federal Funds	416,000	395,656	395,656	336,000	293,708	260,000	260,000	361,673
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 4,140,384</b>	<b>\$3,926,571</b>	<b>\$ 4,838,500</b>	<b>\$ 3,737,880</b>	<b>\$ 6,438,784</b>	<b>\$4,256,434</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 5,067,952</b>
<b>FTE</b>	39.5	41.0	41.0	32.0	32.0	32.0	32.0	38.0

## Capital Improvements

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The capital improvement program is used solely for budgeting and recording expenditures related to rehabilitation and repair projects. KDOC central office is appropriated \$500,000 from the State Institutions Building Fund annually for rehabilitation and repair projects at KJCC. Funds are transferred to the facility as projects are approved. Eliminating this program would prohibit the Department from making repairs, upgrades, and improvements.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General    KSA 75-7024, KSA 76-2101	Discretionary	No	2

### Program Goals

A. None

### Program History

None

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	394,375	1,376,256	284,464	1,036,599	716,745	-	-	792,488
Federal Funds	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 394,375</b>	<b>\$ 1,376,256</b>	<b>\$ 284,464</b>	<b>\$ 1,036,599</b>	<b>\$ 716,745</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 792,488</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## APRA - 24/7 Pay Plan

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

N/A; this program is for budgetary and accounting purposes only.

**Statutory Basis**

**Mandatory vs.  
Discretionary**

**MOE/Matc  
h Rqt.**

**Priority  
Level**

### Program Goals

A. None

### Program History

None

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1.									#DIV/0!
<i>Output Measures</i>									
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	1,235,382	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,235,382</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Administration program provides for the overall management and operational control of the facility. This program includes the warden, human resources, mailroom, policy and compliance, staff development, and fiscal. Not funding this program would eliminate the leadership and support functions necessary to operate the facility.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5201, 75-5202, 75-5206, 75-5246, 75- 5252, 75-5253, 75-5256, 75-52,131	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Operate and maintain a personnel system in accordance with state and departmental regulations, ensuring that positions are classified appropriately and that vacant positions are filled in a timely manner.
- B. Operate programs for existing and new employees that provide the training required by state law and departmental regulations.
- C.

### Program History

The Kansas State Penitentiary was authorized by Article VII, Section 2, of the Kansas Constitution in 1859. On November 19, 1861, the land for the prison was purchased in Leavenworth County and construction on the prison started in 1864, near the site of the old Oklahoma Territorial Prison. Completion was delayed by the Civil War. Additional ground purchases were made in the late 1800s and early 1900s. In 1917 the Legislature established the State Industrial Farm for Women at Lansing. This institution was later renamed the Kansas Correctional Institution at Lansing (KCIL) and later housed both male and female residents. In 1995 the female residents were transferred to the Topeka Correctional Facility. To address the growing inmate population, a medium security facility was constructed next to the original maximum-security facility in the 1980s. In 1990 KCIL and the Kansas State Penitentiary were consolidated and renamed the Lansing Correctional Facility. In 2018 the medium security facility was demolished and a new facility to house maximum and medium custody offenders was constructed on the site. The same project also replaced the minimum-security East Unit (the former KCIL) with a new 512-bed unit. Residents were moved into the new minimum unit in December 2019 and the new medium/maximum unit was occupied in April 2020.

Lansing Correctional Facility

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Turnover Rates - Uniformed	A	21.8%	22.9%	27.1%	33.3%	28.0%	25.1%	24.5%	26.0%
2. Turnover Rates - Non-Uniformed	A	23.3%	27.8%	25.8%	24.7%	29.7%	27.7%	25.7%	27.8%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Average Daily Population		1,923	1,762	1,762	2,142	2,164	2,212	2,212	1,896
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 2,769,449	\$ 2,673,822	\$ 2,095,323	\$ 2,246,989	\$ 2,618,839	\$ 2,571,027	\$ 2,517,604	\$ 2,462,661
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 2,769,449	\$ 2,673,822	\$ 2,095,323	\$ 2,246,989	\$ 2,618,839	\$ 2,571,027	\$ 2,517,604	\$ 2,462,661
<b>FTE</b>	45.0	30.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	27.0	27.0	26.7

## Security

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Security program include salaries and wages for all uniformed security officers and operating expenses, such as clothing, drug testing, and security equipment. This program is essential to operating the facility.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5201, 75-5202, 75-5206, 75-5246, 75- 5252, 75-5253, 75-5256, 75-52,131	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To maintain an effective posture of physical/perimeter security as measured by the KDOC Security Inspection and accreditation audits.
- B. To effectively control unsanctioned prison groups in the prison population through proper identification, tracking, intelligence gathering techniques, and management strategies.
- C. To maintain a safe environment for incarcerated offenders.

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of inmates involved in escape by facility type	A								
Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Secure		1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0.33
2. Number of escape events and number of inmates involved by security custody level	A								
Secure		1/1	1/1	0	0	0	1/1	0	0
Non-Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Number of apprehensions	A								
Secure		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Non-Secure		1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.33

Lansing Correctional Facility

4. Number of validated security threat group members as identified.	B	0	15	0	10	0	5	10	5
5. Number of gang related activities/disruptions based on incident reports and facility activity reports.	B								
6. Number of inmate-on-inmate assaults/batteries by custody level (injury/non-injury).	C	16	12	2	10	7	7	12	7
Minimum		6/0	2/0	5/0	2/0	0/0	2/0	2/0	2/0
Medium		2/0	4/0	23/2	8/0	19/5	20/4	20/3	18/3
Maximum		75/6	74/3	47/2	77/0	66/19	70/20	72/20	70/12
7. Number of inmate-on-staff batteries by custody level, which have been referred for criminal prosecution (injury/non-injury).	C								
Minimum		0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
Medium		2/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
Maximum		2/0	4/0	2/1	2/2	0/0	5/3	4/2	3/2
8. Number of disruptive events	C	4	7	0	0	5	5	5	4
9. Number of substantiated inmate-on-inmate sexual assaults	C	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0.33
10. Number of substantiated staff-on-inmate sexual assaults	C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 24,644,593	\$ 26,163,121	\$ 13,523,020	\$ 22,644,707	\$ 20,090,732	\$ 28,609,862	\$ 29,187,814	\$ 19,925,624
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 24,644,593	\$ 26,163,121	\$ 13,523,020	\$ 22,644,707	\$ 20,090,732	\$ 28,609,862	\$ 29,187,814	\$ 19,925,624
<b>FTE</b>	504.0	404.0	313.0	315.0	315.0	341.0	341.0	344.0

## Inmate Transportation

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Transportation between correctional facilities, to and from other jurisdictions in the state, and out-of-state is coordinated through Central Transportation Coordinator at the Hutchinson Correctional Facility. Transportation hubs are also located at the Lansing and Norton Correctional Facilities. Elimination of this program would result in a decentralized system operated by individual facilities.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5206	Discretionary	No	2

### Program Goals

A. To provide for the safe and secure transportation of inmates during inter-facility transfers and of those inmates being returned for parole violations.

### Program History

The Transportation Unit began operation in March 1989 to provide for the orderly and secure movement of inmates utilizing a regularly scheduled program of transportation, while employing needed security measures to prevent escape and ensure the safety of escort personnel and the public. The unit was originally divided into two hub operations; one hub was located at the Lansing Correctional Facility and the other at the Hutchinson Correctional Facility. Early in 1998, a third hub was established at Norton Correctional Facility.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of inmates transported	A	3,944	2,203	3,947	2,900	1,951	2,060	2,060	2,700.33
2. Total number of miles traveled	A	116,729	117,372	145,745	117,000	96,807	120,000	120,000	119,974.67
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 444,134	\$ 483,452	\$ 293,299	\$ 462,254	\$ 452,733	\$ 560,684	\$ 554,948	\$ 409,828
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 444,134</b>	<b>\$ 483,452</b>	<b>\$ 293,299</b>	<b>\$ 462,254</b>	<b>\$ 452,733</b>	<b>\$ 560,684</b>	<b>\$ 554,948</b>	<b>\$ 409,828</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>

## Classification & Programs

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This program includes Classification and Records and various support functions. Classification and Records are responsible for the reporting and recording of all pertinent information regarding the movement and progress of residents at the facility, to included establishment of legal authority to incarcerate, movement, behavior, progress, disciplinary history, and program participation. Under the coordination of the unit teams, an individualized treatment program is developed, implemented, and maintained for each resident. Each resident, as well as facility staff, is kept aware of the resident's status within the correctional process. This program provides direct case management to the inmates, holding them accountable for their behavior, while identifying and localizing problems within each unit. Also include in this program are chaplain services, library services, and recreation. Not funding this program would eliminate the processes and activities that are critical to appropriate placement, documentation, and treatment plan development and implementation.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 75-5210, 75-5210a, 75-5211	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. To provide effective caseload management from reception to release of offenders from confinement.

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Percentage of inmates available for work who are employed; percent of inmates unemployed due to no jobs available.	A								
Inmates employed		72.0%	70.0%	65.0%	73.0%	67.0%	70.0%	74.0%	67.3%
Inmates unemployed - no jobs available		13.0%	25.0%	33.0%	26.0%	31.0%	25.0%	21.0%	29.7%
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

Lansing Correctional Facility

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 3,729,950	\$ 3,453,382	\$ 3,250,559	\$ 3,728,077	\$ 3,347,092	\$ 4,509,804	\$ 4,578,221	\$ 3,350,344
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 3,729,950	\$ 3,453,382	\$ 3,250,559	\$ 3,728,077	\$ 3,347,092	\$ 4,509,804	\$ 4,578,221	\$ 3,350,344
<b>FTE</b>	76.0	59.5	55.0	54.0	54.0	60.0	60.0	56.2

## Support Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Functions included in this program consist of maintenance, laundry, warehouse operations. Also included in this program are utility expenditures. Not funding the support services program would eliminate funding necessary for the operation and maintenance of the facility.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5201; 75-52,125	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

A. None

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Output Measures									
Additional Measures as Necessary									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 5,968,975	\$ 6,204,325	\$ 4,137,939	\$ 4,094,536	\$ 4,540,599	\$ 4,676,363	\$ 4,382,015	\$ 4,960,954
Non-SGF State Funds	119,983	93,355	190,000	250,000	178,136	250,000	250,000	153,830
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 6,088,958	\$ 6,297,680	\$ 4,327,939	\$ 4,344,536	\$ 4,718,735	\$ 4,926,363	\$ 4,632,015	\$ 5,114,785
<b>FTE</b>	55.0	27.0	11.0	11.0	11.0	12.0	12.0	16.3

## Capital Improvements

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The capital improvement program is used solely for budgeting and recording expenditures related to rehabilitation and repair projects. KDOC central office is appropriated \$4,920,000 from the Correctional Institutions Building Fund annually for rehabilitation and repair projects throughout the KDOC system. Funds are transferred to the facility as projects are approved. Eliminating this program would prohibit the Department from making repairs, upgrades, and improvements to the facilities.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5210, 75-52,125	Discretionary	No	2

### Program Goals

A. None; this program is for budgetary and accounting purposes only.

### Program History

None

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Output Measures									
Additional Measures as Necessary									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	46,086	1,142,904	280,231	591,613	595,345	438,855	-	672,827
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 46,086</b>	<b>\$ 1,142,904</b>	<b>\$ 280,231</b>	<b>\$ 591,613</b>	<b>\$ 595,345</b>	<b>\$ 438,855</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 672,827</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## ARPA - 24/7 Pay Plan

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

N/A

**Statutory Basis**

**Mandatory  
vs.**

**MOE/Matc  
h Rgt.**

**Priority  
Level**

### Program Goals

A. None; this program is for budgetary and accounting purposes only.

### Program History

None

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
<i>Output Measures</i>									
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	2,730,604				-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,730,604	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Administration program provides for the overall management and operational control of the facility. This program includes the warden, human resources, mailroom, policy and compliance, staff development, and fiscal. Not funding this program would eliminate the leadership and support functions necessary to operate the facility.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General    KSA 75-5201, 75-5202, 75-5206, 75-5246, 75- 5252, 75-5253, 75-5256, 75-52,130	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Operate and maintain a personnel system in accordance with state and departmental regulations, ensuring that positions are classified appropriately and that vacant positions are filled in a timely manner.
- B. Operate programs for existing and new employees that provide the training required by state law and departmental regulations.

### Program History

The Larned Correctional Mental Health Facility (LCMHF) was built in response to an April 1989 federal court order, which directed that the State develop and implement an acceptable long-term plan for the mentally ill, protective custody, and high-security offenders. Construction of the 150- bed facility began on the grounds of the Larned State Hospital (LSH) in January 1991, and the facility was dedicated in December of that same year. The facility was designed with a shared services concept in mind. Under this concept, Larned State Hospital would provide food service, laundry, and warehouse function for the correctional facility. As such, the new facility was designed with minimal warehouse, kitchen, and support services space. In 1996, the Department entered into a lease with the LSH to utilize a vacant building for housing minimum-security residents. This unit was designated the LCMHF -West Unit. Most residents housed in the West Unit were assigned to work details at LCMHF or LSH, though some residents were assigned to private industry jobs. These jobs allow residents to begin saving and preparing for eventual release and to begin paying for such expenses as room and board, transportation, court costs, fines, restitution, child support and taxes while they are still incarcerated. During FY 2017, the mental health program at Larned was moved to El Dorado. This allowed LCMHF to double bunk and increase Central Unit capacity from 150 to 300. In addition, this move allowed KDOC to increase mental health beds from 150 to 190 and have access to a larger recruiting pool for mental health staff. At the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, KDOC reopened the former Larned Juvenile Correctional Facility for use as an intake isolation unit. Redesignated LCMHF – South Unit, new male admissions were housed in this unit for a two-week quarantine before moving on to the reception and diagnostic unit at El Dorado. Later, this unit was used to house older residents at risk of COVID-19 complications that were previously housed in an open dorm setting. In 2021, the West Unit population was moved to the South Unit. This allowed KDOC to take advantage of the more efficient designed that required fewer staff as well as the improved ventilation systems. On July 1, 2021, KDOC's contract food service provider took over the food service operation at LCMHF. The lower cost per meal under the KDOC contract generated an estimated net savings of \$2.1 million in savings to the state and improved efficiencies at both LCMHF and LSH.

Larned Correctional Mental Health Facility

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Turnover Rates - Uniformed	A	22.7%	24.2%	31.8%	18.0%	19.1%	18.0%	18.0%	25.0%
2. Turnover Rates - Non-Uniformed	A	9.1%	10.5%	17.5%	12.7%	17.5%	12.7%	10.9%	15.2%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Average Daily Population		578	595	609	575	487	488	451	564
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,450,861	\$1,456,698	\$ 1,302,508	\$ 1,404,251	\$ 1,496,740	\$1,662,082	\$ 1,685,660	\$ 1,418,649
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,450,861	\$1,456,698	\$ 1,302,508	\$ 1,404,251	\$ 1,496,740	\$1,662,082	\$ 1,685,660	\$ 1,418,649
<b>FTE</b>	19.0	19.0	19.0	19.0	19.0	20.0	20.0	19.0

## Security

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Security program include salaries and wages for all uniformed security officers and operating expenses, such as clothing, drug testing, and security equipment. This program is essential to operating the facility.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5201, 75-5202, 75-5206, 75-5246, 75- 5252, 75-5253, 75-5256, 75-52,130	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To maintain an effective posture of physical/perimeter security as measured by the KDOC Security Inspection and accreditation audits.
- B. To effectively control unsanctioned prison groups in the prison population through proper identification, tracking, intelligence gathering techniques, and management strategies.
- C. To maintain a safe environment for incarcerated offenders.

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of inmates involved in escape by facility type	A								
Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Secure		0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0.67
2. Number of escape events and number of inmates involved by security custody level	A								
Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Secure		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.33
3. Number of apprehensions	A								
Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Larned Correctional Mental Health Facility

4. Number of validated security threat group members as identified.	B	42	45	58	45	65	45	45	56
5. Number of gang related activities/disruptions based on incident reports and facility activity reports.	B	6	7	5	7	0	3	3	4
6. Number of inmate-on-inmate assaults/batteries by custody level (injury/non-injury).	C								
Minimum		12/0	15/0	3/0	12/4	1/0	12/4	12/4	10/2
Medium		8/0	10/1	4/5	5/2	1/5	5/2	5/2	7/2
Maximum		13/0	4/0	2/3	5/2	12/6	5/2	5/2	8/2
7. Number of inmate-on-staff batteries by custody level, which have been referred for criminal prosecution (injury/non-injury).	C								
Minimum		10/0	6/0	1/0	10/0	0/0	10/0	10/0	9/0
Medium		6/0	2/0	5/0	7/0	0/0	7/0	7/0	6/0
Maximum		15/2	6/0	6/0	3/0	0/1	3/0	3/0	6/0
8. Number of disruptive events	C	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.33
9. Number of substantiated inmate-on-inmate sexual assaults	C	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. Number of substantiated staff-on-inmate sexual assaults	C	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 7,191,531	\$ 8,685,536	\$ 5,257,929	\$ 8,671,647	\$ 7,829,506	\$10,019,543	\$10,153,608	\$ 7,257,657
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	964,058	-	-	-	-	482,029
<b>Total</b>	\$ 7,191,531	\$ 8,685,536	\$ 6,221,987	\$ 8,671,647	\$ 7,829,506	\$10,019,543	\$10,153,608	\$ 7,579,010
<b>FTE</b>	129.0	129.0	129.0	130.0	130.0	128.0	128.0	129.3

## Classification & Programs

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This program includes Classification and Records and various support functions. Classification and Records are responsible for the reporting and recording of all pertinent information regarding the movement and progress of residents at the facility, to included establishment of legal authority to incarcerate, movement, behavior, progress, disciplinary history, and program participation. Under the coordination of the unit teams, an individualized treatment program is developed, implemented, and maintained for each resident. Each resident, as well as facility staff, is kept aware of the resident's status within the correctional process. This program provides direct case management to the inmates, holding them accountable for their behavior, while identifying and localizing problems within each unit. Also include in this program are chaplain services, library services, and recreation. Not funding this program would eliminate the processes and activities that are critical to appropriate placement, documentation, and treatment plan development and implementation.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 75-5210, 75-5210a, 75-5211	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. To provide effective caseload management from reception to release of offenders from confinement.

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Percentage of inmates available for work who are employed; percent of inmates unemployed due to no jobs available.	A								
Inmates employed		70.1%	89.1%	64.7%	85.5%	69.0%	85.5%	85.5%	74.3%
Inmates unemployed - no jobs available		18.5%	18.4%	24.7%	20.6%	23.0%	20.6%	20.6%	22.0%
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

Larned Correctional Mental Health Facility

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,756,501	\$1,818,765	\$ 1,808,608	\$ 1,758,207	\$ 1,797,827	\$1,992,425	\$ 2,019,415	\$ 1,808,400
Non-SGF State Funds	(134)	(1,371)	2,366	70				498
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,756,367	\$1,817,394	\$ 1,810,974	\$ 1,758,277	\$ 1,797,827	\$1,992,425	\$ 2,019,415	\$ 1,808,732
<b>FTE</b>	26.0	26.0	26.0	26.0	0.0	26.0	26.0	17.3

## Support Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Functions included in this program consist of maintenance, laundry, warehouse operations. Also included in this program are utility expenditures. Not funding the support services program would eliminate funding necessary for the operation and maintenance of the facility.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General    KSA 75-5201; 75-52,125	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

A. None

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Output Measures									
Additional Measures as Necessary									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 1,536,093	\$1,737,983	\$ 1,794,507	\$ 1,765,121	\$ 1,612,527	\$1,414,575	\$ 1,403,359	\$ 1,715,006
Non-SGF State Funds	-	10,560	4,145			158,642		7,353
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,536,093	\$1,748,543	\$ 1,798,652	\$ 1,765,121	\$ 1,612,527	\$1,573,217	\$ 1,403,359	\$ 1,719,907
<b>FTE</b>	13.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	0.0	11.0	11.0	10.0

## Capital Improvements

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The capital improvement program is used solely for budgeting and recording expenditures related to rehabilitation and repair projects. KDOC central office is appropriated \$4,920,000 from the Correctional Institutions Building Fund annually for rehabilitation and repair projects throughout the KDOC system. Funds are transferred to the facility as projects are approved. Eliminating this program would prohibit the Department from making repairs, upgrades, and improvements to the facilities.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5210, 75-52,125	Discretionary	No	2

### Program Goals

A. None; this program is for budgetary and accounting purposes only.

### Program History

None

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Output Measures									
Additional Measures as Necessary									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -			\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	388,899	76,338	520,704	453,251	181,174			259,405
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 388,899	\$ 76,338	\$ 520,704	\$ 453,251	\$ 181,174	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 259,405
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## ARPA - 24/7 Pay Plan

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

N/A
-----

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Matc h Rqt.	Priority Level
-----------------	------------------	--------------------	-------------------

### Program Goals

A. None; this program is for budgetary and accounting purposes only.
--

### Program History

None
------

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
<i>Output Measures</i>									
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -			\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	1,130,206	\$ -			-
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,130,206	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Administration program provides for the overall management and operational control of the facility. This program includes the warden, human resources, mailroom, policy and compliance, staff development, and fiscal. Not funding this program would eliminate the leadership and support functions necessary to operate the facility.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5201, 75-5202, 75-5206, 75-5246, 75- 5252, 75-5253, 75-5256, 75-52,131	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Operate and maintain a personnel system in accordance with state and departmental regulations, ensuring that positions are classified appropriately and that vacant positions are filled in a timely manner.
- B. Operate programs for existing and new employees that provide the training required by state law and departmental regulations.
- C.

### Program History

The Norton Correctional Facility was originally the Norton Tuberculosis Hospital, which received its first patient in 1915. By 1963, the need for tuberculosis treatment beds had declined while the need for more hospital beds for the care of the intellectually disabled increased. For five years the institution served both tuberculosis and intellectually disabled patients. In 1967 the institution was renamed the Norton State Hospital and the mission transitioned solely to the treatment of the intellectually disabled. The transition to smaller, community-based settings for this population in the 1980s and the need for more prison beds led to the decision transfer the institution to the Kansas Department of Corrections in 1987. The 1987 Legislature also authorized the acquisition of a farm implement dealership in Stockton for use as a minimum-security facility. The Stockton Correctional Facility received its first residents in 1988. In 1990, Stockton was administratively consolidated with Norton and renamed the Norton Correctional Facility – East Unit. In 1997, a new medium-security housing unit was constructed at the Norton Correctional Facility – Central Unit. Budgetary constraints in 2009 led to the suspension of East Unit operations. On September 1, 2010 the East Unit was re-opened.

Norton Correctional Facility

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Turnover Rates - Uniformed	A	17.9%	26.0%	22.4%	23.0%	26.0%	25.0%	23.0%	24.8%
2. Turnover Rates - Non-Uniformed	A	14.7%	7.4%	15.1%	13.0%	15.5%	20.5%	13.0%	12.7%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Average Daily Population		973	965	821	853	851	821	787	879
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,293,975	\$ 1,271,226	\$ 1,234,761	\$ 1,279,566	\$ 2,147,120	\$ 1,486,907	\$ 1,510,791	\$ 1,551,036
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,293,975	\$ 1,271,226	\$ 1,234,761	\$ 1,279,566	\$ 2,147,120	\$ 1,486,907	\$ 1,510,791	\$ 1,551,036
<b>FTE</b>	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	31.0	31.0	20.0

## Security

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Security program include salaries and wages for all uniformed security officers and operating expenses, such as clothing, drug testing, and security equipment. This program is essential to operating the facility.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5201, 75-5202, 75-5206, 75-5246, 75- 5252, 75-5253, 75-5256, 75-52,131	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To maintain an effective posture of physical/perimeter security as measured by the KDOC Security Inspection and accreditation audits.
- B. To effectively control unsanctioned prison groups in the prison population through proper identification, tracking, intelligence gathering techniques, and management strategies.
- C. To maintain a safe environment for incarcerated offenders.

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of inmates involved in escape by facility type	A								
Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Number of escape events and number of inmates involved by security custody level	A								
Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Secure		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Number of apprehensions	A								
Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Secure		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Number of validated security threat group members as identified.	B								
		42	37	31	31	34	30	35	34

Norton Correctional Facility

5. Number of gang related activities/disruptions based on incident reports and facility activity reports.	B								
		0	0	0	0	11	0	0	3.67
6. Number of inmate-on-inmate assaults/batteries by custody level (injury/non-injury).	C								
	Minimum	1/1	0/0	0/0	0/0	4/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Medium	4/1	1/7	7/2	2/2	13/1	4/0	0/0	6/0
	Maximum	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
7. Number of inmate-on-staff batteries by custody level, which have been referred for criminal prosecution (injury/non-injury).	C								
	Minimum	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Medium	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Maximum	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
8. Number of disruptive events	C	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.33
9. Number of substantiated inmate-on-inmate sexual assaults	C	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.33
10. Number of substantiated staff-on-inmate sexual assaults	C	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.33
Additional Measures as Necessary									

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 9,612,172	\$ 11,189,794	\$ 10,444,892	\$ 10,120,507	\$ 9,561,006	\$ 12,460,513	\$ 12,571,609	\$ 10,398,564
Non-SGF State Funds	137,378	114,587	77,561	140,764	131,132	218,861	221,620	107,760
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 9,749,550</b>	<b>\$ 11,304,381</b>	<b>\$ 10,522,453</b>	<b>\$ 10,261,271</b>	<b>\$ 9,692,138</b>	<b>\$ 12,679,374</b>	<b>\$ 12,793,229</b>	<b>\$ 10,506,324</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>166.0</b>	<b>166.0</b>	<b>166.0</b>	<b>152.0</b>	<b>152.0</b>	<b>164.8</b>	<b>164.8</b>	<b>161.3</b>

## Inmate Transportation

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Transportation between correctional facilities, to and from other jurisdictions in the state, and out-of-state is coordinated through Central Transportation Coordinator at the Hutchinson Correctional Facility. Transportation hubs are also located at the Lansing and Norton Correctional Facilities. Elimination of this program would result in a decentralized system operated by individual facilities.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General    KSA 75-5206	Discretionary	No	2

### Program Goals

A. To provide for the safe and secure transportation of inmates during inter-facility transfers and of those inmates being returned for parole violations.

### Program History

The Transportation Unit began operation in March 1989 to provide for the orderly and secure movement of inmates utilizing a regularly scheduled program of transportation, while employing needed security measures to prevent escape and ensure the safety of escort personnel and the public. The unit was originally divided into two hub operations; one hub was located at the Lansing Correctional Facility and the other at the Hutchinson Correctional Facility. Early in 1998, a third hub was established at Norton Correctional Facility.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of inmates transported	A	1,564	1,035	2,086	1,583	879	985	985	1,333
2. Total number of miles traveled	A	88,315	86,389	113,895	105,000	89,657	95,000	95,000	96,647
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	-
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Classification & Programs

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This program includes Classification and Records and various support functions. Classification and Records are responsible for the reporting and recording of all pertinent information regarding the movement and progress of residents at the facility, to included establishment of legal authority to incarcerate, movement, behavior, progress, disciplinary history, and program participation. Under the coordination of the unit teams, an individualized treatment program is developed, implemented, and maintained for each resident. Each resident, as well as facility staff, is kept aware of the resident's status within the correctional process. This program provides direct case management to the inmates, holding them accountable for their behavior, while identifying and localizing problems within each unit. Also include in this program are chaplain services, library services, and recreation. Not funding this program would eliminate the processes and activities that are critical to appropriate placement, documentation, and treatment plan development and implementation.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 75-5210, 75-5210a, 75-5211	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. To provide effective caseload management from reception to release of offenders from confinement.

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Percentage of inmates available for work who are employed; percent of inmates unemployed due to no jobs available.	A								
Inmates employed		85.0%	99.0%	94.0%	95.0%	90.0%	89.0%	97.0%	94.3%
Inmates unemployed - no jobs available		13.0%	1.0%	5.0%	3.0%	10.0%	11.0%	5.0%	5.3%
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

Norton Correctional Facility

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,702,101	\$ 1,796,097	\$ 1,594,633	\$ 1,623,459	\$ 1,529,917	\$ 1,852,559	\$ 1,878,436	\$ 1,640,216
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,702,101	\$ 1,796,097	\$ 1,594,633	\$ 1,623,459	\$ 1,529,917	\$ 1,852,559	\$ -	\$ 1,640,216
<b>FTE</b>	28.0	28.0	28.0	28.0	28.0	28.0	28.0	28.0

## East Unit

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

All expenditures for the East Unit, located in Stockton, are recorded separately from expenses related to the operation of the Central Unit. Included in this program are the salaries and wages for unit staff, unit administrator, support staff, unit team, and maintenance staff, as well as utilities, clothing, and other operating expenditures. Not funding for this program would result in the unit's closure.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5201, 75-5202, 75-5206, 75-5246, 75-5252, 75-5253, 75-5256, 75-52,131	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. To provide effective caseload management from reception to release of offenders from confinement.

### Program History

The 1987 Legislature authorized the acquisition of a farm implement dealership in Stockton for use as a minimum-security facility. The Stockton Correctional Facility received its first residents in 1988. In 1990, Stockton was administratively consolidated with Norton and renamed the Norton Correctional Facility – East Unit. Budgetary constraints in 2009 led to the suspension of East Unit operations. On September 1, 2010 the East Unit was re-opened.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Output Measures									
Additional Measures as Necessary									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 1,942,228	\$ 2,112,239	\$ 2,128,504	\$ 2,052,144	\$ 2,082,432	\$ 2,654,909	\$ 2,649,852	\$ 2,107,725
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,942,228	\$ 2,112,239	\$ 2,128,504	\$ 2,052,144	\$ 2,082,432	\$ 2,654,909	\$ 2,649,852	\$ 2,107,725
<b>FTE</b>	32.0	32.0	32.0	30.0	30.0	34.0	34.0	31.3

## Support Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Functions included in this program consist of maintenance, laundry, warehouse operations. Also included in this program are utility expenditures. Not funding the support services program would eliminate funding necessary for the operation and maintenance of the facility.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5201; 75-52,125	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

A. None

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Output Measures									
Additional Measures as Necessary									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 2,635,967	\$ 2,810,320	\$ 3,062,224	\$ 3,057,115	\$ 3,664,728	\$ 3,951,469	\$ 3,003,597	\$ 3,179,091
Non-SGF State Funds	112,204	125,858	113,093	47,552	165,875	63,852	75,000	134,942
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-				-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 2,748,171	\$ 2,936,178	\$ 3,175,317	\$ 3,104,667	\$ 3,830,603	\$ 4,015,321	\$ 3,078,597	\$ 3,314,033
<b>FTE</b>	18.0	18.0	18.0	18.0	18.0	17.0	17.0	18.0

## Capital Improvements

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The capital improvement program is used solely for budgeting and recording expenditures related to rehabilitation and repair projects. KDOC central office is appropriated \$4,920,000 from the Correctional Institutions Building Fund annually for rehabilitation and repair projects throughout the KDOC system. Funds are transferred to the facility as projects are approved. Eliminating this program would prohibit the Department from making repairs, upgrades, and improvements to the facilities.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5210, 75-52,125	Discretionary	No	2

### Program Goals

A. None; this program is for budgetary and accounting purposes only.

### Program History

None

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Output Measures									
Additional Measures as Necessary									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	450,026	164,058	464,282		\$ 400,798	\$ 326,828	-	343,046
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 450,026	\$ 164,058	\$ 464,282	\$ -	\$ 400,798	\$ 326,828	\$ -	\$ 343,046
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Administration program provides for the overall management and operational control of the facility. This program includes the warden, human resources, mailroom, policy and compliance, staff development, and fiscal. Not funding this program would eliminate the leadership and support functions necessary to operate the facility.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5201, 75-5202, 75-5206, 75-5246, 75- 5252, 75-5253, 75-5256, KSA 75-52,131a, KSA 75-52,134	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Operate and maintain a personnel system in accordance with state and departmental regulations, ensuring that positions are classified appropriately and that vacant positions are filled in a timely manner.
- B. Operate programs for existing and new employees that provide the training required by state law and departmental regulations.

