# COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

### FISCAL NOTE

<u>L.R. No.</u>: 0249-06

Bill No.: HCS for SB 243

Subject: Education, Elementary and Secondary; Elementary and Secondary Education

Department

Type: Original

Date: April 29, 2011

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies provisions relating to education resources and

services, including charter schools.

# **FISCAL SUMMARY**

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND					
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014		
General Revenue	(Unknown - Could Exceed \$1,502,775)	(Unknown - Could Exceed \$1,464,455)	(Unknown - Could Exceed \$1,460,912)		
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	(Unknown - Could Exceed \$1,502,775)	(Unknown - Could Exceed \$1,464,455)	(Unknown - Could Exceed \$1,460,912)		

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS					
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014		
State School Monies Fund*	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Total Estimated Net Effect on Other State Funds*	\$0	\$0	\$0		

<sup>\*</sup>Offsetting transfers in and Transfers Out are Unknown annually.

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses. This fiscal note contains 20 pages.

Page 2 of 20 April 29, 2011

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS					
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014		
Total Estimated					
Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0		

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	
General Revenue	10 FTE	10 FTE	10 FTE	
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	10 FTE	10 FTE	10 FTE	

- □ Estimated Total Net Effect on All funds expected to exceed \$100,000 savings or (cost).
- Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund expected to exceed \$100,000 (cost).

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	
<b>Local Government</b>	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	

L.R. No. 0249-06 Bill No. HCS for SB 243 Page 3 of 20 April 29, 2011

## FISCAL ANALYSIS

## **ASSUMPTION**

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri State Highway Patrol** state this proposal will have no fiscal impact on their agency.

Officials from the **Department of Higher Education** state this proposal has no direct, foreseeable fiscal impact on their agency.

Officials from the **Department of Insurance**, **Financial Institutions and Professional Registration** state this proposed legislation will have no fiscal impact on their agency.

Officials from the **Joint Committee on Education** state there will be no new costs to the Committee beyond its current appropriation resulting from this proposed legislation.

Officials from the **Missouri Senate** state this proposal either has no fiscal impact as it relates to their agency, or minimal costs which can be absorbed with present appropriations.

According to officials from the **Office of Secretary of State (SOS)**, many bills considered by the General Assembly include provisions allowing or requiring agencies to submit rules and regulations to implement the proposal. The SOS is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of normal activity resulting from each year's legislative session. The fiscal impact for this fiscal note to the SOS for Administrative Rules is less than \$2,500.

**Oversight** assumes the SOS could absorb the costs of printing and distributing regulations related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require the printing and distribution of regulations at substantial costs, the SOS could request funding through the appropriation process. Any decisions to raise fees to defray costs would likely be made in subsequent fiscal years.

According to officials from the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules (JCAR)**, this proposal should not create any additional fiscal impact above current appropriations to JCAR.

Officials from the **Office of the Governor** state there should be no added cost to the Governor's Office as a result of this proposed legislation. However, if additional duties are placed on the office related to appointments in other TAFP legislation, there may be the need for additional staff resources in future years.

L.R. No. 0249-06 Bill No. HCS for SB 243 Page 4 of 20 April 29, 2011

## ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Division of Budget and Planning** state this proposed legislation should not result in additional costs or savings to their agency. BAP defers to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education on the fiscal impact of this legislation.

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** provided the following assumptions and fiscal impact regarding this proposed legislation:

### \$160.080

DESE states that at the present time there are 2,361 individual buildings, 522 school districts, and 35 charter LEA's.

- DESE currently reviews on average 25 districts per year @ approximately \$1,500 per review (does not include cost of DESE staff on each review).
- Assume DESE reviews 479 buildings in each year during a five year period.
- Assume 10% of buildings (48) qualify for on-site review.
- The total number of review days in traditional reviews is 204.
- The total number of review days for individual building review is 816.
- The average cost for staff on each review includes lodging, meals, and travel/mileage: \$160.
- DESE estimates 5 staff per review (could potentially be significantly larger depending on the size of the individual district or building).

