

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 1373-10
Bill No.: SS#2 for SCS for HCS for HB 604 with SA 1
Subject: Elementary and Secondary Education; Department of Elementary and Secondary Education; Teachers
Type: Original
Date: May 16, 2019

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies provisions relating to elementary and secondary education.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	Fully Implemented (FY 2024)
General Revenue	\$0	(Could exceed \$22,727,590)	(Could exceed \$31,097,844)	(Could exceed \$31,281,957)
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	\$0	(Could exceed \$22,727,590)	(Could exceed \$31,097,844)	(Could exceed \$31,281,957)

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.
This fiscal note contains 48 pages.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	Fully Implemented (FY 2024)
School Turnaround Fund*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
School Intervention Fund*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
School Recognition and Reward Fund*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State School Moneys Fund*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Criminal Records System Fund (0671)	\$0	\$71,148 to Could exceed \$241,384	\$71,148 to Could exceed \$241,384	\$71,148 to Could exceed \$241,384
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	\$71,148 to Could exceed \$241,384	\$71,148 to Could exceed \$241,384	\$71,148 to Could exceed \$241,384

*Transfers in and distributions net to zero.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	Fully Implemented (FY 2024)
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	Fully Implemented (FY 2024)
General Revenue	0 FTE	3 to Could Exceed 6 FTE	3 to Could Exceed 6 FTE	3 to Could Exceed 6 FTE
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0 FTE	3 to Could Exceed 6 FTE	3 to Could Exceed 6 FTE	3 to Could Exceed 6 FTE

☒ Estimated Net Effect (expenditures or reduced revenues) expected to exceed \$100,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	Fully Implemented (FY 2024)
Local Government	Unknown	Unknown to (Could exceed \$842,874)	Could exceed \$7,559,339 to (Unknown)	Could exceed \$7,559,339 to (Unknown)

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Due to time constraints of less than 2 hours, **Oversight** was unable to receive some of the agency responses in a timely manner and performed limited analysis. Oversight has presented this fiscal note on the best current information that we have or on information regarding a similar bill(s). Upon the receipt of agency responses, Oversight will review to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek the necessary approval of the chairperson of the Joint Committee on Legislative Research to publish a new fiscal note.

Section 160.410 Free and Reduced Lunch Preference

Oversight assumes this proposal could allow Charter Schools to give preference for admission to students who are eligible for free and reduced lunch. Oversight assumes this could shift costs and funding from school districts to charter schools, but would not result in a net impact.

Section 160.545 A+ Dual Credit and Dual Enrollment

In response to a similar proposal, officials from **Department of Higher Education (DHE)** assumed this bill proposes to revise the student eligibility requirements for the A+ scholarship and extend A+ eligibility to include dual credit and dual enrollment courses.

Paragraph (1) of Subsection 8 reduces the number of years from three to two that a student must attend a designed high school in order to be eligible for the postsecondary scholarship. In addition, the revised provision would no longer require the eligible student to graduate from an A+ designated high school. While these changes would have the effect of expanding the pool of eligible students, and thus the cost of the program, accurate data regarding the extent of that change is not available. Consequently, this cost estimate does not include these provisions.

Paragraph (3) of Subsection 8 would potentially require schools to check student grade point average (GPA) before each semester. Currently some institutions only check student GPA once per academic year. As such, this change could impact eligibility, both positively and negatively, for some students. It is assumed the positive and negative impacts would offset and there would be no fiscal impact from this change.

Subsection 9 requires the MDHE to establish a procedure to reimburse students for costs associated with enrollment in dual credit and dual enrollment coursework offered by any institution of higher education. Dual credit coursework is defined by the MDHE as college-level coursework delivered within a high school classroom taught by a high school faculty member that results in both high school and college credit. Dual enrollment is coursework delivered by a

ASSUMPTION (continued)

college or university and taught by regular college faculty that results in both high school and college credit. Dual enrollment courses may be delivered within the high school or on the college campus.

The only limitation on institutional eligibility for dual credit and dual enrollment reimbursement relates to private two-year institutions and religious institutions. Consequently, it is assumed dual credit and dual enrollment coursework delivered by any public or four-year independent (non-profit) higher education institution would be eligible for reimbursement. Although the proposed provision does not limit the reimbursement to higher education institutions located in Missouri, it is assumed reimbursable coursework would be limited to that delivered by institutions domiciled within Missouri.

The primary eligibility criteria for A+ reimbursement that would be applicable to dual credit and dual enrollment students is a 2.5 cumulative grade point average and an attendance rate of 95 percent. The other eligibility provisions applied to college level coursework would not be appropriate to apply to high school students. Since most high schools already require dual credit and dual enrollment students to meet at least a 2.5 GPA requirement, that provision would have no impact. It is assumed students taking these courses are higher achieving students and, as a consequence, the attendance requirement would have limited or no impact on eligibility.

The most recent year for which **dual credit** data are available is the 2015-2016 academic year. In that year, 49,743 students completed 242,074 credit hours from dual credit coursework. Based on data collected by the MDHE, the average per credit hour cost of dual credit coursework is approximately \$75 per credit hour. Using that cost basis and assuming full funding for all eligible students, this component of the proposal would cost approximately **\$18,155,550** (242,074 X \$75) in the first year of implementation.

The following are the major assumptions underlying this estimate.

- Because the majority of these credit hours are earned at postsecondary institutions that are not currently eligible to participate in the A+ program (68%) and this level of dual credit participation already exists, it is assumed there would be no cost overlap with the current program that would reduce this figure.
- While it would be expected that reimbursement of the costs for dual credit coursework would increase the number of credit hours produced, it is not possible to accurately estimate that cost increase. Some of this increase could represent a shift from taking coursework at A+ institutions, where the program already covers the tuition and fee costs, to taking the coursework as dual credit making a reliable estimate of the increase even more difficult.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

- It is important to note that the data used in this calculation only include credit hours for completed coursework rather than all coursework for which high school students enrolled. Although some additional students may be eligible for reimbursement, depending on payment policies, no adjustment has been made to reflect this issue.
- Since the average credit hour rate has been relatively stable for the past several years, it is assumed this estimated cost per credit hour would not change substantially during the period covered by this fiscal note.

The most recent year for which dual enrollment data are available is the 2016-2017 academic year. In that year, 14,761 high school students completed 41,316 credit hours at public two- and four-year institutions. Approximately 89 percent of those hours were for enrollment in coursework at public community colleges. As with the dual credit calculation, it is assumed the GPA and attendance requirements will have little to no effect on the eligibility of students taking dual enrollment coursework for the proposed program. The 2017-2018 average tuition calculation for the Higher Education Student Funding Act was \$234 for public four-year institutions and State Technical College. Students enrolled in dual enrollment coursework at these institutions completed 4,737 credit hours. Based on the HESFA tuition average, this would result in a cost of \$1,108,458 ($\$234 \times 4,737$). Students enrolled in dual enrollment coursework at public community colleges completed 36,579 credit hours. Since we do not have the necessary data to calculate an average tuition cost for these courses, a \$100 credit hour rate is assumed for this calculation. This results in a cost of \$3,657,940 ($\$100 \times 36,376$) for this component. Total estimated cost for the reimbursement of tuition for dual enrollment coursework is \$4,766,398 before any adjustments are made.

The following are the major assumptions underlying this estimate.

- Since approximately 11 percent of public high school graduates receive an A+ payment in the year following high school graduation, it is assumed that 89 percent of these credit hours would not overlap with the current program and would constitute additional cost for the program. This adjustment would reduce the cost for the first year of the dual enrollment component to \$4,242,095 ($\$4,766,398 \times 89\%$).
- While it would be expected that reimbursement of the costs for dual enrollment coursework would increase the number of credit hours produced, it is not possible to accurately estimate that cost increase.
- It is important to note that the data used in this calculation only include credit hours for completed coursework rather than all coursework for which high school students enrolled. Although some additional students may be eligible for reimbursement, depending on payment policies, no adjustment has been made to reflect this issue.
- Independent, non-public institutions provide dual enrollment coursework through a number of mechanisms to Missouri high school students. Since the data used in this

ASSUMPTION (continued)

calculation do not include credit hours generated by students enrolled at those institutions, this estimate likely underestimates the actual total cost. Since the MDHE does not collect dual enrollment data from this sector, it is not possible to estimate this additional cost.

- Tuition costs at public four-year institutions and State Technical College have averaged less than two percent per year for the past several years. Average tuition costs at community colleges, based on A+ reimbursement rates for the past two years has been approximately five percent. The following table displays the related cost increments for the first three years of operation.

Dual Enrollment

Fiscal Year	Public 4 Year * State Tech	Community Colleges	Total
FY 2020	\$986,528 (\$234 x 4,737 x 89%)	\$3,255,567 (\$100 x 36,376 x 89%)	\$4,242,095
FY 2021	\$994,329 (\$236 x 4,737 x 89%)	\$3,399,337 (\$105 x 36,376 x 89%)	\$4,393,666
FY 2022	\$1,007,607 (\$239 x 4,737 x 89%)	\$3,561,210 (\$110 x 36,376 x 89%)	\$4,568,817

Based on these assumptions, the total increased cost to the A+ program for the implementation of this proposal for the reimbursement of dual credit and dual enrollment costs (not including items below for related staff and expenses) would be as follows.