### Program History

In 1961 the Kansas Legislature authorized the Director of Penal Institutions to convert facilities of the Kansas Technical Institute into a State Reception and Diagnostic Center (SRDC). The primary function of the facility was to perform evaluations on convicted offenders sentenced to the Kansas State Penitentiary and the Kansas State Industrial Reformatory. Offender work crews from the Penitentiary performed the renovation and the first residents were received in early 1962. Legislation in 1971 established the Kansas Correctional-Vocational Training Center (KCVTC). The targeted population was non-violent, youthful, first-time male offenders. KCVTC was built next to the SRDC and began to receive residents on January 2, 1975. KCVTC began housing female residents alongside the male population in 1979 to relieve the overcrowding at the Kansas Correctional Institution for Women at Lansing and to provide non-traditional vocational training opportunities to the female population. Legislation in 1984 established the Topeka Pre-Release Center on the grounds of the Topeka State Hospital. The purpose of this program was to provide male and female residents with a smoother transition from prison to the community. The Pre-Release Center operated until 1988 when it transitioned to a work-oriented facility for minimum custody male residents, and later female residents, under the name Topeka Correctional Facility. A work release program was then added at the Forbes Industrial Area, where it operated as the Forbes Correctional Facility. Consolidation of the four separate operations in Topeka began with the passage of Senate Bill 748 in 1990. Initially, SRDC and KCVTC became the Topeka Correctional Facility-East and the Topeka Correctional Facility and Forbes Correctional Facility became known as the Topeka Correctional Facility-West. In 1991 these two operations were further consolidated under a single administration designated as the Topeka Correctional Facility. In 1994 the work release unit at Forbes closed. In 1995, construction of I-Cell House was completed and the maximum-security female population at Lansing was relocated to Topeka. In 2001, the last of the male population departed TCF when the reception and diagnostic unit was relocated to El Dorado. In 2002 the unit on the former State Hospital grounds was closed and the staff reassigned to the newly remodeled J-Cellhouse, bringing all TCF operations within the complex that exists today.

Topeka Correctional Facility

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Turnover Rates - Uniformed	A	28.3%	20.0%	26.6%	25.2%	29.0%	36.6%	36.3%	25.2%
2. Turnover Rates - Non-Uniformed	A	15.6%	12.0%	32.5%	31.7%	20.3%	17.6%	17.4%	21.6%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Average Daily Population		922	887	750	741	709	730	724	782
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,099,480	\$ 1,503,344	\$ 1,186,404	\$ 1,128,010	\$ 1,136,678	\$ 1,309,849	\$ 1,447,262	\$ 1,275,475
Non-SGF State Funds	42,044	-	-					-
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,141,524	\$ 1,503,344	\$ 1,186,404	\$ 1,128,010	\$ 1,136,678	\$ 1,309,849	\$ 1,447,262	\$ 1,275,475
<b>FTE</b>	17.0	19.0	17.0	16.0	16.0	18.0	18.0	17.3

## Security

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Security program include salaries and wages for all uniformed security officers and operating expenses, such as clothing, drug testing, and security equipment. This program is essential to operating the facility.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5201, 75-5202, 75-5206, 75-5246, 75- 5252, 75-5253, 75-5256, KSA 75-52,131a, KSA 75-52,134	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To maintain an effective posture of physical/perimeter security as measured by the KDOC Security Inspection and accreditation audits.
- B. To effectively control unsanctioned prison groups in the prison population through proper identification, tracking, intelligence gathering techniques, and management strategies.
- C. To maintain a safe environment for incarcerated offenders.

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of inmates involved in escape by facility type	A								
Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Number of escape events and number of inmates involved by security custody level	A								
Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Number of apprehensions	A								
Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Topeka Correctional Facility

Non-Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Number of validated security threat group members as identified.	B							
		1	1	1	0			1
5. Number of gang related activities/disruptions based on incident reports and facility activity reports.	B							
		3	0	0	0			0
6. Number of inmate-on-inmate assaults/batteries by custody level (injury/non-injury).	C							
		49/0	46/1	0/1	0/0	9/0	4/0	5/0
7. Number of inmate-on-staff batteries by custody level, which have been referred for criminal prosecution (injury/non-injury).	C							
		0/14	1/8	0/3	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/4
8. Number of disruptive events	C	0	2	0	0	0	0	0.67
9. Number of substantiated inmate-on-inmate sexual assaults	C							
		2	2	1	1	0	0	1
10. Number of substantiated staff-on-inmate sexual assaults	C							
		1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Additional Measures as Necessary								

Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 10,912,902	\$ 12,809,633	\$ 12,457,962	\$ 12,245,208	\$ 11,843,553	\$ 13,151,499	\$ 13,747,421	\$ 12,370,383
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	60,525	53,226	58,719		17,742
Federal Funds	-	66	-					33
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 10,912,902</b>	<b>\$ 12,809,699</b>	<b>\$ 12,457,962</b>	<b>\$ 12,305,733</b>	<b>\$ 11,896,779</b>	<b>\$ 13,210,218</b>	<b>\$ 13,747,421</b>	<b>\$ 12,388,147</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>181.0</b>	<b>186.0</b>	<b>187.5</b>	<b>185.5</b>	<b>185.5</b>	<b>185.0</b>	<b>185.0</b>	<b>186.3</b>

## Classification & Programs

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This program includes Classification and Records and various support functions. Classification and Records are responsible for the reporting and recording of all pertinent information regarding the movement and progress of residents at the facility, to included establishment of legal authority to incarcerate, movement, behavior, progress, disciplinary history, and program participation. Under the coordination of the unit teams, an individualized treatment program is developed, implemented, and maintained for each resident. Each resident, as well as facility staff, is kept aware of the resident's status within the correctional process. This program provides direct case management to the inmates, holding them accountable for their behavior, while identifying and localizing problems within each unit. Also include in this program are chaplain services, library services, and recreation. Not funding this program would eliminate the processes and activities that are critical to appropriate placement, documentation, and treatment plan development and implementation.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 75-5210, 75-5210a, 75-5211	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. To provide effective caseload management from reception to release of offenders from confinement.

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Percentage of inmates available for work who are employed; percent of inmates unemployed due to no jobs available.	A								
Inmates employed		75.0%	75.0%	76.0%	77.0%	79.0%	80.0%	82.0%	76.7%
Inmates unemployed - no jobs available		25.0%	18.0%	12.0%	12.0%	21.0%	20.0%	18.0%	17.0%
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

Topeka Correctional Facility

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 2,201,681	\$ 2,382,981	\$ 2,304,703	\$ 2,170,116	\$ 2,136,870	\$ 2,561,199	\$ 2,661,534	\$ 2,274,851
Non-SGF State Funds	61,673	-	-		105,128			35,043
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 2,263,354	\$ 2,382,981	\$ 2,304,703	\$ 2,170,116	\$ 2,241,998	\$ 2,561,199	\$ 2,661,534	\$ 2,309,894
<b>FTE</b>	32.0	33.0	35.0	33.0	33.0	33.5	33.5	33.7

## Support Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Functions included in this program consist of maintenance, laundry, warehouse operations. Also included in this program are utility expenditures. Not

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General    KSA 75-5201; 75-52,125	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

A. None

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Output Measures									
Additional Measures as Necessary									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 2,353,125	\$ 2,435,729	\$ 2,856,156	\$ 2,357,595	\$ 3,314,535	\$ 3,339,355	\$ 3,574,080	\$ 2,868,807
Non-SGF State Funds	164,593	79,152	158,074	188,216	91,174	180,554	183,118	109,467
Federal Funds	123,964	107,136	67,900	107,717	77,174	109,401	111,414	84,070
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,641,682</b>	<b>\$ 2,622,017</b>	<b>\$ 3,082,130</b>	<b>\$ 2,653,528</b>	<b>\$ 3,482,883</b>	<b>\$ 3,629,310</b>	<b>\$ 3,868,612</b>	<b>\$ 3,062,343</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>32.0</b>	<b>22.0</b>	<b>22.0</b>	<b>22.0</b>	<b>22.0</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>22.0</b>

## Capital Improvements

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The capital improvement program is used solely for budgeting and recording expenditures related to rehabilitation and repair projects. KDOC central office is appropriated \$4,920,000 from the Correctional Institutions Building Fund annually for rehabilitation and repair projects throughout the KDOC system. Funds are transferred to the facility as projects are approved. Eliminating this program would prohibit the Department from making repairs, upgrades, and improvements to the facilities.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
General KSA 75-5210, 75-52,125	Discretionary	No	2

### Program Goals

A. None; this program is for budgetary and accounting purposes only.

### Program History

None

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
<i>Output Measures</i>									
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	110,236	77,507	489,022	516,180	436,608	844,434		334,379
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 110,236	\$ 77,507	\$ 489,022	\$ 516,180	\$ 436,608	\$ 844,434	\$ -	\$ 334,379
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## APRA - 24/7 Pay Plan

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

N/A

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Matc h Rqt.	Priority Level
-----------------	------------------	--------------------	-------------------

### Program Goals

A. None; this program is for budgetary and accounting purposes only.

### Program History

None

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Output Measures									
Additional Measures as Necessary									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-		-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	1,034,679				-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,034,679	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Administration program provides for the overall management and operational control of the facility. This program includes the warden, human resources, mailroom, policy and compliance, staff development, and fiscal. Not funding this program would eliminate the leadership and support functions necessary to operate the facility.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
General KSA 75-5201, 75-5202, 75-5206, 75-5246, 75- 5252, 75-5253, 75-5256, 75-3370	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Operate and maintain a personnel system in accordance with state and departmental regulations, ensuring that positions are classified appropriately and that vacant positions are filled in a timely manner.
- B. Operate programs for existing and new employees that provide the training required by state law and departmental regulations.

### Program History

The Winfield Correctional Facility was established in 1984 by SB 496 as the Winfield Pre-Release Center on the grounds of the Winfield State Hospital and Training Center (WSH&TC). In 1987, funds were appropriated to expand capacity and in 1989 the name was changed to the Winfield Correctional Facility. As the need for more prison beds grew, funds were appropriated in 1995 and 1998 to renovate vacant WSH&TC housing units. On July 1, 1997, WCF assumed operations of the maintenance shop, laundry, and warehouse formerly operated by WSH&TC. WCF also assumed the responsibility of maintaining the security of the entire complex. Following the recommendations of the Hospital Closure Commission, WSH&TC was closed during FY 1998. In 1999 the ownership of the property was split between and the Kansas Veterans Commission. The Kansas Veteran's Home (KVH) opened in February 2000. WCF provides laundry services, grounds maintenance, trash removal, perimeter and grounds security, warehouse space and maintenance shop services. WCF also pays electricity, natural gas, water, and solid waste utilities for KVH. On July 1, 2020, Triplett and Funston Halls were transferred from KVH to WCF. These units will be used as an assisted living and acute care unit and substance abuse program unit. Renovations are expected to be completed during FY 2021 and the units occupied in FY 2022. In 1976 the Wichita Work Release Facility (WWRF) was established as a separate facility in accordance with the 1974 Penal Reform Act, which required the establishment of work release programs designed to provide residents with an opportunity to develop work skills and secure employment prior to release. Originally consisting of 22 mixed-gender beds near Wichita State University, WWRF relocated and expanded capacity in 1978 and again in 1989. The 1990 Legislature appropriated funds to purchase and renovate a building in downtown Wichita, where WWRF is located today. In 1996, WWRF was administratively consolidated with WCF. In 2002, the female population was transferred to the Topeka Correctional Facility.

Winfield Correctional Facility

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Turnover Rates - Uniformed	A	21.8%	10.8%	17.0%	16.8%	23.9%	18.2%	18.2%	17.2%
2. Turnover Rates - Non-Uniformed	A	1702.0%	12.9%	8.5%	12.5%	14.9%	13.0%	13.0%	12.1%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Average Daily Population		785	577	577	755	557	661	749	570

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,015,484	\$ 980,367	\$ 915,809	\$ 960,965	\$ 935,165	\$1,278,374	\$ 1,326,615	\$ 943,780
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,015,484	\$ 980,367	\$ 915,809	\$ 960,965	\$ 935,165	\$1,278,374	\$ 1,326,615	\$ 943,780
<b>FTE</b>	12.0	12.0	13.0	13.0	13.0	18.0	18.0	12.7

## Security

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Security program include salaries and wages for all uniformed security officers and operating expenses, such as clothing, drug testing, and security equipment. This program is essential to operating the facility.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5201, 75-5202, 75-5206, 75-5246, 75- 5252, 75-5253, 75-5256, 75-3370	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To maintain an effective posture of physical/perimeter security as measured by the KDOC Security Inspection and accreditation audits.
- B. To effectively control unsanctioned prison groups in the prison population through proper identification, tracking, intelligence gathering techniques, and management strategies.
- C. To maintain a safe environment for incarcerated offenders.

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Number of inmates involved in escape by facility type	A								
Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Secure		1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.33
2. Number of escape events and number of inmates involved by security custody level	A								
Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Secure		1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.33
3. Number of apprehensions	A								
Secure		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Secure		1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.33

Winfield Correctional Facility

4. Number of validated security threat group members as identified.	B	56	93	82	88	62	70	68	79
5. Number of gang related activities/disruptions based on incident reports and facility activity reports.	B	88	86	45	73	9	53	53	46.67
6. Number of inmate-on-inmate assaults/batteries by custody level (injury/non-injury).	C								
Minimum		1/1	4/12	9/0	5/0	11/0	6/0	6/0	6/0
Medium		0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
Maximum		0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
7. Number of inmate-on-staff batteries by custody level, which have been referred for criminal prosecution (injury/non-injury).	C								
Minimum		1/1	1/0	0/0	1/0	1/0	1/0	1/0	1/0
Medium		0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
Maximum		0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
8. Number of disruptive events	C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. Number of substantiated inmate-on-inmate sexual assaults	C	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. Number of substantiated staff-on-inmate sexual assaults	C	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0.67
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 5,825,444	\$ 6,701,321	\$ 5,620,009	\$ 6,585,694	\$ 6,705,715	\$10,750,609	\$ 11,466,779	\$ 6,342,348
Non-SGF State Funds	11,033	28,469	(4,189)	427,451	10,442	515,393	541,163	11,574
Federal Funds	-	(28)	164					68
<b>Total</b>	\$ 5,836,477	\$ 6,729,762	\$ 5,615,984	\$ 7,013,145	\$ 6,716,157	\$11,266,002	\$ 12,007,942	\$ 6,353,968
<b>FTE</b>	105.0	104.0	104.0	104.0	104.0	150.0	151.0	104.0

## Classification & Programs

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This program includes Classification and Records and various support functions. Classification and Records are responsible for the reporting and recording of all pertinent information regarding the movement and progress of residents at the facility, to included establishment of legal authority to incarcerate, movement, behavior, progress, disciplinary history, and program participation. Under the coordination of the unit teams, an individualized treatment program is developed, implemented, and maintained for each resident. Each resident, as well as facility staff, is kept aware of the resident's status within the correctional process. This program provides direct case management to the inmates, holding them accountable for their behavior, while identifying and localizing problems within each unit. Also include in this program are chaplain services, library services, and recreation. Not funding this program would eliminate the processes and activities that are critical to appropriate placement, documentation, and treatment plan development and implementation.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 75-5210, 75-5210a, 75-5211	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. To provide effective caseload management from reception to release of offenders from confinement.

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Percentage of inmates available for work who are employed; percent of inmates unemployed due to no jobs available.	A								
Inmates employed		90.0%	76.0%	78.0%	81.0%	95.0%	78.0%	78.0%	83.0%
Inmates unemployed - no jobs available		8.0%	15.0%	17.0%	13.0%	2.0%	5.0%	5.0%	11.3%

### Funding

Winfield Correctional Facility

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 133,160	\$1,441,748	\$ 1,393,565	\$ 1,353,789	\$ 1,301,681	\$1,674,003	\$ 1,823,894	\$ 1,378,998
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 133,160	\$1,441,748	\$ 1,393,565	\$ 1,353,789	\$ 1,301,681	\$1,674,003	\$ 1,823,894	\$ 1,378,998
<b>FTE</b>	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	24.0	24.0	20.0

## Wichita Work Release Facility

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

All expenditures for the Wichita Work Release Facility are recorded separately from expenses related to the operation of the Winfield Correctional Facility. Included in this program are the salaries and wages for unit staff, the deputy warden, support staff, unit team, and maintenance staff, as well as utilities, clothing, and other operating expenditures. Not funding for this program would result in the unit's closure.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General    KSA 75-5206	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. None; measures are included in administration, security, and classification & programs

### Program History

In 1976 the Wichita Work Release Facility (WWRF) was established as a separate facility in accordance with the 1974 Penal Reform Act, which required the establishment of work release programs designed to provide residents with an opportunity to develop work skills and secure employment prior to release. Originally consisting of 22 mixed-gender beds near Wichita State University, WWRF relocated and expanded capacity in 1978 and again in 1989. The 1990 Legislature appropriated funds to purchase and renovate a building in downtown Wichita, where WWRF is located today. In 1996, WWRF was administratively consolidated with WCF. In 2002, the female population was transferred to the Topeka Correctional Facility.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

Winfield Correctional Facility

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 2,870,055	\$3,054,643	\$ 2,386,885	\$ 2,540,213	\$ 2,441,530	\$ 2,979,447	\$3,173,362	\$ 2,627,686
Non-SGF State Funds	546	(103)	-		3,489			1,129
Federal Funds	-	328	(898)					(285)
<b>Total</b>	\$ 2,870,601	\$3,054,868	\$ 2,385,987	\$ 2,540,213	\$ 2,445,019	\$ 2,979,447	\$3,173,362	\$ 2,628,625
<b>FTE</b>	43.0	44.0	44.0	44.0	44.0	43.0	43.0	44.0

## Support Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Functions included in this program consist of maintenance, laundry, warehouse operations. Also included in this program are utility expenditures. Not funding the support services program would eliminate funding necessary for the operation and maintenance of the facility.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5201; 75-52,125	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

A. None

### Program History

See the Administration program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
<i>Output Measures</i>									
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 3,070,338	\$3,020,118	\$ 3,135,258	\$ 3,158,045	\$ 3,719,430	\$5,471,697	\$ 4,531,444	\$ 3,291,602
Non-SGF State Funds	(25,975)	(33,707)	(11,800)		4,349			(13,719)
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 3,044,363</b>	<b>\$2,986,411</b>	<b>\$ 3,123,458</b>	<b>\$ 3,158,045</b>	<b>\$ 3,723,779</b>	<b>\$5,471,697</b>	<b>\$ 4,531,444</b>	<b>\$ 3,277,883</b>
<b>FTE</b>	21.0	21.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	22.0	22.0	20.3

## Capital Improvements

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The capital improvement program is used solely for budgeting and recording expenditures related to rehabilitation and repair projects. KDOC central office is appropriated \$4,920,000 from the Correctional Institutions Building Fund annually for rehabilitation and repair projects throughout the KDOC system. Funds are transferred to the facility as projects are approved. Eliminating this program would prohibit the Department from making repairs, upgrades, and improvements to the facilities.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-2101	Discretionary	No	2

### Program Goals

A. None; this program is for budgetary and accounting purposes only.

### Program History

None

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Output Measures									
Additional Measures as Necessary									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	574,876	250,975	704,401	287,515	\$ 337,812	-	-	431,063
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 574,876</b>	<b>\$ 250,975</b>	<b>\$ 704,401</b>	<b>\$ 287,515</b>	<b>\$ 337,812</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 431,063</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## ARPA - 24/7 Pay Plan

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

N/A

**Statutory Basis**

**Mandatory  
vs.**

**MOE/Matc  
h Rqt.**

**Priority  
Level**

### Program Goals

A. None; this program is for budgetary and accounting purposes only.

### Program History

None

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1.									
<i>Output Measures</i>									
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	\$ -	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	781,336				-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 781,336</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## Office of the Adjutant General

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Without adequate funding, the Adjutant General would cease to have the essential administrative support that is required to coordinate and synchronize all efforts of the Adjutant General's Department.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Generak	KSA 48-204	Discretionary	No	

### Program Goals

- A. Military forces trained and prepared to respond to state and federal missions.
- B. Prepare the state to provide effective and coordinated response and recovery to natural and manmade disasters, to include terrorism.

### Program History

--

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percentage of military forces trained and prepared	A	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
2. Level of preparedness coordinate response and recovery to diasters	B	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Adjutant General's Department

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 412,224	\$ 389,349	\$ 365,915		\$ 389,930	\$ 390,079		\$ 381,731
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 412,224	\$ 389,349	\$ 365,915	\$ -	\$ 389,930	\$ 390,079	\$ -	\$ 381,731
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## State Comptroller

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

With reduced or eliminated funding, the agency would incur late fees, loss of credibility from suppliers, missed state and federal deadlines, reduction of turnaround time on reimbursement from the federal government, reduced staff morale, inability to properly follow procurement and travel rules, inability to pay State Active Duty in a timely manner, loss of inventory control and increased deficiency findings from state and federal audits.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt. No	Priority Level 3
General KSA 48-205 through 48-206			

### Program Goals

- A. Total number of repeat audit findings on the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards (SEFA)
- B. Total amount of late fees paid annually

### Program History

--

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of repeat findings on SEFA audits	A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Amount of late fees paid annually	B	\$ 5,060	\$ 5,415	\$ 2,627	\$ -	\$ 1,558	\$ 1,000	\$ 750	\$ 3,200

Adjutant General's Department

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 464,370	\$ 508,592	\$ 365,725			\$ 574,066	\$ 570,574	\$ 437,159
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-			-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-			137,645	139,096	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 464,370</b>	<b>\$ 508,592</b>	<b>\$ 365,725</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 711,711</b>	<b>\$ 709,670</b>	<b>\$ 291,439</b>
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.0	11.0	0.0

## Administration and Overhead - Human Resources

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Employees will not have direct access to information and technical support for benefits and payroll. There would be no structure for the implementation and administration of agency policies and procedures that ensure the fair and equitable treatment of employees as required by state and federal laws, statutes, regulations and practices. The agency will be vulnerable to equal employment opportunity (EEO) claims and employment lawsuits.

**Statutory Basis**

**Mandatory  
vs.**

**MOE/Match  
Rgt.**

**Priority  
Level**

### Program Goals

A. 100% of employees received New Employee Orientation (NEO) including enrollment in State Benefits for which they are eligible within two weeks of start date.

B. Percentage of employees that received a performance review annually.

### Program History

--

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percentage of employees that received new employee orientation	A	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
2. Percentage of employees that received an annual performance review	B	99.5%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Adjutant General's Department

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 171,582	\$ 183,847	\$ 188,819			\$ 237,046	\$ 239,289	\$ 186,333
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 171,582</b>	<b>\$ 183,847</b>	<b>\$ 188,819</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 237,046</b>	<b>\$ 239,289</b>	<b>\$ 124,222</b>
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	0.0

## Public Affairs Office

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The public will not be informed or updated on emergencies or disasters, which would have an impact on the Governor's ability to effectively respond to emergencies or disasters. Additionally, a lack of awareness of the activities of the Adjutant General's Department would have a negative impact on recruiting in the Kansas National Guard. The inability to meet recruiting requirements would put the State at risk to lose force structure and vital capabilities needed to respond to emergencies or disasters.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
-----------------	------------------	-------------------	-------------------

### Program Goals

- A. Staff the Joint Information Center during emergencies that require activation of the State Emergency Operations Center to coordinate and disseminate messages with Emergency Support Function partners via the media and social media platforms.
- B. During educational campaigns (Severe Weather Awareness Week, Suicide Prevention Month, Read the Label Campaign, Sexual Assault Awareness, Kansas Preparedness Month, etc.) content is created and provided through various channels which include social media platforms, internal/external e-mails and news releases to the media.
- C. Publication of agency (Kansas Division of Emergency Management and the Kansas Army and Air National Guard) news and stories to keep the stakeholders in our agency, communities and state engaged and informed on what is happening within the agency.

### Program History

The Kansas Militia, was formed Aug. 30, 1855. In 1993, the Division of Emergency Preparedness was redesignated as the Division of Emergency Management.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percentage of times the JIC was staffed during emergencies	A	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
2. Percentage of times content was created for educational campaigns	B	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Adjutant General's Department

<i>Output Measures</i>								
3. Percentage of times agency news stories were published	C							
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 151,230	\$ 153,272	\$ 111,811			\$ 251,458	\$ 252,557	\$ 132,542
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 151,230</b>	<b>\$ 153,272</b>	<b>\$ 111,811</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 251,458</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 88,361</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## Information Technology

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Adjutant General's Department does not receive IT support from the KS Office of Information Technology Services (OITS). State employees/functions within the department receive IT support from the National Guard (NG) under a memorandum of agreement (MOA) at nominal cost to the state. Reducting the funding used for this purpose would result in the inability to pay for IT support from the NG. Thus the agency would have to secure IT support through other emans, which would result in significantly increased costs to the state.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
-----------------	------------------	-------------------	-------------------

### Program Goals

- A. Percentage of uptime for all prescribed services
- B. Percentage of all Help Desk tickets responded to within 1 business day
- C. Percentage of all requests for application and/or IT project development reviewed and evaluated and clarly approved or rejected within 28 working days.
- D. Percentage of all approved projects completed within established time and cost parameters
- E. Percentage of customer service feedback is rated "Positive"

### Program History

--

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percentage of uptime for prescribed services	A	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%				99.0%
2. Percentage of Help Desk tickets responded to within 1 business day	B	98.0%	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%				99.0%
3. Percentage of requests for IT projects reviewed within 28 days	C	86.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%				100.0%

Adjutant General's Department

<i>Output Measures</i>								
4. Percentage of projects completed within established time and cost	D							
		72.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%			95.0%
5. Percentage of customer feedback rated "Positive"	E							
		92.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			100.0%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 151,230	\$ 153,272	\$ 111,811					\$ 132,542
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 151,230</b>	<b>\$ 153,272</b>	<b>\$ 111,811</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 88,361</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## Civil Air Patrol

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Emergency and other services provided by the Civil Air Patrol (CAP) such as search and rescue and disaster relief would be cost prohibitive if the State were required to purchase the services. The State would have to either pay the CAP or contract those duties that the CAP currently provides.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Mandatory	MOE/Match Rqt. No	Priority Level 5
Specific KSA 48-3301 through KSA 3304			

### Program Goals

A .Agency simply administers the program.

### Program History

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1.									
2.									
3.									
Output Measures									
4.									
5.									

### Funding

# Adjutant General's Department

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 42,236	\$ 42,236	\$ 42,236			\$ 43,200	\$ 42,236	\$ 42,236
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 42,236	\$ 42,236	\$ 42,236	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 43,200	\$ -	\$ 28,157
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Army National Guard Facilities - Infrastructure

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Reduced or eliminated state funding would result in significantly increased risk for Army facilities. Kansas ARNG facilities are currently rated as "poor" in multiple areas and without acceptable funding levels from the state, we cannot sustain and modernize these facilities in order to support training Soldiers for State and Federal missions. If the condition of our facilities falls below acceptable levels there is risk of losing the units associated with those facilities. The loss of those units would result in the loss of the capabilities they possess for our state during an emergency and a loss of economic impact to our Kansas communities. Additionally, increased state investment in facility maintenance provides additional leverage when pursuing accompanying federal resources.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
-----------------	------------------	----------------	-------------------

### Program Goals

- A. Fund and support 84 Readiness Centers & other Federal buildings and ground maintenance across the State (1,376,723 sq ft)
- B. Fund and Support 103 Training Site Facilities across the State (753,842 sq ft)
- C. Fund and Support 28 Logistical Facilities across the State (283,170 sq ft)

### Program History

Funding supports activities associated with the maintenance of Army National Guard (ARNG) buildings and grounds through sustainment, restoration, and modernization. These efforts are essential to providing community based installations and training sites that by virtue of their geographical dispersion can be leveraged by the Army and the State; and that facilitate communications, operations, training, and equipment sustainment to support the deployment of required forces for assigned State and Federal missions.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Routine Facility WO w/in 60 days		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
2. Urgent WO w/in 7 days		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
3. Emergency WO w/in 24 hours		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
4. Preventative WO completed each quarter		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
5. Percent of federal \$ per state \$ invested		80.0%	80.0%		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	90.0%

Adjutant General's Department

<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>								
6. Lease Renewals/New Leases	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
7. Energy Audits (required 25% yearly)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
8. A/E Compliance w/ EEP Standards	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
9. Building Mgr Training per year		2	2	2	2	2	2	2

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,303,883	\$ 1,790,106	\$ 2,384,714			\$ 1,618,287	\$ 1,322,107	\$ 2,087,410
Non-SGF State Funds	483,375	367,136	154,314					260,725
Federal Funds	18,045,539	23,050,035	18,228,707			16,123,521	16,150,239	20,639,371
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 19,832,797</b>	<b>\$ 25,207,277</b>	<b>\$ 20,767,735</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 17,741,808</b>	<b>\$ 17,472,346</b>	<b>\$ 15,325,004</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## Air Guard Facilities - Infrastructure

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Significant risk is associated with a lack of state funding for Air Guard facilities sustainment and modernization to support State and Federal missions. State funds equals federal financial support and without it Kansas communities will witness an economic impact and degraded emergency response.

**Statutory Basis**

**Mandatory  
vs.**

**MOE/Match  
Rqt.**

**Priority  
Level**

### Program Goals

- A. Provide a trained, professional force ready to serve Community, State and Nation
- B. Provide sustainment, repair and maintenance for Air National Guard licensed facilities
- C. Operate facilities economically, efficiently and timely to be good stewards of state funding

### Program History

This agreement is a contract between the State of Kansas and the United States government for the operation and maintenance of US Government facilities licensed for use by the State of Kansas. This agreement is written pursuant to Public Law 95-224, Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-104 and approved by the Adjutant General pursuant to authorities prescribed in K.S.A. 48-204 A.D. Title 32 U.S.C.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Manpower funded/authorized		72	75	78	80	69	80	80	74
2. Base Population Authorized							2300	2300	

Adjutant General's Department

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 965,982	\$ 960,521	\$ 1,109,903			\$ 1,083,306	\$ 1,084,955	\$ 1,035,212
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	5,689,356	6,106,409	6,811,908			6,475,398	6,510,006	6,459,159
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 6,655,338</b>	<b>\$ 7,066,930</b>	<b>\$ 7,921,811</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 7,558,704</b>	<b>\$ 7,594,961</b>	<b>\$ 4,996,247</b>
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Kansas Intelligence Fusion Center

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Reduced funding would result in fewer analysts, which would dramatically reduce the awareness of the threats to Kansas, its citizens, governmental institutions, critical infrastructure, key resources and private sector businesses and industry. This will result in increased risk to the items listed above, and reduced ability to prevent or mitigate the effects of naturally-occurring events like emerging diseases or purposeful acts, such as terrorism.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 48-3701 through 48-3710	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Create high-value all-source intelligence products to protect life, freedoms and property of the people of Kansas. KIFC is focused on the three primary Kansas Homeland Security (HLS) risk areas:
- B. Terrorism threats, asymmetric warfare threats and transnational criminal organization (TCO) threats;
- C. Biological threats (both manmade and natural pathogens threatening human health, animal health, and plant/crop health)
- D. Cyber-warfare threats and threats to Critical Infrastructure/Key Resources (CIKR)

### Program History

Since 2012, KIFC has aggressively sought to search, process, and exploit classified information from national intelligence networks, databases and message handling systems that support Kansas specific HLS intelligence analysis while building trusted partnerships with federal homeland security, intelligence community and law enforcement (LE) agencies to improve KIFC's ability to access threat information impacting Kansas. Gather local and state level threat events and suspicious activity reporting (SAR) for early detection of homeland security threats and for correlation with national level intelligence to develop analysis of persistent threats and long term trends, while protecting the civil liberties and privacy of Kansas citizens. Conduct rigorous intelligence analysis to support Kansas specific homeland security decision making needs at both the strategic and tactical levels. Develop networks of state and local homeland security, public safety, law enforcement and critical infrastructure partners to maximize dissemination of threat reporting and risk assessments and to collect continual feedback for regular reassessment of Kansas intelligence needs.

