

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 0999H.11C
 Bill No.: HCS for SS for SCS for SB 68
 Subject: Education, Elementary and Secondary; Department of Elementary and Secondary Education; Children and Minors; Teachers; Firearms
 Type: Original
 Date: April 14, 2025

Bill Summary: This proposal creates provisions relating to safe school environments.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2029)
General Revenue*	(\$3,050,652) or Could exceed (\$12,172,221)	(\$2,176,522) or Could exceed (\$9,666,999)	(\$2,203,593) or Could exceed (\$9,856,198)	(\$2,235,002) or Could exceed (\$10,052,892)
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	(\$3,050,652) or Could exceed (\$12,172,221)	(\$2,176,522) or Could exceed (\$9,666,999)	(\$2,203,593) or Could exceed (\$9,856,198)	(\$2,235,002) or Could exceed (\$10,052,892)

*Subject to an appropriation by the General Assembly (§160.485 & §160.663), in order to implement provisions of this proposal Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) would be required to provide bleeding control kits and anti-intruder window and door locks to school districts that will exceed the \$250,000 threshold.

*Oversight notes in order for the DESE to meet the requirements of this proposal they will need to develop and revise performance level descriptors, related assessments, notifications, and meetings for Section 160.522. In addition, DESE estimates cost for childcare for Adult High schools.

*§163.045 allows for the potential that some schools will become eligible for additional (1% up to 2%) state aid payments that otherwise would not have been eligible. Oversight assumes this cost would not exceed \$250,000.

*Oversight notes that Section 161.670 of the proposal states that any virtual school or program **may** administer any statewide assessment required pursuant to the provisions of section 160.518 in a virtual setting that aligns with the student’s regular academic instruction.

*§167.151, the amount of fiscal impact to the state depends upon the number of students that attend a different school district based on children whose parent is regular employee or contractor of a nonresident district. Oversight notes a difference in state aid paid to separate school districts (ranges from under \$1,000 per student to over \$8,000 per student). Therefore, Oversight assumes the net impact to General Revenue would be an unknown cost to an unknown savings for General Revenue. Oversight assumes this would result in a minimal number of transfers and therefore, would not exceed the \$250,000 threshold.

*Oversight notes section 167.151 also states that resident school districts may still be allowed to count students that transferred out in their weighted average daily attendance (ADA) count used in the foundation formula calculation. Section 163.036 states school districts **may** use an estimate of the weighted ADA for the current year, or the weighted ADA for the immediately preceding year, or the weighted ADA attendance for the second preceding year, whichever is greater. This could result in the state paying the resident district and the transfer district in the same year for a student. However, since Oversight is unable to determine which year each school district will use in future years to determine the amount of state aid each school district is entitled to (weighted ADA), Oversight will, for purposes of this fiscal note, assume the savings/losses will occur immediately.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2029)
State Facility Maintenance and Operations Fund (0501)*	(\$357,421)	(\$436,851)	(\$444,956)	(\$453,853)
Total Estimated Net Effect on Other State Funds	(\$357,421)	(\$436,851)	(\$444,956)	(\$453,853)

*Oversight notes cost for additional 2 FTE required by OA-FMDC to implement §160.077.

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2029)
Federal Funds*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Estimated Net Effect on All Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

*Income and distributions net to zero.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2029)
General Revenue	13-22 FTE	13-22 FTE	13-22 FTE	13-22 FTE
State Facility Maintenance and Operations Fund (0501)	2 FTE	2 FTE	2 FTE	2 FTE
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	15-24 FTE	15-24 FTE	15-24 FTE	15-24 FTE

- Estimated Net Effect (expenditures or reduced revenues) expected to exceed \$250,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act or at full implementation of the act.
- Estimated Net Effect (savings or increased revenues) expected to exceed \$250,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act or at full implementation of the act.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2029)
Local Government*	Unknown or (Unknown)	Unknown or (Unknown)	Unknown or (Unknown)	Unknown or (Unknown)

*§ 160.077 reflects the transfer in from federal funds and costs to school districts for lead remediation net to zero.

*§160.482 would have cost to school districts for the establishment of cardiac emergency response teams and the placement of automated external defibrillators (AEDs) throughout the school campuses.

*§160.045 includes the potential that some schools will become eligible for additional (1% up to 2%) state aid payments that otherwise would not have been eligible.

*§170.014 includes a potential cost to public schools and charter schools that currently use a three-cueing system model of reading instruction to implement and purchase materials for a new literacy system.

*§167.151 has potential fiscal impact to the school districts depending upon the number of students that attend a different school district based on children whose parent is regular employee or contractors of a non-resident district.

*§168.025 includes potential costs for salary adjustments from credit earned on externships.

*Fiscal impact includes the costs for potential administrative, training, and various other costs to local education agencies to implement the provisions of this proposal. Oversight assumes the fiscal impact could be significant.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

§160.077 - Get the Lead Out of School Drinking Water Act

Oversight notes that DHSS provided that the testing program outlined in 701.200 was voluntary and has been superseded by the GLOS program/statutes.

DHSS provided the information on the table below that shows the expenditures of the GLOS program since implementation.

	SFY22	SFY23	SFY24	YTD SFY25	Total
PS	0	33,351.06	237,951.26	175,676.97	446,979.29
EE	0	-	8,302.57	17,100.73	25,403.30
Total PS & EE		33,351.06	246,253.83	192,777.70	472,382.59
GLOS School Invoices	0		173,589.00	4,182,102.11	4,355,691.11
TOTALS for All	0	33,351.06	419,842.83	4,374,879.81	4,828,073.70

Upon further inquiry with DHSS, **Oversight** notes that the GLOS school invoices are reimbursed with federal monies.

Oversight notes, TAFP HB 3020 (2023) appropriated \$27 million for grants to schools for lead remediation from the Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery – Health and Economic Impacts Fund (2463) which accounts for America Rescue Plan moneys.

In response to similar legislation, SB 581 (2025), officials from the **Office of Administration (OA)** assumed section 160.077 requires schools that receive state funding to provide drinking water with a lead concentration level below five parts per billion. The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) operates state schools that would need to meet this requirement. In order to be in compliance, the Office of Administration's Division of Facilities Maintenance, Design and Construction (OA-FMDC) would schedule lead testing at each DESE school to determine the lead concentration level. OA-FMDC would need additional staff and time to schedule the testing and track the results. If the test results at a location are above the standard, testing is required every five years. Those schools with water sources that test below the standard will require remediation which could consist of adding filters or replacing fixtures. Once this work is completed, the source would need to be tested again to see if the standard has been met. OA-FMDC will need to track every water source at every school to determine which sources have been tested and met the standard or if a source requires remediation and track all testing for each source. Based on reports from each DESE school, OA-FMDC has determined there are 1,048 sources that must be tested. OA-FMDC anticipates the cost per hour for testing, reporting and remediation to be \$24.81/hour and would take 2.00 Specialized Trades Workers to

complete the test scheduling of 20% of all sources annually and providing maintenance so that each source tests above the standard. The tracking of each test and its pass/fail, additional testing required, maintenance work performed at each source and when other testing would be required would be completed by 0.50 Administrative Support Professional.

Oversight assumes the OA is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of activity each year. Oversight assumes OA could absorb the costs for a partial FTE in the role of Admin Support Professional. If multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties at substantial costs, OA could request funding through the appropriations process. Therefore, Oversight will reflect the cost as estimated by OA for the two specialized trades workers in the fiscal note.