- FY 2020 - \$22,397,645
- FY 2021 - \$22,549,216
- FY 2022 - \$22,724,367

Oversight notes the following anticipated total program distributions:

Fiscal Year	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022
Dual Credit	\$18,155,550	\$18,155,550	\$18,155,550
Dual Enrollment	\$4,242,095	\$4,393,666	\$4,568,817
Total	\$22,397,645	\$22,549,216	\$22,724,367

ASSUMPTION (continued)

DHE assumes, in addition to these direct costs for reimbursement, revisions to the current system for administering state student assistance programs (FAMOUS) would be necessary to incorporate this additional component into the A+ program. ITSD has estimated the cost of those revisions to be \$257,580 in the year of implementation. It is assumed any ongoing costs would be within the current maintenance cost for the FAMOUS system. Detailed information regarding the ITSD estimate is attached.

Given this proposal would substantially expand the program, including both additional scholarship recipients and the need for increased communication and data verification from the more than 600 A+ designated Missouri high schools, one additional staff FTE for a Research Associate I at \$35,000 annual salary and related costs for expense and equipment are included per OA guidelines and are required for adequate implementation and operation of this program.

Oversight notes ITSD assumes that every new IT project/system will be bid out because all their resources are at full capacity. For this proposal, ITSD assumes they will contract out the programming changes need to A+ FAMOUS system. ITSD estimates the project would take 3,434.40 hours at a contract rate of \$75 per hour for a total cost to the state of \$257,580. Oversight notes that an average salary for a current IT Specialist within ITSD is \$51,618, which totals roughly \$80,000 per year when fringe benefits are added. Assuming that all ITSD resources are at full capacity, Oversight assumes ITSD may (instead of contracting out the programming) hire an additional two IT Specialists to perform the work required from this bill. Therefore, Oversight will range the fiscal impact from the cost of hiring two additional FTE IT Specialists (roughly \$160,000 per year) to contracting out the work (\$257,580).

In response to a previous version, SB 205 (2019), officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization. Since 2011, the Department of Higher Education has handled the payment portion of the A+ program.

In response to a similar proposal, officials from **Missouri State University** assumed there is no fiscal impact from this proposal.

In response to a similar proposal, officials from the **State Technical College of Missouri** assumed this could potentially have a negative fiscal impact if the result is a reduced amount of A+ available to full-time students.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

In response to a similar proposal, officials from the **University of Missouri System** stated the precise fiscal impact on the university system is unable to be determined but is expected to be in excess of \$100,000.

Section 161.700 Definition of Holocaust

In response to a similar proposal, SB 373 (2019), officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** assumed the proposal would result in no cost to the department.

Oversight assumes this proposal removes the phrase “in Nazi concentration camps” from the definition of holocaust. Oversight notes the Holocaust Education and Awareness Commission is housed in DESE. DESE has stated that the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note.

In response to a similar proposal, officials from **Southeast Missouri State University** assume there is a potential negative impact on Southeast Missouri State University of \$487,000 to \$1,900,000 based on assumptions that the number of dual credit or dual enrollment students taking courses from Southeast Missouri State University may decline and assumptions that take into account a possible decline in the percentage of dual credit/dual enrollment students that then enroll full-time as students at Southeast Missouri State University.

Section 160.2500

Oversight assumes this provision states that a public school district shall not discriminate against any person on the basis of a religious viewpoint or religious expression. Oversight assumes the proposal will have no fiscal impact on school districts.

Sections 161.1080 - 161.1130 School Turnaround Program

In response to a similar proposal, officials from the **DESE** assumed the proposal would result in no cost to the department.

Officials from the **Office of the State Treasurer** assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

In response to a similar proposal, SCS for HCS for HB 604 (2019), officials from the **Springfield Public Schools** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

In response to a previous version, HB 604 (2019) officials from the **Bakersfield R-IV School District** assumed an impact of approximately \$150,000.

In response to a previous version, Perfected HCS for HB 604 (2019), officials from the **Wellsville-Middletown R-1 School District** assumed the proposal would have no direct fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight assumes the School Turnaround Act creates the School Turnaround Fund which consists of appropriations and gifts, contributions, grants, or bequests received from federal, private or other sources to be used for payments to independent school turnaround experts and administrative expenses. Oversight assumes that all money will be used by the Fund in the year in which it is received.

Oversight assumes the School Turnaround Act creates the School Intervention Fund which consists of appropriations and gifts, contributions, grants, or bequests received from federal, private or other sources for purposes of distributing grants to local educational agencies to fund interventions. Oversight assumes that all money will be used by the Fund in the year in which it is received.

Oversight assumes the School Turnaround Act creates the School Recognition and Reward Fund which consists of appropriations and gifts, contributions, grants, or bequests received from federal, private or other sources for the purpose of distributing grants to local educational agencies to reward eligible schools or teachers employed by eligible schools. Oversight assumes that all money will be used by the Fund in the year in which it is received.

Oversight assumes these funds would be funded by general revenue if appropriated by the state.

Oversight notes the School Turnaround Act is subject to appropriation; therefore, Oversight will range the potential impact from “\$0 to” estimated expenditures.

Oversight notes §161.1090.5 states DESE shall not designate any school as in need of intervention before September 1, 2020 (FY 2021). Therefore, Oversight will not reflect an appropriation made for the School Turnaround Act in FY 2020.

Oversight notes §161.1100.1 states before August 30, 2020, DESE shall identify two or more approved independent school turnaround experts through an RFP process that a school in need of intervention may select from to partner with. Also, §161.1105 states DESE shall pay no more than fifty percent of the independent school turnaround expert’s professional fees during the time

ASSUMPTION (continued)

period the expert is providing services to the school (with remainder of the fee to be paid upon successfully helping a school turnaround within four years after a school is designated as needing intervention). Also, in that section, in negotiating the contract, DESE shall offer an average of \$650,000 for the entirety of the project.

Oversight will assume there could be two school turnaround experts under contract by FY 2021, each responsible for a school and each receiving \$108,333 (1/3 of 50% or 16.6%) on their contract within their first year, another \$108,333 within their second year and an additional \$108,333 within their third year (for a total of 50% over three years.) with the remaining 50% being paid in the fourth year.

Assuming two new turnaround experts are hired each year, **Oversight** notes this would total \$216,666 in FY 2021 (2 experts), \$433,333 in FY 2022 (4 experts), \$650,000 in FY 2023 (6 experts) and \$1,300,000 in FY 2024 (8 experts 2 of which are paid the final 50% of their contract). The number of experts and the number of projects does not appear to be limited in the Act, only limited by the appropriation awarded by the General Assembly.

Therefore, **Oversight** will range the fiscal impact from \$0 (no appropriation made) to a cost that could exceed the amounts as estimated above depending on the number of experts hired and the timing of the payments.

Section 162.068, 162.203 and 170.045 Sexual Misconduct

In response to a similar proposal, Perfected HCS for HB 739 (2019), officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** assumed the proposal would result in no cost to the department. DESE assumes the training materials will be developed by the task force as established in section 210.1200.

Oversight notes §210.1200 created the Task Force on the Prevention of Sexual Abuse of Children, from SB 843 (2018).

In response to a similar proposal, Perfected HCS for HB 739 (2019), officials from the **Department of Social Services, Missouri Office of Prosecution Services, Department of Mental Health and Department of Health and Senior Services** each assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

Oversight notes that the responding state agencies have stated that these provisions would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

In response to a similar proposal, Perfected HCS for HB 739 (2019), officials from **Wellsville-Middletown R-1 School District** assumed this would not have a major fiscal impact on the district.

In response to a similar proposal, Perfected HCS for HB 739 (2019), officials from **Springfield Public Schools** assumed this would cost \$130,000 for staff for training and human resource processes.

Oversight assumes this proposal requires school districts to provide training on identifying the signs of sexual abuse to school board members beginning in FY 2020. In addition, school districts shall provide trauma-informed, developmentally-appropriate sexual abuse training to students in all grades not lower than the sixth grade beginning in FY 2021. Oversight will show an unknown cost to schools districts beginning in FY 2020.

Intervention Powers and Apportionment - §162.081

Oversight assumes section 162.081 requires the state board of education is to determine an equitable apportionment of state and federal funds for the special administrative board. Oversight assumes this would result in a transfer of funds from the school district to the special administrative board and would not result in a fiscal impact to the local school districts as a whole.

Section 163.018 Early Childhood Education Contracts

In response to a similar proposal, HB 594 (2019), officials from **DESE** assumed there would be a fiscal impact; however, that impact is unknown. DESE does not know how many children districts or charter schools are currently serving in this age group. The new language would imply all of the services could be contracted out to another entity.