•	25 district level reviews @ \$1,500 =	\$ 37,500
•	5 staff cost for traditional review (204 x \$160 per day) =	\$163,200
•	48 building level reviews @ \$1,500 =	\$ 72,000
•	5 staff cost for building review (816 x \$160 per day) =	\$652,800
		\$925,500

DESE will require 3.0 FTE supervisors and 1.0 FTE administrative assistant to oversee the implementation of the classification and review of individual buildings as called for in the proposal. DESE will also require 3.0 FTE accounting specialists to provide technical assistance

L.R. No. 0249-06 Bill No. HCS for SB 243 Page 5 of 20 April 29, 2011

## ASSUMPTION (continued)

to the school buildings and districts being classified and for the creation of the annual performance review.

**Oversight** confirmed with DESE that the review process for individual buildings within a district would be more comprehensive than the current review process which may only involve random sampling within individual buildings.

**Oversight** has, for fiscal note purposes only, adjusted the salary and benefits of the supervisors and administrative assistants to correspond with the range for the starting salary posted by DESE for a similar position.

## *§160.400*

This section allows the expansion of charter schools "in any school district in the state"... Currently, **DESE** is adding approximately 6 charter schools per year. This legislation has the potential of significantly increasing the number of charter schools. DESE cannot ignore the shortage of staff to provide guidance (technical assistance for data collection, certification, fiscal management, special education, food service, assessment, federal program, etc.) to these new charter schools to meet state and federal guidelines. A complicating factor is the high turnover of existing charter schools at the administrative level of existing charter schools.

## Personnel needed (ongoing):

- 1.0 FTE director that would only handle charter school business;
- 2.0 FTE supervisors to provide technical assistance for the charter schools (data collection, certification, fiscal management, special education, food service, transportation, assessment, federal programs);
- 2.0 FTE administrative assistants to handle the paperwork and phone calls connected with a growing program.

**Oversight** assumes that DESE is coordinating the current charter school program with one person. Oversight assumes it is unknown how many new charter schools would be created in addition to increased oversight of existing charter schools. **Oversight** assumes 3 additional FTE (2 Supervisors and 1 Administrative Assistant) can administer the program. These additional FTE may also assist with monitoring alternative programs and renewal applications as outlined in §160.405. If the program expands beyond current growth, additional personal services can be

L.R. No. 0249-06 Bill No. HCS for SB 243 Page 6 of 20 April 29, 2011

## ASSUMPTION (continued)

requested through the appropriations process.

**Oversight** has, for fiscal note purposes only, adjusted the salary and benefits of the supervisors and administrative assistant to correspond with the range for the starting salary posted by DESE for a similar position.

## *§160.403*

This section requires **DESE** to establish an annual application and approval process for all entities eligible to sponsor charters as well as to review all existing charter sponsors. This is a necessary process to improve the quality of charter schools and would require a director and a supervisor be hired at a minimum for the coming fiscal year. Two important deadlines makes this critical: (1) "No later than January 1, 2012, DESE shall make available information and guidelines for all eligible sponsors concerning the opportunity to apply for sponsoring authority"; and (2) " all entities sponsoring a charter school upon the effective date of this section shall apply to DESE for approval to continue as a sponsor no later than April 1, 2012." By July first of each year, DESE shall decide whether to grant or deny a sponsoring authority to a sponsor applicant. All these duties will take additional staff.

**Oversight** assumes the **Oversight** staff assumptions made in §160.400 would be able to perform the duties required by this section.

#### *\$160.405*

§160.405.6 (1) and (2) proposes that charter schools establish alternative arrangements for students to obtain credit for satisfying graduation requirements. These special arrangements would be approved by the state board of education at the time the charter is approved. Subsection (2) indicates that DESE shall conduct a study of any charter school granted alternative arrangements which will require 1.0 FTE supervisor to monitor alternative programs and renewal applications.

**Oversight** assumes the **Oversight** staff assumptions made in §160.400 would be able to perform the duties required by this section.