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** assume the provision will have no fiscal impact on their organization. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these organizations.

In response to similar legislation, HB 995 (2025), officials from **Washington School District** assumed with 11 different school buildings from an Early Learning Center, 7 Elementary Schools, Middle School, High School, and Career center, they initially tested 467 water outlets with 335 meeting the statutory level of 5 ppb or less. That testing cost and remediation cost the district over \$50,000 to exceed statutory levels that are higher than restaurant facilities are expected to be tested at. With this new bill, they are looking at the potential of an additional \$10,000-\$15,000.

Oversight notes the proposal requires that lead filters meet the standards set by the Department of Natural Resources (DNR). Oversight has no way to determine how many filters would need to be replaced or installed with each school district. Oversight assumes that there will be an unknown cost to school districts if their test proves the water source is contaminated. Oversight will reflect a zero or unknown cost to schools to install new filters in the fiscal note.

Oversight assumes there will be a cost for school buildings constructed after January 4, 2014, which were not required to install, maintain, and replace filters but would now have to conduct maintenance and replace filters to be in compliance. Oversight was unable to determine how many schools this would affect. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero or unknown cost to school districts in the fiscal note.

Oversight notes this proposal allows school districts to seek federal funds for reimbursement for compliance incurred under this proposal. Oversight will show a range of impact to Federal Funds of \$0 (no federal funds) to an unknown transfer from Federal Funds to school districts. The fiscal impact to school districts will net to zero if federal funds are available for reimbursement.

Sections 160.261, 160.263, 162.065, 162.069, 167.950, 168.331, 170.048 and – Training Requirements

Officials from **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** assume the provision will have no fiscal impact on their respective organization. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note.

Oversight assumes there could be savings for school districts if annual training is no longer required and districts elect a training schedule other than annually (based on the needs of the school district, each individual employee, or both). Oversight assumes new training, instruction or education required under state law or rules promulgated by DESE must occur for three consecutive years beginning in FY 2026 for each newly hired employee.

Section 160.264 – Funding for absent students

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** assume this section will have an impact to the foundation formula, but it is unknown to what extent. Currently, when a student is not in attendance the school does not receive money, but the proposed bill would require the school to still receive money for students not in attendance. Given this, it is unknown how much additional money will be paid to schools as DESE cannot assume the number of students who will not be in attendance.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero to unknown impact to DESE as it is unclear how many students would not be in attendance but would still receive funding. Oversight will also reflect the corresponding revenue to school districts.

Section 160.480 – Emergency Operations Plan

Officials from **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** assume this section would require significant development of resources/protocols as well as administration of multiple grant opportunities described in Sections 160.485 and 160.663 that exceed the current capacity of Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) staff to implement. Duties that could have been absorbed in prior years can no longer be absorbed at current staff levels. In addition, current DESE staff does not have the experience or expertise in this area to meet the guidelines as outlined and provide technical assistance to districts and charter schools on an ongoing basis. The 2025 review of this language and current resources determined the fiscal impact would include the addition of an FTE Director with associated salary (\$74,808) and expenses.

The development of these standards would require a workgroup to consist of individuals familiar with school safety and emergency planning. Workgroup expenses would include a 13-member group to meet for 12 days to develop the standards at a total cost of \$79,833. DESE has

identified potential resources through the Missouri School Boards Association that could take the place of these workgroups and so will show a potential cost of \$0-\$79,833.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect the estimated impact by DESE in the fiscal note.

In response to similar legislation, HB 416 (2025), officials from the **Phelps County Sheriff's Office** and the **St. Louis County Police Department** both assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organizations.

In response to similar legislation, HCS HB 1946 (2024), officials from the **Eureka Fire Protection District** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note.

Section 160.482 - Cardiac Emergency Response Plans

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** assume the provision will have no fiscal impact on their organization. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for this agency.

Officials from the **Office of Administration – Budget & Planning** assume this section places new requirements on schools/districts that may require new equipment. The General Revenue fund may be impacted to the extent that the General Assembly appropriates monies for these programs.

In response to similar legislation, HB 416 (2025), officials from the **St. Louis County Police Department** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organizations. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note.

Oversight notes the proposal specifies certain guidelines that a cardiac emergency response plan shall integrate, including the establishment of a cardiac emergency response team and the placement of automated external defibrillators (AEDs) throughout the school campus. Based on a brief review, AEDs range in cost from \$1,000 to \$3,000. Oversight assumes if 50% of the 2,408 public school buildings installed AEDS, the cost is estimated at \$1,204,000 using the lower end of the price range (\$1,000 * 1,204). **Oversight** will show a cost that could exceed \$1,204,000 to install AEDs in FY 2027. This amount does not include costs for maintenance, accessories, or staff training.

Regular maintenance costs, including those for replacing batteries, pads, and other supplies as required are difficult to determine and will vary by device and manufacturer specifications. Therefore, Oversight will reflect an unknown cost in FY 28 to replace, maintain or repair AEDs to the school districts on the fiscal note.

This proposal also requires the appropriate school personnel shall be certified in first aid, CPR, and AED use that follow evidence-based guidelines set forth by the American Heart Association or nationally recognized guidelines focused on emergency cardiovascular care. AED training is often provided simultaneously with cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) training. Their costs vary depending on the provider and method of delivery. However, public school employee training costs will vary depending on the implementation decisions and training arrangements school districts make and the number of additional staff that need the training. Therefore, Oversight will show an unknown cost for staff training beginning in FY 2026.

Section 160.485 - Bleeding Control Kits

Officials from **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** state, subject to appropriation, the minimum total cost to provide the bleeding control kits would be \$1,759,700 with ongoing costs to replenish/replace used or expired items.

The cost per bleeding control kit is estimated at \$100 each (kits from different sources cost between \$40 and \$160+). The number of buildings in Missouri that would require kits is 2,406. The Department estimates a minimum of six kits per building (main hall, auditorium, library, gymnasiums, science classrooms, and cafeterias) with the number of kits estimated to be around 14,436. Additional kits to be required at the career-technical centers (57) at a minimum of three per center is estimated to be approximately 171.

The Department assumes that the general assembly will appropriate funds to award grants/reimbursement to local education agencies for the cost of “Stop the Bleed” kits. $14,607 \text{ kits} \times \$100 \text{ per kit} = \$1,460,700$ plus an additional five kits for approximately 25% of schools (598) who have an additional need for high traffic areas or multiple required locations = \$299,000 for a total of \$1,759,700.

Once the program has been implemented throughout Missouri materials will need replaced/restocked as they are used or expire. The Department estimates a minimum cost of \$100,000 with additional potential costs due to inflation.

DESE estimates current staff will develop guidelines as required and administer the grants/reimbursement, however it will increase the workload on current staff and require administrative support. If multiple items of legislation are passed that require additional duties, DESE will seek additional FTE through the appropriation process.

Officials from the **Office of Administration – Budget & Planning** assume this section places new requirements on schools/districts that may require new equipment. The General Revenue fund may be impacted to the extent that the General Assembly appropriates monies for these programs.

In response to a similar proposal, HB 1487 (2024), officials from the **Henry County R-1 School District** assumed the proposal will have a fiscal impact due to monies spent to provide kits.