Based on experiences with Missouri Preschool Program grants few districts chose to work with other entities. Of those that did chose to work with another entity, the partnership did not always last the duration of the grant.

Oversight notes that if school districts choose to participate, this could result in additional students being covered under the average daily attendance. This proposal has the potential to increase the call to the foundation formula. Based on the 17-18 formula payment per ADA (\$3,996), Oversight notes an additional 26 children would potentially increase the call to the foundation formula by \$103,896 (26 * \$3,996).

While the foundation formula was fully funded in FY 2018, **Oversight** is unable to predict

ASSUMPTION (continued)

whether it will be fully funded in future fiscal years. Oversight notes that if the foundation formula is not fully funded then this proposal may not result in a cost to General Revenue or the State School Moneys Fund. Therefore, Oversight assumes the range of fiscal impact is \$0 (no contracts with school districts or no increase in appropriation) to an unknown cost that could exceed \$100,000 (increased call to the foundation formula and increase in appropriation).

Oversight assumes this proposal could result in a positive impact to school districts if they are currently contracting out and are now able to receive state aid for those students. However, Oversight notes that if the foundation formula is not fully funded then any cost would be incurred by the school districts rather than General Revenue. For purposes of this fiscal note, Oversight assumes school districts can currently contract out for early childhood education programs and the cost of contracting out is not a result of this proposal. Therefore, Oversight will show a range of potential fiscal impact to school districts of \$0 (no contracts or no appropriation) to an unknown increase in revenue (contracted and appropriated).

In response to a similar proposal, HB 594 (2019), officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri State Highway Patrol** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization. The Office of Early Childhood currently fingerprints applicants for early childhood education.

Oversight notes this proposal requires staff members of any early childhood education program that is under contract with a district or charter school to undergo background checks. However, Oversight notes the Department of Public Safety - Missouri State Highway Patrol assumed there would be no fiscal impact. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note from this provision.

In response to a similar proposal, HB 594 (2019), officials from the **Springfield Public Schools** and **Wellsville-Middletown R-1 School District** each assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

Section 163.031 Financial Institution Taxes

In response to a similar proposal, officials from **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** stated, based on information received from the Department of Revenue, school districts received \$23,339,482 in distributions from the financial institution taxes due under Sections 148.030, 148.140, and 148.620 in FY 2019. When the corporate tax rate is reduced to 4 percent for tax years beginning January 1, 2020, the proportional tax reduction will result in a reduced rate for the financial institutions tax of 4.48 percent. DESE calculated a reduced distribution of the financial institutions tax of \$14,937,269. This legislation indicates

ASSUMPTION (continued)

that DESE would be responsible for the distribution of the difference to school districts under the appropriation provided for in section 163.031. DESE will include a negative impact to general revenue of \$8.4 million in FY 2021 going forward as the Department expects an additional call on the formula of that amount to make up the difference.

In response to a similar proposal, SB 475 (2019), officials from the **Office of Administration - Information Technology (ITSD)**, on behalf of DESE, assumed they would need to create a calculation process to compare two different numbers for prior year and current year then multiply it by the defined formula. ITSD will need to create two reports, a payment report and a payment transmittal transaction report, and potentially create a data entry screen if we cannot get a data file from DOR. There will be a slight change to the payment management system to create the payment. ITSD estimates this will cost \$89,100 (1,188 hours * \$75 per hour).

Oversight notes ITSD assumes that every new IT project/system will be bid out because all their resources are at full capacity. ITSD estimates the project would take 1,188 hours at a contract rate of \$75 per hour for a total cost to the state of \$89,100. Oversight notes that an average salary for a current IT Specialist within ITSD is \$51,618, which totals roughly \$80,000 per year when fringe benefits are added. Assuming that all ITSD resources are at full capacity, Oversight assumes ITSD may (instead of contracting out the programming) hire an additional IT Specialist to perform the work required from this bill. Therefore, Oversight will range the fiscal impact from the cost of hiring an additional FTE IT Specialist (roughly \$80,000 per year) to contracting out the work (\$89,100).

Officials from **Department of Revenue (DOR)** assume this proposed section (163.031) states that, beginning with January 1, 2020, any school district that receives revenue from the tax authorized under 148.030, 148.140, 148.620, and 148.720 shall each district shall be the total of the revenue received by the district from the tax authorized under sections 148.030, 148.140, 148.620, and 148.720 during the applicable calendar year times one and five thousand six hundred and twenty five ten thousandths (1.5625) minus the total of the revenue received by the district from the tax authorized under sections 148.030, 148.140, 148.620, and 148.720 during the same calendar year, and this payment shall be in addition to payments authorized under subsections 1, 2, and 7 of this section and shall be made from the annual appropriation to fund this section.

Methodology

DOR distributed \$23,339,482 to the school districts in the 2018 tax year. This amount was based off of the tax collections at a rate of 7.00%. Beginning January 1, 2020 the tax rate will be reduced from 7.00% to 4.48%, per SB 884 and SB 769(2018). Based on the amount distributed

ASSUMPTION (continued)

for the 2018 tax year, the DOR determined that in December 2020, the amount that will be distributed to the school districts will be \$14,937,268. The difference is \$8,402,213.

Distribution from tax collections at 7%	\$23,339,482
Distribution from tax collections at 4.48%	<u>\$14,937,269</u>
Difference	\$8,402,213

In response to a similar proposal, SB 475 (2019), officials from **Jefferson City Public Schools** stated the tax cuts for financial institutions last year, inadvertently reduced money to local school districts. The tax cut percentage was 36%. This bill shows the reduced amount and multiplies it by 1.5625 which will make the districts whole from this tax cut. JCPS estimates \$8,253,971 in lost revenue for all districts.

In response to a similar proposal, SB 475 (2019), officials from the **Springfield Public Schools** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization.

In response to a similar proposal, SB 475 (2019), officials from the **Rockwood School District** assumed this would allow the district to retain the Financial Institution Tax collections that were reduced by SB 769 (2018) and becomes effective for the 2021-22 school year. This proposal would benefit the Rockwood School District in the amount of \$197,719.

In response to a similar proposal, SB 475 (2019), officials from **Wellsville-Middletown R-1 School District** assumed this would have minimal fiscal impact on the district.

In response to a similar proposal, SB 475 (2019), officials from **Parkway Schools** assumed the estimate of lost revenue from SB 769 (2018) to all schools is \$8,253,971.

In response to a similar proposal, SB 475 (2019), officials from the **Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Travel Hardships §167.125

Oversight assumes this proposal establishes requirements for certain districts in Maries county for pupils to qualify for an assignment to another school district due to travel hardships.

Oversight notes the applicable school districts did not responded to Oversight's request for fiscal impact. Oversight is unable to determine the change in the number of travel hardship assignments granted under this proposal.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight assumes this provision would result in a transfer of funds from one school district to another and would not result in a fiscal impact to the local school districts as a whole.

Transportation - §167.241

In response to a similar proposal, SB 25 (2019), officials from **DESE** assumed transportation costs are unknown. In 2015-16 there were two unaccredited school districts in the state. If we use those as a specific example, the cost of transporting students to accredited districts was approximately \$1.2 million.

Oversight notes that in the 2015-2016 school year Normandy and Riverview Gardens were the two unaccredited school districts. Currently, no school district is classified as unaccredited. However, under this proposal, a student is eligible to transfer if their attendance center is located within an unaccredited district and has an annual performance report score consistent with a classification of unaccredited. This portion of the proposal would require the transfer student's sending district to pay for transportation costs to at least one designated receiving district. Oversight is unable to determine how many students would apply to transfer. Oversight for fiscal note purposes, will show a fiscal impact of \$0 (no unaccredited districts) to a cost that could exceed half the 2015-2016 transportation figure provide by DESE.

Performance Data §167.890

In response to similar provision, SCS for HB 485 (2019), **DESE** assumes the cost to collect this data is estimated at \$5,000 to \$10,000.

Oversight assumes DESE can absorb the cost of this provision with existing resources.

Transient Data, Student Transfers and Eligible Districts §167.890, §167.895 and §167.898

In response to a similar proposal, SCS for HB 485 (2019), officials from **DESE** assumed determining a cost for the transfer requests is difficult and is dependent upon an unknown number of potential requests. If the number of requests remains below 10,000 DESE will require 1.0 FTE supervisor to fulfill the required duties. Each increment of 10,000 requests (exceeding the initial 10,000 requests) will require an additional FTE and significant data support structure.

Oversight assumes the number of transfers are unknown but assumes there could be costs to DESE to track transfer requests. Oversight will show a cost that could exceed one FTE supervisor (\$47,952) beginning in FY 2020 depending on the transfers.

Oversight assumes current statute requires districts that are not accredited to pay tuition and

ASSUMPTION (continued)

provide transportation for each resident pupil who attends an accredited school in another district in the same or adjoining county (section 167.131 RSMo.).