Adjutant General's Department

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Number of threat briefings		106	56	100	100	100	100	100	85
2. Publish Intel Reports to intelligence community		31	53	75	50	50	50	50	59
3. Intel products disseminated to KS intelligence community		13	44	20	20	20	20	20	28

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 222,779	\$ 251,230	\$ 339,454			\$ 882,622	\$ 881,977	\$ 295,342
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 222,779</b>	<b>\$ 251,230</b>	<b>\$ 339,454</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 882,622</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 196,895</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## Mitigation, Preparedness, Prevention, Response & Recovery

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

A reduction in funding would greatly reduce the ability for the State of Kansas to prepare, respond, and recover from natural or unnatural disasters. It is necessary to have state funds in order to receive federal funds. Without State funds these programs would not be able to support their statutory requirements. The inability to serve our state in times of need would be evident during a disaster. Lack of funds to adequately prepare for, respond to, and recover from any disaster could be devastating to our state.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	KSA 48-9	Mandatory	Yes/50%	1

### Program Goals

- A. Strengthen the State of Kansas' ability to prevent, protect, respond to, and recover from all hazards
- B. Funding provides for KDEM personnel and administrative costs associated with planning, mitigation, response, recovery, training, and exercises.
- C. Enhance statewide preparedness capabilities through collaboration and partnerships.

### Program History

The Division was established in 1941 as State Council of Defense evolving to all an all-hazard program in 1974. KDEM was created under the revised statutes of Kansas, KSA Chapter 48, Article 9, (Kansas Emergency Preparedness for Disasters Act); and KSA Chapter 65, Article 57, (Kansas Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act).

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of training courses conducted		87	35	24		16	32	70	25
2. Number of exercises conducted		215	144	75		78	125	165	99
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Number of reviewed County Emergency Operations Plans		20	6	57		6	44	11	23

Adjutant General's Department

4. Number of public awareness campaigns	6	6	6	6	12	6	6
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>							
5. Number of ESF partner meetings	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
6. Maintain KRP	1	1	1	100	100	100	34

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 933,492	\$ 845,469	\$ 834,661			\$ 1,414,814	\$ 1,414,817	\$ 840,065
Non-SGF State Funds	26,724	-	-					-
Federal Funds	3,454,034	4,734,592	3,741,929			5,168,097	5,168,094	4,238,261
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 4,414,250</b>	<b>\$ 5,580,061</b>	<b>\$ 4,576,590</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 6,582,911</b>	<b>\$ 6,582,911</b>	<b>\$ 3,385,550</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## Crisis City Training & Exercise Facility

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Operations at Crisis City will be curtailed or stopped, leaving large parts of the training venue unusable. This will result in a degradation of Kansas first responder skills, and an increase in local, county, and state agency costs by forcing them to pursue this training outside the state of Kansas.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General	KSA 48-928	Discretionary	No	3

### Program Goals

A. Ensure maintenance of venues and utilities are in working order.

### Program History

The facility opened in October 1, 2009 and provides a state-of-the-art training and exercise facility to for first responders, the private sector, military civil support and emergency managers to apply learning in a practical environment.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Operational & Ready Status 100% 365/24/7	A	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 72,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 72,000			\$ 40,412	\$ 40,412	\$ 72,000
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 72,000</b>	<b>\$ 72,000</b>	<b>\$ 72,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 40,412</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 48,000</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## Disaster Recovery Payments

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Eligible applicants at the local, state, and Indian Tribes will not receive pass through funds for federally declared disaster which is a violation of the Federal/State Agreement. These funds are associated with eligible reimbursements for disasters.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 48-926	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

A. Provide reimbursement to eligible applicants as a result of a federal disaster declaration.

### Program History

--

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Reimburse eligible applicants	A								

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 3,034,739	\$ 2,855,688	\$ 1,626,600					\$ 2,241,144
Non-SGF State Funds	348,766	-	1,096,980					548,490
Federal Funds	19,501,837	19,656,073	24,333,687					21,994,880
<b>Total</b>	\$ 22,885,342	\$ 22,511,761	\$ 27,057,267	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,523,009
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## State Declared Disaster Payments

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Without funding there would be no coordination of resources, causing chaos and potentially more loss. The State Emergency Operations Center (SEOC) reduces those risks. During emergencies and disasters, the SEOC facility serves as the nerve center for federal, state, and local coordination, and is necessary to ensure continuity of operations and government in major disasters caused by any hazard. The cost burden of state-only is that there is no federal funding is available.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific      KSA 48-926	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

A. Provide funds to supplement resources needed to respond to a governor's state of disaster declaration

### Program History

--

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of State Declared	A	7	12			6			9
2. Number of damage assessments completed	A	181	3			6			5
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Total state funds paid for State-only declared disasters		\$ 613,702	\$ 699,178						\$ 699,178

Adjutant General's Department

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 453,040			\$ 151,013
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 453,040	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 151,013
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Federally-Declared Disaster Payments

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Without federal disaster funding, all response and recovery mission costs will fall onto the state and local levels. This will place a massive cost burden on those affected. Currently when a disaster is federally declared the state must provide 25% and the federal government provides 75%. Of the state's 25% share, 15% is paid by the applicant and 10% is paid with state funds (SGF or State Emergency Funds). The state must commit 25% or the federal share will not be available and provided.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 48-926	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

A.

B.

C.

### Program History

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, PL 100-707, signed into law November 23, 1988; amended the Disaster Relief Act of 1974, PL 93-288.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of federal declaration requests		3				3			3
2. Number of federal disaster declarations		3				3			3
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Number of damage assessments completed		181				3			3

Adjutant General's Department

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -			\$ 6,064,697	\$ 3,400,000	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	-	-	-			51,719,480	38,118,868	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 57,784,177	\$ 41,518,868	\$ -
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Emergency Communications

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This section is vital to public safety communications for the state. It functions as the sole focal point for coordinated efforts to ensure effective and available communications in disasters as well as daily public safety operations. Due to its small size, any appreciable reduction in funding could result in complete elimination of functions essential to the statewide application of public safety communications.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific    KSA 48-937	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Maintain readiness to provide statewide interoperable communications

### Program History

The function of emergency communication was established in 2007 due to the Governor's Executive Order establishing Interoperability in Kansas. One personnel reported to the Adjutant General and the Kansas Department of Transportation provided personnel and two deployable Communication on Wheels (COW) to support the state's 800 MhZ radio system. Later, the Office of Emergency Communications was established within the military division of the Adjutant General's Department and the personnel and equipment from KDOT was transferred to this office. In 2017, the Office was transferred to KDEM and is located within the Response & Recovery Bureau.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. All requests for training/information are responded to within 1 business day	A	99.0%	99.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.7%
2. Percentage of time deployable communications capabilities are available for response.	A	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<i>Output Measures</i>									

Adjutant General's Department

3. Deployable communications capabilities are able to respond within 12 hours.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
4. State Emergency Operations Center (SEOC) activations are provided with Emergency Support Function #2 (ESF2) support.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 320,089	\$ 486,776	\$ 110,548			\$ 398,953	\$ 637,798	\$ 298,662
Non-SGF State Funds	569,794	272,929	224,823					248,876
Federal Funds	26,093	3,062	-					1,531
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 915,976</b>	<b>\$ 762,767</b>	<b>\$ 335,371</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 398,953</b>	<b>\$ 637,798</b>	<b>\$ 366,046</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## Radiological, Biological & Nuclear

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Reduced or eliminated funding would inhibit the state's ability to properly prepare and exercise for an event and the State would be in non-compliance with Kansas Regulations. Additionally, if the State does not plan and successfully pass an evaluated exercise, nuclear plants in the State can lose their license to operate.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific    KSA 48-9, 40-48	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Provide outreach to ingestion pathway counties, update incident specific plan and calibrate and distribute radiological equipment

### Program History

1970s: To meet requirements of the federal Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), a Radiological Systems Management section was established. Responsibilities included inspection, repair, calibration, and exchange services for over 70,000 radiological detection, as well as identification, and computation instruments in Kansas. The construction of two nuclear power plants – the Wolf Creek Generating Station near Burlington, Kansas, and the Cooper Nuclear Station in southeast Nebraska – required increased planning activities to protect the public from a potential release of radioactive material into the environment. The Kansas Statute that governs this section is Chapter 48 Article 9 Section 40-48, which is the Kansas Nuclear Safety Emergency Management Act.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percentage of outreach to local emergency planning committees and industry	A	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
2. Percentage of repairs/calibration	A	100.0%	100.0%			100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
3. Conduct of annual nuclear power plant exercise	A	1	1	1		1	1	1	1

Adjutant General's Department

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 50,853	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	604,008	617,707	586,301			775,301	775,301	602,004
Federal Funds	244,802	320,226	68,246			351,682	351,682	194,236
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 899,663</b>	<b>\$ 937,933</b>	<b>\$ 654,547</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,126,983</b>	<b>\$ 1,126,983</b>	<b>\$ 530,827</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## State Active Duty

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Kansas National Guard would be unable to perform the duties as ordered by the Governor in the event of an emergency.

**Statutory Basis**

**Mandatory  
vs.**

**MOE/Match  
Rqt.**

**Priority  
Level**

### Program Goals

A.  
B.  
C.

### Program History

State laws passed in 1885 created the Kansas National Guard from resources of the State Militia. As a joint State/Federal agency, the dual mission of the Kansas National Guard is mandated in Article 8, Constitution of Kansas and Article 1, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution. A 1903 Congressional Act formalized Federal/State authorities in U.S.C. Titles 32, 10, and 5. K.S.A. 48-209 authorizes the Governor to place retired members of the Kansas National Guard on State duty for short periods of time to fulfill essential public safety service to Kansas. K.S.A. 48-253 provides authorities for the State to assist funding the KNG marksmanship programs. A major share is now federally funded including pay, travel, equipment and training.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percentage of all approved State Active Duty missions filled by KSNG per KDEM requirements		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
2. Percentage of guardsmen assigned against authorized positions		92.9%	90.8%	100.0%		90.0%	92.0%	92.0%	93.6%
<i>Output Measures</i>									

Adjutant General's Department

3. Percentage of qualified		78.3%	8401.0%	87.5%		88.0%	88.0%	88.0%	2858.8%
----------------------------	--	-------	---------	-------	--	-------	-------	-------	---------

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000			\$ 51,000	\$ 51,000	\$ 40,000
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 40,000</b>	<b>\$ 40,000</b>	<b>\$ 40,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 51,000</b>	<b>\$ 51,000</b>	<b>\$ 26,667</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## State Emergency Operations Center

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The State Emergency Operations Center is the visual and operational hub to coordinate the state's response and recovery actions to support local governments. Care and upkeep is of the utmost importance. Without a properly maintained facility, the State's ability to respond to and recover from incidents would be greatly diminished. Additionally, without the State Emergency Operations Center, the ability to coordinate efforts with other State and Federal Agencies is eliminated.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific    KSA 48-928	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

A. Sustain and enhance state operational readiness and response capabilities

### Program History

The Division was established in 1941 as State Council of Defense evolving to an all-hazards program in 1974. KDEM was created under the revised statutes of Kansas, KSA Chapter 48, Article 9, (Kansas Emergency Preparedness for Disasters Act); and KSA Chapter 65, Article 57, (Kansas Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act).

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. SEOC 24/7/365 readiness		100.0%	100.0%			100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Adjutant General's Department

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Without funding for this program there would be a complete loss of leadership and overhead functions for the Kansas Bureau of Investigation.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General	Discretionary	No	6

### Program Goals

A. Administration division includes the office of the director which is the agency's central management. It also includes governmental affairs, fiscal office, office of general counsel, human resources office, office of communications and engagement, office of professional standards and facilities operations. These divisions have the vital responsibility of providing accurate information and timely services to support the operations of the bureau.

B. Maintain a vacancy level below 5% as compared to established staffing levels. This includes both FTE and Non-FTE positions.

C.

### Program History

This program has been established and is dedicated to support the other divisions of the bureau and provide criminal justice information to public and private agencies.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percent vacant		17.0%	15.0%	15.0%	8.0%	16.0%	10.0%	5.0%	15.3%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
2. Number of positions authorized		392	403	394	397	398	398	398	398
3. Number of filled positions		322	344	333	362	332	350	350	336

Kansas Bureau of Investigation

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 3,450,290	\$ 3,575,426	\$ 3,019,352	\$ 3,263,858	\$ 3,643,525	\$ 3,338,590	\$ 3,594,304	\$ 3,412,768
Non-SGF State Funds	412,152	531,088	419,717	658,814	379,802	636,113	763,069	443,536
Federal Funds	687,647	105,978	171,199	45,550	149,695	72,270	72,270	142,291
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 4,550,089</b>	<b>\$ 4,212,492</b>	<b>\$ 3,610,268</b>	<b>\$ 3,968,222</b>	<b>\$ 4,173,022</b>	<b>\$ 4,046,973</b>	<b>\$ 4,429,643</b>	<b>\$ 3,998,594</b>
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.0	27.0	27.0	27.0	9.0

## Field Investigation Division

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Field Investigation Division (FID) investigates approximately 200 violent person crimes per year. In particular, the division investigates about 80 suspicious death cases per year and about 25 to 30 of those are actually murders. The FID investigates approximately 45 to 50 cases per year involving public officials. The elimination of this program would be catastrophic to public safety in Kansas, particularly in the rural areas.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General 75-712(a), 75-711, 74-5607 (a)	Mandatory	No	1
Specific 75-712 (b-d), 75-4315d, 74-8705, 74-8805, 74-9804	Mandatory	No	

### Program Goals

A. The Field Investigations Division (FID) will endeavor to provide professional investigative assistance to local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies in response to all requests for assistance.

B.

C.

### Program History

Kansas Statutes Annotated 75-712, enacted by the Kansas legislature in 1939, empowered members of the KBI to make full and complete investigations at the direction of the attorney general. This originating statute embued the power and authority of a Kansas Sheriff to the commissioned members of the KBI.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percent of priority investigations declined	A	2.6%	1.7%	9.3%	5.0%	39.0%	5.0%	5.0%	16.7%
2. Percent of cases substantially completed in 90 days	A	54.3%	25.4%	38.5%	45.0%	40.5%	45.0%	45.0%	34.8%
3. Percent of prosecuted offenders convicted	A	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	97.0%	98.0%	97.0%	97.0%	99.3%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Number of investigations initiated	A	326	251	288	295	291	295	295	277
5. Number of investigations declined	A	24	59	86	20	41	20	20	62
6. Number of prosecuted offenders convicted	A	103	30	59	80	95	80	80	61

Kansas Bureau of Investigation

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 6,456,415	\$ 6,876,511	\$ 6,513,159	\$ 6,504,549	\$ 6,387,409	\$ 7,737,214	\$ 7,946,548	\$ 6,592,360
Non-SGF State Funds	131,144	109,373	79,055	117,072	88,404	76,476	77,018	92,277
Federal Funds	53,414	49,250	52,979	69,342	89,817	68,982	79,346	64,015
<b>Total</b>	\$ 6,640,973	\$ 7,035,134	\$ 6,645,193	\$ 6,690,963	\$ 6,565,630	\$ 7,882,672	\$ 8,102,912	\$ 6,748,652
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	72.0	72.0	72.0	72.0	24.0

## Special Operations Division

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The majority of Special Operations Division's (SOD) investigations target drug trafficking and manufacturing group, thus working to reduce the availability of illicit and dangerous drugs in Kansas communities. The elimination of this program would be catastrophic to public safety in Kansas, particularly in the rural areas.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General 75-711, 74-5607(a), 75-712(a)	Mandatory	No	2

### Program Goals

A. The Special Operations Division of the Kansas Bureau of Investigation is dedicated to enhancing public safety in Kansas by providing professional investigative, technical, and tactical services to the criminal justice community. The SOD prioritizes its investigations toward organized criminal groups and career criminal offenders, especially those engaged in drug manufacture and distribution, weapons offenses and other acts of violence. The SOD will provide an efficient response for criminal investigations and to assist in the timely arrest or charging of any suspect of a criminal act, and, to that end, will endeavor to substantially complete every criminal investigation within 90 days. The SOD primary goal is to help ensure public safety in Kansas.

### Program History

Kansas Statutes Annotated 75-712, enacted by the Kansas legislature in 1939, empowered members of the KBI to make full and complete investigations at the direction of the attorney general. This originating statute embued the power and authority of a Kansas Sheriff to the commissioned members of the KBI.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percent of prosecuted criminal offenders and organizations convicted	A	80.0%	72.0%	90.0%	90.0%	45.0%	50.0%	50.0%	80.7%
2. Percent of cases substantially completed in 90 days	A	32.0%	27.0%	50.0%	50.0%	49.0%	50.0%	50.0%	36.3%
3. Percent of Kansas counties served	A	31.0%	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	30.3%
4. Percent of population served by agencies using KIS	A	46.0%	46.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	55.0%	55.0%	47.3%
5. Percent of MWDP requests honored	A	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Kansas Bureau of Investigation

<i>Output Measures</i>									
6. Number of criminal offenders and organizations identified and targeted	A	113	153	200	200	631	576	591	328
7. Number of criminal offenders and organizations prosecuted	A	98	102	125	125	N/A	N/A	N/A	114
8. Number of MWDP requests received	A	12	4	10	12	9	8	9	8
9. Number of KIS Users	A	506	531	585	585	536	550	557	551
10. Number of KIS agencies	A	54	56	65	65	59	60	61	60
11. Number of KIS subjects	A	2,956	6,119	6,500	6,500	16,398	N/A	N/A	9,672

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 4,038,774	\$ 4,601,943	\$ 4,288,592	\$ 4,837,956	\$ 4,735,437	\$ 5,438,657	\$ 5,506,174	\$ 4,541,991
Non-SGF State Funds	24,543	18,994	2,489	-	54,220			25,234
Federal Funds	4,490,522	4,336,192	4,527,565	3,821,528	4,491,188	3,676,378	3,886,905	4,451,648
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 8,553,839</b>	<b>\$ 8,957,129</b>	<b>\$ 8,818,646</b>	<b>\$ 8,659,484</b>	<b>\$ 9,280,845</b>	<b>\$ 9,115,035</b>	<b>\$ 9,393,079</b>	<b>\$ 9,018,873</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>58.0</b>	<b>58.0</b>	<b>58.0</b>	<b>58.0</b>	<b>19.3</b>

## Forensic Laboratory Division

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The laboratory will be unable to provide information to Kansas law enforcement and the courts relating to the identification of weapons and firearm components, digital evidence, the identify of suspect prints, the presence of alcohol or drugs which may have contributed to impairment, determining if a substance is controlled under State or Federal law, identifying suspects which will result in criminal remaining free to prey on other victims and arrestee samples would not be profiled and loaded into CODIS.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific 65-448, 65-67a09, 22-2902c, 21-2511	Mandatory	No	3

### Program Goals

A. To provide timely, state of the art forensic science services to the Kansas criminal justice system. Our employees are dedicated to preserving the safety of all Kansas citizens through the application of science and modern technology. To ensure the interpretation of evidence is meaningful, objective, and free of bias.

### Program History

The Kansas Bureau of Investigation Forensic Science Laboratory began in the 1950's with a latent prints section and photograph unit. The laboratory expanded and over the years regional laboratories were placed in Great Bend, Kansas City and Pittsburg to provide regional services and support required by Kansas law enforcement.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Total backlog	A	3,266	5,437	4,911	3,900	3,513	3,500	3,500	4,620
2. Backlog over 60 days	A	1,001	2,378	2,790	2,200	1,394	1,400	1,400	2,187
3. Percent of Backlog over 60 days	A	30.6%	43.7%	56.8%	45.0%	39.7%	40.0%	40.0%	46.7%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. New assignments	A	18,501	17,917	19,313	19,500	18,296	18,500	18,600	18,509
5. Completed assignments	A	19,433	15,772	18,320	18,500	18,743	18,600	18,700	17,612
6. Number completed in 60 days	A	9,882	9,884		7,700	9,504	9,000	9,000	9,694

Kansas Bureau of Investigation

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 6,934,663	\$ 7,214,737	\$ 7,694,924	\$ 8,484,811	\$ 8,089,886	\$ 9,397,504	\$ 9,163,211	\$ 7,666,516
Non-SGF State Funds	3,011,311	3,283,866	2,636,387	2,653,135	2,914,185	2,592,846	2,947,399	2,944,813
Federal Funds	298,874	543,277	277,200	277,200	479,279	326,837	198,848	433,252
<b>Total</b>	\$ 10,244,848	\$ 11,041,880	\$ 10,608,511	\$ 11,415,146	\$ 11,483,350	\$ 12,317,187	\$ 12,309,458	\$ 11,044,580
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	92.5	92.5	92.5	92.5	30.8

## KCJIS & IT

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Loss of access to out of state users to critical points of contact within the state for criminal justice information. Significant negative impact on public safety in Kansas due to local, state, and federal criminal justice partners (including law enforcement, prosecutors, and courts) losing access to critical operational real-time information access via KCJIS. Degredation of quality of information available to local, state, and federal criminal justice partners (including law enforcement, prosecutors and courts), as well as non-criminal justice partners (state agencies requiring restricted access to criminal justice information for business purposes).

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific 74-5707, 74-5702(d)	Mandatory	No	5

### Program Goals

- A. To maintain a secure, highly available, and responsive network capable of transporting criminal justice and related information to and from public and private agencies for the purpose of promoting public safety and the prevention of crime in Kansas.
- B. Develop, deploy, and maintain high availability solutions for critical systems.
- C.

### Program History

Since the functional inception of Kansas Criminal Justice Information System (KCJIS) in 2000, the KBI has committed the financial resources and technical staff necessary to enhance and maintain the KCJIS, and to ensuring the information critical to officer and public safety remains useful and accessible. Over these years, demand for the information KCJIS provides has grown, and statutory and regulatory requirements related to this information have continued to evolve and demand continued modification of the system.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Total average uptime for all critical systems		99.99%	99.98%	99.99%	99.99%	99.99%	99.99%	99.99%	99.99%
2. Optimal staffing percentage		64.0%	69.0%	67.0%	82.0%	67.0%	82.0%	82.0%	67.7%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Minutes of unplanned downtime		46	84	9	60	45	60	60	46
4. Optimal staffing number		45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45

Kansas Bureau of Investigation

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 969,946	\$ 356,322	\$ 318,274	\$ 446,578	\$ 508,856	\$2,144,047	\$ 2,288,199	\$ 394,484
Non-SGF State Funds	3,475,836	4,114,590	3,460,822	4,347,274	3,864,566	2,800,815	2,916,295	3,813,326
Federal Funds	55,319	142,267	209,802	507,748	145,013	801,325	276,651	165,694
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 4,501,101</b>	<b>\$ 4,613,179</b>	<b>\$ 3,988,898</b>	<b>\$ 5,301,600</b>	<b>\$ 4,518,435</b>	<b>\$5,746,187</b>	<b>\$ 5,481,145</b>	<b>\$ 4,373,504</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>29.0</b>	<b>29.0</b>	<b>36.0</b>	<b>36.0</b>	<b>9.7</b>

## Information Services Division

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Criminal History Record Information Act requires the KBI to develop and maintain the central repository for defined criminal history records. Statute requires the KBI to collect law enforcement agencies offense reports. This is accomplished by collecting electronic and manual entry of Kansas Standard Offense Reports and Kansas Standard Arrest Reports into the KIBRS repository. Offender Registration Act requires KBI to maintain offender registration for sex, violent, and drug offenders and make available on a public website.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	K.S.A. 22-4701 et seq, Kansas Administrative Regulation (K.A.R.) 10-9-1 through 10-15-1, K.A.R. 10-19-1 through 10-19-9, K.S.A. 75-712, K.S.A. 38-2313, K.S.A. 21-2501, K.S.A. 21-4619, K.S.A. 22-2410, K.S.A. 12-4516, K.S.A. 38-2312, K.S.A. 75-7c25, K.S.A. 75-7c27, K.S.A. 7-127, K.S.A. 8-2, 151, K.S.A. 9-509, K.S.A. 9-1722, K.S.A. 9-1801, K.S.A. 9-2209, K.S.A. 12-1, 120, K.S.A. 12-1679, K.S.A. 16a-6-104, K.S.A. 17-2234, K.S.A. 19-826, K.S.A. 39-970, K.S.A. 41-311h	Mandatory	No	4
Specific	K.S.A. 46-1103, K.S.A. 50-1128, K.S.A. 50-6, 112b, K.S.A. 58-3039, K.S.A. 58-4127, K.S.A. 58-4709, K.S.A. 65-516, K.S.A. 65-1120, K.S.A. 65-1505, K.S.A. 65-1696, K.S.A. 65-2402, K.S.A. 65-28, 129, K.S.A. 65-4209, K.S.A. 65-5117, K.S.A. 73-1210a, K.S.A. 74-1112, K.S.A. 74-2113, K.S.A. 74-50-184, K.S.A. 74-5605, K.S.A. 74-8705, K.S.A. 74-8804, K.S.A. 74-9805, K.S.A. 75-7b04, K.S.A. 75-7b21, K.S.A. 75-7c05, K.S.A. 75-712, K.S.A. 75-3707e, K.S.A. 75-5156, K.S.A. 75-53, 105, K.S.A. 75-5609a	Mandatory	No	4

# Kansas Bureau of Investigation

Specific	Public Law (P.L.) 109-248, Section 152 and Section 153; P.L. 103-209; P.L. 105-251; P.L. 92-544, K.S.A. 39-969, K.S.A. 40-5504 ,K.S.A. 41-2610 ,K.S.A. 46-3301 ,K.S.A. 50-6,126 ,K.S.A. 65-2839a ,K.S.A. 65-3407 ,K.S.A. 65-3503 ,K.S.A. 74-4905 ,K.S.A. 74-8705 ,K.S.A 74-8763 ,K.S.A. 74-8769,K.S.A. 74-8803,K.S.A. 74-8805 ,K.S.A. 74-8806 ,K.S.A. 74-8816 ,K.S.A. 74-9804 ,K.S.A. 75-4315d, Title 5, United States Code (U.S.C.), Section 552;Title 28, U.S.C. Sectin 534;Title 5, U.S.C., Section 552a; Title 42, U.S.C., Chapter 140, Subchapter II, Section 14616; Title 28, Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.), 20.30; Title 28, C.F.R., 20.33 (a)(2);Title 28, C.F.R., 20.33 (a)(3).K.S.A. 21-2501a, K.S.A. 75-712, K.S.A. 22-4618	Mandatory	No	4
----------	---	-----------	----	---

## Program Goals

A. Enhance public safety in Kansas by providing the public with information regarding convicted offenders who could pose a threat, providing Kansas criminal history record checks and providing valuable statistical crime information in Kansas to local law enforcement partners through incident based reporting.

## Program History

Pursuant to K.S.A. 22-4701 et seq, the KBI is required to maintain the central repository for criminal history records for the State of Kansas. These records include fingerprint-based arrests, filings, and dispositions for criminal cases. In 2011, after the conclusion of the DUI Commission, the Legislature mandated that DUI filings and dispositions be reported electronically to the KBI central repository. As required by K.S.A. 22-4901 et seq, the KBI also maintains the central repository for all registered offenders in the State of Kansas.

## Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Records collection - Percent of dispositions submitted manually		34.0%	48.0%	19.0%	15.0%	16.0%	12.0%	11.0%	27.7%
2. Records collection - Percent of dispositions submitted electronically		66.0%	52.0%	81.0%	85.0%	84.0%	88.0%	89.0%	72.3%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Records collection - Submitted Manually		51,487	42,385	60,909	45,000	38,103	32,000	30,000	47,132
4. Records collection - Submitted electronically		217,178	185,997	259,823	270,000	243,179	263,000	283,000	229,666

Kansas Bureau of Investigation

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 71,798	\$ 122,222	\$ 7,012,790	\$ 119,186	\$ 126,912	\$ 159,239	\$ 187,411	\$ 2,420,641
Non-SGF State Funds	834,721	80,000	204,468		248,481	335,145	126,900	177,650
Federal Funds	390,520	439,979	746,038	888,451	515,749	755,941	2,409,140	567,255
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,297,039	\$ 642,201	\$ 7,963,296	\$ 1,007,637	\$ 891,142	\$ 1,250,325	\$ 2,723,451	\$ 3,165,546
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.0	18.0	18.0	18.0	6.0

## Operations Support

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Expenditures in this program reflect the costs of performing the agency's main statutory purpose; to enforce traffic, criminal and other laws. Without funding, the agency would be unable to fulfill the mandated duties outlined by Kansas Statute and the responsibilities would then fall to the local law enforcement agencies to administer.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
General K.S.A. 74-2105, 74-2108	Mandatory	Yes	1

Match Required for Troop I

### Program Goals

- A. Enforce the laws of the state relating to public and private motor carriers of passengers or property. Maximize public presence and road patrol by Troopers.
- B. Reduce the number and severity of traffic crashes through the enforcement of impaired driving and occupant protection laws.
- C. To reduce the number of impaired drivers operating vehicles on Kansas roadways.
- D. Deter motorists from driving impaired and will arrest impaired drivers through proven DUI countermeasures, such as selective enforcement efforts and sobriety check lanes.
- E. Pursue, apprehend, and prosecute those who utilize Kansas Highways for criminal activities.
- F. Promote the use of child restraints and safety belts through aggressive enforcement and educational programs.

### Program History

The Operations Program was established when the agency was formed in 1937 and contains most of the agency's staffing and operating costs. Expenditures in this program reflect the costs of performing the agency's main statutory purpose; to enforce traffic, criminal, and other laws.

Historically the subprogram's main financing came from the State General Fund. However; the Legislature approved the elimination of SGF from the KHP's budget, and replaced the funding source with a transfer from the State Highway Fund, effective July 1, 2013.

Effective July 1, 2010, several programs were incorporated into the "Operations Support" program due to the implementation of the new financial management system (SMART). The following programs are included under "Operations Support" 01050: Breath Alcohol Unit; Training Center; Civil Assessment; and Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program.