In response to a similar proposal, HCS for HB 1991 (2020), officials from the **Maries County R-1 School District** assumed the cost would be approximately \$69.99 per classroom: \$68.99 for the Curaplex Stop the Bleed Kit and \$1.00 for the Emergency Thermal Blanket (10 for \$9.95). Fifty five spaces would need one in their school, it would cost them \$3,850 to put them in. They would have to replace the kits when they expire.

In response to a similar proposal, HCS for HB 1722 (2022), **DESE** used an estimated cost per kit of \$35. However, based on their research this past year, DESE estimated the cost to be closer to \$100 per kit based on the average cost of bleeding control kits. For example, the American Red Cross offers a [Professional Bleeding Control Kit](#) for \$122.95. In addition, they indicated some of the cost increase may be related to inflation and supply chain issues.

Ultimately, **Oversight** is uncertain what cost would be realized but notes prices ranged from \$50 to over \$200 per kit based on a brief review. Oversight will show the costs to provide bleeding control kits at \$1,759,700 as estimated by DESE.

Oversight assumes the requirements in this proposal are subject to appropriation by the General Assembly that would cover all costs. Oversight assumes kits will not be used frequently, so restocking and annual training costs will be shown as ‘could exceed (\$100,000)’ in future years.

Section 160.518 & 160.522 – Student Grade-Level Equivalence Data

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** assumed to revise performance-level descriptors and define grade-level equivalence therein, the department would need to conduct on-site review/revise meetings with panelists – meeting costs and stipends for six meeting days with 160 panelists [Four grade-span groups (primary, elementary, middle school, high school) of 10 participants in each of four subjects (mathematics, English language arts, science, social studies).] representing various regions of the state. \$587,040 for all review/revise meetings.

Contractor facilitation of review/revise meetings and generation of new performance level descriptors (PLDs) that define range, threshold and are suitable for reporting. \$65,500 for two years in order to follow up on all requirements.

Psychometric and measurement work to incorporate five new PLDs into the prior four PLD structure. \$175,000

Revise building, district and statewide assessment reporting; revise individual student reports (ISRs) and related material. \$100,000

Costs associated with statute-required notifications and public meetings upon revision of the

MSIP 6 Comprehensive Guide. \$5,000

DESE's **Office of Data System Management (ODSM)** will be involved with the collection of data and reporting including the searchable engine. DESE estimates 20 hours total for time to test and deploy report card changes post ITSD services. The position responsible for the work is a Research Analyst position. At this time DESE can absorb these duties, however, if multiple pieces of legislation are passed that require additional duties that lead to additional FTE needed DESE will seek approval for the needed FTE through the appropriations process.

Oversight notes DESE shall establish panels to review and revise the performance-level descriptors for each academic subject and grade level. The proposal states for the 2026-27 (FY27) school year and all subsequent school years, the school accountability report card shall include information about each student's grade-level equivalence as outlined in the proposal. For simplicity, Oversight will show the total costs as estimated by DESE (\$932,540) in FY26.

Officials from the **Office of Administration – Information Technology (OA-ITSD)** state it is assumed that every new IT project/system will be bid out because all ITSD resources are at full capacity. This project would have to be prioritized by DESE to be worked among DESE's other projects. ITSD assumes the Report Card is a set of data processes (ETLs) that gather data that DESE has collected from districts using the MOSIS application/system. These ETL's will need modified to handle the changes required in this legislation. ITSD estimates the project would take 1,004.40 hours at a contract rate of \$105 for a total cost of \$105,462 in FY26 with on-going support costs of \$21,620 in FY27 and \$22,161 in FY28.

Oversight will show the costs as estimated by OA-ITSD.

In response to similar legislation, HB 371 (2025), officials from the **Washington School District** assumed the financial impact would be for additional training for staff on the new classifications, \$5000 for the first year.

In response to similar legislation, HB 371 (2025), officials from the **Osage County R-I School District** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight does not anticipate a measurable fiscal impact to school districts; therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note.

Section 160.663 – Anti-intruder Door Locks and Windows

Officials from the **DESE** assume they would require anti-intruder door locks on all interior doors and bullet-resistant window film on all exterior doors or entryways. DESE is unable to estimate the number of each that would be required to make all schools compliant as the number of doors, buildings, etc. varies greatly district to district and some districts have instituted these measures. DESE would assume each district would need a minimum of one door lock and roll of bullet-resistant film for each building at a minimum cost of \$125. The number of buildings is 2,406

plus the 57 career-technical centers multiplied by \$125 for a minimum cost of \$307,875. This cost would be up to an unknown amount depending on the total buildings and doors. DESE assumes this would be a one-time grant.

Anti-intruder door locks: \$50 - \$200
Bullet-resistant window film: \$75 - \$250 per roll

In response to a similar proposal, HS for HCS for HB Nos 1108 & 1181 (2023), officials from **DESE** stated Section 160.660.1(3) requires that the state board of education shall add to the school facilities and safety criteria provisions the requirement that each school district building have bullet-resistant doors and windows on all first-floor entryways and bullet resistant glass for each exterior window large enough for an intruder to enter through. Section 160.660.2 makes this requirement subject to a specific appropriation to address school safety.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act funding of \$15 million could be used for the replacement of doors and windows made with bullet-resistant materials. However, DESE cannot require that schools use the BSCA funding on only doors and windows. There are approximately 2,200 public school buildings in Missouri. It is unknown how many currently have bullet-resistant doors and windows. It is also unknown how many doors and windows would need to be replaced. A search on bullet-resistant products showed widely different costs depending on the material and size selected. DESE is unable to estimate an exact cost. The cost is unknown but DESE estimates that it could exceed \$1 million.

Officials from the **Office of Administration – Budget & Planning** assume this section places new requirements on schools/districts that may require new equipment. The General Revenue fund may be impacted to the extent that the General Assembly appropriates monies for these programs.

Oversight notes Section 160.663.4 (2) states each existing exterior door or entryway, and interior door shall be equipped with the required anti-intruder door lock and bullet-resistant window film before July 1, 2029.

Oversight notes a bullet-resistant door can range in cost from \$2,500 to more than \$4,000 based on a CNN [article](#) from 2019. Oversight notes the number of buildings is 2,406 plus the 57 career-technical centers in Missouri according to DESE. Oversight is uncertain how many school buildings currently have bullet-resistant doors. However, if this proposal requires installing two doors per building in half of the buildings (2,463 doors), the cost is estimated to be \$ 6,157,500 (assuming a cost of \$2,500 per door). Therefore, Oversight assumes the cost for this provision could substantially exceed \$6,157,500.

Oversight notes Section 160.663.3 states a school district or charter school shall not be required to equip an interior door with an anti-intruder door lock or to equip the glass of an exterior door or entryway with bullet-resistant window film under this section unless the general assembly specifically appropriates moneys to cover all costs related to equipping such door or entryway

with such lock or window film. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a \$0 (no appropriation) to unknown that could exceed the cost of \$6,157,500.

Oversight notes Section 160.663.6 (2) states a school district or charter school shall develop and implement school building access policies and practices that require classroom doors with windows and adjoining sidelights be equipped with material that provides concealment of students and staff in lockdown while maintaining some limited visibility into the room for first responders. Oversight is unable to determine how many doors with windows and adjoining sidelights would need to be equipped with concealment material to meet the requirement of this provision. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a \$0 (no appropriation) to an unknown cost in the fiscal note.