Oversight assumes this proposal (under section 167.895) would allow, if capacity exists, students to transfer within their district of residence if they are attending an attendance center that is located within an unaccredited district and the attendance center has a score consistent with a classification of unaccredited.

Oversight notes there are no districts currently classified as unaccredited; however, Oversight cannot predict the number of districts that maybe classified as unaccredited in the future.

Sections 167.131 and 167.132 Tuition payments

In response to a similar proposal, SB 25 (2019), **DESE** assumed there would be no increased costs for tuition.

Oversight assumes this proposal limits the tuition payments to the lesser of the receiving district's set tuition or the state adequacy target (SAT) plus the ((average local tax effort above the SAT) per child). Oversight assumes this proposal would cap the tuition rate the sending district would pay to the receiving district.

Oversight assumes there is some uncertainty regarding the language used in this section. The average local tax effort is calculated using ADA (the calculation of attendance hours) rather than on a per child basis. Also, local tax revenue does not appear to be defined in statute. Based on information from DESE's website local tax effort is "computed by adding the prior year tax revenue the district of domicile received from property taxes, Intangible (Financial Institution) taxes, M & M surtaxes, In Lieu of taxes, and city sales tax then dividing that sum by the prior year resident average daily attendance of the district of domicile." Oversight used this calculation in the example below.

For Example:

The local tax effort for Riverview Gardens per ADA: \$2,495.59

SAT: \$6,308

$$(\$2,495.59 - \$6,308) = - \$3,812.41$$

Oversight assumes, in effect, the local revenue above the SAT is \$0 in this example. Therefore, Riverview Gardens, as a sending district, would only be required to pay \$6,308 (or the SAT) for transferring students.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Using the Local Tax Effort information on DESE's website, Oversight estimates there are currently no districts that would have to pay more than they receive in basic state aid and local tax revenue per ADA. However, Oversight assumes it is possible that a district could have to pay more than it receives in state aid and local revenue per ADA depending on future local tax effort.

For example, Winnona R-III received an estimated \$5,704 in state aid per ADA and \$1,244 in local tax revenue for a total of \$6,948 per ADA. Oversight assumes if the local tax revenue per ADA were to fall below \$604, the district would have to pay more than it receives in state aid and local tax revenue per ADA.

Section 168.025 Teacher Externships

In response to a similar proposal, Perfected HCS No. 2 for HB 462 (2019), officials from the **Department of Revenue** and the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** each assumed there was no fiscal impact from this proposal.

In response to a similar proposal, Perfected HCS No. 2 for HB 462 (2019), officials from the **Department of Economic Development (DED)** assumed this legislation will require DED to hire 1 Economic Development Incentive Specialist III (\$51,108) to implement the program, to work toward creating the required definitions under 168.025 and to help DOR in administering the program from the DED side.

Oversight assumes DED could absorb these duties with existing staff.

Oversight notes this proposal allows DED and DESE to create rules for the program regarding requirements for teacher externships to be considered equivalent to credit hours of graduate-level courses for salary schedules. Section 163.172 outlines the minimum starting salary for a teacher of \$25,000 and for teachers with masters degrees the minimum is \$33,000. Should DED and DESE determine that externships be allowed to be substituted for graduate-level courses, it is possible that teachers may move up their district's salary schedule quicker. Oversight does not know what program parameters DED and DESE will develop, but will show this could have a \$0 (no change to salary schedules) to Unknown impact on the school districts for increased teacher salaries.

In response to the similar proposal HCS for HB 462 (2019), officials at the **Raymore-Peculiar School District** assumed they have only had teachers participate in externships using the grant and that these externships are minimal time involvement. They noted that teachers can move laterally on the salary schedule for each 8 hours of graduate credit they have. Each 8 hours is worth about \$700. If the hours lead to an advanced degree, the increase in salary is \$2,500

ASSUMPTION (continued)

annually per teacher.

In response to the similar proposal HCS for HB 462 (2019), officials at the **Columbia Public Schools** stated they have teachers that participate in externships in the local community and that those are done for 6-8 weeks in the summer months.

In response to the similar proposal HCS for HB 462 (2019), officials at the **Bellevue R-III School District** stated they can not afford to hire substitute teachers and pay a teacher, so they do not participate in externships.

In response to the similar proposal HCS for HB 462 (2019), officials at the **Wellsville-Middletown R-1 School District** do not have teachers that participate in externships.

Background Checks §168.133

In response to a similar proposal, SB 295 (2019), officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** assumed the proposal would result in no cost to DESE.

Officials from **Department of Public Safety - Missouri State Highway Patrol (MHP)** stated, in 2018, public school districts submitted 694 criminal record checks on volunteers. These requests were submitted from 98 school districts of the 560 school districts within the state. Based on this, the CJIS Division estimates, an additional 3,234 record checks will be generated annually resulting in \$71,148 deposited into the Criminal History Record Fund.

694 records checks divided by 98 districts = an average of 7 submissions per district per year on volunteers.

462 districts not submitting x 7 volunteer submissions = 3,234 volunteers x \$22.00 = \$ 71,148

The cost for a state and federal fingerprint based criminal record check for a volunteer submission is \$31.25, per request. The state portion of the record check fee is \$20.00, and the federal portion is \$11.25. If the submitting agency chooses to utilize the state fingerprint services vendor, then an additional \$8.50 is charged by the vendor for this service. Thus, the fee breakdown per request is as follows:

State Fee: \$20.00
Federal Fee (volunteer): \$11.25
Total (state and federal Fee) \$31.25
Total (state, federal and vendor fee): \$39.75

ASSUMPTION (continued)

The total amount retained in the Criminal History Record fund after paying the FBI is \$22.00 per request. This equals \$20.00 for the state fee, pursuant to Section 43.530, and \$2.00 of the federal fee, pursuant to 28 CFR 20.31(e) (2) and the current fee schedule as posted in the Federal Register. The remaining amount of \$9.25 ($\$31.25 - \$22.00 = \9.25) is passed onto the FBI.

In response to a similar proposal, SB 295 (2019), officials from the **Francis Howell School District** and **Wellsville-Middletown R-1 School District** both stated that since they already perform background checks on volunteers, this proposal would have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

Oversight notes this proposal requires a school district to perform background checks on screened volunteers which includes persons who mentor or tutor students. Oversight notes one of the requirements of the A+ program is to perform at least 50 hours of unpaid tutoring or mentoring. Oversight is uncertain if the A+ tutors would meet the definition of screened volunteer. Therefore, Oversight is uncertain if school districts would be required to perform background checks on A+ tutors. Oversight notes there were 7,738 first time, full-time degree seeking students enrolled in the A+ program in FY 2018. If school districts were required to perform background checks on these students, the cost is estimated at \$241,812 ($7,738 * \31.25) plus \$101,062 ($3,234 * \31.25 based on the numbers estimated by MHP) for a total of \$342,874.

Based on a brief review, **Oversight** notes some school districts pay for volunteer background checks while other school districts require the volunteer to pay for the background check.

Oversight notes if school districts were required to perform background checks on A+ tutors the Criminal Records System Fund would have an increase in income of \$170,236 plus \$71,148 (the amount estimated by the MHP) for a total of \$241,384.

Oversight will show a range of income to the Criminal Records System Fund of \$71,148 (background checks on A+ tutors not required) to \$241,384 (background checks on A+ tutors required).

Oversight will show a range of cost to the school districts of \$0 (volunteer pays for the background check) to \$101,062 (background checks on A+ tutors not required) to \$342,874 (background checks on A+ tutors required).

Section 170.020 Social and Emotional Educational Pilot Program

In response to a previous version, officials from **DESE** estimated costs of approximately \$100,000 to develop the curriculum. The curriculum will need to address bullying, youth suicide

ASSUMPTION (continued)

prevention and awareness, trauma informed practices, etc. Extra precautions such as a crisis team and plan must be in place for students who, due to that curriculum, self report and seek counseling.

In addition, DESE will have to hire an adequate number of FTE, certified in mental and emotional health, distributed regionally throughout the state to provide accountability for program delivery. DESE estimates hiring 1.0 FTE supervisor to fulfill this requirement.

In response to a previous version, officials from **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** stated the new language added to section 170.020.1(3) has negated the need for FTE and curriculum development costs. The language in the previous version required DESE to collaborate with school districts to establish the instructional model for each elementary social and emotional health education program. The new language allows the use of the Missouri Comprehensive School Counseling Program.

Oversight notes per the webpage on [School Counseling](#), DESE currently has staff “to work with schools to help ensure that each school has a fully implemented comprehensive school counseling program that supports the academic, career, and social/emotional development of all students through the delivery of counseling content.” Oversight notes this proposal states any such instructional model established by the local school district shall use the Missouri Comprehensive School Counseling program. Oversight is unsure if the existing curriculum or employees meet the requirements of this proposal. Oversight will show a range of impact of the FTE and curriculum development of \$0 to the costs as estimated by DESE based on a previous version.

Oversight assumes there could be costs to school districts for course development, materials and teaching staff to implement this amendment. Oversight will show a range of impact to school districts from \$0 to an unknown cost beginning in FY 2021.