L.R. No. 0249-06 Bill No. HCS for SB 243 Page 7 of 20 April 29, 2011

## <u>ASSUMPTION</u> (continued)

## \$160.417

This section requires **DESE** to review the information required by §162.821 to identify charter schools experiencing financial stress. Additional information could be requested by the Department. Charter schools identified as experiencing financial stress will be notified by the Department. A budget and education plan will be submitted to DESE to review that adequate educational services to students of the charter school shall continue uninterrupted.

### *§160.420*

Officials from the **Department of Social Services** state there is no fiscal impact to their agency. Using the family care safety registry for background screenings reflects current practice. The provision to allow certain charter schools to accept students from adjacent counties may provide an additional resource for children in some alternative care settings. However, since resident students are given preference over nonresident students very few children are likely to be affected

Officials from the **Department of Health and Senior Services (DOHSS)** state that, according to information obtained from DESE, there are currently 36 charter schools in Missouri. The number of new charter schools that might arise as a direct result of this legislation is unknown, although the expectation is that the number would be minimal. The schools are chartered for a minimum of five years, and the number of board members ranges from 5 to 30, with the average number being 10. For the 2010-2011 school year, the total staff size of the 36 schools was approximately 2,120 FTE. All staff members will be required to be registered and screened through the Family Care Safety Registry. Background screenings for school staff members must be conducted annually. A two percent growth factor for subsequent year registrations has been included in the estimates.

DOHSS assumed during the first year that 360 (36 schools X average of 10 board members) registrations and background screenings will be conducted on board members. Since the charters last for a minimum of five years, it is assumed that the maximum number of additional background screenings for board members in subsequent years would be 72 (360/5).

L.R. No. 0249-06 Bill No. HCS for SB 243 Page 8 of 20

Page 8 of 20 April 29, 2011

## <u>ASSUMPTION</u> (continued)

Given the following assumptions, DOHSS predicts the following FTE needs:

- Approximately 30 percent of registrations and screenings are conducted via the Internet and 70 percent are processed manually.
- One HPR-I/II FTE can process 12,000 manual registrations in a year.
- One HPR-I/II FTE and .5 OSA FTE can process 12,000 manual background screenings in a year.

Additional FTE needs are minimal, therefore DOHSS will not request additional staff related to this proposed legislation.

DOHSS assumes the proposed legislation would result in an estimated 2,480 new registrations in the Family Care Safety Registry for charter school staff and board members in FY 2012 (114 in FY 2013 and 115 in FY 2014). For each registration, \$10 is collected, resulting in \$24,800 in revenue in FY 2012 (\$1,140 in FY 2013 and \$1,150 in FY 2014). This money will be collected by the Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS) and deposited into the Highway Patrol Criminal Records Fund.

DOHSS estimates related postage costs of \$2,492 for FY 12; 1,487 for FY 13; \$1,516 for FY 14.

**Oversight** assumes, after verification from a charter school sponsor, that the background checks and registrations in the Family Care Safety Registry are already being done. **Oversight** will assign no revenue for the Highway Patrol Criminal Records fund and will also assume minimal postage costs that can be absorbed with existing appropriations.

### *§160.425*

This section requires **DESE** to provide start-up funding for the commission to operate. The commission shall reimburse DESE's costs from any funds it receives as sponsor under section 160.400. The first year the commission would only be approving charters and would not have any income provided from operating charters so the entire commission would be funded by DESE funds. Estimates from the state of Georgia and their first couple of years range between \$250,000 and \$300,000.

Page 9 of 20 April 29, 2011

## ASSUMPTION (continued)

The commission would need approximately 8 average size charter schools to generate \$300,000 for the second year. That would seem optimistic for a new commission. Subsequent years could generate additional income but as realized in Georgia, the commission has grown to rely on an annual appropriation.

School year 2011-2012	\$300,000
School year 2012-2013	\$150,000
School year 2013-2014	\$150,000

**Oversight** assumes this section of the proposal does not provide for additional staff. Current legislation also caps the amount of funding retained for the expenses associated with sponsorship of charter schools at \$125,000. For fiscal note purposes, Oversight will assume one-time cost for FY 12 as (\$125,000).

Officials from the **Parkway School District** assume that for each resident Parkway student that would attend a charter school, Parkway would pay \$11,639. While some reduction in expenses could be made, it would not be equivalent to that amount, and would vary depending on the total number of students, their grade levels, school attendance areas, and types of services accessed.