Section 160.664 – School Safety Incidents

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** state Section 160.664 will require changes/additions to the current data collection system. DESE Office of Data System Management (ODSM) assumes these duties can be absorbed. However, if multiple pieces of legislation are passed which require additional duties in this area DESE may need to seek additional FTE through the appropriations process.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for this agency.

Officials from **Office of Administration – Information Technology (OA-ITSD)** state DESE is a consolidated agency under OA-ITSD. It is assumed that all new IT project/systems will be bid out because all ITSD resources are at full capacity.

Section 160.664 will require changes/additions to the data collection system. DESE Office of Data System Management (ODSM) and DESE Data Governance will define all data elements needed to be captured and provide those to ITSD. These will be used to establish the database table(s) and fields. DESE ODSM will also collect any historical information in a standard data layout, that aligns with the database/fields they define, compile all data from all districts and charters.

OA-ITSD state the project would take 928.80 hours at a contract rate of \$105 for a total cost of **\$97,524** in FY 2026 with on-going support costs of **\$19,992** in FY 2027, and **\$20,492** in FY 2028.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect the estimated impact by OA-ITSD in the fiscal note.

Officials from **Department of Public Safety – Director’s Office (DPS-DO)** assume section 160.664.4.4 requires DPS to do investigations. Assuming this will not be a function of MSHP, DPS believes it will need 9-18 investigators, 1-2 investigators per MSHP Troop Region. In

addition, due to the nature of investigations generally, 2 legal counsel will also be needed. DPS does not have a way to calculate the need for how many investigations will be required under this statute.

DPS – DO also noted they will need additional space to house @ 9-18 employees at any one time. Jefferson City leased space rate is \$18.00/square foot plus \$2.45/square foot for janitorial costs and \$2.48/square foot for utility expenses. OA FMDC estimates a need of 200 square feet per FTE/employee. A secure location in either a leased location or within a state owned facility in Jefferson City covering 1,200 square feet will be needed.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect the estimated impact by DPS-DO in the fiscal note.

§§160.1052 - 160.1055 – Missouri Educators and Parental Empowerment and Rights Act

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB Nos. 408, 306, and 854 (2025), officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**, the **Missouri House of Representatives**, and the **Missouri Senate** each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organizations. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB Nos. 408, 306, and 854 (25), officials from **Washington School District** assumed this bill could cost \$200K-\$500K annually for the addition of administrative and secretarial work/positions to ensure the compliance requests are being met. In addition, there would be a significant change in language and procedures that would need to be updated with items such a safety language throughout all buildings from their current "I love you guys" national standard protocol to the language in the bill of "lockdown/lockout". While the majority of the requests in this bill are items that they are already transparent about; however, the compliance procedures would cause stress and strain on their system and their current staffing.

Oversight assumes the following will have a fiscal impact on local school districts and charter schools:

Section 160.1055.1 states each local educational agency shall develop policies and procedures for such LEA to follow to accommodate and assist parents and teachers in the exercise of the rights described in sections 160.1052 to 160.1055.

Section 160.1055.6 (1) states each LEA shall provide a physical or electronic copy of sections 160.1052 to 160.1055 to each parent, teacher, and student at the beginning of each school year.

Section 160.1055.9 (1) states a local educational agency may, at such LEA's discretion and with school board or governing board approval, incorporate evidence-based training for teachers and counselors on strategies to guide students toward personal resilience.

Section 160.1055.10 states each local educational agency shall ensure that teachers and staff are trained in methods to maintain order, encourage compliance, and foster respect, using an approach grounded in traditional values and personal responsibility.

Section 160.1055.12 states each LEA's governing board shall adopt such policies and procedures required by this section for the 2026-27 school year and all subsequent school years.

Oversight assumes there could be administrative costs and employee training costs to implement the provisions of this section. Oversight will show a range of impact of \$0 (could absorb costs) or an unknown cost to LEAs.

Oversight notes Section 160.1053 shall be known as the Parent Bill of Rights. Oversight assumes there could be training costs and administrative costs related to notifications and printing. Oversight is uncertain if these costs could be absorbed by school districts. Therefore, Oversight will a zero (no additional costs or costs can be absorbed) or unknown costs to LEAs in the fiscal note.

Oversight notes Section 160.1054 shall be known as the Educators' Bill of Rights. §160.1054.2(2) states “The right to be free from physical abuse from a parent and to be protected from oral, written, or electronically generated threats of harm. Such abuse is grounds for the prohibition of the physical presence of the perpetrator of such abuse on the LEA's property and at the LEA's events and may result in other legal actions taken by such teacher”. Oversight assumes there could be legal costs to school districts to provide legal defense. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero (no litigation) or an unknown cost to LEAs in the fiscal note.

Section 160.2700, 160.2705, & 160.2710 – Adult High Schools

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 712 (2025), officials from **DESE** assumed they currently provide childcare services to participants in Adult High Schools. Assuming the average participation in Adult High School is 191 students/month, the average cost per child is \$639.05/month. DESE assumed a 10% increase for year one (\$146,470), 20% year two (\$292,940) and 30% increase year three (\$439,410).

Current Contract Amount: \$1,464,700.00

Oversight is uncertain if the costs estimated by DESE would be realized. Therefore, Oversight will assume a range of impact of \$0 up to the costs estimated by DESE.

Oversight notes that in response to similar legislation, SB 426 (2025), officials from the DSS stated the Children’s Division (CD) would not see an increased cost and the Family Support Division (FSD) believes the costs would be negligible. Therefore, DSS assumes the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for DSS.

Oversight notes DSS presented the following information in the [FY26 DSS Programs Book](#):

The Department of Social Services (DSS) administers funding for the Adult High School (Excel Centers), which were bid through the Department of Education and Secondary Education (DESE) and awarded to MERS Goodwill. The Excel Centers offer public high school for adults 21 and over through flexible class schedules, supportive relationships with staff, and a life coach who works with students to find solutions for life’s challenges that could hinder progress. While earning their diploma, students earn college credits and a variety of industry-recognized certifications in order to increase their earning potential. Excel Centers provide a free drop-in center for child care, transportation assistance, extended hours and year-round operations to support students as they work toward the goal of earning a diploma.

Excel Center Enrollments:

FY 2022	1,206
FY 2023	1,310
FY 2024	1,547

Section 161.670 – Standards for Virtual Schools

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 220 (2025), officials from **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** stated Section 161.670, RSMo., 12. – This legislation would allow the virtual administration of the statewide assessment of students enrolled in virtual school.

The Missouri Technical Advisory Committee for Assessment recommends that the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) create a separate test form to meet the requirements as outlined and to limit the exposure of the item bank used for all assessments.

Data Recognition Corporation (DRC) currently is contracted to do similar work and DESE assumes would be responsible for the development of forms (tests), scoring, and reporting either through a contract amendment or a new contract. Based on the current contract costs, fourteen forms will need to be developed for grade levels: 3-8 English Language Arts, 3-8 Mathematics, 5 & 8 Science (\$73,941 year one) and ten forms will need to be developed for end-of-course English 1 & 2, Algebra 1 & 2, Geometry, Government, Biology, Physical Science, American History, and Personal Finance (\$69,978 year one).

This development includes the creation of forms dedicated to virtual administration, online administration, reporting, dedicated IT services, psychometric services, validity study of virtual administration, program coordination and manual production for virtual administration. Annual costs for this would be:

1. \$443,822, plus;

2. \$200,000 annually for data forensics and test security.