Section 171.031 Delayed Start

In response to a similar proposal, SCS HCS HB Nos. 161 & 401 (2019), officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** assumed the proposal would result in no cost to their organization.

In response to a similar proposal, SCS HCS HB Nos. 161 & 401 (2019), officials from **Wellsville-Middletown R-1 School District** assumed this provision would have a negative fiscal impact on the district in the amount of time spent in re-figuring and re-doing class and work schedules and resetting contracts.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

In response to a similar proposal HB 401 (2019), officials from the **Francis-Howell School District** could not calculate a fiscal impact. However, they indicated the later start dates would make it impossible to complete the semester before Christmas Break, which creates a whole set of issues, academic and otherwise, that have to be dealt with.

In response to a similar proposal HB 401 (2019), officials from **Maries County R-1 School District** assumed this proposal would have a direct impact on our district as we are one of many districts that begin school before this date. Changes to the school calendar could be detrimental to student learning.

In response to a similar proposal, officials from the **Springfield Public Schools** assumed this proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization.

In response to a similar proposal, HB 161 (2019), officials from **Kirksville R-III School District** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization.

In response to a similar proposal, HB 401 (2019), officials from the **Carondelet Learning Academy** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight notes this provision would set the opening day of school districts at no earlier than fourteen calendar days prior to the first Monday in September. Oversight assumes school districts that currently start before fourteen calendar days prior to the first Monday in September would be required to delay their start date. Oversight assumes there could be costs to delay a district's start date. Therefore, Oversight will show a range of no impact to an unknown cost.

Section 171.033 Alternative Instruction Methods

In response to a similar proposal, Perfected HCS for HB Nos. 281 & 570, officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** assumed the proposal would result in no cost to the department.

In response to a similar proposal, Perfected HCS for HB Nos. 281 & 570, officials from the **Springfield Public Schools** and **Wellsville-Middletown R-1 School District** each assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

In response to a previous version, HB 281 (2019), officials from the **Francis Howell School District** assumed the proposal would have no negative fiscal impact on their organization.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

In response to a previous version, HB 281 (2019), officials from the **Northeast Nodaway R-5 School District** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight notes that the responding organizations stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their respective organizations. However, Oversight assumes school districts could possibly save on transportation costs if they are allowed to implement alternative instructions plans including virtual learning methods. Oversight will show a range of \$0 to an unknown savings to school districts.

Section 171.033.6 Make-Up Days

In response to a similar proposal, SCS HCS HB Nos. 161 & 401 (2019), officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** assumed the proposal would result in no cost to the department.

In response to a similar proposal, SB 478 (2019), officials from **Osborn R-O School** assumed this proposal would positively impact our budget and maintenance schedule for our small district. The areas of savings would be substitute pay, transportation, utilities/lighting/cooling.

In response to a similar proposal, SCS HCS HB Nos. 161 & 401 (2019), officials from the **Wellsville-Middletown R-1 School District** assumed the provision would have no fiscal impact on their organization.

In response to a similar proposal, SB 478 (2019), officials from the **Springfield Public Schools** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight assumes school districts could save on operation costs as mention by Osborn R-O School if they are only required to make-up the first six days of school cancelled due to inclement weather for the FY 2018-2019 school year. Oversight will show an unknown savings to school districts for the 2018-2019 school year (FY 2019).

Section 177.086 Construction of Facilities

In response to a similar proposal, SB 206 (2019), officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** assumed the proposal would result in no cost to their organization.

In response to a similar proposal, SB 206 (2019), officials from the **Francis Howell School District** assumed this proposal would have a minimal positive fiscal impact for district, as we would have to publish bid notices less frequently.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

In response to a similar proposal, SB 206 (2019), officials from the **Springfield Public Schools** assumed a minimal unknown savings and no cost to the district.

In response to a similar proposal, SB 206 (2019), officials from the **Wellsville-Middletown R-1 School District** assumed this proposal has the potential to have a positive fiscal impact on the district.

In response to a similar proposal, SB 206 (2019), officials from the **KIPP St. Louis Charter School** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight assumes there could be a savings to school districts that are no longer required to advertise in the newspaper for certain projects. Oversight will show a fiscal impact of \$0 (no qualifying projects) to an unknown savings.

§178.530 Agricultural Education Pilot Program

In response to a similar proposal, SB 218 (2019), officials from the **DESE** assumed this provision would result in no cost to their organization.

Oversight notes DESE currently has an agricultural education staff and agricultural curriculum content per their webpage on [Agricultural Education](#). Based on DESE's response, Oversight assumes DESE can absorb the administration of this proposal with existing resources.

In response to a similar proposal, SB 218 (2019), officials from the **Wellsville-Middletown R-1 School District** assumed the proposal would have a negative fiscal impact on their organization.

In response to a similar proposal, SB 218 (2019), officials from the **Lee's Summit R-7 School District** assumed this proposal would cost over \$50,000 due to instructional resources and FTE support.

In response to a similar proposal, SB 218 (2019), officials from the **Francis Howell School District** and **Springfield Public Schools** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight notes a school district selected to participate in the pilot program shall agree to implement and fully fund the agricultural education program. Oversight notes some school districts indicated costs for course development, materials and teaching staff to implement this proposal. Oversight will show a range of cost to school districts from \$0 to unknown beginning in FY 2021.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Section 210.110 Care and Custody

In response to a similar proposal, Perfected HCS for HB 739, officials from the **Department of Social Services** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization.

In response to a similar proposal, HB 1976 (2018), officials from the **Shell Knob School District #78** stated the proposal would likely result in an increased cost to the district to cover extra liability insurance.

In response to a similar proposal, HB 1976 (2018), officials from the **Kirksville R-III School District** assumed this proposal would have an unknown negative fiscal impact on Kirksville schools if the personnel time is during the class day.

In response to a similar proposal, HB 1976 (2018), officials from the **Summersville R2 School District** stated this proposal would have an unknown fiscal impact on their school district.

Oversight assumes the proposal would have an unknown negative fiscal impact to school districts.

Senate Amendment 1 Section 168.221 Hearing Officer

Oversight assume this provision is permissive and will have no fiscal impact.

Promulgate Rules

In response to a similar proposal, officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** stated many bills considered by the General Assembly include provisions allowing or requiring agencies to submit rules and regulations to implement the act. 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 \$5,000. The SOS recognizes that this is a small amount and does not expect that additional funding would be required to meet these costs. However, the SOS also recognizes that many such bills may be passed by the General Assembly in a given year and that collectively the costs may be in excess of what the office can sustain with the core budget. Therefore, the SOS reserves the right to request funding for the cost of supporting administrative rules requirements should the need arise based on a review of the finally approved bills signed by the governor.

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 require additional resources.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

In response to a similar proposal, officials from the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules (JCAR)** assumed this proposal is not anticipated to cause a fiscal impact beyond its current appropriation.

Oversight assumes JCAR will be able to administer any rules resulting from this proposal with existing resources.

FISCAL IMPACT -
State Government

	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	Fully Implemented (FY 2024)
GENERAL REVENUE				
<u>Cost</u> - DHE - A+ expansion for dual credit & dual enrollment \$160.545	\$0	(Could exceed \$22,397,645)	(Could exceed \$22,549,216)	(Could exceed \$22,724,367)
<u>Cost</u> - DHE \$160.545				
Personal Service	\$0	(\$29,167)	(\$35,350)	(\$37,514)
Fringe Benefits	\$0	(\$19,397)	(\$23,383)	(\$24,814)
Equipment and Expense	<u>\$0</u>	<u>(\$10,717)</u>	<u>(\$4,478)</u>	<u>(\$4,752)</u>
Total Cost - DHE	\$0	(\$59,281)	(\$63,211)	(\$67,080)
FTE Change - DHE	0 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE
<u>Cost</u> - DHE \$160.545 modifications to the A+ web application - ranged from ITSD estimate of contracting out (\$257,580 in FY 2020) to hiring 2 additional FTE	\$0	(\$133,263 to \$257,580)	\$0 to (\$161,262)	\$0 to (\$171,133)
FTE Change - ITSD	0 FTE	0 or 2 FTE	0 or 2 FTE	0 or 2 FTE
<u>Transfer Out</u> - to the School Turnaround Fund \$161.1105	\$0	\$0	\$0 or (Unknown, Could exceed \$216,666)	\$0 or (Unknown, Could exceed \$1,300,000)
<u>Transfer Out</u> - to the School Intervention Fund \$161.1110	\$0	\$0	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)