Kansas Highway Patrol

**Performance Measures - NOTE: Statistics are calculated on a calendar year basis**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles. ( <b><i>KDOT Perf. Metric</i></b> )	B	1.29	1.53	N/A	1.25	N/A	1.25	1.25	1.53
2. Accidents per million vehicle miles. Serious injury rate/million VMT. ( <b><i>KDOT Perf. Metric</i></b> )	B	4.40	5.71	N/A	2.75	N/A	2.75	2.75	5.71
3. Percent compliance with seat belt laws. ( <b><i>KDOT Perf. Metric</i></b> )	E	85.0%	85.0%	N/A	93.0%	86.0%	93.0%	93.0%	85.5%
4. Percent of fatal accidents related to alcohol ( <b><i>KDOT Perf. Metric</i></b> )	C	19.9%	18.6%	24.0%	19.0%	N/A	19.0%	19.0%	21.3%
5. Percent of injury accidents related to alcohol ( <b><i>KDOT Perf. Metric</i></b> )	C	6.1%	7.2%	6.0%	6.0%	N/A	6.0%	6.0%	6.6%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
6. Number of Miles Patrolled	A	12,299,030	12,372,738	10,918,165	12,750,000	10,918,165	12,750,000	12,750,000	11,403,023
7. Number of seat belt / child restraint violations	E	16,960	11,429	14,200	14,200	10,427	14,200	14,200	12,019
8. Total fatality accidents on U.S. & K. highways	B	175	230	150	150	225	150	150	202
9. Number of safety programs given.	E	881	563	1,600	1,600	595	1,600	1,600	919
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
10. Estimated attendance at safety programs	E	75,000	8,782	75,000	75,000	9,552	75,000	75,000	31,111
11. Number of service renders *Includes MAP #'s	A	70,107	108,282	21,500	21,500	104,480	5,000	5,000	78,087
12. Number of unattended vehicles checked	A	10,584	9,087	5,000	5,000	8,649	5,000	5,000	7,579
13. Number of DUI arrests	C	1,240	1,271	900	900	1,197	900	900	1,123
14. Number of felony arrests	D	1,550	1,365	1,000	1,000	1,445	1,000	1,000	1,270
15. Number of NCIC hits	D	2,540	2,353	1,450	1,450	2,583	1,450	1,450	2,129

# Kansas Highway Patrol

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	\$66,224	66,436	54,689	53,536	69,356	58,972	61,486	\$ 63,494
Federal Funds	5,697	7,835	7,875	7,648	9,095	8,321	6,407	\$ 8,268
<b>Total</b>	\$ 71,921	\$ 74,271	\$ 62,564	\$ 61,184	\$ 78,451	\$ 67,293	\$ 67,893	\$ 71,762
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	576.0	466.5	576.0	576.0	\$ 156

## Vehicle Identification Number (VIN)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Without funding, the VIN program would be in violation of Kansas Statute and unable to sustain the level of support to other law enforcement agencies, level of service to the citizen's of Kansas through the VIN inspection services, or continue the enforcements in an effort to identify stolen or illegally operated motor vehicles.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific    KSA 8-116a, 74-2135	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Preserve the integrity of Kansas motor vehicle titles and to provide prompt and courteous service to our customers by increasing the detection and recovery of stolen vehicles and/or component parts; training other law enforcement agencies in auto theft and vehicle inspections; and working closely with the Kansas Department of Revenue in titling and registering vehicles.

### Program History

The KHP was awarded a one-time Byrne grant for auto theft prevention that funded 2.0 positions previously budgeted in the SGF. The Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) Program was established in 1984 (K.S.A. 8-116). Receipts to the VIN Fee Fund are derived from the fee charged for inspecting the title of a non-new vehicle brought into Kansas to be titled. The KHP charged \$10 per inspection from 1984 until 2011. The fee increased to \$15 per inspection in 2012 and was increased again in 2013 to \$20 per inspection. In FY 2013, the grant ended and the positions are now funded with VIN fees. The positions funded with SGF were also moved to the VIN fee fund in FY 2013. The VIN program became self-sufficient in FY 2013 due to dedicated funding source.

### Performance Measures - NOTE: Statistics are calculated on a calendar year basis

<b>Outcome Measures</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>FY 2019 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2020 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2021 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2022 Previous Est.</b>	<b>FY 2022 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2023 Est.</b>	<b>FY 2024 Est.</b>	<b>3- yr. Avg.</b>
1. Eliminate stolen vehicles from being brought from other states and titled in Kansas.	A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Kansas Highway Patrol

2. Inspect and label rebuilt salvage vehicles to ensure they are designated to consumers as formerly salvaged vehicles and ensure no stolen parts are used.	A								
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Output Measures</b>									
3. Number of Vehicles Inspected.	A	237,104	141,348	215,000	215,000	220,935	215,000	215,000	192,428

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	3,845	3,185	3,474	3,268	3,333	3,384	3,384	3,331
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 3,845	\$ 3,185	\$ 3,474	\$ 3,268	\$ 3,333	\$ 3,384	\$ 3,384	\$ 3,331
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	41.0	45.0	41.0	41.0	15.0

## Motorist Assistance Program (MAP)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Federal and State funds are the primary sources of capital for salaries and wages, commodities, contractual services, and capital outlay for the Motor Assistance Program. Without these funds, there would be an increase in trooper time required to perform non-law enforcement duties; reduced ability; and reduced timeliness in assisting stranded motorists on Kansas highways. The agency would not be in a position to subsidize this program without impacting resources (personnel & funding) for other programs.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
General	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Protect and assist stranded motorists by reducing safety risks created by themselves and other drivers.
- B. Reducing congestion in the metropolitan areas during peak traffic hours by removal of disabled vehicles from traffic lanes.
- C. Assist State and local law enforcement agencies in the prevention of incidents that endanger motorists and disrupt traffic flow.
- D. Freeing road patrol troopers to perform duties requiring law enforcement powers through the cost-effect employment of non-sworn motorist assist technicians.

### Program History

In 1994, Kansas Governor Joan Finney introduced the Motorist Assistance Program (MAP) in Kansas to elevate issues associated with disabled vehicles and high volume traffic areas. The program, developed by the Kansas Highway Patrol and the Kansas Department of Transportation, was modeled after existing programs in Virginia, Iowa, and Missouri. On June 17, 1995, the MAP was continued indefinitely. The MAP utilizes non-FTE unclassified employees to assist motorists traveling in or near the metropolitan areas of Topeka, Wichita, Salina, and Kansas City, Kansas and other areas in Kansas as directed by KHP & KDOT. The cost of the specially equipped vehicles, salaries and wages, and other operating expenditures is shared with the KDOT (80%) through the use of federal funds, with the remaining (20%) from the Highway Safety Fund. In 2005, MAP enhanced the Kansas City Scout Program by adding two system operators to the bi-state traffic management system designed by KDOT and MoDOT.

Kansas Highway Patrol

**Performance Measures - NOTE: Statistics are calculated on a calendar year basis**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Decrease the amount of time spent by Troopers on service rendered responses, while still providing the same quality service to the public.	D	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/a	N/A
2. Increase the safety of those traveling Kansas highways by providing rapid response to incidents and providing direct assistance to remove the stranded motorist from the roadway/highway, as quickly as possible.	A, B, C	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/a	N/A
<b>Output Measures</b>									
3. Percent of "Service Renders" where the technician responds to the scene in 10 minutes or less.	A, B, C, D	61%	75%	65%	62%	55%	65%	65%	65%
4. Percent of those surveyed that indicate they are pleased with MAP service and support.	A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	951	314	318	314	309	314	314	314
Federal Funds	254	1,256	1,271	1,256	1,269	1,256	1,256	1,265
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,205	\$ 1,570	\$ 1,589	\$ 1,570	\$ 1,578	\$ 1,570	\$ 1,570	\$ 1,579
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.0	19.0	19.0	19.0	6.3

## Capitol Police

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Without funding, this program would greatly reduce the visibility of law enforcement presence in the Capitol Complex buildings and availability of law enforcement support for the citizens of Kansas that visit or work in the complex. In addition, the responsibility of overseeing the security of the complex, as well as Cedar Crest, would be assumed by another agency or absorbed into an already strained staffing pool of KHP officers. Funding for the operations would need to be shifted to another agency or outsourced to a private entity.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific KSA 74-2108, 74-2105, 75-4503	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Provide for the pro-active safety of persons and the protection of property within the Capitol Complex and on other state-owned or state-leased property within Shawnee County.
- B. Decrease the damage and losses suffered by employees, and by the State, for property located within the Capitol Security's area of operation.
- C. Increase the pro-active safety of persons and property to include state parking lots located within the respective area of operations.

### Program History

The Capitol Area Security Police was established by the Department of Administration in 1955 (K.S.A. 75-403). 1975, the Kansas Highway Patrol assumed responsibility of Capital Area Security Patrol. Headquartered in Topeka, Troop K, now known as Capitol Police, functions as a full service law enforcement entity within the Kansas Highway Patrol in Shawnee County, Kansas. Employees with Troop K stay active in the Capitol Complex community by providing classes that promote safety and security. Law enforcement officers actively enforce criminal and traffic laws, expedite traffic flow around the Capitol and other state office buildings, investigate accidents, respond to and administer emergency medical assistance, and assist visiting citizens to the Capitol Complex. Law enforcement officers also provide interior police security at the Governor's residence, Kansas Judicial Center, Memorial Building, Kansas Insurance Building, and the State House. The Communication group within Troop K is responsible for radio and telephone communications for the Capitol Police.

Kansas Highway Patrol

**Performance Measures - NOTE: Statistics are calculated on a calendar year basis**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Maximize the visibility of law enforcement officers at all state owned or leased properties in respective areas of operations.	A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2. Educate state employees regarding safety awareness and means to make oneself less likely to be victimized by crime.	A, C	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
3. Remove potential criminal presence by arresting a suspect in each reported crime occurring.	B	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
4. Provide crime prevention presentations to increase the awareness of state employees and attempt to minimize activities, which facilitate criminal behavior.	A, C	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Output Measures</i>									
5. Number of safety lectures presented to State Employees	A, B, C	61	24	6	40	6	40	40	12
6. Number of assaults occurring in area of operations	A, C	14	8	4	10	7	10	10	6
7. Number of thefts, burglaries and criminal damage in area of	B	61	44	13	30	21	30	30	26
8. Number of patrol hours	B	40,385	32,021	19,140	30,000	10,271	30,000	30,000	20,477
9. Number of escorts	A	273	117	38	750	13	750	750	56
10. Miles patrolled	A, B	254,800	194,681	87,941	220,000	153,887	220,000	220,000	145,503
11. Number of arrests resulting from filed complaints	B	498	267	19	290	219	290	290	168
12. Number of crimes reported & complaints filed	B	1,277	1,233	89	1,000	903	1,000	1,000	742
13. Number of crime prevention presentations.	A, B, C	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

Kansas Highway Patrol

14. Number of service renders	A	674	300	85	300	207	300	300	197
15. Number of motor vehicle accidents	B	116	54	45	90	77	90	90	59

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	1,617	1,385	1,404	1,409	1,243	1,441	1,442	1,344
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,617	\$ 1,385	\$ 1,404	\$ 1,409	\$ 1,243	\$ 1,441	\$ 1,442	\$ 1,344
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.0	20.0	21.0	21.0	6.7

## Homeland Security

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Homeland Security Grant Program provides funds to Kansas and its political subdivisions for improving the State's capability to prevent, protect, mitigate, respond, and recover from acts of terrorism and other catastrophic events. Funds from the Homeland Security Grant Program are provided to the State of Kansas from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS). The KHP is the subrecipient of these federal funds from DHS. Should funding be eliminated, the program would either be absorbed into the already strained resources of the agency, or redirected to another state/private entity which would greatly impact the integrity and effectiveness of the program and the ability to carry out the mission of the DHS.

	<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific	Public 111-83, Public Law 110-53, 6 U.S.C. §101 et seq.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Support state, local, and tribal efforts to prevent terrorism and other catastrophic events, and to prepare the Nation for the threats and hazards that pose the greatest risk to the security of the United States.

### Program History

There are no applicable Kansas statutes. DHS requires each state's governor to appoint an administrative agency, responsible for pass-through and oversight for this program. The KHP has served in that capacity since Federal Fiscal Year 1999. The Kansas Highway Patrol Homeland Security Office (HSO) has served as the Governor-appointed State Administrative Agency (SAA) for The Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) since 2001 and The Non-Profit Security Grant Program (NSGP) since 2018.

The State of Kansas is divided into seven Homeland Security Regions with each represented by a governing council made up of local volunteers from various disciplines. As the SAA, the Patrol is responsible for pass-through and oversight of the HSGP and NSGP.

The Homeland Security Grant Program provides funds to Kansas and its political subdivisions for improving the State's capability to prevent, protect, mitigate, respond, and recover from acts of terrorism and other catastrophic events. Funds from the Homeland Security Grant Program are provided to the State of Kansas from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

The enabling federal legislation for FFY 2010 HSGP is The Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public 111-83); the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-53) (hereafter "9/11 Act"); and the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. §101 et seq.)

### Performance Measures

# Kansas Highway Patrol

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percentage of funds obligated within 45 days of receipt by the State.	A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
2. Percentage of proposals for funding reviewed within 30 day of receipt from sub-recipients. <b><i>This Metric was removed during LPA audit in 2021. All funds are to be reviewed, approved, obligated within 45 days of receipt by KHP.</i></b>	A	100%	100%	100%	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Expenditure of Homeland Security funds	A	\$ 3,377,539	\$ 3,191,728	\$ 3,960,399	\$ 3,873,763	\$ 3,199,653	\$ 3,871,324	\$ 3,919,865	\$ 3,450,593

## Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-				-
Federal Funds	2,884	3,304	3,421	3,874	3,200	3,871	3,871	3,308
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,884</b>	<b>\$ 3,304</b>	<b>\$ 3,421</b>	<b>\$ 3,874</b>	<b>\$ 3,200</b>	<b>\$ 3,871</b>	<b>\$ 3,871</b>	<b>\$ 3,308</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>

## Motor Carrier Inspection (MCI)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Agency is a subrecipient of federal funding from the Federal Highway Administration via Kansas Department of Transportation. Should funding from this entity be eliminated, the agency would be in violation of Kansas Statute as the agency would not be able to supplement funding to the extent the program operates today. The responsibilities would be absorbed and performed at a much reduced rate, or the role, along with the expenses, would be transferred to another state entity or private firm, thus reducing the oversight of the commercial trucking industry in Kansas and the risk that come with the reduction in monitoring this industry.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 66-1302, 66-1318, 74-2108	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. To protect the infrastructure of highways in Kansas and to enhance the safety of motorists on Kansas roads by eliminating overweight and unsafe commercial motor vehicles from operating in Kansas.

### Program History

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is an agency within the U.S. Department of Transportation that supports State and local governments in the design, construction, and maintenance of the Nation's highway system (Federal Aid Highway Program) and various federally and tribal owned lands (Federal Lands Highway Program). Through financial and technical assistance to State and local governments, the Federal Highway Administration is responsible for ensuring that America's roads and highways continue to be among the safest and most technologically sound in the world.

The Motor Carrier Inspection Program was transferred from the Department of Revenue to the KHP in FY 1989. The program was established to comply with federal highway funding requirements to reduce the number of oversize, overweight and/or unsafe commercial carriers traveling Kansas highways. On an annual basis, the KHP Commander for the Commercial Motor Vehicle Enforcement Unit oversees the submission of the State of Kansas Vehicle Size and Weight Enforcement Plan to the Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT).

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
------------------	------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------	--------------	--------------	-------------

# Kansas Highway Patrol

1. Percent of trucks stopped by mobile units which are illegally overweight.	A	26.0%	20.0%	30.3%	20.0%	56.3%	30.0%	30.0%	35.5%
2. Percent of vehicles at the ports which are in violation of the weight laws.	A	1.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
3. Number of safety programs.	A	139	97	55	75	56	75	75	69
4. Number of active mobile units.	A	29	32	23	23	23	23	23	26

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	\$ 3,824	\$ 3,708	\$ 4,654	4,394	2,898	4,394	4,394	3,753
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 3,824</b>	<b>\$ 3,708</b>	<b>\$ 4,654</b>	<b>\$ 4,394</b>	<b>\$ 2,898</b>	<b>\$ 4,394</b>	<b>\$ 4,394</b>	<b>\$ 3,753</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>59.0</b>	<b>31.0</b>	<b>59.0</b>	<b>59.0</b>	<b>10.3</b>

## Turnpike (KTA)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Kansas Turnpike Authority (KTA) is the primary funding source for this program. By agreement, the Turnpike reimburses the Patrol for all expenditures. Should funding be eliminated, the program as it operates today would be greatly impacted in that the responsibilities and expenses would be absorbed into the agency's operations fund and additional appropriations needed. If a secure funding source is not identified, the policing of the Turnpike would be redirected to another agency or shifted to already strained resources of local law enforcement organizations in Kansas.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific	KSA 75-5012	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Reduce fatality and serious injury accidents occurring on the Kansas Turnpike.
- B. Enhance the safety of persons traveling on Kansas roads by removing the criminal element from the Kansas Turnpike.
- C. Service motorists needing assistance on the Kansas Turnpike.

### Program History

## Kansas Highway Patrol

The Patrol began policing the Kansas Turnpike in October 1956, with 13 officers and Troopers. Increasing traffic and mounting responsibilities necessitated an increase in the strength of the Turnpike Patrol to the present 52.5 Troopers, which is set and must be retained by agreement between the KHP and the Kansas Turnpike Authority (KTA). Additional Troopers were added to this program in FY 1998 (2), FY 1999 (1), FY 2000 (2), and FY 2012 (4) by transferring Troopers from the Highway Patrol Operations Program. Troopers assigned to the KTA unit receive the same stringent training as all KHP Troopers. Assignment is like the other units in that a Trooper may bid the position; or be assigned out of necessity by leadership.

The KHP Turnpike Troop provides law enforcement and security to the Kansas Turnpike. This major artery is an exception to the general patrol operations in that it provides twenty-four-hour patrol coverage. Radio communications are continuously maintained, the same as all field Troop headquarters. The radio communications are staffed, operated by, and maintained by the Kansas Turnpike Authority. Troopers enforce traffic laws, render services to the motoring public, investigate accidents, provide emergency aid to injured persons, and develop cases pertaining to all criminal activity occurring on the Kansas Turnpike Authority property.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percent of fatalities to total accidents	A	0.55%	0.55%	0.55%	0.55%	0.41%	0.55%	0.55%	0.50%
2. Percent of DUI arrests to miles traveled on the Turnpike	B	0.0152%	0.0027%	0.0027%	0.0027%	0.0157%	0.0027%	0.0027%	0.0070%
3. Number of felony arrests	B	253	307	365	200	275	200	200	316
4. Number of NCIC hits	B	671	691	735	250	657	250	250	694
5. Number of unattended vehicles	C	1,373	1,256	1,104	1,800	1,128	1,800	1,800	1,163
6. Number of service renders	C	16,536	16,315	15,415	18,590	15,972	18,590	18,590	15,901
<b><i>Output Measures</i></b>									
7. Total miles traveled on the Turnpike	A, B, C	1,754,861	1,823,642	1,793,765	1,500,000	1,736,220	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,784,542
8. Number of miles patrolled	A, B, C	1,754,861	1,823,642	1,793,765	1,800,000	\$1,736,220	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,784,542
9. Total Number of accidents	C	2,005	1,721	1,499	1,800	1,854	1,800	1,800	1,691
10. Total Number of Fatalities	A	11	15	9	10	7	10	10	10

Kansas Highway Patrol

11. Number of seat belt/child restraint violations	A	1,833	1,224	1,174	1,600	1239	1,600	1,600	1,212
12. Number of DUI arrests	B	825	239	233	400	302	400	400	258

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	4,060	4,181	4,920	4,212	4,748	4,250	4,258	4,616
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 4,060</b>	<b>\$ 4,181</b>	<b>\$ 4,920</b>	<b>\$ 4,212</b>	<b>\$ 4,748</b>	<b>\$ 4,250</b>	<b>\$ 4,258</b>	<b>\$ 4,616</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>51.5</b>	<b>45.0</b>	<b>51.5</b>	<b>51.5</b>	<b>15.0</b>

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The services provided by these sub program units ensure the viability of the agency by administering strategic plans/directives of the Department of Administration, Executive Branch, as well as State and Federal laws. The agency as a whole would fail to meet statutorily required activities (74-2114, 74-2117, 74-2118), agency goals, and lack the leadership and support services necessary to carry out these critical functions of the agency.

	<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
General	K.S.A. 74-2113 (Administration, 45-215 thru 45-223 (Records Unit)	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

A. To improve the function, operation, and cohesiveness of KHP programs; maintain or improve the consistency of agency management and operations.

### Program History

The Legislature officially organized the Kansas Highway Patrol in 1937. The Administration program represents universal administrative costs for common functions existing in the agency. These functions include the office of the Superintendent, Fiscal, Legal, Records, Professional Standards Unit, Information Technology, Public and Governmental Affairs, and Human Resources.

### Performance Measures - NOTE: Statistics are calculated on a calendar year basis

<u>Outcome Measures</u>	<u>Goal</u>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
-------------------------	-------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------

Kansas Highway Patrol

1. PSU - Provide Fact Finding investigative services for Agency, focused on safeguarding administrative investigative processes, upholding agency integrity, and ensuring employees due process rights.	A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2. P&GA - Promote the Patrol's public image through media releases, media interviews, web presence, publications, and production of public announcements. Prepare and present legislative testimony for proposed traffic and public safety legislation, and develop agency wide policy and procedures.	A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
3. Human Resources - Provide guidance and support on personnel issues such as benefits, payroll; affirmative action; recruitment and selection; classifications; discipline and guidance; employee and labor relations; employee assistance programs; mentoring; performance management; and training.	A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
4. Fiscal - Preparation of the agency budget, procurement of goods and services, management of owned and leased facilities, federal grant oversight, and accounting and reporting of all financial transactions.	A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5. IT - Provide hardware to support the agency's mission, including mobile computers; write custom applications; manage agency servers, storage space needs, network security and other computer applications such as e-mail, archive, spam filtering, Net Motion for MDUs and all other law enforcement software applications for the agency.	A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Kansas Highway Patrol

6. Legal - Provide guidance and advice on all aspects of KHP policy and procedure, while providing direction to various KHP commanders and senior staff for day-to-day operations.	A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7. Records - Process, maintain, and archive reports generated by the KHP field personnel. Respond to requests from public, courts, prosecution and defense attorneys, insurance companies, and other law enforcement agencies for copies of reports based on Kansas Open Records Act/Freedom of Information Act	A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	7,036	7,340	7,253	7,686	6,653	8,086	8,324	7,082
Federal Funds	1,002	642	455	309	85	320	184	394
<b>Total</b>	\$ 8,038	\$ 7,982	\$ 7,708	\$ 7,995	\$ 6,738	\$ 8,406	\$ 8,508	\$ 7,476
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	75.5	75.5	75.5	75.5	75.5	50.3

## Aircraft Operations

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

In FY2021, the Air Support Unit assisted 140+ Agencies (Local, State and Federal) with law enforcement and public safety aircraft support. The Air Support Unit participates in every public safety flight category including Vehicle Pursuits, COVID19 response, Surveillance, Patrol, Manhunts, Search, Red Cross Flights blood relay flights, Photo, Survey, Relay-Transport, in addition to Maintenance and Training Flights. The KHP Unit has flown a total of 847 hours and conducted over 375 missions or calls for service in the first 7 months of 2021. Should funding be eliminated from this program, these activities would be left for local law enforcement, or non-existent as the KHP is the only Law Enforcement agency in the state with air support.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific    74-2105	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. The KHP is the only statewide law enforcement agency that provides airborne services to local, state and federal agencies. In addition to the KHP aircraft fleet, the agency also manages the executive aircraft, which provides secure transportation services to the governor and other state agencies.

### Program History

The executive aircraft, and its debt, was transferred to the KHP from the Department of Administration in FY 2003. The superintendent is authorized to fix, charge and collect fees for aircraft services to other state agencies in order to recover all or part of the operating expenses of the aircraft program. The KHP Air Support program was created in FY 2018 for the aircraft fleet management, including the executive aircraft, as a result of the performance-based budgeting requirement. The Highway Patrol is the only statewide law enforcement agency that provides airborne service. The Patrol has aircraft based in Topeka, Wichita, and Hays. The agency maintains a Bell 407 helicopter, a fixed-wing Cessna 182 RG, and three fixed wing Cessna 206s. The helicopter and 2 of the 206s are equipped with forward Looking Infrared (FLIR), which allows pilots to see at night by sensing body heat, making it a valuable tool in searching for persons. Local, state and federal law enforcement agencies rely heavily on the Patrol's air assets. This program includes maintenance, fuel and parts costs and aircraft acquisitions. In FY 2007, a hangar was constructed at Billard Airport in Topeka to house the aircraft.

Kansas Highway Patrol

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percent readiness for FLIR/Law enforcement equipped aircraft.	A	80%	78%	56%		50%	75%	85%	61%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
1. Percent readiness for FLIR/Law enforcement equipped aircraft.	A	80%	78%	56%		50%	75%	85%	61%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	545	496	571	24,616	324	4,959	3,193	464
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 545</b>	<b>\$ 496</b>	<b>\$ 571</b>	<b>\$ 24,616</b>	<b>\$ 324</b>	<b>\$ 4,959</b>	<b>\$ 3,193</b>	<b>\$ 464</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>6.5</b>

## Fleet

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

KHP operating expenditures would increase due to higher vehicle repair costs and lower gas mileage.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	74-2124, 74-2136	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. To maintain a vehicle replacement program which will provide safer, better quality vehicles for the KHP and provide low mileage vehicles for sale to local law enforcement and other state and local agencies.

### Program History

The Kansas Legislature established the KHP Motor Vehicle Fund in 1994 through the passage of SB 212. Receipts to the fund are based on a \$3.50 fee added to each title issued in Kansas and receipts from the sale of retired patrol vehicles.

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	2,938	2,682	3,050	7,000	6,049	9,180	9,196	3,927
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,938</b>	<b>\$ 2,682</b>	<b>\$ 3,050</b>	<b>\$ 7,000</b>	<b>\$ 6,049</b>	<b>\$ 9,180</b>	<b>\$ 9,196</b>	<b>\$ 3,927</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>

## Kansas Commission on Peace Officers' Standards and Training

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Without funding, this program would fail to meet the statutory mandates of KSA 74-5607, KSA 74-5611, and KSA 74-5620. Kansas Statutes dictate commission structure, function and the establishment of a central registry database for law enforcement officer training. The KSCPOST serves over 8300+ Kansas law enforcement officers.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Mandatory	MOE/Match Rgt. No	Priority Level 1
Specific KSA 74-5607, 74-5611, 74-5620			

### Program Goals

- A. KSCPOST is committed to providing the citizens of Kansas with qualified, trained, ethical, competent, and professional peace officers.
- B. KSCPOST is dedicated to adopting and enforcing professional standards for certification of peace officers to promote public safety and preserve public trust and confidence.
- C.

### Program History

This regulatory (and law enforcement agency) began operation in FY 2008 in Hutchinson, Kansas, where its one employee was provided a temporary office in the Kansas Law Enforcement Training Center. The KSCPOST agency currently has a permanent location in Wichita, Kansas with 6 FTE. The Commission consists of a 12-member body appointed by the governor.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Percentage of Agency Information Requests Filled	A	99.2%	105.9%	100.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	102.3%
2. Percentage of Officers Certified Per Provisional License Issued	A	74.6%	86.2%	76.8%	82.0%	73.8%	72.0%	72.0%	78.9%
3. Number of Investigations Presented to the Commission Investigative Committee	B	164	106	144	150	141	145	150	130

Kansas Commission on Peace Officers' Standards and Training

4. Number of Certification Actions Taken	B	51	45	43	45	57	55	60	48
5. Number of Demographic Forms Processed	B	1340	1155	1339	1278	1406	1350	1350	1300
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	798,260	818,665	809,008	917,379	878,319	965,051	1,058,116	835,331
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 798,260</b>	<b>\$ 818,665</b>	<b>\$ 809,008</b>	<b>\$ 917,379</b>	<b>\$ 878,320</b>	<b>\$ 965,051</b>	<b>\$ 1,058,116</b>	<b>\$ 835,331</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>5.7</b>

## Kansas Board of Emergency Medical Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Public safety in pre-hospital care is jeopardized when the competency of resources are not ensured prior to dispatch. Qualified attendants and services are not in place to respond to emergencies appropriately. Substandard care from failure to adhere to evidence based medicine.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	KSA 65-6101 through KSA 65-6160	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To promote emergency medical services (EMS) through the consistent application of laws
- B. To provide support for the ambulance services, EMS providers, and EMS educational organizations in maintaining statutory and regulatory compliance
- C. To enhance patient care through evidence-based practice

### Program History

Beginning with the Bureau of Emergency Medical Services within the Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE), and later, legislation transferred EMS operations to the Kansas Highway Patrol while EMS training remained within the University of Kansas Medical Center, the Kansas Board of Emergency Medical Services was established in 1988 by K.S.A. 65-6102, and the current board assumed all powers, duties and functions concerning EMS. The 2004 Legislature established permanent funding for the Board of Emergency Medical Services with the passage of SB 312 which allows the Board .25% of Kansas Fire Insurance Premiums in the State of Kansas (K.S.A. 75-1508). The 2006 Legislature, with the passage of SB 546, established the Kansas EMS Information System (KEMSIS). The intent of this system is to collect and analyze EMS information for assisting the Board in improving the quality of emergency medical services. The 2010 Legislature with the passage of SB 262 established a Medical Advisory Council for KBEMS and added two physicians to the Board. This will assist the Board as state ambulance services need assistance in the development of guidelines for their attendants. Additionally, SB 262 enhanced the treatment capabilities of EMS attendants by moving from authorized activities to a scope of practice. As a result, communities throughout Kansas will be afforded a higher level of pre-hospital care. The 2016 Legislature passed SB 225 incorporating the State of Kansas in the Interstate Compact for Recognition of Emergency Personnel Licensure. The Compact is being established to facilitate the day-to-day movement of EMS personnel across state boundaries in performance of their EMS duties. The Compact serves many purposes including increasing public access to EMS personnel, enhancing public safety, and supporting licensing of military members separating from active duty. The Legislature also amended K.S.A. 65-6111 by passing SB 224 to enable the board to levy fines and issue subpoenas. The 2019 Legislature passed SB 53, which amended multiple statutes in completing four items: 1) Changed the term "attendant" to "emergency medical service provider"; 2) created an inactive certificate; 3) enabled the Board to perform a fingerprint based criminal history record check on new applicants; and 4) changed the minimum board meeting frequency from six meetings annually to four annually. The 2021 Legislature passed SB 238 which further strengthened medical direction in Kansas by clearing identifying the roles and responsibilities of the position of medical director and defined medical oversight. This Legislature also passed HB 2270 which made permanent what had been addressed historically as an annual proviso to the appropriations bill for the distribution of funding pursuant to K.S.A. 75-4215 with 20% of those funds being distributed to the EMS Operating Fund.