In addition, DESE estimates \$186,000 for camera and communication devices necessary for remote test administration. DESE assumes the state would be responsible for providing these to vendors with an estimated cost per camera = \$30 per x 6,200 unduplicated count of students enrolled in MoCAP 203-24 academic year = \$186,000. This equipment would be returned to vendors with an estimated annual need to replace a minimum number. Annual replacement cost is estimated at \$15,000.

Officials from DESE also noted that they did not include costs for college readiness or workforce readiness assessments in the original estimate.

Oversight notes that the proposal states that any virtual school or program may administer any statewide assessment required pursuant to the provisions of section 160.518 except for college readiness or workforce readiness assessments provided by a national college and career readiness assessment provider in a virtual setting that aligns with the student's regular academic instruction. Oversight is unable to determine how many virtual schools or programs will decide to administer virtual assessments.

In addition, the cost of camera and communication devices necessary for remote test administration could potentially vary depending on compatibility with specific devices as well as the required wide degree angle of view in order to meet the requirements of the proposal. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a \$0 (no participation in virtual assessment) to a fiscal impact that could exceed the estimate provided by DESE in the fiscal note.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 220 (2025), officials from the **University of Missouri** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organizations. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

In response to similar legislation, HB 220 (2025), officials from **Hume R-VIII School District** assumed MOCAAP already cost their district a lot of money.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 220 (2025), officials from the **Northwest Missouri State University**, and **Concordia R-II School District** each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note.

In response to a similar proposal, SB 1049 (2024), officials from the **Henry County R-1 School District** assumed the proposal will have a fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight does not anticipate a fiscal impact to school districts. However, Oversight received limited responses from school districts related to the fiscal impact of this proposal.

Section 162.207 - Student Electronic Personal Communication Device Usage

In response to similar legislation, HB 854 (2025), officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** assumed this section of the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for this section.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB Nos. 408, 306 & 854 (2025), officials from the **Washington School District** assumed the impact of this bill could be \$3,000 annually for administrative training, additional time for discipline, and communication costs for families. They would also caution that approval of this bill takes away local control of the district's Board of Education, parent rights, and procedures that each school should be putting in place.

Oversight assumes any additional costs to schools as a result of the proposal would be immaterial and will not reflect them in the fiscal note.

Section 163.045 - Additional funding to school districts with 169-day school calendar

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 368 (2025), officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

In addition, DESE provided the Department does not collect final calendars till the school year is complete, so based upon the School Year (SY) 2024 actual calendar only 49 school districts had calendars for all students claimed for state aid of 169 days or more. Please note, many LEA's are reviewing their SY 2025 calendars and considering adjustments based upon their LEA's specific benefit if they ensure calendars for all students claimed for state aid equal or exceed 169 days. DESE expects these numbers to fluctuate as schools make decisions and changes to their calendars.

Oversight notes Section 163.045 clarifies language relating to additional funding for teacher salaries that districts receive if the district has a school calendar with 169 school days. The clarification provided allows for inclement weather or authorized reductions to the number of days the district must be in session to qualify for the funding

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 368 (2025), officials from **East Buchanan Co. C-I School District** assumed the school district has made every effort to meet the 169-calendar requirement. Although their calendar was already created and approved prior to this opportunity being enacted, they already had an approved 170-day calendar. They have used their full allotment (6 days) of AMI and have added as many days as possible to their calendar without interrupting their summer school and going past Memorial Day. Despite this, they are currently on track to go 168 days because of the 11 days of weather cancellations they have endured this year.

Passage of this bill would allow their district to receive approximately \$35,000 in additional funding for teachers in the upcoming school year.

Oversight notes Section 163.045 clarifies language relating to additional funding for teacher salaries that districts receive if the district has a school calendar with 169 school days. The clarification provided allows for exceptional or emergency circumstances or authorized reductions to the number of days the district must be in session to qualify for the funding.

Oversight has no way to determine how many schools will adjust their school calendar to a 169 day or more school term to obtain additional funding. There is potential that more schools will become eligible for the amount equal to one percent for fiscal years 2026 and 2027, or two percent for fiscal year 2028 and all subsequent fiscal years, of each district's preceding year's annual state aid entitlement moving forward. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a \$0 or Unknown cost to GR, as well as a \$0 to Unknown gain to school districts in the fiscal note.

Section 163.172 - Baseline Teacher Salary

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 607 (2025), officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note.

Section 167.151- Admission of nonresident and other tuition pupils

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 1238 (2025), officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 1238 (2025), officials from the **Joplin School District** reviewed HB 1238 and anticipated a need to adjust current policies and practices to accommodate a potential increase in permit requests for student enrollment. This will necessitate a process to determine building capacity based on class sizes. Furthermore, while an immediate, direct fiscal impact is not anticipated, Joplin Schools foresees potential additional costs associated with serving students who may enroll through the expanded permit process. The bill's provisions, along with existing legal obligations to serve all students regardless of disability, may require the district to provide additional resources and support services to meet the diverse needs of incoming students. At this time, it is challenging to accurately estimate the extent of these potential costs.

Oversight notes this proposal expands who can qualify for this tuition waiver and state aid qualification and allows any child whose parent is a contractor or regular employee of a nonresident school district to attend such school district without paying tuition and to count as a resident pupil for the purpose of state aid.

Oversight assumes the number of transfers cannot be estimated but assumes the number would be minimal. Additionally, the amount of state funding is district specific (can vary from under \$1,000 per student to over \$8,000 per student, depending upon the school district). Therefore, this note will reflect a potential Unknown cost (if students would attend a school district that receive more state aid) to an Unknown positive impact (if students would leave districts that receive less state aid) for both general revenue and school districts. Oversight assumes that some districts would see a net negative direct fiscal impact, while others would see a net positive direct fiscal impact.

Section 167.167 - Prohibiting zero-tolerance policies/practices of discipline in public schools

In response to similar legislation, HB 454 (2025), officials from **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organization.

Oversight notes that the above mentioned agency has stated 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.

Oversight does not anticipate a fiscal impact to schools as a result of this proposal, therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note.

Section 168.025 - Teachers Externships

Oversight notes, with the proposal, HCS for HB 604 (2019), the DED and DESE created rules for the program regarding requirements for teacher externships to be considered equivalent to credit hours of graduate-level courses for salary schedules.

Oversight notes Section 163.172 outlined the minimum starting salary for a teacher of \$25,000 and for teachers with master's degrees the minimum is \$33,000. Should DED and DESE determine that externships be allowed to be substituted for graduate-level courses, Oversight assumed it was possible that teachers may move up their district's salary schedule quicker.

Oversight notes that according to the DESE Certified Externship: Information Guide <https://dese.mo.gov/media/pdf/occr-pathways-certified-educator-externship-experience>

Requirements of the Externship Program are:

1. The externship participant is to spend a required total of 120 hours at the host industry site. This will equate to two (2) college graduate hours for possible advancement on the district's salary schedule. The site must be a prior district-approved location.
2. Complete the outlined requirements that include the following:
 - a. Making daily journal/reflections (one page per day) during the experience;

- b. Developing a unit plan, lesson plan, presentation, or improvement plan for implementation that the educator will share with instructors, administrators, board of education, or any other group as specified by the participant's district at their direction.
 - c. Evaluating the externship experience.
 - d. Writing a thank you note to the host site.
3. Be punctual, appropriately dressed, and follow the host site instructions for working at the assigned facility.
4. Actively seek opportunities to learn about the company and to identify company resources that may be useful to students and colleagues.