FISCAL IMPACT -
State Government

	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	Fully Implemented (FY 2024)
GENERAL REVENUE				
<u>Transfer Out</u> - to the School Recognition and Reward Fund §161.1120	\$0	\$0	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<u>Transfer Out</u> - to the State School Moneys Fund §163.018	\$0	\$0 or (Unknown, Could exceed \$100,000)	\$0 or (Unknown, Could exceed \$100,000)	\$0 or (Unknown, Could exceed \$100,000)
<u>Cost</u> - DESE - ITSD - costs (ranged from contracting out programming (\$89,100) to hiring additional FTE IT Specialist) §163.031 FTE Change - ITSD	\$0 0 FTE	(\$89,100) to (\$66,632) 0 or 1 FTE	\$0 to (\$80,631) 0 or 1 FTE	\$0 to (\$85,566) 0 or 1 FTE
<u>Cost</u> - distribution of Financial Inst. Taxes §163.031	\$0	\$0	(\$8,402,213)	(\$8,402,213)

FISCAL IMPACT -
State Government

**GENERAL
REVENUE**

Cost - DESE -

\$167.890 - \$167.898

	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	Fully Implemented (FY 2024)
Personal Service	\$0	Could exceed (\$39,960)	Could exceed (\$48,432)	Could exceed (\$51,396)
Fringe Benefits	\$0	(\$22,686)	(\$27,369)	(\$29,044)
Equipment and Expense	<u>\$0</u>	<u>(\$8,123)</u>	<u>(\$7,403)</u>	<u>(\$7,856)</u>
Total Cost - DESE	\$0	(\$70,769)	(\$83,204)	(\$88,297)
FTE Change - DESE	0 FTE	Could exceed 1 FTE	Could exceed 1 FTE	Could exceed 1 FTE

Cost - DESE -

curriculum

development \$170.020	\$0	\$0 or (\$100,000)	\$0	\$0
-----------------------	-----	-----------------------	-----	-----

Cost - DESE \$170.020

Personal Service	\$0	\$0 or (\$39,960)	\$0 or (\$48,432)	\$0 or (\$51,396)
Fringe Benefits	\$0	(\$22,686)	(\$27,369)	(\$29,044)
Equipment and Expense	<u>\$0</u>	<u>(\$2,956)</u>	<u>(\$1,048)</u>	<u>(\$1,112)</u>
Total Cost - DESE	<u>\$0</u>	<u>(\$65,602)</u>	<u>(\$76,849)</u>	<u>(\$81,553)</u>
FTE Change - DESE	0 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE

**ESTIMATED NET
EFFECT ON
GENERAL
REVENUE**

	<u>\$0</u>	<u>(Could exceed \$22,727,590)</u>	<u>(Could exceed \$31,097,844)</u>	<u>(Could exceed \$31,281,957)</u>
--	-------------------	---	---	---

Estimated Net FTE Change for GR	0 FTE	3 to Could Exceed 6 FTE	3 to Could Exceed 6 FTE	3 to Could Exceed 6 FTE
------------------------------------	-------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

<u>FISCAL IMPACT -</u> <u>State Government</u> Continued	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	Fully Implemented (FY 2024)
SCHOOL TURNAROUND FUND				
<u>Transfer In - from</u> General Revenue §161.1105	\$0	\$0	\$0 or Unknown, could exceed \$216,666	\$0 or Unknown, could exceed \$1,300,000
<u>Income - gifts,</u> contributions, bequests, or grants §161.1105	\$0	\$0	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Cost - payments to</u> school turnaround experts and administration costs §161.1105	<u>\$0</u>	\$0	\$0 or (Unknown, Could exceed <u>\$216,333</u>)	\$0 or (Unknown, could exceed <u>\$1,300,000</u>)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE SCHOOL TURNAROUND FUND	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT -</u> <u>State Government</u> Continued	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	Fully Implemented (FY 2024)
SCHOOL INTERVENTION FUND				
<u>Transfer In</u> - from General Revenue §161.1110	\$0	\$0	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Income</u> - gifts, contributions, bequests, or grants §161.1110	\$0	\$0	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Cost</u> - grants to local educational agencies §161.1110	\$0	\$0	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE SCHOOL INTERVENTION FUND	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT -</u> <u>State Government</u> Continued	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	Fully Implemented (FY 2024)
SCHOOL RECOGNITION AND REWARD FUND				
<u>Transfer In</u> - from General Revenue §161.1120	\$0	\$0	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Income</u> - gifts, contributions, bequests, or grants §161.1120	\$0	\$0	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Cost</u> - grants to local educational agencies §161.1120	<u>\$0</u>	\$0	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE SCHOOL RECOGNITION AND REWARD FUND	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

FISCAL IMPACT -
State Government
 Continued

Fully
 Implemented
 (FY 2024)

FY 2019

FY 2020

FY 2021

**STATE SCHOOL
 MONEYS FUND**

<u>Transfer In</u> - from General Revenue Fund §163.018	\$0	\$0 or Unknown, Could exceed \$100,000	\$0 or Unknown, Could exceed \$100,000	\$0 or Unknown, Could exceed \$100,000
---	-----	---	---	---

<u>Transfer Out</u> - distribution to school districts §163.018	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0 or</u> <u>(Unknown,</u> <u>Could exceed</u> <u>\$100,000)</u>	<u>\$0 or</u> <u>(Unknown,</u> <u>Could exceed</u> <u>\$100,000)</u>	<u>\$0 or</u> <u>(Unknown,</u> <u>Could exceed</u> <u>\$100,000)</u>
---	------------	---	---	---

**ESTIMATED NET
 EFFECT ON STATE
 SCHOOL MONEYS
 FUND**

\$0

\$0

\$0

\$0

**CRIMINAL
 RECORDS
 SYSTEM FUND**

<u>Income</u> - MHP - increase in background check fees	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$71,148 to</u> <u>Could exceed</u> <u>\$241,384</u>	<u>\$71,148 to</u> <u>Could exceed</u> <u>\$241,384</u>	<u>\$71,148 to</u> <u>Could exceed</u> <u>\$241,384</u>
---	------------	---	---	---

**ESTIMATED NET
 EFFECT ON THE
 CRIMINAL
 RECORDS
 SYSTEM FUND**

\$0

\$71,148 to
Could exceed
\$241,384

\$71,148 to
Could exceed
\$241,384

\$71,148 to
Could exceed
\$241,384

FISCAL IMPACT -
Local Government

**LOCAL
 POLITICAL
 SUBDIVISIONS**

	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	Fully Implemented (FY 2024)
Revenue - grants from School Intervention Fund §161.1110	\$0	\$0	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
Revenue - grants from School Recognition Fund §161.1120	\$0	\$0	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
Cost - administration of School Turnaround Program §161.1080 to §161.1130	\$0	\$0	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
Cost - sexual abuse training for school board members and students (§162.203)	\$0	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
Transfer In - from State School Moneys Fund §163.018	\$0	\$0 or Unknown, Could exceed \$100,000	\$0 or Unknown, Could exceed \$100,000	\$0 or Unknown, Could exceed \$100,000
Revenue - Financial Institution Taxes distribution §163.031	\$0	\$0	\$8,402,213	\$8,402,213

FISCAL IMPACT -
Local Government

	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	Fully Implemented (FY 2024)
LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS				
<u>Cost</u> - to Public School Districts - for transportation of transfer students §167.241	\$0	\$0 or (Could exceed \$600,000)	\$0 or (Could exceed \$600,000)	\$0 or (Could exceed \$600,000)
<u>Cost</u> - to Public Schools - for transfer students §167.125 and §167.895	\$0	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<u>Income</u> - to Public Schools or Charter Schools - for transfer students §167.125 and §167.895	\$0	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Cost</u> - Potential salary adjustments from credit earned on externships §168.025	\$0	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)
<u>Cost</u> - to Public Schools and Charter Schools - background check fees §168.133	\$0	\$0 to (\$101,062 to Could exceed \$342,874)	\$0 to (\$101,062 to Could exceed \$342,874)	\$0 to (\$101,062 to Could exceed \$342,874)

FISCAL IMPACT -
Local Government

	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	Fully Implemented (FY 2024)
LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS				
<u>Cost</u> - School Districts - social and emotional health education course development, materials and teaching staff - §170.020	\$0	\$0	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<u>Cost</u> - School Districts - delayed start date §171.031	\$0	\$0	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)
<u>Savings</u> - transportation savings from alternative methods of instruction §171.033	\$0	\$0	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown
<u>Savings</u> - on operation costs if not required to make-up more than six days of school §171.033.6	Unknown	\$0	\$0	\$0
<u>Savings</u> - no longer required to advertise in the newspaper for certain projects §177.086	\$0	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown

FISCAL IMPACT -
Local Government

	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	Fully Implemented (FY 2024)
LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS				

Cost - School
 Districts -
 agricultural course
 development,
 materials and
 teaching staff -
 \$178.530

\$0 \$0 \$0 to (Unknown) \$0 to (Unknown)

Cost - School
 Districts - increase
 in costs for
 insurance \$210.110

\$0 (Unknown) (Unknown) (Unknown)

**ESTIMATED NET
 EFFECT ON
 LOCAL
 POLITICAL
 SUBDIVISIONS**

Unknown Unknown to
(Could exceed
\$842,874) Could exceed
\$7,559,339 to
(Unknown) Could exceed
\$7,559,339 to
(Unknown)

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

Oversight assumes there could be a fiscal impact to small businesses as a result of this proposal.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

Section 160.410 Free and Reduced Lunch Preference

This proposal could allow Charter Schools to give preference for admission to students who are eligible for free and reduced lunch.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION (continued)

Section 160.545 A+ Dual Credit and Dual Enrollment

This act modifies the A+ Schools program by adding a requirement that high schools in the program shall demonstrate a commitment to ensure that all students earn credits towards any type of college degree while in high school. The Department of Higher Education shall establish a procedure for the reimbursement of the cost of tuition and fees for any dual-credit or dual-enrollment course offered to a student in high school in association with a public community college or vocational or technical school.