For fiscal note purposes only, **Oversight** will assume an (Unknown) cost for school districts.

#### *§160.522*

**DESE** assumes no fiscal impact on their agency or on local school districts to this section that requires school districts to include in their school accountability report cards whether they have a gifted education program and the percentage and number of students enrolled.

#### *§160.1990*

Officials from the **Department of Social Services - Children's Division** do not anticipate this proposed legislation will result in fiscal or programmatic impact.

Officials from **DESE** state this proposal does not appear to impact the school foundation formula; however, the additional assistance and monitoring assigned to DESE will require .5 FTE supervisor.

DESE defers to the local school districts regarding costs to implement this proposal.

L.R. No. 0249-06 Bill No. HCS for SB 243 Page 10 of 20 April 29, 2011

## ASSUMPTION (continued)

DESE assumes portions of the proposal appear to be a mandate in accordance with IDEA, 20 U.S.C.A. Section 1400 et seq.; Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C.A. Section 794; and Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C.A. Sections 12131-12165.

**Oversight** assumes procedures would already be in place in school districts regarding enrollment and placement of foster care children. If it is determined that additional oversight is needed, DESE may request additional personnel through the budgetary process.

Also in response to HB 419, officials from the **St Louis Public School District (SLPS)** do not see an additional cost to this proposed legislation specific to the processing of transition component. Staff should follow up immediately on students and the process is already in place for this to happen. SLPS assumes this proposal just places a focus in this area (foster care). SLPS does not see new additional costs specific to most general education classes or programs. Additional resources could be needed if a particular specialized (unique stand-alone) general education class at the maximum class size and a new student joins the class.

### \$162.1250

According to DESE, there could be increased costs to the state because students that may not have been attending public schools will now be counted for state aid and included in the calculation. There is no way to determine an amount, but the cost could be substantial.

Officials from the **Parkway School District** state this section is likely to have a negative fiscal impact on their district. For every Parkway student who might attend a virtual charter school, the state would deduct up to \$7,000 per student from Parkway which they are not currently receiving from the state. If even 100 students (.004 of school-aged children in the district) were to enroll, it would cost their district \$700,000. This is because they currently receive less than \$600 per ADA from the state.

In response to SB 329 (FN 1620-02) from this session, officials from the **St Louis Public School District** assume the proposed legislation would result in a fiscal impact of \$250,000 in salaries and benefits for one full time administrator and one full time assistant to manage additional students in the program, along with funds needed to purchase supplies and equipment.

Also in response to SB 329, Officials from the **Blue Springs School District** state this proposal would cost their district approximately \$6,000 for every student who would enroll in their district to participate in their virtual education programs.

L.R. No. 0249-06 Bill No. HCS for SB 243 Page 11 of 20 April 29, 2011

## <u>ASSUMPTION</u> (continued)

### *§167.131*

Officials from **DESE** state that students transferring from one school district to another would not increase state aid. However, there could be an indeterminable amount of increase to the state if students who had not been enrolled in the public school system now opted to enroll to take advantage of attending an adjoining school district.

This proposal includes language that would somewhat prohibit the transfer of students who had been attending private schools. The provision requires enrollment and attendance in the resident public school district in the year that a declaration to attend another school district is made, or if the pupil has enrolled and attended in the unaccredited district in school years subsequent to the year in which the declaration is made. This effectively curtails the number of private school students who could expand the ADA and create an increase in state aid. While there might be some additional cost to the state it shouldn't be great but could be over \$100,000.

**Oversight** assumes additional cost to the state has not been determined and for fiscal note purposes only, will assign no fiscal impact.

In response to HB 763 (FN 1776-01) from this session, officials from the **Clayton School District** stated this proposal does not appear to have a negative impact on their school district finances. It appears that they would not be required to add teachers or space, special education costs would be covered by the district of residence, and tuition would be the lesser of Clayton tuition or the sending district's average cost for the prior year. The lowest St. Louis County average cost for 2009-10 was \$7,881 which is similar to the current VST reimbursement rate.