Oversight notes according to the [DESE statistics of Missouri Public School 2023-2024](#) there were 70,858 classroom teachers (the total potential includes some double counting of dual position holders).

Oversight will show this proposal could have a \$0 (no change to salary schedules) to an unknown impact, on the school districts, for increased teacher salaries due to the continuation of the program, after the proposal was set to expire August 28, 2024.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 267 (2025), officials from the **Hume R-VIII School District** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

In response to the similar legislation, 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 annually per teacher.

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

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 267 (2025), officials from the **Office of Administration – Budget & Planning** assumed the provisions of this bill have no direct impact

on total state revenues. The General Revenue fund may be impacted to the extent that the General Assembly appropriates monies for this program.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 267 (2025), officials from the **University of Missouri** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organizations.

Section 168.036 – Granting Substitute Teacher Certificates

Officials from the **Public Education Employees’ Retirement System (PSRS/PEERS)** note:

PSRS analysis:

PwC, the Systems actuary, estimates the impact of extending the suspension of limitations on working after retirement for part-time or temporary substitute teaching positions through June 30, 2030 to be **an insignificant fiscal impact** if retirement behavior remains unchanged. However, there would be a fiscal cost if there is a change in active member retirement behavior to retire earlier, resulting in fewer full-time teachers participating in, and contributing to, PSRS, and they continue to caution that the fiscal impact could be significant if the suspension of the limitations continues to be extended and effectively becomes a permanent provision.

PEERS analysis:

PwC, the Systems actuary, estimates the impact of extending the suspension of limitations on working after retirement for part-time or temporary substitute teaching positions through June 30, 2030 to be **an insignificant fiscal impact** to PEERS. However, they continue to caution that the fiscal impact could be significant if the suspension of the limitations continues to be extended and effectively becomes a permanent provision.

Additional Information:

Officials from **Public Education Employees’ Retirement System (PSRS/PEERS)** assume this bill, as currently drafted, extends the temporary provision allowing individuals who are receiving a retirement benefit from PSRS or PEERS to substitute teach on a part-time or temporary substitute basis in a covered school district without a discontinuance of the person's retirement benefit. The provisions in this bill only apply to part-time or temporary substitute teaching. As specified in this bill, if an individual chooses to work for a covered employer after retirement under this provision, they will not contribute to additional retirement benefits.

This provision was enacted in 2022 with an expiration of June 30, 2025. This bill extends the temporary provision through June 30, 2030.

The Systems have an actuary firm, PwC US (PwC), that prepares actuarial cost statements on any proposed legislation as well as the annual actuarial valuation reports for the Systems. As discussed in more detail below, the temporary suspension of the working after retirement limitations as proposed in this bill could have a fiscal impact on PSRS and PEERS.

Analysis of impact on PSRS

The 550-hour and 50% of compensation limitations applicable to retired PSRS members who return to work in substitute teaching positions is significantly less than half of the capacity worked by a fulltime teacher and therefore limits the work a rehired retiree can perform in a substitute teaching position without a suspension of their benefit. Suspending these limitations through June 30, 2030 could incentivize existing PSRS members to significantly change their retirement behavior and career planning. In addition, an extension of the working after retirement limits suspension would give employers a greater ability to replace full-time active employees with rehired retirees, allowing employers to save on the cost of contributions to PSRS (for part-time or temporary substitute teaching positions). Such behavior could have a significant impact on the cost of PSRS as earlier retirement by active members could increase the Actuarial Accrued Liability, and therefore the Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liability, and result in a decrease in covered payroll which would increase the Actuarially Determined Contribution Rate.

However, this proposal does include some conditions that would limit the fiscal impact, including:

- The end date for suspension of the working after retirement limitations of June 30, 2030 would limit any changes in retirement behavior and any changes in employer hiring to a temporary period (absent further extensions).
- Retirees who return to work in substitute teaching positions would only be able to return on a part-time or temporary basis, not on a full-time basis.

In addition, current statistical data on retired PSRS members who have returned to work since the temporary suspension of the limits went into effect in 2022 has been reviewed. The COVID pandemic and other legislation affecting working after retirement make it difficult to conclude from the data whether retirement patterns have been affected by the current suspension. However, to date, it does not appear to indicate a significant change in retirement behavior by members or hiring practices by employers as the number of retirees working after retirement remains below pre-pandemic levels. However, there is a recent increase in the average hours worked and average earnings by retirees who have returned to work due to some rehired retirees working in a capacity that would have exceeded the limitations of RSMo 169.560 if not for the suspension of those limits for part-time or temporary substitute teaching in RSMo 168.036.

For the reasons noted above and discussed in the actuarial cost estimate, PwC estimates the impact of extending the suspension of limitations on working after retirement for part-time or temporary substitute teaching positions through June 30, 2030 to be **an insignificant fiscal impact if retirement behavior remains unchanged**. However, there would be a fiscal cost if there is a change in active member retirement behavior to retire earlier, resulting in fewer full-time teachers participating in, and contributing to, PSRS, and they continue to caution that the fiscal impact could be significant if the suspension of the limitations continues to be extended and effectively becomes a permanent provision.

Analysis of impact on PEERS

The 550-hour limitation applicable to retired PEERS members who return to work in substitute teaching positions is significantly less than half of the capacity worked by a full-time employee and therefore limits the work a rehired retiree can perform without a suspension of their benefit. Suspending these limitations through June 30, 2030 for part-time or temporary substitute teaching positions could incentivize existing PEERS members to significantly change their retirement behavior and career planning. In addition, an extension of the working after retirement limits suspension would give employers a greater ability to replace full-time active employees with rehired retirees, allowing employers to save on the cost of contributions to PEERS (for part-time or temporary substitute teaching positions). Such behavior could have a significant impact on the cost of PEERS as earlier retirement by active members could increase the Actuarial Accrued Liability, and therefore the Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liability, and result in a decrease in covered payroll which would increase the Actuarially Determined Contribution Rate.

However, this proposal does include some conditions that would limit the fiscal impact, including:

- The end date for suspension of the working after retirement limitations of June 30, 2030 would limit any changes in retirement behavior and any changes in employer hiring to a temporary period (absent further extensions).
- Retirees who return to work in substitute teaching positions would only be able to return on a part-time or temporary basis, not on a full-time basis.
- The number of PEERS retirees who are certificated and eligible to fill substitute teaching positions has historically been very few.

In addition, current statistical data on retired PEERS members who have returned to work since the temporary suspension of the limits went into effect in 2022 has been reviewed. The COVID pandemic and other legislation affecting working after retirement make it difficult to conclude from the data whether retirement patterns have been affected. However, to date, it does not appear to indicate a significant change in retirement behavior by members or hiring practices by employers, or an increase in the number of PEERS retirees being hired to fill part-time or temporary substitute teaching positions.

For the reasons noted above and discussed in the actuarial cost estimate, PwC estimates the impact of extending the suspension of limitations on working after retirement for parttime or temporary substitute teaching positions through June 30, 2030 to be **an insignificant fiscal impact to PEERS**. However, they continue to caution that the fiscal impact could be significant if the suspension of the limitations continues to be extended and effectively becomes a permanent provision.