Kansas Board of Emergency Medical Services

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Percent of ambulance services	A&B	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
2. Percent of applicants certified within 7 days of passing both exams	A&B	97.0%	97.0%	100.0%	97.0%	100.0%	97.0%	97.0%	99.0%
3. Percent of investigations closed within 180 days	A&B	98.0%	81.0%	73.0%	80.0%	82.0%	80.0%	80.0%	78.7%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Number of providers re-certified	A&B	3,627	4,163	3,869	4,000	3,657	3,400	4,100	3,896
5. Number of continuing education audits	A&B	10	196	215	500	271	3,300	4,000	227
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
6. Number of new applicants certified	A&B	768	570	760	600	866	750	775	732
7. Percent of patient care reports with a validity score of 80-100	C	89.0%	96.0%	98.0%	100.0%	93.4%	94.5%	96.0%	95.8%
8. Number of initial education courses processed	A&B	179	193	282	225	194	200	200	223
9. Average Cost of KRAF grants awards	B	\$14,280	\$19,268	\$11,504	\$14,459	\$13,185	\$12,586	\$15,054	\$14,652

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	1,959,509	1,987,325	2,018,507	2,518,202	2,250,227	2,676,475	2,759,469	2,085,353
Federal Funds	8,499	3,300	321	-	-	-	-	1,207
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,968,008	\$ 1,990,625	\$ 2,018,828	\$ 2,518,202	\$ 2,250,227	\$ 2,676,475	\$ 2,759,469	\$ 2,086,560
<b>FTE</b>	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0

## Research, Statistical Analysis, and Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Sentencing Commission is statutorily mandated to maintain the Kansas Sentencing Guidelines. Monthly, the Commission meets to determine ways to reform efforts in sentencing to be equitable and just. This requires a data-driven approach rather than an anecdotal one. The KSSC serves as the state statistical analysis center for Kansas. State agencies such as KBI, KDOC, OJA provide their data to the KSSC for analysis. The KSSC also collects sentencing data for all felonies committed in the state. This enables stakeholders (governor, legislature, KDOC, and others) to make informed policy decisions based on data and not emotions. Sentencing disparities and disproportional sentencing will occur if not funded.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>		<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	K.S.A. 74-9101 et seq	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To develop and maintain a monitoring system that allows for comprehensive evaluation of the sentencing guidelines.
- B. To forecast the state's adult and juvenile offender populations incarcerated in state institutions, and to determine the impact of proposed legislation on the prison population.
- C. To assist in the process of educating and training judges, attorneys, court services officers, state parole officers, correctional officers, law enforcement officials and other criminal justice groups in the understanding and application of sentencing guidelines. To serve as an information resource for the legislature and various state criminal justice agencies.

### Program History

Senate Bill 50, which became law in 1989, established the Kansas Sentencing Commission, and directed the Commission to: "Develop a sentencing guidelines model or grid based on fairness and equity and...provide a mechanism for linking justice and corrections policies. The sentencing guideline model or grid shall establish rational and consistent sentencing standards which reduce sentence disparity, to include, but not be limited to, racial and regional biases which may exist under current sentencing practices." (See L. 1989, Ch. 225, Sec. 1)

After it was fully formed and staffed by November, 1989, the Commission met semi-monthly in Topeka. The Commission decided early on to confine their activities to adult felony sentences. Further, the Commission identified a set of goals to be attained in developing a uniform sentencing guidelines system:

1. To develop a set of guidelines that promote public safety by incarcerating violent offenders;
2. To reduce sentence disparity to ensure the elimination of any racial, geographical or other bias that may exist;
3. To establish sentences that are proportional to the seriousness of the offense and the degree of injury to the victim;
4. To establish a range of easy to understand presumptive sentences that will promote "truth in sentencing";
5. To provide state and local correctional authorities with information to assist with population management options and program coordination;
6. To provide policy makers information that will enhance decisions regarding resource allocations.

The Sentencing Commission considered a wide range of topics relevant to sentencing guidelines, reviewed information from other states' guidelines (primarily Minnesota, Washington, Oregon and California), heard testimony from local and national criminal justice professionals, and visited several correctional facilities. In addition, the Commission conducted a comprehensive study of existing sentencing practices. The study documented a history of racial and geographical bias in sentencing, attributable to a system which, because it directed decision makers to consider socio-economic factors in sentencing, reflected general societal inequities.

The Sentencing Commission submitted its recommendations at the commencement of the 1991 legislative session, as was required under L. 1989, Ch. 225, Sec. 4. The Commission recommended a presumptive sentencing system, represented by sentencing grids for both non-drug and drug offenses, that provides an appropriate sentence for a crime based upon the crime of conviction and the individual's past criminal history. It further recommended that the sentencing court be allowed to depart from the presumptive sentence provided that the court explain on the record the reasons for a departure, and that a decision to depart be subject to appeal. The Commission recommended that statutory enactments and amendments to implement a sentencing guidelines system become effective on July 1, 1992.

Sentencing Commission

Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Maintain an error rate of +/- 5% in the adult prison population projection.	A	1.25%	10.70%	3.80%	1.50%	1.00%	1.50%	1.50%	5.17%
2. Collect and input source data in an accurate, timely, and complete fashion - number of journal enteries processed.	A	18,148	14,424	12,998	13,130	14,791	15,086	15,388	14,071
3. Cost to process each journal entry	A	\$18	\$19	\$19	\$19	\$19	\$20	\$20	\$19
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Actual prison population - Male	A	9,123	8,404	7,828	7,782	7,729	7,933	8,043	7,987
5. Actual prison population - Female	A	921	783	728	756	720	764	740	744
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
6. Number of Bed Space Impact	B	178	142	190		120	150	135	151
7. Educational trainings provided - # of attendees	C	no data	no data	534	534	833	850	850	684

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,119,874	\$ 1,210,145	\$ 1,108,825	1,464,643	\$ 1,332,441	\$ 1,221,478	\$ 1,284,037	\$ 1,217,137
Non-SGF State Funds	9,005	65,270	70,839	21,195	26,043	147,129	18,100	54,051
Federal Funds	9,969	81,726	39,549	-	13,103	-	-	44,793
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,138,848</b>	<b>\$ 1,357,141</b>	<b>\$ 1,219,213</b>	<b>\$ 1,485,838</b>	<b>\$ 1,371,587</b>	<b>\$ 1,368,607</b>	<b>\$ 1,302,137</b>	<b>\$ 1,315,980</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>14.5</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>11.8</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>15.0</b>	<b>15.0</b>	<b>13.2</b>

## SB 123 Substance Abuse Treatment Program

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Since 2003, the Kansas Sentencing Commission has administered the SB 123 substance abuse treatment program. This community-based program keeps certain controlled substance offenders in the community for treatment, where it is most effective. The program funds a continuum of care from inpatient to family outpatient treatment. One of the highest costs to taxpayers in the criminal justice system is incarcerating its citizens. SB 123 provides up to 18 months of state-paid treatment to keep offenders in the community and out of prison. Increased incarceration of nonviolent offenders with substance abuse disorders will result in higher costs to the state. According to KDOC's FY 2020 Annual Report, the average annual cost to incarcerate one offender is \$35,040. The SB 123 program provides community-based treatment at substantial cost savings to taxpayers of \$2,943/year/offender.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>		<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
Specific	K.S.A. 21-6824 (2003 SB 123)	Mandatory	No	1
Specific	K.S.A. 21-5706 (drug severity level 5 possession)	Mandatory	No	1
Specific	K.S.A. 21-5705 (drug severity level 4 distribution)	Mandatory	No	1
Specific	K.S.A. 21-6825 (RAFT diversion)	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Provide substance abuse treatment and supervision within Kansas communities for offenders with substance abuse addictions and improve local communities by reducing recidivism.
- B. Provide a responsive centralized system that brings cohesion to the management of the program and efficient payment policies.
- C. Track financial records of payments through the system and provide analysis and estimates of funding needs.

# Sentencing Commission

## Program History

K.S.A. 21-6824 (commonly referred to as the SB 123 substance abuse treatment program) was created during the 2003 legislative session. Under community corrections supervision, SB 123 provides certified substance abuse treatment for offenders convicted of K.S.A 21-5706 (drug possession) and a limited number of those convicted of K.S.A. 21-5705 (drug severity level 4, small distribution). Those receiving state-paid substance abuse treatment are nonviolent adult offenders with no prior convictions of drug trafficking, drug manufacturing or drug possession with intent to distribute. In 2021, the Recovery from Addiction For Treatment (RAFT) diversion program was passed to allow for drug possession divertees to received state-paid treatment. The Kansas Sentencing Commission administers this and the SB 123 program by providing administration, monitoring, evaluation, payment services, publications, and informational trainings. The KSSC pays a network of 140 certified substance abuse treatment providers to adminster inpatient and outpatient treatment to the offenders after they have been ordered into treatment by district courts.

## Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Determine the number of offenders that have been reached by the program.	A	3,314	2,680	2,124	2,947	2,240	3,404	3,575	2,348
2. Process invoices for substance abuse treatment services.	B	23,237	36,055	37,408		38,725	41,052	46,638	37,396
3. Tracking the payments made to certified treatment providers.	C	\$6,456,751	\$6,743,362	\$5,904,953	\$8,434,307	\$6,593,145	\$11,039,172	\$9,200,899	\$6,413,820
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Tracking the amount of offender reimbursement the program receives.	C	\$104,228	\$126,146	\$134,203		\$118,344	\$116,463	\$116,463	\$126,231

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 6,456,751	\$ 6,743,362	\$5,904,953	\$ 12,575,135	\$ 5,787,015	\$ 11,039,172	\$ 9,200,899	\$ 6,145,110
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-					-
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 6,456,751</b>	<b>\$ 6,743,362</b>	<b>\$5,904,953</b>	<b>\$ 12,575,135</b>	<b>\$ 5,787,015</b>	<b>\$ 11,039,172</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 6,145,110</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## Investigations Division - Fire Investigations

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Statutory mandate would not be met.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	K.S.A. 31-133, 31-137, 31-138, 31-401, 31-402, 31-403, 31-405, 31-406, 31-157	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Of cases investigated by State Fire Marshal, desire a reduction of 10% of total incendiary fires and explosions in Kansas.
- B. Increase the total number of persons arrested/convicted of arson and other related crimes.
- C. Maintain an above "national standard" arson conviction/clearance percentage due to dedicated specialized investigative skilled personnel for fire/explosive investigations.

### Program History

Arson is one of the hardest crimes to convict. The national conviction rate for arson is 3%. The State Fire Marshal's program consistently maintains an average conviction rate between 10% and 14% annually. In many arson cases other crimes are present such as murder, burglary, insurance fraud, thefts, domestic disputes, and illicit drug manufacturing. Explosives or incendiary weapons are used in 92% of all mass casualty or terrorist (domestic or international) crimes. The Division provides thorough, effective, efficient, and reliable investigation of any fire, explosion or attempt to cause a fire and/or explosion that occurred within the state. All state fire marshal's investigators are state certified law enforcement officers and they hold an assortment of certifications centered around the investigation of fires and explosions/blasts. The Accelerant Detection Canines (ADC) also hold nationally recognized certifications.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Request for OSFM investigations	A,C	373	367	390	400	413	400	400	390
2. Polygraph examinations	A,B,C	11	14	10	15	6	10	10	10
3. Cost per investigation hour		\$49	\$60	\$54	\$51	\$67	\$61	\$62	\$60
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Canine responses	A,B,C	64	78	58	51	77	75	75	71

State Fire Marshal

5. Investigation hours		21,126	18,064	18,004	21,500	15,049	21,500	21,500	17,039
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
6. Mileage driven by investigators	A,B,C	191,089	172,697	234,997	285,000	176,242	185,000	185,000	194,645

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Non-SGF State Funds	\$1,028,823	\$1,077,332	\$980,860	\$1,118,643	\$1,014,248	\$1,306,586	\$1,324,684	\$1,024,147
Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total</b>	\$1,028,823	\$1,077,332	\$980,860	\$1,118,643	\$1,014,248	\$1,306,586	\$1,324,684	\$1,024,147
<b>FTE</b>	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.3	12.3	12.8

## Investigations Division - Fire Safe Cigarette Program

## Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Statutory mandate would not be met.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 31-601 through 31-613	Mandatory	No	1

## Program Goals

- A. Reduce the number of fires caused by cigarette misuse.  
 B. Increase compliance/reduce violations by cigarette vendors.  
 C. Increase cigarette accountability.

## Program History

Program provides for the oversight of Fire Safe Cigarettes and the enforcement/compliance of the statutes and regulations. All cigarettes that are sold in the State of Kansas must be certified and approved as limited ignition cigarettes. FY 2014 began the fourth full registration and certification process for the program and the first year for renewals. In FY 2015 the certification process continued, and we began the random testing of brands to ensure the paper meets the standards set out in K.S.A. 31-603.

## Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Brands holding current certifications	B	1,166	1,226	1,265	1,275	1,060	1,100	1,200	1,184
2. Number of brands certified	C	540	203	709	725	313	55	132	408
3. Safe cigarette testing costs	B	\$24,966	\$11,900	\$0	\$25,000	\$0	\$25,000	\$20,000	\$3,967
<i>Additional Measures as Necessary</i>									
4. Fires caused by smoking	A	217	275	128	280	171	180	180	191
5. Injuries/fatalities worked by OSFM	A	17	19	17	15	41	15	15	26

## Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Non-SGF State Funds	\$24,966	\$11,900	\$0	\$25,000	\$0	\$25,000	\$20,000	\$3,967
Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total</b>	\$24,966	\$11,900	\$0	\$25,000	\$0	\$25,000	\$0	
<b>FTE</b>	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.3	12.3	12.8

## Prevention Division - Plans Review, Inspections, & Enforcement

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Statutory mandate would not be met.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 31-133, 31-133a, 31-139, 31-144, 31-146, 31-148, 31-150, 39-925(a), 55-1807 through 55-1813, 65-34, 133, 136, 137, 65-508(b)	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Inspection and plans review emphasis on priority occupancies; schools, colleges, universities, nursing homes, hospitals, childcare facilities, hotels/motels and as well as jail and corrections institutions. These occupancies have populations at greatest risk (children, senior citizens, mentally or physically challenged, hospitalized and the incarcerated).

B. Inspection and plans review of facilities where larger numbers of people congregate such as restaurants, assembly areas and multiple family residential buildings.

C. Prioritize inspections and compliance of flammables and combustible fuels due to the potential health and safety dangers they pose to Kansans and the environment. These facilities are considered a security risk as they are recognized as targets for terrorism.

### Program History

The fire prevention program reduces the potential impact of fire and explosion hazards where people live, work, and congregate through fire and life safety inspection, code enforcement and public education. The program aids in the reduction of deaths, injuries and property losses that result from fire, explosion, and hazardous materials incidents.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Field inspection hours-general	A,B	15,186	14,188	12,720	14,992	11,113	12,350	13,585	12,674
2. Code enforcement hours	A,B	2,062	2,842	2,252	2,477	2,437	2,681	2,949	2,510
3. Cost per general inspection	A,B	\$282	\$185	\$267	\$274	\$333	\$391	\$387	\$262
<b>Output Measures</b>									
4. Plans review hours	A,B	3,337	4,044	4,885	5,400	6,130	6,743	7,417	5,020
5. Inspections completed annually-general	A,B, C	7,088	11,323	7,912	8,616	6,300	6,939	7,632	8,512
<b>Additional Measures as Necessary</b>									

State Fire Marshal

6. CMS inspections completed annually - Centers for Medicaid/Medicare (CMS)

A							
	628	487	421	677	471	518	577
							460

Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Non-SGF State Funds	\$1,997,096	\$2,097,710	\$2,114,992	\$2,364,208	\$2,098,403	\$2,710,688	\$2,951,666	\$2,103,702
Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total</b>	\$1,997,096	\$2,097,710	\$2,114,992	\$2,364,208	\$2,098,403	\$2,710,688	\$0	\$2,103,702
<b>FTE</b>		30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	31.0	31.0	30.0

## Prevention Division - Boiler Safety Program

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Statutory mandate would not be met.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 44-913 through 44-930	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Locate and inspect all boilers and pressure vessels; issue certificates.
- B. Identify hazards and code violations, enforce corrections, repairs and/or replacement units.
- C. Review inspection reports of partner companies ensuring compliance of regulations and codes.

### Program History

The Boiler Safety Program was transferred to the State Fire Marshal from the Secretary of Labor by the 2013 Legislature. Inspections of boiler units in operation in Kansas are completed to ensure safety requirements are met according to the codes and laws. The agency also inspects all new installations of boilers and unfired pressure vessels in Kansas. Inspection requirements vary by vessel type, some are on a three-year cycle, some are annual, and some are done twice a year. The Office of the State Fire Marshal partners with insurance companies, receiving inspection reports for issuing boiler certifications.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Boilers/pressure vessels inspected - OSFM	A	3,290	3,377	4,021	4,423	3,842	4,226	4,649	3,747
2. Units with deficiencies	B	1,675	2,073	2,365	2,601	1,699	1,869	2,056	2,046
3. OSFM per inspection cost		\$145	\$154	\$132	\$140	\$132	\$147	\$148	\$139
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Certificates issued	A	13,524	11,386	12,069	13,275	11,893	12,063	13,269	11,783
5. Boilers/pressure vessels inspected - Insurance Partners	C	10,982	8,514	10,176	11,093	9,375	10,312	11,343	9,355

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Non-SGF State Funds	\$476,547	\$519,361	\$530,423	\$618,874	\$506,822	\$619,587	\$689,070	\$518,869
Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

State Fire Marshal

<b>Total</b>	\$476,547	\$519,361	\$530,423	\$618,874	\$506,822	\$619,587	\$0	\$518,869
<b>FTE</b>	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	8.0

## Prevention Division - Elevator Safety Program

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Statutory mandate would not be met.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific      2022 HB 2005	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Locate all elevators; issue annual certificates.  
 B. Identify hazards and code violations, enforce corrections, repairs and/or replacement of units.  
 C. Review inspection reports, ensuring compliance of regulations and codes.

### Program History

2022 HB 2005, section 2 through 21, establishes the Elevator Safety Act and the duties of the state fire marshal in relation to safety standards for elevators and licensure requirements for elevator inspection, installation, and repair.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Elevators inspected	A	0	0	0	0	0	6,000	10,000	0
2. Units with deficiencies	B	0	0	0	0	0	60	100	0
3. Per certificate/licensing processing cost		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ -	\$12	\$18	0
<i>Output Measures</i>									
4. Certificates issued	A	0	0	0	0	0	5,950	9,900	0

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,460	\$ 144,984	\$ 321,369	\$ 1,820
Federal Funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,460	\$ 144,984	\$ 321,369	\$ 1,820
<b>FTE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	2.0	0.0

## Emergency Response Division - Hazardous Materials Program (Hazmat)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Statutory mandate would not be met.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 31-133, 75-1519	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Maintain the technician level competencies of each of the 9 regional hazmat response teams.
- B. Provide refresher training for each regional team associated with the hazardous materials response program.
- C. Provide technician courses and specialized training in additional areas of expertise to maintain a cadre of qualified team members.

### Program History

The Hazardous Materials Response Program has the responsibility to ensure all hazardous materials, weapons of mass destruction, toxic industrial chemicals, and radiological spills, releases, fires and/or explosions are handled quickly and safely with minimal exposure to the citizens of Kansas and minimal threat to lives and property. The expectations of the program have increased since the program's inception, primarily due to events of September 11, 2001. Additional response and training required by the memorandum of understanding with the Kansas Department of Health & Environment (KDHE), the Division of Emergency Management (KDEM) for response to Wolf Creek accidents/incidents, in addition to the requirements of the Biological Research Institute (BRI), and the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility (NBAF) in Manhattan have contributed to the expanded role of the program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
1. Number of students trained	A, B, C	297	240	252	290	266	300	300	253
2. Number of hazmat responses	A, B, C	797	822	819	825	837	825	840	826
3. Cost of classes provided		\$70,355	\$138,326	\$134,265	\$145,500	\$133,255	\$165,000	\$175,000	\$ 135,282
Output Measures									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Non-SGF State Funds	\$294	\$364,151	\$410,395	\$451,882	\$413,176	\$470,695	\$439,903	\$395,907
Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

State Fire Marshal

<b>Total</b>	\$294	\$364,151	\$410,395	\$451,882	\$413,176	\$470,695	\$0	\$395,907
<b>FTE</b>	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.5	2.0

## Emergency Response Division - Search and Rescue Program (SAR)

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Statutory mandate would not be met.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 31-133, 75-1518, and 75-6102	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Provide refresher training for each task force associated with the program.
- B. Provide position specific courses to maintain qualified task force members.
- C. Provide specialized training in additional areas of expertise.

### Program History

The Search and Rescue Program is a relatively new program for OSFM that began in FY 2016. The legislation gives the state fire marshal authority to enter into contracts to establish regional search and rescue teams to provide a response to search and rescue incidents. The program provides a coordinated response to man-made and/or natural disasters; bringing relief to affected communities by providing search and rescue, medical support, damage assessment and other humanitarian assistance throughout the state of Kansas. When called upon and approved to do so, these regional teams can and will also deploy outside of the state's jurisdiction to provide these same services across the nation.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Number of students trained	A, B, C	242	293	238	250	249	250	275	260
2. Number of SAR responses	A, B, C	725	694	705	700	713	725	750	704
3. Cost of classes provided		\$161,905	\$70,930	\$70,100	\$140,000	\$71,400	\$145,000	\$150,000	\$70,810
Output Measures									

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Non-SGF State Funds	\$350,472	\$433,795	\$151,690	\$361,649	\$241,623	\$358,960	\$397,272	\$275,703
Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total</b>	\$350,472	\$433,795	\$151,690	\$361,649	\$241,623	\$358,960	\$397,272	\$275,703
<b>FTE</b>	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0

**Department of Administration  
Office of Chief Counsel**

**Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

The Department of Administration serves as the core administrative backbone for state agency operations. DofA provides central oversight and management of various state government operations that are statutorily required. If this program is not funded these functions would cease to exist for the state and would have financial, regulatory, and legal implications for the state and state agencies. While some functions can be replicated in each state agency, the increased cost and loss of efficiencies would be extensive and impact overall state operations.

Statutory Basis		Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific	K.S.A. 75-3701, <i>et seq.</i> 3705a, 75-3702j	K.S.A. 75- Mandatory	No	1

**Program Goals**

- A. Provide departmental offices and customer agencies with timely preparation and review of requested agreements, opinions, policies, procedures and other items requiring the services of counsel.
- B. Provide state agency and other governmental attorneys with relevant, cost-effective continuing legal education (CLE) and training opportunities.
- C. Provide agencies with cost-effective means to prepare and obtain required departmental approval of regulations

**Program History**

The Department of Administration was created by the Legislature in 1953. As part of the Department, the Office of Chief Counsel manages the legal affairs of the Department of Administration and serves as the chief legal advisor to the Secretary of Administration, office directors and managers. The Office of Chief Counsel is responsible for all legal work arising from the activities of the Department and provides legal advice and services in a wide variety of areas of law, including legislation, finance, constitutional matters, commercial transactions, employment, real estate, litigation, contracts, and administrative regulations. Current provisions are found in K.S.A. 75-3701, *et seq.*

**Performance Measures**

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Contracts Completed	A	81	90	104	90	102	105	105	98.7
Register Notices Completed	A	37	37	33	40	53	55	55	41.0
KORA request closed	A	68	120	152	120	224	220	220	165.3
Continuing Legal Ed Credits Offered	B	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12.0
Number of CLE participants (Fall and Spring Conferences)	B	373	331	313	360	352	360	365	332.0
Regulations Completed	C	255	225	398	375	557	375	375	393.3

**Funding**

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ 196,319	\$ 285,931	\$ 249,434	\$ 352,660	\$ 316,764	\$ 360,615	\$ 361,114	\$ 284,043
Non-SGF State Funds	459,260	391,652	426,986	526,745	454,402	624,690	639,918	424,346
Federal Funds	-	-	20,820	-	-	-	-	20,820
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 655,579</b>	<b>\$ 677,582</b>	<b>\$ 697,239</b>	<b>\$ 879,405</b>	<b>\$ 771,166</b>	<b>\$ 985,305</b>	<b>\$ 1,001,032</b>	<b>\$ 715,329</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>

**Department of Administration  
Office of Financial Management**

**Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

The Department of Administration serves as the core administrative backbone for state agency operations. DofA provides central oversight and management of various state government operations that are statutorily required. If this program is not funded these functions would cease to exist for the state and would have financial, regulatory, and legal implications for the state and state agencies. While some functions can be replicated in each state agency, the increased cost and loss of efficiencies would be extensive and impact overall state operations.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rgt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
General      K.S.A. 75-3701 et seq.	Mandatory	No	1

**Program Goals**

- A. Provide accounting and fiscal management services to the Department of Administration and other state agencies.
- B. Provide timely services for our agency and to our customers.

**Program History**

The Department of Administration was created by the Legislature in 1953. As part of the Department, the Office of Financial Management was established during FY 2013 as part of the Department of Administration's reorganization. The three primary functions of the Office of Financial Management include the following: 1) DofA Accounting Services; 2) DofA Budgeting; and 3) Non-Cabinet Agency Service Center. General duties include consulting, supporting and assisting in monitoring and improving the financial health of the Agency, along with administering the security of the SMART system for Agency processors, paying the debt service for the State, and compiling the necessary data for SWCAP (Statewide Cost Allocation Plan).

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
Overall satisfaction with the recommendations, guidance and services provided by the State Agency Service Center (Using a scale of 1 to 5 where 5 is very satisfied and 1 means very dissatisfied)	A	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4.44	4.44	4.50	4.4
Amount of late charges paid on invoices	B		0	0		0	\$ 200.00	\$ 200.00	0.0
Number of transaction lines of late payments	B		0	0		0	4	4	0.0

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 134,939	\$ 110,238	\$ 139,376	\$ 142,586	\$ 487,558	\$ 150,301	\$ 149,602	\$ 245,724
Non-SGF State Funds	1,116,047	1,060,371	986,885	1,410,126	1,450,270	2,689,684	2,584,205	1,165,842
Federal Funds	-	-	25,358	250,000				12,679
<b>Total</b>	\$ 1,250,986	\$ 1,170,609	\$ 1,151,620	\$ 1,802,712	\$ 1,937,828	\$ 2,839,985	\$ 2,733,807	\$ 1,420,019
<b>FTE</b>	22.0	19.0	19.0	18.0	18.0	18.0	18.0	18.7

**Department of Administration  
Office of Systems Management**

**Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

The Department of Administration serves as the core administrative backbone for state agency operations. DofA provides central oversight and management of various state government operations that are statutorily required. If this program is not funded these functions would cease to exist for the state and would have financial, regulatory, and legal implications for the state and state agencies. While some functions can be replicated in each state agency, the increased cost and loss of efficiencies would be extensive and impact overall state operations.

<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
General      K.S.A. 75-3701 et seq.	Mandatory	No	1

**Program Goals**

- A. Maintain or improve performance of the SHARP and SMART batch cycles and ensure uptime during business hours.
- B. Address and resolve programmatic abends, application defects, user enhancement requests & application updates.
- C. Identify, research and resolve agency user issues at both a Tier 1 and a Tier 1.5 level for the PeopleSoft ERP, including SMART, and SHARP, as well Employee Self Service, eSupplier, and Candidate Gateway (jobs portal).
- D. Safeguard end-user and application security of the SMART and SHARP systems.

**Program History**

The Department of Administration was created by the Legislature in 1953. As part of the Department, the Office of Systems Management is tasked with providing technical, development and help desk support for the statewide Oracle/PeopleSoft Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system, including Financials Supply Chain Management (SMART) and Human Capital Management (SHARP) ERP used by all agencies. Current provisions are found in K.S.A. 75-3701 et seq.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
SMART Average Nightly Run Time		4:55	4:51	4:53	4:55	4:10	4:10	4:05	0.2
SHARP Average Nightly Run Time		1:43	1:42	1:43	1:45	1:48	1:48	1:48	0.1
SHARP- Payroll Average Nightly Run Time		5:48	5:47	5:46	5:45	3:10	3:10	3:10	0.2
SMART % of uptime during business hours of the systems		99.95%	100%	99.95%	100.00%	99.95%	99.96%	99.96	1.0
SHARP % of uptime during business hours of the systems		99.95%	100.00%	99.95%	99.99%	99.95%	99.96%	99.96	1.0
SMART Programmatic abends, application defects and user requests resolved		1074	1200	814	900	730	800	800	914.7
SHARP Programmatic abends, application defects and user requests resolved		401	501	310	400	307	400	400	372.7

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
Tier 1 Calls received				39,729	38,000	37,080	38,500	38,500	38404.5
Percentage of Tier 1 calls missed				3.09%	1.50%	4.89%	3.50%	3.50%	0.0
Percentage of Tier 1.5 resolved with no elevation				8.80%	10.00%	4.30%	6.00%	6%	0.1
% of user security provisioning meeting service level agreements - SHARP		99.99%	99.99%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100%	1.0
% of user security provisioning meeting service level agreements - SMART		99.99%	99.99%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100%	1.0

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 695,040	\$ 73,447	\$ 534,292	\$ 270,356	\$ 73,487	\$ 76,912	\$ 77,400	\$ 227,075
Non-SGF State Funds	5,584,201	5,442,959	5,833,962	7,908,237	7,725,115	8,057,483	8,068,934	6,334,012
Federal Funds	-	9,200	113,457					61,329
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 6,279,241</b>	<b>\$5,525,607</b>	<b>\$ 6,481,710</b>	<b>\$ 8,178,593</b>	<b>\$ 7,798,602</b>	<b>\$8,134,395</b>	<b>\$ 8,146,334</b>	<b>\$ 6,601,973</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>19.7</b>

**Department of Administration  
Office of Facilities and Property Management**

**Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

The Department of Administration serves as the core administrative backbone for state agency operations. DofA provides central oversight and management of various state government operations that are statutorily required. If this program is not funded these functions would cease to exist for the state and would have financial, regulatory, and legal implications for the state and state agencies. While some functions can be replicated in each state agency, the increased cost and loss of efficiencies would be extensive and impact overall state operations.

	<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
	K.S.A. 75-3762; K.S.A. 75-1250 et seq.; K.S.A. 75-5801 et seq.; K.S.A. 75-3739; K.S.A. 75-3765(a)(1);	Mandatory	No	1
Specific				

**Program Goals**

- A. Respond to all tenant building maintenance, un-scheduled cleanups and emergency services in an efficient manner (including mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems) in the Capitol Complex, Forbes and Cedar Crest.
- B. Efficiently provide quality housekeeping services to Capitol Complex buildings, Forbes and leased buildings, Zibell, Scott, Mills and State Defense Building. In addition, complete Statehouse and Statehouse Grounds event setup and tear down as required.
- C. Track number of actions processed for project code review, bid posting, administration by Planning and Administration staff.

**Program History**

The Division of Facilities Management (DFM) was created as a result of a reorganization of the Department of Administration in March 1989 to facilitate the statutory duties of the Secretary of Administration. K.S.A. 75-3762 grants the Secretary of Administration the "...charge, care, management and control of the Statehouse, the state office buildings, the Kansas Technical Institute...the office building at 801 Harrison [in Topeka], the Memorial Hall, the Governor's mansion, [the Landon State Office Building] and all other buildings or grounds now or hereafter owned or to be owned by the state in Shawnee County, the custody of which buildings or grounds is not assigned by law to some other state agency." In January 2002, The Division of Architectural Services merged with the Division of Facilities Management. During FY 2012, the Office of Facilities and Procurement Management was created as part of a functional re-structuring of the Department. In FY 2015, the Office of Procurement and Contracts was separated from the Office of Facilities and Procurement Management, resulting in returning the name back to the Office of Facilities and Property Management.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
Maintenance Work Orders completed	A	4,444	4,603	3,526	4,000	3,400	3,750	3,750	3843.0
Lock Shop Work Orders Completed	A	596	603	472	525	553	525	550	542.7
Housekeeping Work Orders Completed	A	1,194	1,190	823	1,000	989	1,000	1,000	1000.7
Grounds Work Orders Completed	A	175	186	142	165	121	130	130	149.7
Events supported in Statehouse	B	336	466	315	350	537	550	550	439.3
Housekeeping Sq Ft Maintained	B	2,149,630	2,149,630	2,149,630	2,134,890	2,149,630	2,134,890	2,134,890	2149630.0
Cost per Housekeeping Sq Ft	B	\$ 1.32	\$ 1.34	\$ 1.36	\$ 1.38	\$ 1.36	\$ 1.40	\$ 1.40	1.4
Capitol Improvement Projects actions	C	2,315	2,565	2,852	3,000	3,454	3,500	3,750	2957.0

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 2,321,402	\$ 3,486,059	\$ 2,475,168		\$ 72,890	\$ 207,000	\$ 200,304	\$ 2,011,372
Non-SGF State Funds	21,837,952	23,385,172	19,849,717	21,053,491	29,544,593	21,468,954	21,918,131	24,259,827
Federal Funds								
<b>Total</b>	\$ 24,159,354	\$ 26,871,231	\$ 22,324,885	\$ 21,053,491	\$29,617,483	\$ 21,675,954	\$ 22,118,435	\$ 26,271,200
<b>FTE</b>	188.0	188.0	188.0	188.0	188.0	188.0	188.0	188.0

**Department of Administration  
Office of Printing, Central Mail and Surplus**

**Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

The Department of Administration serves as the core administrative backbone for state agency operations. DoFA provides central oversight and management of various state government operations that are statutorily required. If this program is not funded these functions would cease to exist for the state and would have financial, regulatory, and legal implications for the state and state agencies. While some functions can be replicated in each state agency, the increased cost and loss of efficiencies would be extensive and impact overall state operations.