Also in response to HB 763, based on a review conducted by their CFO, officials from the **Webster Groves School District** (WGSD) assumed that there would be a minimal cost to the district of \$3,000 per student for any student coming from the Riverview Gardens School District. Based on the information provided, it is unknown how many of these students would enroll in their district. Therefore a complete fiscal note cannot be submitted. Only 8% of the funding for a student attending WGSC is provided by the state. Approximately 90% is provided by local tax payers. The cost of education to attend the WGSD is approximately \$12,000 compared to \$9,000 in the Riverview Gardens School District.

L.R. No. 0249-06 Bill No. HCS for SB 243 Page 12 of 20 April 29, 2011

## <u>ASSUMPTION</u> (continued)

## \$170.310

Officials from the **Department of Social Services - Division of Youth Services (DYS)** state that most education programs operated by DYS include this type of instruction in their health curriculum. If this proposal passes, DYS would review its current practice to ensure universal participation; however, DYS does not anticipate any significant additional cost.

**DESE** assumes there is insufficient staff at American Heart Association or American Red Cross agencies to train every student enrolled in Missouri schools. The most appropriate way to deliver the training would require local school personnel, most likely the health teacher, to enroll in and pass a "Train the Trainer" workshop by the agencies. For the American Heart Association, a session would cost approximately \$165 for each trainer involved. DESE cannot estimate how many trainers the local school districts will choose to involve in this training.

If classroom health teachers are delivering the instruction, schools could purchase a kit with lesson plans from the American Heart Association called "CPR for Everyone." These kits cost approximately \$10.00 each and students could practice chest compression but not mouth-to-mouth resuscitation. The recommended ration for these kits is 1 kit for every 2 students. The Missouri School Directory lists fall enrollment for 2009-2010 at 892,291. Assuming 1 kit for every 2 students equates to \$4,461,455.

DESE also assumes that to bring in a trained American Red Cross or American Heart Association trainer could cost up to \$15.00 per student, once expenses, materials and training mannequins are rented. This potential cost based on an enrollment of 892,291 equals \$13,384,365.

DESE assumes the cost will likely fall somewhere between the range of \$4,461,455 to \$13,384,365.

Oversight assumes the proposal only relates to grades 9 to 12. According to the Missouri School Directory for 2010-2011, the fall enrollment in secondary schools for 2009-2010 was 279,797. Oversight also assumes that instruction shall be through a program developed by either the American Heart Association or the American Red Cross, or through a nationally recognized program and that staff from these organizations will not be required to do the instruction. Since schools may develop agreements with any local chapter of a voluntary organization of first responders for the "hands-on" training, costs associated with this proposal would be limited to training for health instructors and materials. Based on 623 high schools and charter high schools at \$165 per instructor, the cost could be \$102,595. For fiscal note purposes only, Oversight

L.R. No. 0249-06 Bill No. HCS for SB 243 Page 13 of 20 April 29, 2011

## ASSUMPTION (continued)

assumes fiscal impact to school districts of (Unknown - Could exceed \$100,000)

## \$630.590

Officials from the **Department of Mental Health (DMH)** state Missouri specific statistics are incomplete as they relate to eating disorders. The DMH assumes the cost for the development of the curriculum to be unknown but less than \$100,000 for FY 12. It is further assumed that once the curriculum is developed, the proposal will have no significant impact on the DMH for FY 13 and FY 14.

Officials from **DESE** state their agency would incur administrative expenses related to collaborating with the required parties to develop a continuing professional education curriculum. However, the expenses will not likely be significant. School districts choosing to implement the curriculum will likely incur significant expense. DESE defers to local school districts regarding the extent of those costs.

In response to SB 192 (FN 887-02) from this session, officials from the **Parkway School District** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their agency.

Also in response to SB 192, officials from the **St. Louis Public Schools** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization as the provisions of the proposal are optional. If the proposal is implemented, existing professional development resources would likely be adequate.

## **Charter School Sponsors**

The following Charter School Sponsors provided assumptions of fiscal impact:

Saint Louis University (SLU): SLU anticipates neither positive nor negative fiscal impact.