Currently, to be eligible for the program, a student must have attended a high school in Missouri for at least three years prior to graduation. This act provides that the student must have attended a high school in the state for at least two years.

The Department shall, under this act, distribute reimbursements first to community college or vocational or technical school students, then to any dual-credit or dual-enrollment students, on the basis of financial need.

Section 161.700 Definition of Holocaust

Under current law, as used in the Holocaust Education and Awareness Commission Act, the term "holocaust" is defined as the period from 1933 through 1945 when 6 million Jews and millions of others were murdered in Nazi concentration camps as part of a structured, state-sanctioned program of genocide. This act removes "in Nazi concentration camps" from the definition of "holocaust".

Section 160.2500 Religious Expression

A public school district shall not discriminate against any person on the basis of a religious viewpoint or religious expression. Oversight assumes the proposal will have no fiscal impact on school districts.

Sections 161.1080 - 161.1130 School Turnaround Act

This bill establishes that Sections 161.1080 to 161.1130, RSMo shall be known as the "School Turnaround Act." The bill states beginning September 1, 2020 and subject to appropriations, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education shall use an outcome-based measure to set criteria for the designation of schools in need of intervention and specifies a time line for the initial remedial year (Section 161.1090 and Section 161.1095).

The bill specifies that before August 30, 2020, the department must identify two or more approved independent school turnaround experts of which schools in need of intervention may partner. The bill specifies that the department shall award contracts to independent school

turnaround experts and that governing boards shall not be required to pay independent school turnaround experts. The bill also establishes the "School Turnaround Fund" for the payment of contracts (Section 161.1105).

The bill specifies that the department shall review school turnaround plans within 30 days of submission. Criteria for approval is specified in the bill as well as an appeal process. The bill establishes the "School Intervention Fund," to fund interventions identified in approved school turnaround plans (Section 161.1110).

The bill specifies that a school in need of intervention that does not meet the exit criteria within three school years may petition the department for an extension to continue school improvement efforts for up to two years (Section 161.1115).

Sections 162.068, 162.203 and 170.045 Sexual Misconduct

This bill requires full disclosure between school districts about a former employee when requested, specifically regarding any confirmed violation of a board policy related to abusive behavior toward a student. Additionally, any school, before offering employment, must contact the district or charter school that previously employed the prospective hire and request information (Section 162.068, RSMo).

The bill increases the training hours for initial school board members from 16 to 18 hours and 30 minutes, and further requires that the training include two hours and 30 minutes of sexual abuse training. Additionally, returning board members must take at least one hour of refresher training annually (Section 162.203).

This bill requires that schools provide age appropriate sexual abuse training to students in grades six and up. The training will be developed by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (Section 170.045).

Section 162.081 Intervention Powers

This act allows the State Board of Education to lapse the corporate organization of all or part of an unaccredited school district. If the State Board appoints a special administrative board for the operation of a part of an unaccredited school district, the State Board shall determine an equitable apportionment of state and federal aid for the part of the district. In addition, the school district shall provide local revenue in proportion to the weighted average daily attendance of the part governed by the special administrative board.

The State Board may appoint members of the elected board to a special administrative board, but members of the elected board shall not comprise more than 49% of the special administrative board.

When the State Board determines another form of governance for an unaccredited district, that other form of governance shall be subject to the following provisions of law: it will retain the authority granted to a board of education; it will expire at the end of the third year of its appointment unless reauthorized; it will not be deemed to be the state or a state agency; and it will not be considered a successor entity for purposes of employment contracts, unemployment compensation, or any other purpose.

If the State Board reasonably believes that a school district is unlikely to provide for the minimum number of school hours required in a school term due to financial difficulty, the State Board may, prior to the start of the school term, allow continued governance by the existing district school board under terms and conditions established by the State Board. As an alternative, the State Board may lapse the corporate organization of the district and implement one of the options available to the State Board to intervene in an unaccredited district. However, this provision shall not apply to any district solely on the basis of financial difficulty resulting from paying tuition and providing transportation for transfer students.

Section 163.018 Early Childhood Education Contracts

This bill expands the eligibility of children between the age of three and five to qualify for a district's or charter school's calculation of average daily attendance if they attend an early childhood education program under contract with a school. Contracted programs must follow standards as outlined in the bill, and be established by the State Board of Education. Staff members must undergo a background check (Section 168.133, RSMo).

Section 163.031 Financial Institutions Taxes

Under this act, beginning January 1, 2020, any school district that receives revenue from the income tax on banking institutions, credit institutions, credit unions and savings and loan associations shall report the amount of such revenue received by the district to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

Using such data, the Department shall determine the amount of revenue the district would have received from the taxes but for the reduction in such income taxes, and remit said amount to each applicable district within 30 days of the end of each calendar year. The amount remitted to the district shall be the total of the revenue received by the district from the tax, times 1.5625, minus the total of the revenue received from the tax.

Such payments shall be in addition to payments made under the foundation formula.

Section 167.131 and 167.132 Tuition Payments

The board of education of each district in Missouri that does not maintain a high school offering work through the twelfth grade shall pay tuition as calculated by the receiving district, and

provide transportation for each student resident therein who has completed the work of the highest grade offered in the schools of the district and who attends an accredited public high school.

This provision does not apply to students who attend an approved charter school in the same or adjoining county.

Under this act, the tuition rate paid by a sending school district to the receiving district is either the tuition rate set by the receiving district or the receiving approved charter school, or the state adequacy target plus the average sum produced per child by the local tax effort above the state adequacy target of the sending district, whichever is less.

Section 167.241 Transportation of Pupils

For transferring students, the district of residence is required to provide transportation only to school districts or approved charter schools designated by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. DESE must designate at least one accredited district or approved charter school to which the district of residence shall provide transportation, but if the designated district or charter school reaches full student capacity and is unable to receive additional students, DESE shall designate at least one additional accredited district or approved charter school to which the district of residence must provide transportation.

Section 167.890 Transfers and Transient Student Data

DESE shall compile and maintain student performance data scores of all transient and transfer students enrolled in districts other than their resident districts and make the data available on the Missouri Comprehensive Data System. Personally identifiable information shall not be accessible on the database.

Sections 167.895 Transfers

Any student may transfer to another public school in the student's district of residence if such student is enrolled and has attended, for the full semester immediately prior to requesting the transfer, an attendance center, as defined in the act, that is located within an unaccredited district and that has an annual performance report score consistent with a classification of unaccredited. However, such transfers shall not be allowed if the transfers result in a class size or assigned enrollment in a receiving school that exceeds the standards promulgated in the Missouri School Improvement Program resource standards. Any student wishing to transfer to a magnet school, an academically selective school, or a school with a competitive entrance process shall meet those admissions requirements in order to attend.

The school board of each unaccredited district shall determine the capacity at each of the district's attendance centers that have an APR score consistent with the classification of

accredited. The district's school board is responsible for coordinating transfers within the district.

The school board of each unaccredited district shall annually make a report to DESE or its designee with the following information: the number of available slots in attendance centers that have APR scores consistent with the classification of accredited, the number of students who request to transfer within the district, and the number of such transfers that are granted.

Any student who is eligible to transfer within his or her district but who is unable to do so due to a lack of capacity in the attendance centers in his or her district of residence may apply to DESE or its designee to transfer to:

- 1) An attendance center that is located within an accredited district that is located in the same or an adjoining county and that has an APR score consistent with a classification of accredited; or
- 2) An approved charter school located in another district in the same or an adjoining county. A student who is eligible to begin kindergarten or first grade at an attendance center located within an unaccredited district that has an APR score consistent with the classification of unaccredited and that offers classes above the second grade level may apply to DESE for a transfer to one of the two schools described immediately above. Such student is required to reside in the attendance area of the unaccredited school on March 1 preceding the school year of first attendance. A student who does not apply by March 1 is required to enroll and attend for one semester to become eligible.

Any student who does not maintain residency in the attendance area of his or her attendance center in the district of residence loses the eligibility to transfer. With exception as set forth in the act, a student who transfers but later withdraws shall also lose eligibility to transfer. No student enrolled in and attending an attendance center that does not offer classes above the second grade is eligible to transfer under these provisions.