	<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific	K.S.A. 75-1005, 75-1001a; K.S.A. 75-4512 ; K.S.A. 75-6601	Mandatory	No	1

**Program Goals**

- A. To excel and increase the number of digital impressions to our agencies, producing a quality product that is cost-effective and delivered on time.  
 B. To increase state agency surplus reimbursements.  
 C. Increase number of donees and sales of surplus property  
 D. Increase pieces of mail processed and promote convenient, cost effective mail services to state agencies to maximize volume capacity.

**Program History**

The Office of Printing, Surplus and Central Mail provides printing, copying, binding, fulfillment and mail services for state agencies and operates the Surplus Property program. K.S.A. 75-1005 grants the State Printer to do all the printing and binding required by the legislature, the supreme courts, the governor or any state agency. 75-1001a established the Division of Printing, transferring all the functions of the elected State Printer to the Director of Printing. K.S.A. 75-4512 allows the Secretary of Administration to provide and maintain central and consolidated mail services for state agencies. K.S.A. 75-6601 et seq. establishes the State Surplus program. In July 2004, the Surplus Programs were transferred from the Department of Corrections to the Department of Administration and in May 2007 the Surplus Property programs were merged with the Division of Printing. Surplus Property has (4) four programs: Federal Surplus, State Surplus, LESO/1033 and Fixed Price Vehicles Sales. In 2017, adjustments to the organization were made. Printing, Central Mail and Surplus became a separate office.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
Impressions produced	A	27,724,479	31,567,187	31,567,187	32,500,000	39,859,719	43,000,000	\$ 48,000,000.00	34,331,364.33
Percentage of State agencies using State Printer	A	84%	84%	84%	85%	86%	86%	86%	0.85
*New* wide format jobs produced	A				50	122	150	175	122.00
Number of production errors	A				12	14	10	8	14.00
Cost of Production errors (time and materials)	A				\$ 18,000.00	\$69,560	\$50,000	\$ 40,000.00	69,560.00
Annual reimbursements to state agencies	B	\$ 182,043.00	\$ 228,897.00	\$ 228,897.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 568,678.00	\$ 500,000.00	\$ 450,000.00	342,157.33
New donees utilizing Surplus program	C	17	8	8	15	10	15	15	8.67
Value to donees of federal property acquired on behalf of eligible entities in Kansas	C	\$ 7,652,984.00	\$ 1,534,319.00	\$ 1,534,319.00	\$ 1,500,000.00	\$2,714,644.00	\$ 2,500,000.00	\$ 2,500,000.00	1,927,760.67
Total Surplus Revenue - Federal Surplus	C	\$ 111,931.00	\$ 55,224.00	\$ 55,224.00	\$ 75,000.00	\$ 110,334.00	\$ 125,000.00	\$ 150,000.00	73,594.00

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
Total Surplus Revenue - State Surplus	C	\$ 520,685.00	\$ 596,701.00	\$ 596,701.00	\$ 625,000.00	\$ 537,008.00	\$ 570,000.00	\$ 570,000.00	576,803.33
Total Surplus Revenue - LESO/1033	C	\$ 225.00	\$ 6,670.00	\$ 6,670.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	7,780.00
Mail Inserts Processed	D	5,704,933	7,432,682	7,432,682	7,500,000	6,281,720	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,049,028.00
Cost savings for presorted vs full postage	D		\$ 710,283.00	\$ 710,283.00	\$ 750,000.00	\$ 742,713.00	\$ 750,000.00	\$ 775,000.00	721,093.00
Total mail pieces handled	D	9,618,875	9,323,415	9,323,415	10,000,000	7,597,607	9,000,000	9,000,000	8,748,145.67

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund								
Non-SGF State Funds	10,365,371	9,703,664	9,648,164	11,646,158	18,690,038	12,850,207	12,795,971	12,680,622
Federal Funds								
<b>Total</b>	\$ 10,365,371	\$ 9,703,664	\$ 9,648,164	\$ 11,646,158	\$ 18,690,038	\$ 12,850,207	\$ 12,795,971	\$ 12,680,622
<b>FTE</b>	53.0	53.0	53.0	53.0	53.0	49.0	49.0	53.0

**Department of Administration  
Office of Procurement Contracts**

**Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

The Department of Administration serves as the core administrative backbone for state agency operations. DoFA provides central oversight and management of various state government operations that are statutorily required. If this program is not funded these functions would cease to exist for the state and would have financial, regulatory, and legal implications for the state and state agencies. While some functions can be replicated in each state agency, the loss of subject matter expertise in state procurement processes, increased cost and loss of efficiencies would be extensive and impact overall state operations.

	<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific	K.S.A. 75-3737a to 75-3744; K.S.A. 75-37.130; K.S.A. 75- 37,102;K.S.A. 75-3739 (a) and (h); K.S.A. 75-3317 through 75- 3322c	Mandatory	No	1

**Program Goals**

- A. To provide information on the amount of procurement activity generated through the Office of Procurement and Contracts. All purchase requisitions generated by state agencies through SMART require some level of review and action.
- B. Minimize the number of non-competitive bid requests approved.
- C. Maximize the number of state contracts that are managed in a fiscal year by the Office of Procurement and Contracts.
- D. Maximize the number of statewide contracts available to political subdivisions within the state.
- E. Implement strategic sourcing of state contracts for goods and services when practicable.

**Program History**

Kansas statutes provide authority and guidance to OPC for the procurement of goods and services. A Division of Purchases was originally established in 1953 under the Department of Administration (K.S.A. 75-3737a to 75-3744). In 1987, the Legislature provided specific authorization to use negotiated procurement as a source selection method for the acquisition of technical equipment and services, with the Director of Purchases as a statutory member of the procurement negotiating committee (K.S.A. 75-37,102, as amended). The 2000 Legislature established the Professional Services Sunshine Act. This Act, K.S.A. 75-37.130 et seq., requires competitive contracts for professional and consulting services exceeding \$25,000 to be bid by the Office of Procurement and Contracts, formerly the Division of Purchases, which do not meet the requirements of K.S.A. 75-3739 (a) and (h). In accordance with state statute, the Office of Procurement and Contracts posts all potential sole source transactions in the amount of \$100,000, or greater, to its website for seven days prior to award, allowing potential competitors an opportunity to challenge the sole source nature of the transaction.

OPC is involved in the State Use Program, which prioritizes sales of certain goods and services by qualified vendors who employ people with disabilities as set forth in K.S.A. 75-3317 through 75-3322c.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
Requisitions Received	A	7,150	7,569	6,624	7,200	7,726	7,200	7,200	7306.3

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
Prior Authorization Contracts Approved	B	3,780	3,989	3,489	3,600	3,477	3,600	3,600	3651.7
Managed open state contracts	C	3,805	3,670	3,887	3,800	3,949	3,800	3,800	3835.3
Contracts available to political subdivisions	D	946	1,106	1,684	1,500	1,480	1,500	1,500	1423.3
Percentage of state contracts open to political subdivisions	D	25%	30%	43%	40%	37%	40%	40%	0.4
Bid events conducted	E	757	765	642	750	744	750	750	717.0

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 3,024	\$ 2,300	\$ 1,300					\$ 1,800
Non-SGF State Funds	1,261,914	1,402,916	1,347,943	1,605,058	1,412,496	1,985,535	1,956,794	1,387,785
Federal Funds	-	-	6,293					3,146
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,264,938</b>	<b>\$ 1,405,216</b>	<b>\$ 1,355,536</b>	<b>\$ 1,605,058</b>	<b>\$ 1,412,496</b>	<b>\$ 1,985,535</b>	<b>\$ 1,956,794</b>	<b>\$ 1,391,083</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>15.0</b>	<b>15.0</b>	<b>15.0</b>	<b>15.0</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>15.0</b>

## Department of Administration

### Office of Personnel Services

#### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Department of Administration serves as the core administrative backbone for state agency operations. DofA provides central oversight and management of various state government operations that are statutorily required. If this program is not funded these functions would cease to exist for the state and would have financial, regulatory, and legal implications for the state and state agencies. While some functions can be replicated in each state agency, the increased cost and loss of efficiencies would be extensive and impact overall state operations.

	<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific	K.S.A. 75-3701, K.S.A. 75-3746, K.S.A. 75-2925 et seq.;K.S.A. 75-37,115, K.S.A. 75-37,105, K.S.A. 75-4362, and K.S.A. 75-7363	Mandatory	No	1

#### Program Goals

- A. Provide quality services and information that meets the HR needs of customer agencies.
- B. Reduce the amount of time that it takes for agencies to fill both classified and unclassified positions.
- C. Provide enhanced and expanded training and staff development opportunities for State employees.

#### Program History

The Department of Administration was created by the Legislature in 1953. The Department was authorized to administer all personnel matters. In 1965, the Department was reorganized and the Division of Personnel was created. Through various name changes and reorganizations, the current the Office of Personnel Services (OPS) administers the Kansas Civil Service Act and other related statutes to provide a comprehensive human resource (HR) program for the State of Kansas. In 2011, Executive Order 11-04 directed that all non-Regents HR staff in agencies under the Governor's jurisdiction report to the Director of Personnel Services and also that OPS is to establish and implement consistent HR policies, procedures and practices for the State workforce.

#### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
Percentage of customer agencies satisfied with OPS services	A	100%	100%		100%	98%	100%	100%	1.0
# of non-Cabinet agencies receiving HR assistance from OPS	A	51	52	57	57	57	57	57	55.3
% of non-Cabinet agencies receiving HR assistance from OPS (excludes	A	89.51%	91.20%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	1.0
# of queries & reports provided for agencies, KORA and Legislative inquiries	A	1,189	1,485	1,770	1,800	1,800	1,850	1,800	1685.0
# of days from start of process to posting - classified	B	3.75	3.96	3.24	3	<4	<3	<3	3.6

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
# of days from start of process to posting - unclassified	B	2.06	2.23	2.12	2	<3	<2	<2	2.2
# of training courses made available to all agencies - state	C	168	170	141	170	170	175	180	160.3
# of training courses made available to all agencies -vendor	C	6,882	7,220	7,300	7,400	7,400	7,900	7,950	7306.7

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,434,689	\$ 1,391,976	\$ 1,289,148	\$ 1,530,171	\$ 1,352,415	\$ 1,893,636	\$ 1,900,602	\$ 1,344,513
Non-SGF State Funds	670,629	708,187	710,497	725,665	707,054	849,425	849,284	708,579
Federal Funds	-	15,158	1,150					8,154
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,105,318</b>	<b>\$ 2,115,322</b>	<b>\$ 2,000,795</b>	<b>\$ 2,255,836</b>	<b>\$ 2,059,469</b>	<b>\$ 2,743,061</b>	<b>\$ 2,749,886</b>	<b>\$ 2,058,529</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>24.0</b>	<b>24.0</b>	<b>24.0</b>	<b>24.0</b>	<b>24.0</b>	<b>26.0</b>	<b>26.0</b>	<b>24.0</b>

**Department of Administration  
Office of State Employee Health Benefit Plan**

**Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

The Department of Administration serves as the core administrative backbone for state agency operations. DoFA provides central oversight and management of various state government operations that are statutorily required. If this program is not funded these functions would cease to exist for the state and would have financial, regulatory, and legal implications for the state and state agencies. While some functions can be replicated in each state agency, the increased cost and loss of efficiencies would be extensive and impact overall state operations.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific K.S.A. 75-6501 et seq.	Mandatory	No	1

**Program Goals**

- A. Manage the fund balance to be 10%-13% of Plan Expenses over the preceding three years (HB 2218)  
 B. Improve the health of members of the plan  
 C. Integrate the Nurse Triage Program to reduce claim expense in State Self-Insurance Fund

**Program History**

In the 2020 legislative session, Executive Reorganization Order No. 45 transferred the functions of the State Employees' Health Benefits Program (SEHBP) and the State Workers Compensation Self-insurance Fund from the Department of Health and Environment to the Office of the State Employees' Health Benefits Program (SEHBP) within the Department of Administration. SEHBP was established as a separate office in the Department of Administration. The State Employees' Health Benefits Plan (SEHBP) program administers the State Employee Health Plan (SEHP) on behalf of the Health Care Commission (HCC). The SEHBP was transferred to the Division of Health Policy and Finance in 2005, consolidated into Kansas Health Policy Authority in 2006, merged with Kansas Department of Health and Environment on July 1, 2011 and merged with the Department of Administration July 1, 2020. Statute (K.S.A. 75-6501 et seq.) provides for an Employee Advisory Committee which was implemented in 1995. That committee consists of 21 members: 18 active employees and three retirees serving three-year rolling terms. The Employee Advisory Committee meets quarterly and provides input to staff on the health plan administration. The Workers' Compensation Program for State employees is called the State Self-Insurance Fund (SSIF). The SSIF was implemented through legislation in 1974 and consolidated into the Division of Personnel Services in 1988. The SSIF was transferred to the Division of Health Policy and Finance in 2005, consolidated into Kansas Health Policy Authority in 2006, merged with Kansas Department of Health and Environment on July 1, 2011 and merged with the Department of Administration July 1, 2020. It is a self-insured, self-administered program and administered by 16 staff members. The SSIF is funded by agencies based on an experience rating. The agency rates are developed by an actuarial service using claims experience, payroll history and caps on expenses. Rates are currently approved by the Department of Administration and published by the Division of Budget.

**Performance Measures**

Outcome Measures	Goal	CY 2019 Actuals	CY 2020 Actuals	CY 2021 Actuals	CY 2022 Previous Est.	CY 2022 Actuals Projected	CY 2023 Est.	CY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
Fund Balance 10-13% of plan expenses	A	8.80%	15.20%	13.40%	12.50%	12.00%	9.40%	9.30%	0.1
Plan Expenses	A	\$ 467,145,863.00	\$ 455,106,674.00	\$ 495,843,214.00	\$ 489,137,016.00	\$ 523,645,783.00	\$ 542,672,942.00	\$ 562,953,098.00	491531890.3
Number of preventive dental cleanings	B	100,797	84,594	86,286	86,286	94,663	96,556	98,487	88514.3
Number of members who get mammograms	B	8,489	5,489	5,599	5,599	9,728	9,900	10,000	6938.7
Number of members who get colonoscopies	B	1,570	3,254	3,319	3,319	7,810	7,900	8,000	4794.3
Numbers of members who get wellness visits	B	36,105	33,840	34,517	34,517	41,191	41,300	41,500	36516.0
Percentage of calls to nurse triage- Self-Care	C			3%	3%	23%	30%	40%	0.1
Percentage of calls to nurse triage- OCC/Med/UCC	C			9%	9%	54%	60%	65%	0.3

Performance measures for State Employees' Health Benefits Program are recorded on a calendar year (CY) basis, in alignment with each plan year's timeframe.

\*The State Self Insurance Fund (State Employees' Workers Compensation) began in April 2021 \*

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund								
Non-SGF State Funds	520,598,053	522,221,191	473,466,793	573,350,676	556,687,399	618,422,832	644,645,353	517,458,461
Federal Funds								
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 520,598,053</b>	<b>\$ 522,221,191</b>	<b>\$ 473,466,793</b>	<b>\$ 573,350,676</b>	<b>\$ 556,687,399</b>	<b>\$ 618,422,832</b>	<b>\$ 644,645,353</b>	<b>\$ 517,458,461</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>45.0</b>	<b>45.0</b>	<b>45.0</b>	<b>45.0</b>	<b>45.0</b>	<b>45.0</b>	<b>45.0</b>	<b>45.0</b>

**Department of Administration  
Office of Accounts & Reports**

---

**Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

The Department of Administration serves as the core administrative backbone for state agency operations. DofA provides central oversight and management of various state government operations that are statutorily required. If this program is not funded these functions would cease to exist for the state and would have financial, regulatory, and legal implications for the state and state agencies. While some functions can be replicated in each state agency, the increased cost and loss of efficiencies would be extensive and impact overall state operations.

	<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs.</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific	K.S.A. 75-3701 et seq; K.S.A. 75-3083; K.S.A. 40-2301 et seq; K.S.A. 75-5501 et seq.; K.S.A. 75-3728 et seq.; K.S.A 75-3728, 75- 3729, 75-3730 and 75-3731; K.S.A. 74-72,122 et seq.; K.S.A. 75- 6201 et seq.; K.S.A. 75-6216; K.S.A. 79-2925 et seq.; K.S.A. 10- 1101 et seq.; K.S.A. 75-1117 et seq.; K.S.A. 79-2926; K.S.A. 79- 2930; K.S.A. 75-1124; K.S.A. 75-1123	Mandatory	No	1

**Program Goals**

- A. To identify and implement solutions that support transparency to taxpayers and other interested groups.
- B. To provide appropriate guidance and support for minimized findings on external audits while ensuring compliance with statutory deadlines
- C. Provide quality customer service to agencies, taxpayers and others served and supported through the KDRS/KTOP programs with the goal of maximizing collection of outstanding debt accounts for the State of Kansas, municipalities and foreign state agencies.
- D. Reduce the cost of printing and mailing by encouraging employees to opt for electronic W-2s and encouraging suppliers to receive payments by ACH.
- E. Ensure statutory, regulatory and accounting compliance for employment taxes through accurate, timely withholding and remittance for all required tax jurisdictions.

## Program History

The Department of Administration was created by the Legislature in 1953. The Department was authorized to develop financial plans and policies; coordinate and supervise the fiscal affairs and procedures of the state; provide accounting, including budgetary accounting, fiscal reporting, pre-auditing. In 1965, the Department was reorganized and the Division of Accounts and Reports was established. With various name changes and reorganization the current Office of Accounts and Reports (OAR) delivers the following external reports: State of Kansas Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (ACFR), Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards (SEFA) and related Statewide Annual Single Audit, Cash Management Improvement Act of 1990 (CMIA) Annual Report of excess interest earning on federal funds, Quarterly and annual reports to the United States Census Bureau and filing of federal 990T and Kansas K120 tax returns, and Issuance of annual W-2, 1099 and 1042-S forms

The OAR provides the following centralized services critical to the state including:

- Maintenance of the Statewide Human Resources and Payroll system (SHARP) and the Statewide Management, Accounting and Reporting Tool (SMART)
- Processing of payroll accounting/calculations/distributions and processing of statewide daily accounting transactions
- Procurement and management of statewide external audit services
- Remittance of all payroll tax withholdings, employer contributions and employee deductions
- Development, adoption and maintenance of statewide accounting policy manual
- Daily and annual audits of state agency transactions, assets and other financial activity to ensure compliance with statutes, regulations, policies and accepted accounting principles
- Accounting and reporting services for the Kansas Public Water Supply Loan Fund and the Kansas Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund
- Assistance in preparing, analyzing, reviewing financial data for bond issuance, bond refunding and annual bond disclosures
- Development and maintenance of KanView, the State's Taxpayer Transparency website
- Administration of the Setoff program and the Kansas Treasury Offset Program (KTOP)
- Provides information to local governments on the Budget Law, Cash Basis Law, Municipal Audit Law and related budget forms.

## Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
Date when all local government budgets are posted online for the current fiscal year		7/15/2019	3/7/2020	3/31/2021	2/15/2022	6/3/2022**	2/15/2023	2/1/2024	44091.5
Overall Satisfaction Score for Municipal Workshops (Good 3, Very good 4,		4.59	4.28	4.64	4.35	4.56	4.5	4.5	4.5
Percent of Municipal Audit Reports posted to the Municipal Services website		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1.0
Number of statewide Municipal workshops conducted		9	3*	9 (3 in person, 6 virtual)	10	10 (7 in person, 3 virtual)	10 (7 in person, 3 virtual)	10 (7 in person, 3 virtual)	#DIV/0!
Number of statewide Municipal workshop attendees		451	371	527	500	466	450	450	454.7
Financial Audit: Number of audit findings		4	2	3	6	2	6	6	2.3
Financial Audit: Number of repeat audit findings		0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.7
SEFA Audit: Number of audit findings		13	8	4	10	19	10	10	10.3
SEFA Audit: Number of repeat audit findings		4	0	2	2	0	2	2	0.7
SRF Audit: Number of audit findings		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
SRF Audit: Number of repeat audit findings		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
ACFR completed by due date	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
SEFA completed by due date		Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
SRF Audit Filed by due date		Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Annual Bond Continuing Disclosure Deadline		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Percent of total UG Roundtable Workshop Satisfaction Surveys with ratings of		92%			94%	100%	94%	94%	1.0
UG Roundtable Attendees		115	59	103	105	79	105	105	80.3
New Debts Entered into Kansas Debt Recovery System		508,098	447,728	385,596	484,200	439,582	484,200	434,900	424302.0
New Debts Researched/Validated by KDRS Staff for Entry into KDRS		3,793	7,414	3,415	5,000	4,476	5,000	4,600	5101.7
Average Rating of Overall Satisfaction with KDRS Training Course (scale of 1-10)		9.04	9.26		9.35		9.35	9.4	9.3
Percentage of Electronic W-2 Employee Consents		48%	49%	51.2%	51%	48%	49%	49%	0.5
Percentage of SMART Accounting payments to suppliers paid by ACH		46.9%	47.9%	47.9%	49%	51%	53%	55%	0.5
Number of Federal, State and Local tax withholding jurisdictions		63	70	78	76	94	96	100	80.7
Number of unemployment jurisdictions		20	20	21	20	36	38	40	25.7

\*In FY20, due to Covid, in person workshops were cancelled and virtual workshops were put into place.

\*\*In FY22, due to SiteViz website content manager migration, budgets could not upload until bulk import programming was completed by vendor.

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 2,755,418	\$ 2,117,315	\$ 1,666,512	\$ 1,619,340	\$ 1,921,422	\$ 1,748,776	\$ 1,758,519	\$ 1,901,750
Non-SGF State Funds	5,153,269	5,196,273	4,612,130	5,306,268	4,875,178	8,876,824	8,632,046	4,894,527
Federal Funds	-	-	55,284		43,802	128,251	128,215	33,029
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 7,908,686</b>	<b>\$ 7,313,589</b>	<b>\$ 6,333,926</b>	<b>\$ 6,925,608</b>	<b>\$ 6,840,402</b>	<b>\$ 10,753,851</b>	<b>\$ 10,518,780</b>	<b>\$ 6,829,306</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>56.0</b>	<b>61.0</b>	<b>63.0</b>	<b>62.0</b>	<b>62.0</b>	<b>62.0</b>	<b>62.0</b>	<b>62.0</b>

**Department of Administration  
Division of Budget**

**Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

The State of Kansas would not have a central budget office to assist agencies in developing and implementing budgets, and strategic plans. The Governor would not have a professional non-partisan staff to aid in making budget decisions, track the proposed budget

	<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific	KSA 75-3715, 75-3721, 75-3722, 75-4802, 11-201, 75-	Mandatory	No	1

**Program Goals**

GOAL 1: Perform comprehensive policy, management, and fiscal analysis.  
GOAL 2: Produce an accurate budget reflecting the Governor's priorities.  
GOAL 3: Balance state receipts and expenditures.  
GOAL 4: To provide accurate budget and policy information in a timely manner.

**Program History**

The Kansas budget system was created by the 1917 Legislature. Major revisions of the original statutes occurred in 1925, 1953, 1972, 1978, and 1980.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
Percentage of state agencies visited in the fiscal year by analysts	1	68.4%	50.0%	3.1%	70.4%	69.4%	73.5%	67.3%	40.8%
Percentage of administrative regulations reviewed with a fiscal effect over \$3.0 million (\$1.0 million after FY 2022)	1	1.7%	0.2%	1.0%	1.0%	2.3%	100.0%	100.0%	1.1%
Percentage of state agencies w/ cashflow problems.	3	4.3%	10.8%	6.5%	1.1%	11.8%	10.8%	10.8%	9.7%
Percentage of fiscal notes completed by the hearing date	4	99.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Percentage of corrected fiscal notes	4	0.6%	0.7%	1.1%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%
<i>Output Measures</i>									
Number of continuing education opportunities attended by staff	1	7	5	8	7	11	8	3	8
Number of administrative regulations reviewed	1	588	455	525	525	222	5	5	400.6666667
Number of administrative regulations with a fiscal effect over \$3.0 million (\$1.0 million	1	10	1	5	5	5	5	5	3.666666667

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
Number of times administrative tools are used to ensure positive cashflow	3	1	3	2	0	0	0	1	1.666666667
Number of agency cashflow models developed and maintained	4	44	50	66	64	51	51	51	55.66666667
Number of fiscal notes completed	4	644	580	761	600	528	620	620	623
Number of surveys completed	4	5	4	4	4	6	4	4	4.666666667

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,517,547	\$ 1,677,674	\$ 1,650,625	\$ 1,774,014	\$ 1,591,530	\$ 2,139,431	\$ 1,997,630	\$ 1,639,943
Non-SGF State Funds	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Federal Funds	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,517,547</b>	<b>\$ 1,677,674</b>	<b>\$ 1,650,625</b>	<b>\$ 1,774,014</b>	<b>\$ 1,591,530</b>	<b>\$ 2,139,431</b>	<b>\$ 1,997,630</b>	<b>\$ 1,639,943</b>
<b>FTE</b>	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0

**Department of Administration**  
**Office of Public Advocates Long Term Care Ombudsman**

**Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

Failure to fund this program would be a violation of the Older Americans Act of 1965, which requires an Office of the State Long-Term Care and Ombudsman in every state. Programs associated with the Older Americans Act serve over 300,000 Kansans. By not funding the program, the State of Kansas would lose federal funding in excess of \$400,000 annually and Kansans would not have access to an ombudsman to investigate and resolve complaints.

	<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific	42-USC 3001 et seq. K.S.A. 75-5916 through 75-5922	Mandatory	No	1

**Program Goals**

A. Through advocacy, self-empowerment and education by the Long-Term Care Ombudsman Program each resident in a Kansas long-term care facility will be treated with dignity and respect and will have his/her rights honored.

**Program History**

The Older Americans Act (42-USC 3001 et seq.) mandates that each state establish and operate an Office of the State Long-Term Care Ombudsman to provide services to protect the health, safety, welfare and rights of residents. K.S.A. 75-5916 through 75-5922, enacted in 1980, establishes the Long-Term Care Ombudsman Program. The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1987 and amendments thereto have further defined the role of the Ombudsman. Public Law 160-175, the 1987 amendments of the Older American Act, authorized Title III Part G grants to states to prevent abuse, neglect, and exploitation of older individuals. The 1987 amendments also provide that adequate legal counsel is available to the ombudsman office and that legal representation is provided to representatives of the office to ensure that the ombudsman has the ability to pursue administrative, legal and other appropriate remedies on behalf of the facility residents. The Older Americans Act of 1998 amendments funded the program under Title VII, Section 702(b). The Older Americans Act Reauthorization Act of 2016 authorizes LTC Ombudsman programs to serve residents transitioning from a LTC facility to a home-care setting, when feasible, and serve all LTC facility residents regardless of their age. In FY 1998, the Kansas legislature amended K.S.A. 75-7301 and moved the State Long-Term Care Ombudsman to the Department of Administration. In 2018, the Kansas Legislature amended K.S.A. 75-7301 through 75-7314 to amend the definition of conflict of interest, add additional eligibility requirements for the Ombudsman, and further define the duties of the Ombudsman to comply with the Older American's Act and its regulations. In 2021, E.O. 21-27 established the Office of Public Advocates to include OSLTCO, with provisions under K.S.A 75-7301 to be unaffected. The objectives previously used to measure outcomes were changed in 2022 to more closely reflect the ombudsman services to the residents living in long-term care facilities in Kansas.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
<b>Outcome Measure #1</b> Total complaints closed per fiscal year	A	1231	1134	1293	1300	1975	2300	2700	1467.3
<b>Outcome Measure #2</b> Increase instances of information and assistance provided to individuals	A	85%	79%	73%	75%	75%	75%	80%	0.8

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
<b>Outcome Measure #3</b>									
<b>A.</b> Increase the # of visits to nursing homes	A	3022	1974	37	1900	762	875	1000	924.3
<b>B.</b> Increase the # of visits to board & care facilities	A					379	430	500	379.0

\* Outcome Measure 3B was combined with outcome measure 3A before FY2022

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ 296,546	\$ 307,391	\$ 258,767	\$ 267,079	243,971	\$ 296,947	\$ 276,721	\$ 270,043
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	386,414	388,960	426,593	462,367	587,569	751,201	787,043	467,707
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 682,960</b>	<b>\$ 696,351</b>	<b>\$ 685,360</b>	<b>\$ 729,446</b>	<b>\$ 831,540</b>	<b>\$ 1,048,148</b>	<b>\$ 1,063,764</b>	<b>\$ 737,750</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>11.0</b>

**Department of Administration**  
**Office of Public Advocates KanCare Ombudsman**

**Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

Failure to fund this office would be in violation the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid (CMS) Special Terms and Conditions for KanCare. KanCare/Kansas Medicaid has over 500,000 members. The KanCare Ombudsman Office is available to assist any of the members, applicants, family and other stakeholders with issues they may be experincing with KanCare/Kanss Medicaid. Not funding this program would create issues with CMS in regard to the KanCare program and not meeting their requirements.

	<b>Statutory Basis</b>	<b>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</b>	<b>MOE/Match Rqt.</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
Specific	CMS Special Terms and Conditions; Number: 11-W-00283/7. Title: KanCare. Awardee: KDHE. 36. Independent Consumer Supports (Ombudsman)	Mandatory	No	1

**Program Goals**

Through advocacy, education, and resource, the KanCare Ombudsman Office assists members, applicants and other stakeholders to navigate and access the application process and covered health care services and supports.

**Program History**

KanCare was started as a new managed care medicad services program in January 2013. When KanCare was created, the KanCare Ombudsman was included in the program per CMS special terms and conditions. The KanCare Ombudsma Office has been included in each of the subsequent renewals that have taken place.