**University of Missouri - Kansas City (UMKC):** The four UM System campuses are working together to develop consistent policies, processes and standards related to the legislative changes. The total cost of a combined 1.0 additional FTE is \$55,000. Other cost (travel, printing, etc.) will be approximately \$20,000, for a total cost of \$75,000.00 for FY 2012. Additional costs in FY 2013 and FY 2014 would be \$40,000.

L.R. No. 0249-06 Bill No. HCS for SB 243 Page 14 of 20

Page 14 of 20 April 29, 2011

## <u>ASSUMPTION</u> (continued)

**University of Central Missouri (UCM):** In response to HCS for HB 473 (0963-05) from this session, there are several provisions in this proposed legislation that will impact the institutional responsibilities of UCM in its role as authorizer / sponsor of public charter schools, and thus will impact the work load associated with sponsorship. The proposed legislation will have a significant impact on the nature and scope of our oversight responsibilities, and thus the work load associated with sponsorship. This will have a fiscal impact on UCM.

Items from the proposed legislation that will impact UCM workload:

- Expansion of charter schools outside of KC and St Louis to include failing schools... (there will be much more of an interest and need for charter application review and decisions).
- Additional responsibilities regarding the closure of a charter school, including the
  collection and analysis of additional achievement and demographic data, additional
  documentation, as well as the need for additional onsite and state-level presence.
- Additional requirements regarding accountability. The legislation includes additional
  mandates for additional oversight, which means additional on site and site team
  involvement, as well as potential legal costs.
- Additional renewal requirements meaning more oversight, more data collection and analysis, more time presenting data to state board.
- More authority given to the State Board regarding ongoing oversight of the schools, and specifically with renewals and revocation decisions.
- Opens enrollment for HS recovery dropouts to adjoining districts resulting in more supervision, more complicated student files oversight needed.
- DESE can withhold funds from a closing school resulting in more communication, more involvement in multiple institutional processes, which can become complex with one institution, much less three or more.

L.R. No. 0249-06 Bill No. HCS for SB 243 Page 15 of 20 April 29, 2011

## ASSUMPTION (continued)

UCM officials assume the fiscal impact as follows:

- \$ 30,000 Increased school oversight services and site visits (\$3,000 per school)
- \$ 40,000 Increased support services for high-risk schools
- \$ 30,000 Increased professional staff (.5 FTE)
- \$ 30,000 Increased profession staff (policy development and implementation) (.5 FTE)
- \$ 20,000 Increased legal costs
- \$150,000

University of Missouri - St Louis (UMSL): Also in response to HCS for HB 473, officials from UMSL assumed the portion of this proposal that deals with sponsors applying to DESE to maintain their authority to sponsor will add a financial burden to sponsors. The documents mentioned would have to be created which mean hiring additional staff to carry out duties of sponsorship and could cost upwards of \$100,000 to create in terms of man hours during the year starting January, 2012 once guidelines are established. This, on top of current sponsorship duties, would create a substantial financial impact on sponsorship offices.

Based on responses from current charter school sponsors, **Oversight** assumes the costs associated with this proposed will be (Unknown - Could exceed \$100,000).

Officials from the following colleges and universities that are not currently charter school sponsors stated this proposal would have no fiscal impact on their respective institutions:

Northwest Missouri State University, Missouri State University, Kansas City Metropolitan Community College, and Linn State Technical College.

L.R. No. 0249-06

Bill No. HCS for SB 243

LMD:LR:OD (12/02)