An unaccredited district, provisionally accredited district, unaccredited attendance center, or provisionally accredited attendance center is not eligible to receive transfer students, except that, within an unaccredited district, students may transfer from unaccredited attendance centers to accredited attendance centers, and a transfer student who chooses to attend a provisionally accredited attendance center in the district of residence shall be allowed to transfer to the school if there is an available slot.

If a receiving district becomes unaccredited or provisionally accredited, or if an approved charter school loses such status, any students who previously transferred to the district or charter school shall have the opportunity to remain enrolled or to transfer to another district or approved charter school without losing their eligibility to transfer.

No attendance center that has received two consecutive APR scores consistent with a classification of provisionally accredited for the years immediately preceding the year in which it seeks to enroll transfer students may receive transfer students, regardless of its State Board classification designation, except that any student who was granted a transfer to the attendance center prior to the effective date of the act may remain enrolled in that attendance center.

Districts and charter schools that receive student transfers are not required to: exceed to class size and assignment enrollment standards of its approved policy on class size; hire additional classroom teachers; or construct additional classrooms unless the school board of the receiving district or the receiving approved charter school's governing board has approved the action. By July 15, 2019, the board of education of each available receiving district and the governing board of each approved charter school shall set the number of transfer students they are able to receive for the 2019-20 school year. The board shall then set such numbers annually by February 1. They shall also publish such numbers and shall not be required to accept any transfer students that would cause it to exceed such number.

Available receiving districts and approved charter schools shall adopt a policy establishing a tuition rate annually for transfer students by February 1.

If an unaccredited school becomes provisionally accredited or accredited without provisions, any resident student who transferred under one of the transfer options shall be permitted to continue his or her educational program in that education option through the completion of middle school, junior high, or high school as specified in the act.

When costs associated with the provision of special education and related services to a student with a disability exceed the tuition amount, the transfer student's district of residence shall remain responsible for paying the excess cost to the receiving district or charter school. When the receiving district is a component district of a special school district, the transfer student's district of residence shall contract with the special school district for the entirety of the costs to provide special education and related services, excluding transportation. The special school district may contract with a district operating an unaccredited school for the provision of transportation of a student with a disability. A special school district shall continue to provide special education and related services, with the exception of transportation, to a student with a disability transferring from an unaccredited school within a component district to an accredited school within the same or a different component district within the special school district.

When the St. Louis City School District operates an unaccredited school, it shall remain responsible for the provision of special education and related services, including transportation, to students with disabilities. A special school district in an adjoining county may contract with the St. Louis City School District for the reimbursement of special education services provided

by the special school district for transfer students who are residents of the unaccredited district. Regardless of whether transportation is identified as a related service within a student's individualized education program, a receiving district that is not part of a special school district shall not be responsible for providing transportation to a student transferring under these provisions. A district operating an unaccredited school may contract with a receiving district that is not part of a special school district for transportation of students with disabilities. When a district other than St. Louis City operates an unaccredited school, it may contract with a receiving district that is not part of a special school district in the same or an adjoining county for the reimbursement of special education and related services provided by the receiving district for transfer students who are residents of the district operating an unaccredited school. These provisions contain an emergency clause.

Section 167.898 Eligible Districts

By July 15, 2019, and by January 1 annually, each district eligible to receive transfer students shall report to DESE the number of its available enrollment slots in accredited schools by grade level. Each unaccredited district shall report the number of available enrollment slots in the district's accredited attendance centers. Each approved charter school eligible to receive transfer students shall report the number of available enrollment slots by the same dates. DESE shall make information and assistance available to parents or guardians who intend to transfer their child using one of the transfer options. The parent or guardian who intends to transfer his or her child shall send initial notification to DESE by March 1 for enrollment in the subsequent school year. DESE shall assign transfer students as space allows.

When assigning students to approved charter schools, the DESE shall coordinate with each approved charter school and its admissions process if capacity is insufficient to enroll all students who submit a timely application. An approved charter school shall not be required to receive any transfer student that would require it to institute a lottery procedure for determining the admission of resident students. DESE shall give first priority to students who live in the same household with family members within the first or second degree of consanguinity or affinity who have already transferred and who apply to transfer to the same accredited school. If insufficient grade-appropriate enrollment slots are available for a student to transfer, that student shall receive first priority the following school year.

DESE shall consider the following factors in assigning schools: the student's or parent's choice of the receiving school, which shall be the most important factor; the best interests of the student; availability of transportation funding; and distance and travel time. DESE shall not consider student academic performance; free and reduced price lunch status; or athletic ability in assigning a student to a school.

DESE may deny a transfer to a student, who in the most recent school year, has been suspended

from school two or more times or has been suspended for an act of school violence, as specified in the act. A student who is denied a transfer for this reason has the right to an in-person meeting with a representative of DESE. DESE shall develop administrative guidelines to provide common standards for determining disruptive behavior that shall include criteria under the Safe Schools Act.

Section 168.025 Teacher Externships

This bill provides a definition for "teacher externship" for Section 168.025, RSMo.

The Department of Economic Development and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education shall adopt requirements for teacher externships along with an equivalency schedule to allow externship hours to be considered for increases similar to graduate-level coursework on the salary schedule for districts before July 1, 2020.

This bill sunsets five years after its effective date.

Section 168.133 Screened Volunteers

Under this act, school districts are required to conduct a criminal background check on screened volunteers, which shall mean any person who assists a school by providing uncompensated service and who may be left alone with students. Volunteers that are not screened shall not be left alone with a student or have access to student records.

170.020 Social and Emotional Education Pilot Program

This proposal authorizes DESE to establish a voluntary pilot program, beginning in the 2020-2021 school year, to provide for social and emotional health education in elementary schools.

Section 171.031 Delayed Start Date

Beginning with school year 2020-21, this bill modifies the law governing school start dates by removing the option that school districts may set an opening date more than 14 calendar days prior to the first Monday in September.

Section 171.033 Alternative Instruction Plans

Beginning with the 2020-21 school year, this bill allows a district to use an alternative instruction plan approved by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education for up to 36 hours due to inclement weather, as specified in the bill.

Section 171.033.6 Make-Up Days

This act exempts school districts from the required number of days school districts are required to make up for days lost due to inclement weather for the 2018-2019 school year. Under this act,

school districts would only be required to make up six days lost due to inclement weather, rather than six days plus half the number of days lost in excess of six days.

Section 177.086 Construction of Facilities

Currently, any school district authorizing the construction of facilities that may cost more than \$15,000 shall advertise in a newspaper and comply with certain bidding requirements. This act increases that amount to \$50,000.

Section 178.530 Agricultural Education Pilot Program

Under this act, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education is authorized to develop a pilot program, beginning in the 2020-2021 school year, to provide for agricultural education in elementary schools in the state. The purpose of the program is to determine whether and how to implement an elementary agricultural education program statewide.

The Department shall select a minimum of one public elementary school from each of the 16 geographic areas across the state designated by the Department. In determining such areas, the Department may use the sixteen Future Farmers of America Association areas. The local school board for each elementary school selected to be in the pilot program shall agree to implement and fully fund an elementary agricultural education program in such school and to continue to provide such elementary agricultural education program for a period of at least 3 years. The local school district may employ an agricultural education teacher to provide such program for the elementary school.

The Department and local school districts shall collaborate to establish the curriculum for each elementary agricultural education program, and such curriculum must meet the criteria set forth in the act.

The Department shall provide for a program evaluation regarding the success and impact of the pilot program and shall report the results of such evaluation to the relevant House and Senate committees on agriculture and education. The Department is required to maintain an adequate number of full-time employees, certified in agricultural education and distributed regionally throughout the state.

Section 210.110 Care and Custody

This bill adds to the list of people responsible for the care, custody, and control of a child for purposes of child abuse: school personnel, contractors, or volunteers if the person has established a relationship with the child through the school or school-related activities, even if the alleged abuse or neglect by the school personnel, contractor, or volunteer occurred outside of school hours, off school grounds, or outside the scope of school functions.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Office of the State Treasurer
Department of Higher Education
Department of Economic Development
Department of Public Safety - Missouri State Highway Patrol
Department of Social Services
Department of Mental Health
Department of Health and Senior Services
Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration
Missouri Office of Prosecution Services
Department of Revenue
Springfield Public Schools
Wellsville-Middletown R-1 School District
Rockwood School District
Parkway Schools
Bakersfield R-IV School District
Raymore-Peculiar School District
Columbia Public Schools
Bellevue R-II School District
Francis Howell School District
Osborn School
KIPP St. Louis Charter School
Shell Knob School District
Maries County R-1 School
Carondelet Learning Academy
Kirksville R-III School District
Maries County R-1 School District
Francis Howell School District
Missouri State University
State Technical College of Missouri

L.R. No. 1373-10
Bill No. SS#2 for SCS for HCS for HB 604 with SA 1
Page 48 of 48
May 16, 2019

SOURCES OF INFORMATION (continued)

University of Missouri System
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules
Office of the Secretary of State



Kyle Rieman
Director
May 16, 2019

Ross Strobe
Assistant Director
May 16, 2019