**Performance Measures**

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Previous Est.</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>
1. Increase first response contact to within 2 days	A	88%	85%	87%		89%	90%	91%	0.9
2. Number of resources updated within 12 months of last update (out of 30 total)	B	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	25%	27%	
3. Outreach to KanCare/Kansas Medicaid Stakeholders	C	217	110	373	n/a	653	250	300	378.7

## Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund						\$ 232,644	\$ 234,849	#DIV/0!
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-			-
Federal Funds						\$ 232,644	\$ 234,849	#DIV/0!
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 465,288	\$ 469,698	\$ -
<b>FTE</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.0	4.0	

**Department of Administration**  
**Office of Public Advocates Division of Child Advocate**

**Consequences of Not Funding this Program**

Failure to fund this program would prohibit the ability to fulfill the duties of the Division as outlined in Executive Orders 21-27 and 21-28.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rgt.	Priority Level
Specific KS Governor's Executive Order 21-28	Mandatory	No	1

**Program Goals**

- A. Independently investigate & address complaints made by or on behalf of children in DCF custody or alleged to be a child in need of care.
- B. Compile and identify concerning patterns and advocate for impactful change to improve Kansas child welfare and family wellbeing systems, making recommendations and advocating for changes to policy, procedures, rules and regulations, and law.
- C. Inform and educate children, their guardians and families, of the child's rights and entitlements under state and federal laws, as well as the generally accepted principles of best practices in child welfare.

**Program History**

Kansas Governor issued Executive Orders 21-27 and 21-28 in October 2021 establishing the Office of Public Advocates and the Division of the Child Advocate (KDCA). KDCA's purpose is to ensure that Kansas children and families receive adequate coordination of child welfare services, prevention, protection and care through services by addressing complaints made by or on behalf of a child in the custody of the Secretary of Department for Children and Families or alleged to be a Child In Need of Care.

**Performance Measures**

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Complaints received, investigated, and	A						144*	200*	
2. Number of returned post case closure	A						65%*	75%*	
3. Training hours and type attended by KDCA staff	A						12*	12*	
4. Number of patterns identified	B						*	*	
5. Recommendations made and responses	B						*	*	
6. Maintain public website & social media	C						75%*	85%*	
7. Number of materials provided	C						*Increase by 10%	*Increase by 10%	
8. Trainings/Stakeholder Meetings attended	C						85%*	100%*	

**Funding**

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund						\$ 590,133	\$ 520,493	
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-			
Federal Funds								
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 590,133	\$ 520,493	\$ -
<b>FTE</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.0	5.0	

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

KPERS administers the collection of employer and employee contributions, oversees the investment management of the KPERS Trust Fund and pays all benefits owed to KPERS members and their beneficiaries. Failure to fund the program would result in an inability for the agency to complete statutory required functions and ultimately be a breach of fiduciary duty to KPERS members.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
K.S.A. 74-4920 eq. seq.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Pay all retirement benefits and death and disability benefits earned by KPERS members.
- B. Prudently manage the investments of the KPERS Trust Fund (pension plan) and group insurance reserve fund (death and disability plan).
- C. Collect all statutorily required employer and employee contributions to the pension plan and all statutorily required employer contributions to the death and disability plan.

### Program History

The Kansas Public Employees Retirement System (KPERS) was created by an act of the 1961 Kansas Legislature. The Act provides that the purpose of the Retirement System is "...to provide an orderly means whereby employees of participating employers who obtain retirement age may be retired from active service without prejudice and without inflicting a hardship upon the employees retired and to enable such employees to accumulate reserves for themselves and their dependents to provide for old age, death, and termination of employment and for the purpose of effecting economy and efficiency in the administration of governmental affairs."

The 1965 Legislature established the Kansas Police and Firemen's Retirement System (KP&F) and assigned the administration of that System to the Board of Trustees of the Kansas Public Employees Retirement System (KPERS). On January 1, 1971, the Kansas School Retirement System (KSRS) was merged into the Kansas Public Employees Retirement System by act of the Legislature. On July 1, 1975, the Kansas Judges Retirement Board was abolished and all the powers, duties and functions of that board were transferred to the Board of Trustees of the Kansas Public Employees Retirement System. Retirement plan design and administration is contained in K.S.A. 74-4920 et. seq.

In addition to serving as the pension plan for State and local governmental employees, KPERS offers basic group life insurance and long-term disability benefits. The KPERS Death and Disability Benefits Program came into existence on January 1, 1966 under the provision of K.S.A. 74-4927. The cost of the plan is paid from a special reserve called the "group insurance reserve" and the statutory employer rate for this is benefit is 1.0 percent of their covered payroll. KPERS contracts with The Standard to underwrite the group life insurance benefits. Disability Management Services, Inc. is the third-party administrator for the disability program.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	3- yr. Avg.
		Actuals	Actuals	Actuals	Previous Est.	Actuals	Est.	Est.	
1. Administrative cost per member and annuitant	7.0%	\$47	\$44	\$48	N/A	\$63	N/A	N/A	\$52
2. Administrative expenses as % of Trust Fund assets		0.062%	0.068%	0.063%	0.085%	0.087%	0.099%	0.095%	0.073%
3. Administrative expenses as % of benefit payments		0.703%	0.767%	0.786%	1.073%	1.000%	1.175%	1.144%	0.851%
4. Total Trust Fund Assets (in billions)		\$20	\$21	\$25	\$27	\$24	\$26	\$28	\$23
5. KPERS portfolio rate of return		6.70%	2.10%	26.30%	7.75%	-4.70%	7.00%	7.00%	7.90%
6. Investment related expenses as % of Trust Fund assets		0.158%	0.159%	0.133%	0.148%	0.156%	0.143%	0.139%	0.149%
7. Benefit Payments, Including Refunds (in billions)		\$1.83	\$1.85	\$2.01	\$2.10	\$2.11	\$2.20	\$2.30	\$1.99
8. Average amount of time to answer phone calls (in seconds)		10	21	21	N/A	34	N/A	N/A	25

Kansas Public Employees Retirement System

9. Percentage of valid retirement applications processed within 30 calendar days	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
10. Percentage of monthly retirement benefit payments initiated by the last working day of the month	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
11. Percentage of workable retirement estimates completed within 30 calendar days of receipt	100%	99%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**Funding**

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2019 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2020 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>FY 2022 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2023 Est.</i>	<i>FY 2024 Est.</i>	<i>3-yr. Avg.</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	12,887,171	14,224,610	15,764,888	22,578,549	21,129,049	25,839,254	26,351,961	17,039,516
Federal Funds	-	-	-					-
	\$12,887,171	\$14,224,610	\$15,764,888	\$22,578,549	\$21,129,049	\$25,839,254	\$26,351,961	\$17,039,516
<b>FTE</b>	95.7	95.7	95.7	95.7	95.7	95.7	95.7	95.7

## Deferred Compensation

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Not funding the deferred compensation plan would result in an inability for the agency to carry out the statutory required duty to administer the deferred compensation plan.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Requirement	Priority Level
K.S.A. 74-49b01 et seq.	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Ensure that the plan is administered and operated according to its terms and to keep the plan compliant with federal as well as applicable state laws.
- B. Maintain control of fiduciary liability through governance, best practices, investment monitoring and fiduciary training.
- C. Increase the number of deferring employees.

### Program History

The Kansas Deferred Compensation Plan is a voluntary, tax-deferred retirement savings program for state employees. In addition, many local public employers offer the plan to their employees. The Plan was administered by the Kansas Department of Administration and the Deferred Compensation Oversight Committee from 1980 to 2007.

Following a 2006 study of the Plan, the Secretary of Administration and the KPERS Board of Trustees recommended transferring Plan administration to KPERS. During the 2007 legislative session, the Kansas Legislature passed, and the Governor signed HB 2385 to implement this recommendation effective January 1, 2008. KPERS' administration of the Plan provides State and local employees with coordinated retirement education and planning information and facilitates an increased emphasis on personal savings for retirement.

### Performance Measures

Outcome Measures	Goal	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Previous Est.	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3- yr. Avg.
1. Total participating members (actively deferring)		13,146	13,280	13,068	N/A	13,081	N/A	N/A	13,143
2. Percentage of active members from participating employers in all retirement systems that also participate in KPERS 457		23%	23%	23%	N/A	32%	N/A	N/A	26%
3. Total 457 Plan assets (in billions)		\$1.14	\$1.17	\$1.46	N/A	\$1.26	N/A	N/A	\$1.30

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2019 Actuals	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Actuals	FY 2022 Approved	FY 2022 Actuals	FY 2023 Est.	FY 2024 Est.	3-yr. Avg.
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	430,734	410,978	451,773	581,216	519,087	618,909	632,913	460,613
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$ 430,734	\$ 410,978	\$ 451,773	\$ 581,216	\$ 519,087	\$ 618,909	\$ 632,913	\$ 460,613
FTE	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6



## BOARD OF REGENTS PERFORMANCE AGREEMENTS

In 1999, the Kansas Legislature enacted the Kansas Higher Education Coordination Act and reorganized all postsecondary education institutions under the Kansas Board of Regents. Within that Act, K.S.A. 74-3202d established improvement plans for the public higher education institutions in Kansas and tied the awarding of new state funds to these improvement plans. These plans are commonly known as performance agreements. All 32 public postsecondary institutions participate in this process.

At least once every three years, the institutions negotiate a new performance agreement with the Board. The Board's strategic plan for the System provides the foundation for each institution's performance agreement. As the Board has adopted a new plan, *Building a Future*, updates to the performance agreements are underway to sync the agreements with the new plan.

The performance agreement process drives the Board of Regents' evaluation of how the institutions are performing against their benchmarks. The agreements are based on maintaining or improving over the previous three-year average for each indicator chosen by the institution. Every institution developed indicators that support the Board's strategic plan and established a baseline for each indicator. The Board approved the current performance agreements at the February 16, 2022 meeting.

The Board is also responsible for determining the amount of new state funds awarded, which is based on an institution's level of compliance with its performance agreement and the funds available for distribution. Institutions report annually on their agreement metrics. In Summer 2022, institutions submitted performance reports covering Academic Year 2021. Any new funding awarded in FY 2024 will depend upon an institution's AY 2021 performance. The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee has reviewed these reports as of January 11, 2023, and the full Board will act on the most recent reports at the January 18, 2023 meeting.

To be eligible for any new funding<sup>1</sup> appropriated, each institution must annually submit a report updating the Board on its progress toward meeting each of the indicators in its performance agreement. The Board evaluates this report each year and determines funding levels. Funding levels awarded in one reporting year do not affect funding levels in subsequent years.

<sup>1</sup> Performance funding applies to the following line items: (1) State university and Washburn University operating grants; (2) community college, technical college, and Washburn Institute of Technology Postsecondary Tiered Technical State Aid and Non-Tiered Course Credit Hour Aid; (3) eligible institutions' Career Technical Education Capital Outlay Aid and Technology Grant Funding; (4) Tuition for Technical Education (secondary students); (5) Postsecondary Education Performance-Based Incentive Special Revenue Fund; and (6) any other state funding consistent with statutes. This provision would also apply to any new state funds received by any postsecondary institution under the original 1999 Senate Bill 345 provisions for 2% performance grant funding, codified in K.S.A. 76-771, should any such funds be appropriated.

The Board-approved Funding Guidelines award new funding based on three outcomes for the indicators in the performance agreement: (1) maintaining the baseline; (2) improving on the baseline; or (3) declining from the baseline, with credit given for maintaining or improving the baseline.

Awarding of new funds is currently based on the following levels of compliance:

- 100% of New Funding Available: The Board has determined the institution maintained the baseline or improved from the baseline in four or more of the indicators.
- 90% of New Funding Available: An institution will be awarded 90% of the new funding for which it is eligible if:
  - The institution has made a good faith effort;
  - The effort has resulted in the institution maintaining the baseline or improving from the baseline in three of indicators; and
  - The performance report includes specific plans for improvement.
- 75% of New Funding Available: An institution will be awarded 75% of the new funding for which it is eligible if:
  - The institution has made a good faith effort;
  - The effort has resulted in the institution maintaining the baseline or improving from the baseline in two of the indicators; and
  - The performance report includes specific plans for improvement.
- No New Funding Awarded: The institution did not make a good faith effort, as defined by:
  - Lacking an approved performance agreement;
  - Failing to submit a performance report; or
  - Maintaining or improving from the baseline in only one indicator, or none of the indicators.

In this process, “new funding” refers only to the increment of the change from one year to the next, not the entire amount. Over the course of when this process has been instituted, there have been 24 instances when an institution has had some money withheld.

The statutes originally provided a mechanism for the Board to grant additional amounts, up to 2% of the prior appropriation to institutions when they demonstrate effectiveness in complying with their role and mission and they meet or exceed the core indicators of qualify performance. The statutory provisions for the coordinated institutions were repealed in 2011 when the tiered and non-tiered state aid grants were created. The statute (KSA 76-711) still exists for the state universities, but no funding has ever been appropriated or awarded for this program.

The Performance Reports are available at:

[https://kansasregents.org/academic\\_affairs/performance-agreements](https://kansasregents.org/academic_affairs/performance-agreements).

Emporia State University Performance Report AY 2021							AY 2021 FTE: 4,999 Date: 7/18/2022	
Contact Person: JoLanna Kord	Foresight Goal	3 yr. History	Reporting AY 2020 (SU19, FA19, SP20)		Reporting AY 2021 (SU20, FA20, SP21)		Reporting AY 2022 (SU21, FA21, SP22)	
Phone: 620-341-6839 email: jkord@emporia.edu			Institution Result	Baseline Comparison	Institution Result	Baseline Comparison	Institution Result	Baseline Comparison
1 Close the gap between ESU and its top three peers for first to second year retention rates for the cohort of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking students	1 (Cohort KBOR data)	Fall 2012 Cohort: 438/601 = 72.9% Fall 2013 Cohort: 485/668 = 72.6% Fall 2014 Cohort: 530/732 = 72.4% Baseline: 72.6% Selected Top Three Peers 2014 Avg. <b>Baseline: 76.7% Gap: 4.1%</b>	524/675 = 77.6% Top 3 Peers 2020 Avg. = 76.3% Gap = -1.3	↑	414/561 = 73.8% Top 3 Peers 2021 Avg. = 77.0% Gap = 3.2	↑		
2 Annually increase the six-year graduation rate for the cohort of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking students	2 (KBOR data)	Fall 2009 Cohort: 275/660 = 41.7% Fall 2010 Cohort: 270/616 = 43.8% Fall 2011 Cohort: 256/575 = 44.5% <b>Baseline: 801/1,851 = 43.3%</b>	(Fall 2014 Cohort) 339/732 = 46.3%	↑	(Fall 2015 Cohort) 365/731 = 49.9%	↑		
3 Increase Scholarship Funds raised	3	FY 2013: \$2,565,418 FY 2014: \$2,883,190 FY 2015: \$2,733,495 <b>Baseline: \$2,727,368</b>	\$3,113,656	↑	\$3,747,614	↑		
4 Increase enrollment for undergraduate traditional students ages 24 and younger	1	AY 2013: 3,203 AY 2014: 3,306 AY 2015: 3,355 <b>Baseline: 3,288</b>	2,876	↓	2,633	↓		
5 Increase performance of students on institutional assessments: core mathematical skills	2	Analytical Reasoning Skills Mean Score AY 2015: (n=106) 2.6 AY 2016: (n=127) 3.0 AY 2017: (n=122) 2.9 <b>Baseline: 2.8</b>	2.9 (n=102)	↑	3.1 (n=94)	↑		
6 Increase student credit hours (SCH) completed through Distance Education	1	AY 2013: 33,834 AY 2014: 36,173 AY 2015: 38,558 <b>Baseline: 36,188</b>	53,363	↑	63,650	↑		

## Emporia State University Performance Report AY 2021

### **Indicator 1: Close the gap between ESU and its top three peers for first to second year retention rates for the cohort of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking students**

**Description:** Aligning with Foresight 2020 strategic goal one, ESU is committed to improving the first-to-second year retention rates of first-year, full-time students. Our goal is to close the 4.1% gap between ESU's (72.6%) baseline retention rate and the baseline rate of peers Pittsburg State University and University of Nebraska at Kearney, and aspirant peer, South Dakota State University (76.7%). We anticipate these retention rates stabilizing with incremental growth over time as improving student success is an institution-wide priority in *The Adaptive University Strategic Plan, 2015-2025*.

**Result:** The students who are attending college right now are committed to their journey and find value in higher education. Though there have been unusual situations and current events, students are seeking out and finding the support resources that we have increasingly made available. Our elevation of support services, including counseling, embedded tutors, and advisor assistance, plus greater utilization of our Early Alert and Care team programs have allowed us to be more proactive to student needs. In addition, an increase in governmental assistance has been valuable for the retention of our students and the additional dollars were used to provide students' assistance not previously offered.

### **Indicator 2: Annually increase the six-year graduation rate for the cohort of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking students**

**Description:** Aligning with Foresight 2020 strategic goal 1 - Increasing Higher Education Attainment, Emporia State University (ESU) is focused on improving the six-year graduation rates for incoming student cohorts of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking students. As per our strategic plan goal 3, ESU contributes to enhancing the competitive role of Kansas by enrolling, retaining, and graduating students ready for life and career. A key performance indicator for ESU's strategic plan goal 3, is the tracking of six-year graduation rates for first-time, full-time degree-seeking cohorts.

**Result:** Annual improvement in our six-year graduation rate reflects institution-wide strategies dedicated to advising, academic support, enhanced scholarships, using the degree-works software to assist students in academic planning and scheduling, reducing major programs of study to 120-credit hours, and the integration of student success support services throughout the educational experience.

### **Indicator 3: Increase Scholarship Funds raised**

**Description:** Aligning with Foresight 2020 strategic goal three, Emporia State University seeks to increase scholarship funds raised on an annual basis to support student success. This indicator tracks success in increasing funding available for student scholarships. The specific metric is cash gifts (i.e., planned gifts are not included) raised in the fiscal year, which corresponds closely to the academic year. The Emporia State University Foundation is focused on raising scholarship funding to fill this gap as a top strategic priority.

**Result:** Emporia State University exceeded the baseline and achieved a year-over-year increase in non-deferred scholarship contributions by \$633,958 (20.4%). This outperformance was due in part to the realization of several large, planned gifts benefiting scholarships, including four that were each greater than \$100,000. We were also able to secure ten new scholarship gifts at or above the \$50,000 level as a direct result of our development activity in support of the Together, Forward campaign. One key facet of the campaign is support for talent awards; that is, scholarships intended to help ESU recruit and retain talented artists, musicians, thespians, and student-athletes. We will continue to promote talent awards as a priority for private support as the campaign progresses.

### **Indicator 4: Increase enrollment for undergraduate traditional students ages 24 and younger**

**Description:** Aligning with Foresight 2020 strategic goal one, Emporia State University is focused on increasing enrollment among undergraduate traditional students while matching peer enrollment growth trends. Traditional students are defined as undergraduates, ages 24 and younger. Over the past three years, increasing ESU's enrollment numbers for traditional students has been a top priority. In a resource-scarce environment, growing enrollment advances Emporia

State University's mission and increases higher education attainment among Kansas citizens.

**Result:** ESU's greatest challenge right now is our decreasing enrollment trend for undergraduate students. Despite the declining number of traditional college-going students in the high school pipeline, the Admissions team has continued to utilize best recruiting practices and has explored new opportunities. ESU is partnering with the City of Emporia, Lyon County, and the ESU Foundation on strategic enrollment initiatives including elevating our E-Sports and Disc Golf student clubs, dedicating more resources to our Basic Needs initiative, and providing scholarships for new transfer students living on-campus in residence halls. We have just launched a Strategic Enrollment Management Plan that reviews and examines recruitment staff and engages the entire campus including academic departments and programs, marketing, administration and finance, and student affairs units which all have roles in our strategic recruitment efforts.

#### **Indicator 5: Increase performance of students on institutional assessments: core mathematical skills**

**Description:** Aligning with Foresight 2020 strategic goal two, Emporia State University uses the American Association of Colleges & Universities Quantitative Literacy Value Rubric to evaluate student works. This course-embedded direct assessment measures student learning of analytical reasoning skills. Annually, a random collection of student works from multiple sections of college algebra is evaluated for application, calculation, interpretation, and representation skills as evidenced in four specific exams administered over the duration of the term. The exam content is dedicated to calculation skills (70%) and real-world application concepts (30%). On average, 19 course sections of college algebra yield a random sample of 119 students with a total of 476 tests scored.

**Result:** The initial random sample from sixteen sections of College Algebra resulted in 109 students selected, which was reduced to ninety-four students as the sample size was based on students' participation in all four exams used in the evaluation. The overall mean score was 3.1/4.0. Students scored highest in the Representation and Interpretation Skills categories as both scores were 3.2/4.0. The Calculation score was 3.1/4.0 and the Application score was 3.0/4.0. Overall, these findings confirm that our strategies were beneficial in improving students' scores. Combining improvement strategies for both representation and application by converting words into algebraic expressions with applications skills matching the conversion exercises was successful. And, as hypothesized led to improvements in both categories. The calculation score remains constant, and students appreciated the integration of competition into the classroom learning experience. Next year we will focus on the application dimension and on improving overall student learning in all four areas.

#### **Indicator 6: Increase student credit hours (SCH) completed through distance education**

**Description:** Continuous growth in distance education provides vital educational opportunities for Kansans by providing increased access to higher education while promoting technology-enhanced learning. ESU is employing targeted recruitment and enhanced technology to achieve growth in distance education, which is central to the university's overall growth strategy. The SCH figures used for measuring and reporting this metric are based on KBOR required reporting of academic year SCH totals which include combined undergraduate and graduate credit hour production.

**Result:** The increase in student credit hours (SCH) can be attributed to a variety of initiatives to increase our online presence and to better serve Kansas citizens who are place-bound and in need of distance education options. At the undergraduate level, we created a General Studies option and expanded our general education online options so students could fulfill all program requirements in that modality. At the graduate level, we followed three strategies to meet the needs of place-bound Kansas students: 1) the creation of four 18-hour certificates to serve the needs of teachers who fell short of Higher Learning Commission (HLC) requirements for graduate-level specialization to teach dual-credit courses or community college level courses; 2) the creation of new professional programs to meet areas of shortage within the state, including an Elementary Education program that allows career changers to access a master's degree and licensure, a Nursing program with concentrations in administration and teaching targeted to nurses working in rural hospitals, and an Information Technology program to train cybersecurity workers throughout the state; 3) developed accelerated online programs (AOP) to allow teachers and business professionals more flexible course dates (7-week blocks with 6-starts per year) to align with their busy lives. Our masters' programs in Accountancy, Business Administration, Curriculum and Instruction, and Educational Administration are our fastest-growing graduate programs.

Fort Hays State University Performance Report AY 2021							AY 2021 FTE: 10,165 Date: 6/22/2022	
Contact Person: Angela Pool-Funai  Phone: 785-628-4241 email: aepoolfunai@fhsu.edu	Foresight Goal	3 yr. History	Reporting AY 2020 (SU19, FA19, SP20)		Reporting AY 2021 (SU20, FA20, SP21)		Reporting AY 2022 (SU21, FA21, SP22)	
			Institution Result	Baseline Comparison	Institution Result	Baseline Comparison	Institution Result	Baseline Comparison
1 Increase first to second year retention rates	1 <i>KBOR data</i>	Fall 2012 Cohort: 621/949 = 65.4% Fall 2013 Cohort: 659/981 = 67.2% Fall 2014 Cohort: 669/975 = 68.6% <b>Baseline: 1,949/2,905 = 67.1%</b>	732/935 = <b>78.3%</b>	↑	640/878 = 72.9%	↑		
2 Increase number of degrees awarded	1 <i>KBOR data</i>	AY 2013: 3,340 AY 2014: 3,252 AY 2015: 3,208 <b>Baseline: 3,267</b>	3,941	↑	4,286	↑		
3 Increase percent of online degree programs for which FHSU ranks higher in U.S. News World Report as compared to KBOR peers	3	AY 2013: 37/40 = 92.5% AY 2014: 38/40 = 95.0% AY 2015: 38/40 = 95.0% <b>Baseline: 113/120 = 94.2%</b>	37/40 (92.5%)	↓	35/40 (87.5%)	↓		
4 Increase number of students (age 25 and above) enrolled	1	AY 2013: 5,084 AY 2014: 5,468 AY 2015: 5,836 <b>Baseline: 5,463</b>	5,935*	↑	5,695	↑		
5 Increase number of degrees awarded in STEM fields	2 <i>KBOR data</i>	AY 2013: 451 AY 2014: 447 AY 2015: 443 <b>Baseline: 447</b>	648	↑	753	↑		
6 Increase Credit Hours completed through distance education	1	AY 2013: 129,686 AY 2014: 135,172 AY 2015: 144,900 <b>Baseline: 136,586</b>	136,451*	↑	137,783	↑		
*Reflects corrections made by institution on 6/22/2022.								

## Fort Hays State University Performance Report AY 2021

### **Indicator 1: Increase first to second year retention rates**

Description: This indicator is the 20th day fall-to-fall retention percentage of first-time, full-time, degree seeking freshman students. This indicator was selected because it is a KBOR Foresight 2020 goal and because institutionally we have lagged behind peers on this metric.

Result: FHSU's performance on this indicator continues to well exceed the baseline. This success can be attributed to our ongoing focus on high-impact practices geared toward Freshmen in their first year at FHSU. Initiatives include the First-Year Experience Program, Learning Communities, and the Early Alert System. The University continues to implement co-requisite remediation for high DFWI courses (grades of D, F, Withdrawal, or Incomplete), diagnostic assessments, policy audits, faculty training, and promoting Learning Communities for second-year students, as well. Our move to a centralized advising model will also assist us in continuing to surpass our baseline indicator.

### **Indicator 2: Increase number of degrees awarded**

Description: This indicator is the number of degrees awarded during an academic year, including, undergraduate (Associates and Bachelors) and graduate (Masters and Education Specialists) degrees. Foresight 2020 has its focus on the concerted push to matriculate a larger number Kansans through quality workforce-focused programs. At FHSU, a great number of graduates come from in-demand programs with immediate workforce application (i.e., teacher education, nursing, business, information networking, and justice studies). Student completion through FHSU Online (formerly the Virtual College) continues to be a key strategic focus for the institution.

Result: Our performance on this indicator shows a trajectory of improvement, with the most recent figures indicating more than 1,000 degrees awarded above the baseline expectation with another record year of graduates. The University continues to focus on retention and graduation rates at all levels, with particular emphasis on efforts to better serve our international students both on campus and through our partnerships.

### **Indicator 3: Increase percent of online degree programs for which FHSU ranks higher by U. S. News World Report as compared to KBOR peers**

Description: This indicator is the percent of degree programs for which FHSU ranks higher in the USNWR ranking of online degree programs across all four areas (online graduate education programs, online graduate nursing programs, online graduate business programs, and online bachelors programs) as compared to the approved KBOR peer list.

Result: Our performance on this metric was below the baseline; however, FHSU remains committed to always improving our program delivery across modalities. The University offers a variety of high-quality, low-cost undergraduate and graduate degrees in an online format specifically designed for adult learners. The indicator this year decreased to 35/40 (87.5%). We finished 1<sup>st</sup> among our peers for our online graduate nursing program, 4<sup>th</sup> among our peers on the MBA, and 2<sup>nd</sup> for our online bachelor's and online graduate education categories this year. FHSU continues to review the methodology of these ranking systems and look for ways to improve our program delivery for higher ranking. Our programs provide rich academic offerings in an online delivery mode specifically designed for adult learners. FHSU provides comprehensive learner support that includes personalized professional advising, free online tutoring, excellent library services, bookstore, financial aid programs, military support services, and more.

**Indicator 4: Increase number of students (age 25 and above) enrolled**

Description: This indicator is the number of students age 25 and above enrolled at FHSU on the 20th day fall semester. FHSU has long been a favorite institution for non-traditional adult learners, and our success in distance education is largely directed toward this demographic. This group is a critical demographic to target due to their immediate connection to the existing workforce – this demographic is likely getting credentialed to improve their position with the workforce.

Result: While we are down from the previous year, the number of students (age 25 and above) enrolled was maintained above the baseline. FHSU has added several process improvements to better serve adult learners, including the expansion of our professional advising and the number of workforce-focused degree programs available online. We strategically add and expand high-demand programs and are working on opportunities for students to complete their credentials more rapidly through short courses and other stackable credentials.

**Indicator 5: Increase number of degrees awarded in STEM fields**

Description: This indicator is an AY count of the number of degrees awarded in STEM fields (coded by particular CIPs). Historically, the University has positioned itself in the undergraduate STEM arena through our successful Kansas Academy of Mathematics and Science (developed as the statewide academy for top-performing high school juniors and seniors) and our strong programs in the sciences and technology. The University continues to improve our undergraduate programming in these areas, and expand our technology programs through distance education, when possible. Completion of STEM programs is a challenge nationally, but FHSU closely monitors student achievement in these areas through personalized advising and partnerships with industry to facilitate rapid student placement upon graduation.

Result: Once again, FHSU exceeded the baseline by more than 300 additional degrees awarded in STEM fields. Through initiatives such as the Kansas Academy of Mathematics and Science (KAMS) program serving Kansas high school students, as well as new curriculum development in STEM programs, the University actively seeks to increase STEM degree awards. Nearly all of our STEM graduates participate in undergraduate research projects. Our current Strategic Enrollment Plan also includes components focused on growing enrollment within the Werth College of Science, Technology, and Mathematics.

**Indicator 6: Increase Credit Hours completed through distance education**

Description: This indicator is a FY count of the number of credit hours successfully completed through FHSU Online. FHSU continues to make great advances in distance education. This indicator signifies our strategic commitment to distance learners. Specifically, this indicator looks only at the number of credit hours completed with a passing grade. Moving this indicator is possible through a comprehensive online course development process which assures adherence to high levels of academic quality in the online environment.

Result: The number of credit hours completed through distance education was maintained above the baseline. FHSU continues to make advances in online course development at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and the University is committed to assuring a high level of academic quality across modalities. A comprehensive online course development and redevelopment process aids us in ensuring this high quality online education.

Kansas State University Performance Report AY 2021							AY 2021 FTE: 18,301 Date: 7/20/2022	
Contact Person: Bin Ning  Phone: 785-532-3931 email: bning@ksu.edu	Foresight Goal	3 yr. History	Reporting AY 2020 (SU19, FA19, SP20)		Reporting AY 2021 (SU20, FA20, SP21)		Reporting AY 2022 (SU21, FA21, SP22)	
			Institution Result	Baseline Comparison	Institution Result	Baseline Comparison	Institution Result	Baseline Comparison
1 Increase First to Second year Retention rates	1  KBOR data	Fall 2012 Cohort: 3,081/3,794 = 81.2% Fall 2013 Cohort: 3,128/3,755 = 83.3% Fall 2014 Cohort: 3,077/3,688 = 83.4% <b>Baseline: 9,286/11,237 = 82.6%</b>	2,753/3,161 = 87.1%	↑	2,507/2,912 = 86.1%	↑		
2 Increase Number of Degrees and Certificates awarded	1  KBOR data	AY 2013 = 4,878 AY 2014 = 5,111 AY 2015 = 5,190 <b>Baseline: 5,060</b>	5,500	↑	5,228	↑		
3 Increase Rank for Total Research Expenditures	3	FY 2012: \$154.9M, control rank = 71 FY 2013: \$163.5M, control rank = 71 FY 2014: \$169.9M, control rank = 70 <b>Baseline: rank average = 70.7</b>	71	↓	\$201.9M 68	↑		
4 Increase Rank for Annual Giving	3	FY 2012: \$66.9M, control rank = 61 FY 2013: \$75.4M, control rank = 56 FY 2014: \$108.1M, control rank = 37 <b>Baseline: rank average = 51.3</b>	54	↓	\$105.2M 54	↓		
5 Increase number of students from underrepresented groups receiving degrees	1	AY 2013: 460 AY 2014: 514 AY 2015: 527 <b>Baseline: 500</b>	740	↑	723	↑		
6 Increase percent of degrees and certificates awarded in STEM fields	2  KBOR data	AY 2013 = 38.1% (1,857/4,878) AY 2014 = 37.9% (1,935/5,111) AY 2015 = 39.1% (2,027/5,190) <b>Baseline: 38.3% (5,819/15,179)</b>	2,667/5,500 = 48.5%	↑	2,427/5,228 = 46.4%	↑		

## Kansas State University Performance Report AY 2021

### Indicator 1: Increase First to Second year Retention rates

**Description:** This indicator is the percent of full-time first-time freshmen who return to K-State for their second year. The data are submitted to the Kansas Board of Regents, and the retention rates are calculated by KBOR staff. This is one of K-State's key metrics for the K-State 2025 strategic plan.