Page 16 of 20 April 29, 2011

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2012 (10 Mo.)	FY 2013	FY 2014
GENERAL REVENUE			
<u>Cost</u> - Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) - Personal Services (3 FTE) (§160.400-160.425)			
Personal Services	(\$87,369)	(\$105,891)	(\$106,950)
Fringe Benefits	(\$45,729)	(\$55,423)	(\$55,978)
Equipment and Expenses	(\$11,315)	(\$4,512)	(\$4,624)
Charter Commission operational			
expenses (§160.425)	(\$125,000)	\$0	<u>\$0</u>
Total DESE Expenses (§160.400 -			
160.425)	(\$269,413)	(\$165,826)	(\$167,552)
<u>Cost</u> - DESE (§160.080)			
Personal Services (7 FTE)	(\$202,089)	(\$244,932)	(\$247,381)
Fringe Benefits	(\$105,773)	(\$128,197)	(\$120,479)
District and building level reviews	<u>(\$925,500)</u>	<u>(\$925,500)</u>	<u>(\$925,500)</u>
Total DESE Cost (§160.080)	(\$1,233,362)	(\$1,298,629)	(\$1,293,360)
<u>Cost</u> - DESE - Increased state aid for virtual students (§162.1250)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
virtual students (§102.1250)	(Clikilowii)	(Clikilowii)	(Clikilowii)
Estimated Net Effect on FTE for DESE	10 FTE	10 FTE	10 FTE
Cost - Charter School Sponsors (State			
Universities)	(Unknown -	(Unknown -	(Unknown -
	Could Exceed	Could Exceed	Could Exceed
	\$100,000)	\$100,000)	\$100,000)
<u>Cost</u> - Department of Mental Health - Development of eating disorder			
curriculum (§630.590)	(Unknown -		
cumculum (8030.390)	Less than		
		0.2	0.2
	<u>\$100,000)</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON			
GENERAL REVENUE	(Unknown -	(Unknown -	(Unknown -
	<u>Could Exceed</u> <u>\$1,502,775)</u>	<b>Could Exceed</b> <b>\$1,464,455</b> )	<b>Could Exceed</b> <b>\$1,460,912</b> )

Page 17 of 20 April 29, 2011

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON STATE SCHOOL MONIES FUND	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
<u>Transfer Out</u> - School districts - Increased state aid for virtual students (§162.1250)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
<u>Transfer In</u> - DESE - Increased state aid for virtual students (§162.1250)	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Estimated Net Effect on FTE for General Revenue  STATE SCHOOL MONIES FUND	10 FTE	10 FTE	10 FTE
FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2012 (10 Mo.)	FY 2013	FY 2014
FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	EV 2012	EV 2013	FV 201/

Page 18 of 20 April 29, 2011

FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government	FY 2012 (10 Mo.)	FY 2013	FY 2014
LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS			
<u>Income</u> - School Districts - Increased state aid for virtual students (§162.1250)	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
<u>Cost</u> - School Districts - Administrative costs (§162.1250)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
<u>Cost</u> - School Districts - Decreased funding (§160.400 - 160.425)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
<u>Cost</u> - School Districts - Education costs associated with enrollment options (§167.131)	(Unknown - Could exceed \$100,000)	(Unknown - Could exceed \$100,000)	(Unknown - Could exceed \$100,000)
Cost - School Districts - Training costs associated with cardiopulmonary resuscitation (§170.310)	(Unknown - Could exceed \$100,000)	(Unknown - Could exceed \$100,000)	(Unknown - Could exceed \$100,000)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)

## FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

No direct fiscal impact to small businesses would be expected as a result of this proposal.

# FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This proposal changes the laws regarding charter schools and establishes the Missouri Charter Public School Commission.

This legislation would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

Page 19 of 20 April 29, 2011

## **SOURCES OF INFORMATION**

Department of Health and Senior Services

Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Department of Mental Health

Department of Higher Education

Department of Social Services

Children's Division

Department of Public Safety

Missouri State Highway Patrol

Office of Secretary of State

Administrative Rules Division

Joint Committee on Education

Joint Committee on Administrative Rules

Office of the Governor

Office of Administration

Division of Budget and Planning

Missouri Senate

**Charter School Sponsors** 

University of Central Missouri

University of Missouri - Kansas City

Saint Louis University

University of Missouri - St Louis

Colleges and Universities

Northwest Missouri State University

Missouri State University

Kansas City Metropolitan Community College

Linn State Technical College

University of Missouri

**School Districts** 

Parkway

St Louis Public School District

Clayton

Webster Groves

Mickey Wilson, CPA

L.R. No. 0249-06 Bill No. HCS for SB 243 Page 20 of 20 April 29, 2011

> Director April 29, 2011