**Result:** Retention rate dipped slightly but is still significantly higher than the baseline level. The rate is expected to rise again this coming fall as a result of institutional wide efforts to improve student experience and success.

### Indicator 2: Increase number of degrees and certificates awarded

**Description:** This indicator is a count of the number of degrees and certificates awarded during the year. The data are submitted to the Kansas Board of Regents and calculated by KBOR staff.

**Result:** It is slightly lower than last academic year as a result of undergraduate enrollment decline in recent years, but still higher than historical 3-year average. Our Strategic Enrollment Plan (SEM) has brought the university together to increase our enrollment and we have seen some positive signs such as increase in out-of-state students, online students, transfer students, and enrollment on the K-State Salina campus. More interdisciplinary programs have been launched which will help create synergies among colleges and pathways for degree completion.

### Indicator 3: Increase Rank for total research expenditures

**Description:** This indicator is the rank for total research expenditures from extramural funds awarded to K-State, as reported to the National Science Foundation. The final control rank is from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst Center for Measuring University Performance annual publication. This indicator is another key metric for the K-State 2025 strategic plan. These rankings usually reflect a 2-3-year lag.

**Result:** Our ranking of 68<sup>th</sup> place is higher than the baseline level and also moved K-State higher from last year's 71<sup>st</sup> place. Under an extremely competitive environment of winning research grants, it is laudable for the faculty and researchers at K-State to gain solid ground at the national level.

### Indicator 4: Increase Rank for annual giving

**Description:** This indicator is the rank for the amount of expendable contributions (not endowed) made each year to the university through the K-State Foundation. Where endowed funds are placed into accounts and the university is able to spend only a portion of the interest earned on the money, expendable contributions are able to be used immediately, usually for purposes specified by the donor. The data (dollars and control rank) are from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst Center for Measuring University Performance annual publication.

**Result:** In recent years, our annual giving has been trending more toward endowed gifts than expendable gifts. Since endowed gifts are not counted in this metric, it affects our ranking. Our three-year average annual giving of all types, including endowed gifts, reached an all-time high of \$182M according to the most recent [KSU Foundation Report \(2021\)](#).

### Indicator 5: Increase number of students from underrepresented groups receiving degrees

**Description:** This indicator is the count of degrees awarded to students from historically underrepresented groups during the year. The count includes both graduate and undergraduate degrees.

**Result:** The number is slightly lower than last year but higher than historical average. Our university-wide emphases on improving diversity and inclusion, greater services to students from underrepresented minorities and first-generation students will continue to show positive outcomes.

**Indicator 6: Increase percent of degrees and certificates awarded in STEM fields**

**Description:** This indicator is calculated using the total number of degrees and certificates awarded in STEM fields (using the Kansas Board of Regents' definition of STEM fields) divided by the total of degrees and certificates awarded over an entire academic year. Based on the Vision 2020 plan for the Kansas Board of Regents, STEM education is an important element that will drive the Kansas workforce needs in the future. The metric is derived by KBOR staff from data provided by K-State.

**Result:** The number remains steady at historically high level. More STEM programs will create greater opportunities to further increase the number of graduates from STEM fields.

Pittsburg State University Performance Report AY 2021							AY 2021 FTE: 5,805 Date: 7/5/2022	
Contact Person: Howard W. Smith	Foresight Goal	3 yr. History	Reporting AY 2020 (SU19, FA19, SP20)		Reporting AY 2021 (SU20, FA20, SP21)		Reporting AY 2022 (SU21, FA21, SP22)	
Phone: 620-235-4009 email: hwsmith@pittstate.edu			Institution Result	Baseline Comparison	Institution Result	Baseline Comparison	Institution Result	Baseline Comparison
<b>1</b> Increase First to Second Year Retention Rates	1 <i>KBOR data</i>	Fall 2012 Cohort: 800/1,076 = 74.3% Fall 2013 Cohort: 816/1,128 = 72.3% Fall 2014 Cohort: 777/1,043 = 74.5% <b>Baseline: 2,393/3,247 = 73.7%</b>	640/865 = 74.0%	↑	596/790 = 75.4%	↑		
<b>2</b> Increase Success in Student Learning: General Education Math Index	2	AY 2013: 2.2186/3 = 74.0% AY 2014: 2.2789/3 = 76.0% AY 2015: 2.2349/3 = 74.5% <b>Baseline: 6.7324/9 = 74.8%</b>	69.1% (2.0736/3)	↓	71.7% (2.1507/3)	↓		
<b>3</b> Maintain or Improve Ranking on Quality Measures (retention, graduation, research expenditures and faculty qualifications) among Peers	3	AY 2013: (3+1+2+1)/4 = 1.8 AY 2014: (2+2+1+2)/4 = 1.8 AY 2015: (2+3+1+1)/4 = 1.8 <b>Baseline: 21/12 = 1.8</b>	2.7 (3+3+2)/3	↓	3.0 (3+4+2)/3	↓		
<b>4</b> Increase Credit Hours Completed through Distance Education	1	AY 2014: 18,493 AY 2015: 21,495 AY 2016: 22,234 <b>Baseline: 20,741</b>	40,229	↑	57,916	↑		
<b>5</b> Increase Number of Bachelor's Degrees Granted to Domestic Minorities	1	AY 2013: 113 (of 1,051) AY 2014: 127 (of 1,136) AY 2015: 153 (of 1,218) <b>Baseline: 131</b>	151 (of 1,004)	↑	154 (of 942)	↑		
<b>6</b> Increase Amount of Scholarship Funds Raised	3	AY 2013: \$1,800,098 AY 2014: \$2,232,575 AY 2015: \$2,149,830 <b>Baseline: \$2,060,834</b>	\$6,189,950	↑	\$8,325,772	↑		

## Pittsburg State University Performance Report AY 2021

### Indicator 1: Increase First to Second Year Retention Rates

**Description:** Retention rate is calculated by determining the number of full-time, first-time bachelor's (or equivalent) degree-seeking undergraduate students who were enrolled on the 20<sup>th</sup> day of a fall semester and returned and were enrolled on the 20<sup>th</sup> day of the next fall semester. PSU is currently in the process of using results from a recent extensive analysis of student retention data and student survey results to targeting freshmen success and first to second year retention rates.

**Result:** Performance above the baseline was achieved in AY 2021 through continued focus on proactive strategies that broadly address improving student success combined with targeted efforts that identify students experiencing academic difficulties and then providing on-time direct assistance and referrals to those students. The first term course launched in fall 2019 (Gorilla Gateway) was assessed, and the review resulted in several changes that were implemented in fall 2020. Learning communities in biology, communication, the College of Business, and School of Construction increased engagement with faculty and with students in the same or similar majors for these programs. Student Success Programs coordinated tutoring for challenging first-year courses, academic skills workshops, and peer mentoring for many students in the Gorilla Gateway class. The retention management system allowed instructors to provide an early alert with follow-up resources for students not meeting their academic or attendance expectations. An ongoing collaboration (Registrar, Student Success, Academic departments) to advise and enroll continuing students helps to address and overcome enrollment barriers.

### Indicator 2: Increase Success in Student Learning: General Education Math Index

**Description:** This indicator tracks success in meeting our math general education objective: *Demonstrate the ability to formulate and solve problems using the tools of mathematics*. Because math tends to have a higher rate of withdrawal, fails, and incompletes compared to many other general education courses, this index is calculated as a percentage of the passing rate in general education math courses combined with the mean of PSU's general education math rubric score.

**Result:** The Index for AY 2021 improved by approximately 2 ½ percentage points as compared to AY 2020; however, the Index continues to perform below the initial level. It is worth noting, however, that every year the passing rate has increased since PSU began using the Math Index. The Math department has adopted several practices intended to increase student retention and success in all general education Math classes, especially College Algebra. This is further evidenced by the focus on College Algebra in the university's Quality Initiative for HLC.

### Indicator 3: Maintain or Improve Ranking on Quality Measures (retention, graduation, research expenditures and faculty qualifications) among Peers

**Description:** To determine relative rank among five identified peer institutions, four variables generally accepted as measures of institutional quality were identified, data were compiled from reputable, external sources (e.g., Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, National Science Foundation), and the institutions were ranked on each variable. An average rank is computed to both establish baseline and measure annual progress.

**Result:** PSU showed a decline in overall ranking compared to peer institutions. PSU continues to rank second in percentage of faculty with terminal degrees. This is below the baseline ranking in this area, resulting from a deliberate decision to hire more part-time faculty as a strategy to address continued financial pressures. For fall-to-fall retention rate of full-time first-time cohort, PSU continues to rank third compared to peer institutions. PSU's six-year graduation rate of first-time, full-time cohort, moved from a ranking of third to fourth, trading spots with one peer institution by a 1% difference. (Beginning in AY 2019 national, comparative data regarding research expenditures were no longer available, eliminating the ability to use that measure. PSU consistently ranked first in research expenditures when that data were available during the earlier years of the performance agreement.)

### Indicator 4: Increase Credit Hours Completed through Distance Education

**Description:** Growth in distance education opportunities for students is tracked using semester credit hours completed through online courses. Providing greater opportunity for online learning is important to address the needs of students whose circumstances do not allow them to attend classes at a physical location.

**Result:** This indicator showed a dramatic increase from last year and is now approaching triple the baseline number. Over the last several years, the primary strategy for increasing number of distance education credits has been significant expansion of online programs, primarily graduate programs. However, in AY 2021, there was a significant increase in the number of distance education courses offered due to the pandemic. To support instruction of the increased number of online courses, PSU offered numerous COVID response training sessions through the Center for Teaching, Learning and Technology in the summer leading up to fall 2020. Nearly 300 faculty participated in these sessions. PSU also continues to incorporate Quality Matters in training opportunities and had 18 faculty complete training in AY 2021.

**Indicator 5: Increase Number of Bachelor's Degrees Granted to Domestic Minorities**

**Description:** This indicator tracks number of degrees awarded to domestic minority students, whether students started at PSU or transferred to us. Retention and completion initiatives center on collaborative efforts among the Academic Affairs and Student Life divisions.

**Result:** We continue to see a small incremental shift upward on the number of bachelor's degrees granted to domestic minorities as compared to the total number of graduates given our efforts to provide a transformational education, despite our students facing trauma associated with COVID 19 along with the racial discrimination being experienced in our country. We attribute much of this success to our faculty and staff who have exercised a high level of empathy for students who struggled academically and emotionally. The Office of Student Diversity and Student Success Programs continued to provide intervention programming and strategies to assist students in meeting their educational goals. The Tilford Group implemented a "Tilford Read" focusing on selecting a book for the campus to read and discuss surrounding national issues that our students are facing. Additionally, we credit our success to academic advisors being present with students and helping them understand the degree plan and academic success workshops. Our campus climate survey was released, and the data will be used to drive our decision making and the next strategic plan which will begin being written in fall 2022.

**Indicator 6: Increase Amount of Scholarship Funds Raised**

**Description:** This indicator tracks success in fundraising for student scholarships. The specific metric is cash gifts (i.e., planned gifts are not included) raised in the fiscal year which corresponds closely to the academic year.

**Result:** Scholarship funds raised total \$6.26 million over baseline. The total does not include an additional amount of \$61,600 documented in FY 2021 that are designated in planned gifts for scholarships to be realized in the future. One goal of the Proven.Promise.PittState. Capital Campaign was to raise \$10 million for scholarships through FY 2021; the total raised was \$31M.

University of Kansas and University of Kansas Medical Center Performance Report AY 2021							KU AY 2021 FTE: 21,403 KUMC AY 2021 FTE: 2,913 Date: 6/24/2022	
Contact Person: Jean Redeker	Foresight Goal	3 yr. History	Reporting AY 2020 (SU19, FA19, SP20)		Reporting AY 2021 (SU20, FA20, SP21)		Reporting AY 2022 (SU21, FA21, SP22)	
Phone: 785-864-1025 email: jrederker@ku.edu			Institution Result	Baseline Comparison	Institution Result	Baseline Comparison	Institution Result	Baseline Comparison
1 Increase Number of Certificates and Degrees Awarded (KU/KUMC)	1 <i>KBOR data</i>	AY 2013: 6,631 (=5,974 + 657) AY 2014: 6,513 (=5,771 + 742) AY 2015: 6,281 (=5,587 + 694) <b>Baseline: 6,475</b>	6,059 + 864 = 6,923	↑	5,965 + 850 = 6,815	↑		
2 Increase First to Second Year Retention Rates (KU)	1 <i>KBOR data</i>	Fall 2012 Cohort: 2,989/3,736 = 80.0% Fall 2013 Cohort: 3,191/3,964 = 80.5% Fall 2014 Cohort: 3,237/4,043 = 80.1% <b>Baseline: 9,417/11,743 = 80.2%</b>	3,492/4,082 = 85.5%	↑	3,160/3,738 = 84.5%	↑		
3 Improve Total Research and Development Expenditures Rankings among Public Institutions (KU/KUMC)	3	FY 2013: 9 <sup>th</sup> FY 2014: 9 <sup>th</sup> FY 2015: 9 <sup>th</sup> <b>Baseline: 9<sup>th</sup></b>	9th	↔	9th	↔		
4 Increase the Percentage of Certificates and Degrees Awarded in STEM Fields (KU/KUMC)	2 <i>KBOR data</i>	AY 2013: 2,374/6,631 = 35.8% AY 2014: 2,337/6,513 = 35.9% AY 2015: 2,282/6,281 = 36.3% <b>Baseline: 6,993/19,425 = 36.0%</b>	2,657/6,923 = 38.4%	↑	2,844/6,815 = 41.7%	↑		
5 Increase Philanthropic Student Support (KU/KUMC)	2	FY 2016: \$33.6 mil FY 2017: \$33.6 mil FY 2018: \$36.4 mil <b>Baseline: \$34.5 mil</b>	\$41.9 mil	↑	\$41.0 mil	↑		
6 Increase the Number of Graduates from Entry-Level Health Career Programs (KUMC)	2	AY 2016: 438 AY 2017: 456 AY 2018: 488 <b>Baseline: 461</b>	530	↑	573	↑		
7 Increase the Number of Students Participating in Interprofessional Education Opportunities (KU/KUMC)	1	AY 2016: 3,410 AY 2017: 3,632 AY 2018: 3,704 <b>Baseline: 3,582</b>	3,864	↑	4,035	↑		

## University of Kansas and University of Kansas Medical Center Performance Report AY 2021

### **Indicator 1: Increase Number of Certificates and Degrees Awarded (KU/KUMC)**

**Description:** This indicator records the number of degrees and certificates conferred at all University campuses. These campuses include KU-Lawrence, KU-Edwards (in Overland Park), and the Medical Center's campuses in Kansas City, Wichita, and Salina.

**Result:** During AY 2021, the university awarded 6,815 degrees/certificates exceeding the baseline by 5.2 percent. Growth from the baseline can be attributed to increased awards in STEM fields which is detailed in indicator 4 – in addition to growth in non-STEM areas. Growth in non-STEM areas includes increased awards from the School of Business, the advanced standing master of social work program which is designed for those with a bachelor of social work degree, and the 2013 creation of the bachelor of science in exercise science and the bachelor of science in sport management.

### **Indicator 2: Increase First to Second Year Retention Rates (KU)**

**Description:** This indicator records the percent of first-time, full-time freshmen who are retained after one year on the KU-Lawrence and KU-Edwards campuses.

**Result:** KU has significantly increased first-year retention and 84.5% of the Fall 2019 freshmen cohort returned for Fall 2020. KU assisted students to remain in school during the pandemic by revising academic and administrative policies and processes to respond to students' concerns and hardships brought about by the pandemic. These responses included 1) leveraging our KU Emergency Aid Network to quickly deliver federal CARES Act and institutional funding to students in need; 2) offering telemedicine and teletherapy appointments for students; 3) adjusting CR/NC grading option and withdrawal deadlines; 4) updating medical and compassionate withdrawal policies; 5) using targeted advising campaigns focused on connecting with students who still needed to enroll in courses; 6) implementing a course adaptation system where students who could not return to campus or who had to quarantine could request to have their course transformed to an online format to support their continued degree progression; 7) creating a laptop-lending program and the loaning of hotspots for students in need; 8) expanding the availability of WIFI hotspots on-campus including in newly-installed tents; and 9) investing in the Jayhawk Cloud platform that can connect up to 10,000 Jayhawks on a single team and allow up to 500,000 different teams with video, calls, chat, instant messaging, and live events for the academic as well as social needs.

### **Indicator 3: Improve Total Research and Development Expenditures Rankings among Public Institutions (KU/KUMC)**

**Description:** This is our ranking of the amount of total research and development expenditures of all University campuses compared with our Regents approved peers based on the National Science Foundation Survey of Research and Development Expenditures at Universities and Colleges/Higher Education Research and Development (HERD) survey.

**Result:** KU's total research and development expenditures increased for the fifth consecutive year, allowing us to sustain a steady ranking relative to peer institutions in the Association of American Universities. Importantly, that growth occurred across a range of funding sources, including the federal government, state/local government, and private industry/business. Through our Jayhawks Rising strategic plan, we are working to communicate the societal impacts of KU research and to enhance our national preeminence in five strategic research areas that align with major global challenges and represent opportunities to build upon KU's historic and emerging strengths.

### **Indicator 4: Increase the Percentage of Certificates and Degrees Awarded in STEM Fields (KU/KUMC)**

**Description:** This indicator records the percentage of students who earned degrees in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics fields on the KU-Lawrence, KU-Edwards (in Overland Park), and the Medical Center's campuses in Kansas City, Wichita, and Salina.

**Result:** For AY 2021, 41.7% of the 6,815 degrees and certificates awarded were in STEM fields. This is a significant increase over the baseline by 5.7 percent. For the Lawrence campus, part of this growth can be attributed to the Engineering Initiative. In AY 2021, KU's School of Engineering awarded 515 degrees as part of

the Initiative. For the Medical Center campuses, the growth can be attributed to increased awards in Physical Therapy program, the Biostatistics program, the MD program and the bachelor of science in nursing (BSN) program. This growth in the BSN can be attributed to offering the degree at KUMC's Salina campus and growth in the Community College Nursing Partnership – a partnership KUMC has with multiple community colleges. The program allows students to stay in their local community while simultaneously pursuing both the Associate Degree in Nursing (ADN) from the community college and BSN from KUMC. After completing the program, students are awarded both an ADN and a BSN, and are eligible to take the National Council Licensing Exam (NCLEX).

**Indicator 5: Increase Philanthropic Student Support (KU/KUMC)**

**Description:** This indicator is the amount the KU Endowment Association (KUEA) provides to the university for student scholarships, awards, and fellowships.

**Result:** In FY 2021, KU Endowment provided \$183.9 million to KU thanks to alumni and friends who generously invested in students, faculty, programs, and research. Of that \$183.9 million, \$41.0 million went to student support and scholarships. In addition, during FY 2021 donors established 89 new endowed permanent funds for student scholarship and support – a 13% increase in new endowed funds for student scholarship and support when compared to FY 2020. This is remarkable given the pandemic hampered travel for Endowment staff.

**Indicator 6: Increase the Number of Graduates from Entry-Level Health Career Programs (KUMC)**

**Description:** The indicator measures the number of students who graduate from the University of Kansas Medical Center's entry-level full-time programs to health career practice fields which involve patient or client interactions. An entry-level health career program is one in which the student enters without the credentials or license to practice in the health care field and graduates with the competencies necessary to sit for a national licensure examination, which is a pre-requisite for obtaining a state (or multi-state) license to practice in the field. We are including the following entry-level pathways: bachelor of science in nursing (BSN), bachelor of science in respiratory care, dietetics internship (pathway to registered dietician), doctor of audiology, doctor of occupational therapy, doctor of physical therapy, doctor of nurse anesthesia practice, and the doctor of medicine (MD).

**Result:** The Medical Center graduated 573 students from entry-level health career programs during the 2020-21 academic year. This is 24% higher than our baseline. Recent increases to class sizes in the physical therapy program and nurse anesthesia practice program were first realized this academic year in terms of number of graduates. The Community College Nursing Partnership program graduated 34% more students from the prior year.

**Indicator 7: Increase the Number of Students Participating in Interprofessional Education Opportunities (KU/KUMC)**

**Description:** The indicator reflects active student participation in interprofessional education (IPE) as measured by enrollment in coursework or educational programs with integrated IPE activities. Interprofessional education occurs when two or more professions learn with each other in a team environment to improve collaboration and the quality of care. Interprofessional and competency-based training for students in the Schools of Medicine, Nursing, and Health Professions at the KU Medical Center, and the Schools of Pharmacy, Law, and Social Welfare at the KU Lawrence campus are included in the metric.

**Result:** There were 4,035 IPE participations in the 2020-21 academic year, exceeding the baseline by 13%, despite several learning activities canceled due to COVID-19. Continuing IPE foundational courses and other opportunities maintained strong enrollment across the spectrum.

Wichita State University Performance Report AY 2021							AY 2021 FTE: 11,758 Date: 6/27/2022	
Contact Person: Shirley Lefever  Phone: 316-978-5761 email: Shirley.lefever@wichita.edu	Foresight Goal	3 yr. History	Reporting AY 2020 (SU19, FA19, SP20)		Reporting AY 2021 (SU20, FA20, SP21)		Reporting AY 2022 (SU21, FA21, SP22)	
			Institution Result	Baseline Comparison	Institution Result	Baseline Comparison	Institution Result	Baseline Comparison
1 Increase number of certificates and degrees awarded	1 <i>KBOR data</i>	AY 2013: 2,999 AY 2014: 3,036 AY 2015: 2,975 <b>Baseline: 3,003</b>	3,222	↑	3,435	↑		
2 Increase the percent of STEM degrees conferred	2 <i>KBOR data</i>	AY 2013: 991/2,999 = 33.0% AY 2014: 1,057/3,036 = 34.8% AY 2015: 1,144/2,975 = 38.5% <b>Baseline: 3,192/9,010 = 35.4%</b>	1,114/3,222 = 34.6%	↓	1,129/3,435 = 32.9%	↓		
3 Maintain National Science Foundation ranking in aeronautical engineering research and development expenditures from industry	3	AY 2013: \$25,306,000 ranking: 1 AY 2014: \$28,797,000 ranking: 1 AY 2015: \$29,146,000 ranking: 1 <b>Baseline: \$27,750,000 ranking: 1</b>	\$74,551,000 Ranking: 1	↑	\$74,329,000 Ranking: 1	↑		
4 Increase the number of undergraduate certificates and degrees awarded to underrepresented minorities	1	AY 2013: 269 AY 2014: 301 AY 2015: 302 <b>Baseline: 291</b>	425	↑	475	↑		
5 Increase the first to second year retention rate of first-time, full-time freshmen	1 <i>KBOR data</i>	Fall 2012 Cohort: 954/1,280 = 74.5% Fall 2013 Cohort: 909/1,218 = 74.6% Fall 2014 Cohort: 996/1,384 = 72.0% <b>Baseline: 2,859/3,882 = 73.6%</b>	1,213/1,602 = 75.7%	↑	1,075/1,496 = 71.9%	↓		
6 Increase the number of undergraduate certificates and degrees awarded to first-generation students	1	AY 2016: 825 AY 2017: 860 AY 2018: 890 <b>Baseline: 858</b>	987	↑	1,091	↑		

## Wichita State University Performance Report AY 2021

### Indicator 1: Increase number of certificates and degrees awarded

**Description:** Wichita State uses a campus-wide, multi-pronged, collaborative approach (includes a student success course [first-year seminar], intrusive advising tools, supplemental instruction, tutoring services, and an early alert system [SEAS – Student Early Alert System]) aimed at increasing retention and graduation rates and increasing the number of degrees awarded. This work is overseen and monitored by the Office of Student Success, which includes a student success coach assigned to each college. Results will be based on the number of certificates and degrees awarded by academic year (summer, fall, and spring) as reported in the Kansas Postsecondary Database.

**Result:** MET - The number of certificates and degrees totaled 432 above the baseline. This increase is the result of continued retention efforts across the entire campus community. The campus Strategic Enrollment Management Committee continues to focus on retention strategies and support to encourage completion.

### Indicator 2: Increase the percent of STEM degrees conferred

**Description:** Several initiatives are underway to increase the number of STEM discipline graduates. WSU is the recipient of funding from the State University Engineering Act to increase engineering graduates 60 percent by 2021. This funding has allowed the College of Engineering to hire additional faculty and support staff to allow increases in enrollment. Once students matriculate into engineering programs, the Engineering Student Success Center (ESSC) supports students towards their completion of an undergraduate degree. The Fairmount College Science and Math Education Center oversees and operates initiatives to encourage enrollment in the natural sciences. This measure will be based on the number of STEM degrees awarded (by academic year: summer, fall, and spring) in STEM disciplines and reported as a percent of all undergraduate degrees awarded as reported in the Kansas Postsecondary Database.

**Result:** NOT-MET - STEM degrees were just under one-third of all earned degrees and 2.5% below the baseline. The number of STEM degrees awarded and the total number of UG degrees are higher than at baseline, having increased in both AY 2020 and AY 2021, but the *proportion* of STEM degrees has declined slightly due to non-STEM degrees increasing at a higher rate. All academic programs continue to foster integration into both the academic and social aspects of the college experience. Efforts to increase applied learning and research experiences have been implemented. Tutoring and academic support services continue and, in some cases, have been enhanced. The new focus on digital transformation and the accompanying academic programs should increase the proportion of STEM degrees awarded.

### Indicator 3: Maintain National Science Foundation ranking in aeronautical engineering research and development expenditures from industry

**Description:** Enhancing industry-based research is one of the focuses of WSU's strategic plan. According to the National Science Foundation (NSF), WSU again ranked No. 4 in the nation with \$105 million, a \$48 million increase from 2018, including both industry and federally funded programs. Additionally, Wichita State has held its position as the top university in the country for industry-funded aeronautical Research & Development (R&D) with a total of \$74 million (according to NSF's National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics). Our current and planned research initiatives focused in this area (industry supported research in engineering and the National Institute for Aviation Research – NIAR) are aimed at increasing industry-related research capacity and to maintain a top 10 ranking. For this indicator data reported will be the latest ranking and available academic year of industry R&D expenditures in aeronautical engineering research from industry.

**Result:** MET- The latest data available indicate retention of WSU's first-place ranking. WSU expended \$74,329,000 in research and development this year, \$46,579,000 more than the baseline. Access to the new crash dynamics lab has yielded new research opportunities for the National Institute for Aviation Research. The Vice Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School continues to work on enhancing faculty research productivity using new supports and expectations.

### Indicator 4: Increase the number of undergraduate certificates and degrees awarded to under-represented minorities (URMs)

**Description:** WSU is the most diverse public university in the state. Our goals are to recruit and retain a student body that is reflective of the community we serve, and work towards a higher degree completion rate among underrepresented minority (URM) graduates. To that end, WSU will: 1) Provide special outreach to

groups where under-represented minorities are represented such as AVID, TRIO, GEAR UP, 2) Host recruitment events, group visits and attending cultural, community and college fairs designated for under-represented minority groups, 3) Offer bilingual services and oversight recruitment of ethnic minorities, with an emphasis on under-represented minorities, 4) Deploy Admissions Office recruitment representatives to schools in highly diverse Kansas communities, 5) Provide academic, cultural, social and outreach services to cultivate and sustain an inclusive campus that strives for academic success, and 6) Provide scholarships, including full-ride, 4 year scholarships to those who achieve national Hispanic Recognition Scholar and a recruitment and retention scholarship program for incoming freshmen who are mostly ethnic minorities and/or first generation students. Data collected for this purpose will include the number of undergraduate under-represented minority students (African American, Hispanic, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander) receiving certificates and undergraduate degrees by academic year.

**Result: MET - WSU awarded 184 more certificates and degrees to URM students over the baseline of 291.** Recruitment along the I-35 corridor continues to result in growth in the diversity of the student body. Outreach programs such as TRIO/ GEAR UP, Passage 2 Success, Passage Scholars, the Fuse, and a new partnership with Wichita Public Schools that supports high achieving Black and Hispanic male students continue to encourage students to attend and be successful in college. Continued refinement of high impact practices, including applied learning efforts that are paid opportunities to earn-while-you-learn, and scholarships that focus on need are helping improve college access and affordability.

#### **Indicator 5: Increase the First to Second Year Retention Rate of First-Time/Full-Time Freshmen**

**Description:** Wichita State University has a strategic enrollment management plan and campus-wide multi-pronged collaborative initiative (includes a student success course [first-year seminar], intrusive advising tools, supplemental instruction, tutoring services, and an early alert system [SEAS – Student Early Alert System]) aimed at supporting retention and graduation rates. Data collection will be based on Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) definition of first-time/full-time freshmen where an undergraduate new student ( $\geq 12$  hours) persists to the following fall semester and reported as a percent of the cohort of all IPEDS-based first-time/full-time freshmen. For AY 2020 the 2019 cohort will be measured and for AY 2021 the 2020 cohort.

**Result: NOT-MET - WSU's first to second year retention rate for this reporting cycle is 1.7% below the baseline of 73.6%.** The number of students retained and the total number of students reflect growth over baseline, but this cycle, compared to the last cycle, reflects the lower number of First-Time/Full Time freshman during the Covid year of enrollment. Success coaches in each of the academic colleges provide individualized support to students and academic advisors use data-driven software to intervene with at-risk students. WSU continues to focus on improvements in connecting students to academic support, campus connections, mental health and psycho-social supports, and financial resources. Academic and student life leaders continue to plan and implement programs that provide wholistic approaches to retention and success of students. These initiatives saw much success in the last reporting cycle and we expect to see retention rates increase again in the coming year.

#### **Indicator 6: Increase number of certificates and degrees awarded to First-Generation students**

**Description:** Wichita State University continues to experience an increase in the enrolled number of first-generation college students. The most recent data shows a difference in completion rates for first-generation population (38.9%) and continuing generation students (46.6%). Over the last year WSU has increased efforts to serve this student population in an effort to increase the graduation rates. A First Generation Coordinating Council was created to inform our work and the (FGCC) was integrated into the university's Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) plan. The committee has already made recommendations to scale much needed and used services, increased awareness of the population with faculty and staff, and made policy recommendations to support retention and completion. Data collected for this purpose will include the number of first-generation students (as identified by students at the time of application, that their parents or legal guardians have not been awarded a post-secondary degree) receiving certificates and undergraduate degrees by academic year.

**Result: MET - WSU awarded 233 more certificates/degrees to first-generation students over the baseline of 858.** This number continues to grow because of recruitment efforts to engage this population and university service expansion to support retention and graduation. Several offices and functional areas are involved in efforts to proactively meet the needs of first generation students and strengthen support services for first generation students. The newly formed First Generation Coordinating Council provides coordination of campus-wide efforts.