PSRS/PEERS provide retirement benefits to approximately 132,000 active members and over 110,000 retired Missouri public school teachers, school employees, and their families. The total invested assets of both PSRS and PEERS were \$58.7 billion as of June 30, 2024.

Oversight notes this provision was enacted in 2022 with an expiration of June 30, 2025. This proposal extends the temporary provision through June 30, 2030. Therefore, Oversight assumes the temporary change will result in an insignificant fiscal impact to PSRS/PEERS and therefore, no impact to member employers.

Officials from **Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement** assume SB 68 indicates it will not affect retirement plan benefits as defined in Section 105.660(9).

Section 170.014 – Three- Cueing System

In response to similar legislation, SB 556 (2025), officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note.

Upon further inquiry, DESE stated it is not clear as to how many, but some schools are implementing a three-cueing system currently and there could be significant cost to LEAs to replace instructional materials where they do use them.

In response to similar legislation, SB 556 (2025), officials from the **Washington School District** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight notes that the proposal prohibits school districts and charter schools from using a three-cueing system to teach students to read. Oversight is unable to determine how many schools use this system. Oversight assumes there could be a potential cost to those schools to implement and purchase materials for a new literacy system. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a \$0 or unknown impact on the fiscal note.

Oversight notes in the summer of 2022, the Missouri legislature approved the Evidence-Based Reading Instruction Program Fund (Senate Bill 681, Section 161.241, RSMo) to be used to reimburse LEAs for efforts to improve student literacy. DESE administers this funding and provides support to LEAs as they move through the application process.

Oversight notes the [Missouri Read, Lead, Exceed](#) is the state's comprehensive plan to dedicate \$25 million in state funding and just over \$35 million in federal relief funding to support student literacy. DESE provides the state-approved evidence-based reading instructional materials list that serves as a resource for schools to select materials. Local Education Agencies (LEAs) are not required to select materials from this list. However, LEAs that are eligible to request reimbursement for instructional materials must select materials from this list.

Section 170.315 – Intruder Response Training

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol (MHP)** assume with the provisions in Section 170.315.6, the Highway Patrol does anticipate an increase in the

number of tips due to the required annual training of every student in the state. The training component in House Bill 416 would bring the Courage2Report information to every student and promote the use of the tip line. Courage2Report started in 2019, and since 2020 the tip line has had a steady increase in tip volume annually. From 2020 to 2021, there was an 80% increase in the number of tips, from 2021 to 2022 there was a 75% increase in the number of tips, from 2022 to 2023 there was a 48% increase in the number of tips, and from 2023 to 2024 there was a 25% increase in the number of tips. This equates to 430 received tips in 2019 to 2000+ tips received in 2024. The Patrol does foresee a need for at least one (1) additional FTE to help with the increased workload based on the projected increase in tips that go beyond what current staffing can field.

Oversight notes this section requires that beginning in the 2026-27 school year the Active Shooter and Intruder Response Training for Schools Program be required for teachers and school employees on an annual basis. The bill requires that initial training be eight hours and continuing training be four hours in length.

Oversight assumes there could be costs for school districts if annual training is required. Oversight assumes new training, instruction or education required under state law or rules promulgated by DESE will be dependent on each school districts' needs. Therefore, Oversight will reflect an unknown impact on the fiscal note.

In response to similar legislation, HB 416 (2025), officials from the **Wheaton School District** assumed the estimated financial impact of facility improvements, training requirements, and other considerations of the bill \$20,000-\$30,000 initially and \$3,000 annually.

In response to similar legislation, HB 416 (2025), officials from the **St. Louis County Police Department** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organizations.

Section 173.232 – Teacher recruitment and Retention State Scholarship Program

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 712 (2025), officials from the **DESE** assumed this section of the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 712 (2025), officials from the **University of Missouri** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organizations.

Section §160.775 – Missouri Childhood Hero Act

In response to similar legislation, HB 655 (2025), officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organizations. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for their agency.

In response to similar legislation, HB 655 (2025), officials from the **Office of Attorney General (AGO)** assumed any potential litigation costs arising from this proposal can be absorbed with existing resources. However, the AGO may seek additional appropriations if the proposal results in a significant increase in litigation or investigation.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight assumes the AGO will be able to perform any additional duties required by this proposal with current staff and resources and will reflect no fiscal impact to the AGO for fiscal note purposes.

In response to similar legislation, HB 655 (2025), officials from **Concordia R-II School District** assumed annual cost (direct and indirect) is \$6,000. Training, implementation, and evaluation of this change to the bullying legislation is another unfunded mandate that places undue hardship on public schools in regards to bullying and anti-bullying programs.

Oversight assumes there could be costs for school districts to implement the proposal as well as court costs, attorney fees, and damages if a parent brings a civil action against a district. Oversight will show a range of impact of \$0 to an unknown cost.

Oversight notes that Section 160.775.9 (2) states that if a school district or charter school, or an employee of such district or charter school, prevails in an action brought against such school district or charter school described in subdivision (1) of this subsection, the court shall award court costs and attorney's fees to such prevailing school district, charter school, or employee. For purposes of the fiscal note, Oversight will reflect a potential revenue gain to school districts in the fiscal note.

Section 177.086 - Construction of Facilities

Oversight notes Section 177.086.4 states "The requirements of this statute are not applicable if the district utilizes a cooperative procurement service, state procurement services as authorized in sections 34.046 and 67.360, services as authorized under section 67.5060, or other purchasing processes authorized by state or federal law." Therefore, Oversight assumes there could be a zero to unknown savings to school districts that are exempt from the requirements of this section.

Responses regarding the proposed legislation as a whole

Officials from the **Office of Attorney General (AGO)** assume any potential litigation costs arising from this proposal can be absorbed with existing resources. The AGO may seek additional appropriations if the proposal results in a significant increase in litigation or investigation costs.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight assumes the AGO will be able to perform any additional duties required by this proposal with current staff and resources and will reflect no fiscal impact to the AGO for fiscal note purposes.

Officials from the **Branson Police Department, Kansas City Police Department, Office of the State Treasurer, Office of Administration, Department of Social Services, Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development, Department of Health and Senior Services, Department of Natural Resources, Department of Mental Health, Department of Corrections, Missouri Office of Prosecution Services, Department of Public Safety - Fire Safety, Oversight Division, and Office of the State Courts Administrator** each assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

Rule Promulgation

Officials from the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules** assume this proposal is not anticipated to cause a fiscal impact beyond its current appropriation.

Officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** note 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 its 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.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2029)
GENERAL REVENUE				
<u>Costs – MHP §170.315 p. 26</u>				
Personnel Service	(\$56,300)	(\$68,911)	(\$70,289)	(\$71,695)
Fringe Benefits	(\$51,188)	(\$62,654)	(\$63,907)	(\$65,185)
Expense & Equipment	(\$3,500)	(\$0)	(\$0)	(\$0)
<u>Total Costs - MHP</u>	<u>(\$110,988)</u>	<u>(\$131,565)</u>	<u>(\$134,196)</u>	<u>(\$136,880)</u>
FTE Change - MHP	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE
<u>Costs – DESE §160.480 p.7</u>				
Personnel Service	(\$62,340)	(\$76,304)	(\$77,830)	(\$79,387)
Fringe Benefits	(\$38,146)	(\$46,375)	(\$46,986)	(\$47,926)
Expense & Equipment	(\$15,910)	(\$13,416)	(\$13,684)	(\$13,958)
<u>Total Costs – DESE</u>	<u>(\$116,396)</u>	<u>(\$136,095)</u>	<u>(\$138,500)</u>	<u>(\$141,271)</u>
FTE Change - DESE	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE
<u>Costs – DPS-DO §160.664 p.13</u>				
Personal Service	(\$612,229) to (\$1,068,848)	(\$749,369) to (\$1,308,270)	(\$764,356) to (\$1,334,435)	(\$779,643) to (\$1,361,124)
Fringe Benefits	(\$390,142) to (\$691,594)	(\$474,059) to (\$840,195)	(\$480,066) to (\$850,682)	(\$489,667) to (\$867,696)
Expense & Equipment	(\$41,549) to (\$75,544)	(\$0)	(\$0)	\$0
<u>Total Costs – DPS-DO</u>	<u>(\$1,043,920)</u> to <u>(\$1,835,986)</u>	<u>(\$1,223,428)</u> to <u>(\$2,148,465)</u>	<u>(\$1,244,422)</u> to <u>(\$2,185,117)</u>	<u>(\$1,269,310)</u> to <u>(\$2,228,820)</u>
FTE Change – DPS-DO	11-20 FTE	11-20 FTE	11-20 FTE	11-20 FTE
<u>Costs – DESE – Workgroup to Develop Standards - §160.480 p.7</u>	\$0 to (\$79,833)	\$0	\$0	\$0
<u>Costs – DESE/ITSD – programming §160.664 p.13</u>	(\$97,524)	(\$19,992)	(\$20,492)	(\$21,004)
<u>Costs – DESE – additional funding for absent students §160.264 p.7</u>	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2029)
<u>Costs – DESE – additional funding for 169-day calendar to schools §163.045 p.19</u>	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<u>Costs – DESE – Student technology for test administration §161.670 p.16-17</u>	More or less than (\$186,000)	More or less than (\$15,000)	More or less than (\$15,000)	More or less than (\$15,000)
<u>Costs – DESE – Data Forensics/Test Security §161.670 p.16-17</u>	(\$200,000)	(\$200,000)	(\$200,000)	(\$200,000)
<u>Costs – DRC for development/scoring/reporting §161.670 p.16-17</u>	(\$443,822)	(\$443,822)	(\$443,822)	(\$443,822)
<u>Costs - DESE - to develop and revise performance level descriptors, related assessments, notifications and meetings - §§160.518 & 160.522 p.10-11</u>	(\$932,540)	\$0	\$0	\$0
<u>Costs – DESE – Childcare for Adult High schools §160.2700 p. 15</u>	\$0 up to (\$146,470)	\$0 up to (\$292,940)	\$0 up to (\$439,410)	\$0 up to (\$585,880)
<u>Costs - DESE/OA-ITSD - changes to MOSIS application - §§160.518 & 160.522 p.10-11</u>	(\$105,462)	(\$21,620)	(\$22,161)	(\$22,715)
<u>Costs or Cost Avoidance – Difference in state funding for eligible students attending nonresident districts §167.151.6 p.20</u>	(Unknown) or <u>Unknown</u>	(Unknown) or <u>Unknown</u>	(Unknown) or <u>Unknown</u>	(Unknown) or <u>Unknown</u>
<u>Transfer Out – DESE - for cost of anti-intruder door</u>				

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2029)
locks on all interior doors, bullet-resistant window film and concealment material for doors with windows and sidelights - §160.663 p.13	\$0 to (Unknown, Could exceed \$6,157,500)	\$0 to (Unknown, Could exceed \$6,157,500)	\$0 to (Unknown, Could exceed \$6,157,500)	\$0 to (Unknown, Could exceed \$6,157,500)
<u>Transfer Out - DESE - bleeding control kits and school personnel training - §160.485 p.8</u>	\$0 to (Could exceed <u>\$1,759,700</u>)	\$0 or (Could exceed <u>\$100,000</u>)	\$0 or (Could exceed <u>\$100,000</u>)	\$0 or (Could exceed <u>\$100,000</u>)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE	(\$3,050,652) or Could exceed <u>(\$12,172,221)</u>	(\$2,176,522) or Could exceed <u>(\$9,666,999)</u>	(\$2,203,593) or Could exceed <u>(\$9,856,198)</u>	(\$2,235,002) or Could exceed <u>(\$10,052,892)</u>
Estimated Net FTE Change on General Revenue	13-22 FTE	13-22 FTE	13-22 FTE	13-22 FTE
STATE FACILITY MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS FUND (0501)				
<u>Costs – OA §160.077 p.6</u>				
Personnel Service	(\$117,005)	(\$143,214)	(\$146,078)	(\$149,000)
Fringe Benefits	(\$73,216)	(\$88,984)	(\$90,132)	(\$91,935)
Expense & Equipment	<u>(\$167,200)</u>	<u>(\$204,653)</u>	<u>(\$208,746)</u>	<u>(\$212,921)</u>
<u>Total Costs – OA</u>	<u>(\$357,421)</u>	<u>(\$436,851)</u>	<u>(\$444,956)</u>	<u>(\$453,856)</u>
FTE Change - OA	2 FTE	2 FTE	2 FTE	2 FTE
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON STATE FACILITY MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS FUND	<u>(\$357,421)</u>	<u>(\$436,851)</u>	<u>(\$444,956)</u>	<u>(\$453,856)</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2029)
Estimated Net FTE Change on State Facility Maintenance and Operations Fund	2 FTE	2 FTE	2 FTE	2 FTE
FEDERAL FUNDS				
<u>Income</u> – program reimbursements §160.077 p.6	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Transfer Out</u> - to school districts for funding for filtration, testing, and other remediation efforts - §160.077 p.6	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2029)
SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND CHARTER SCHOOLS				
<u>Revenue</u> - Additional State Aid §163.045 p.19	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Revenue</u> – potential collection of court fees and attorney’s fees if the school district prevails §160.775.9 (2) p.27	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Revenue</u> – DESE – additional funding for absent students §160.264 p.7	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2029)
<u>Savings</u> - exemption for construction of facilities §177.086 p.27	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Savings</u> – annual training on certain policies may no longer be required for established employees - §160.261 p.7	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Transfer In</u> - from state General Revenue - §160.663 p.13	\$0 to Could exceed \$6,157,500			
<u>Transfer In</u> - from state General Revenue - §160.485 p.8	\$0 to Could exceed \$1,759,700	\$0 or Could exceed \$100,000	\$0 or Could exceed \$100,000	\$0 or Could exceed \$100,000
<u>Transfer In</u> - from Federal Funds §166.077 p.5*	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Costs</u> - to school districts for lead filtration, testing, and other remediation efforts - §160.077 p.5*	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<u>Costs</u> – for implementation costs, court costs, attorney fees and damages §160.775 p.27	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<u>Costs</u> – School Districts & Charter Schools – Implement new literacy system §170.014 p.25	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<u>Costs</u> - Potential salary adjustments from credit earned on externships – §168.025 p.21	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2029)
<u>Nonresident Districts - additional State funding for non-resident transfers but also additional costs to educate those students §167.151.6 p. 20</u>	Unknown or (Unknown)	Unknown or (Unknown)	Unknown or (Unknown)	Unknown or (Unknown)
<u>Resident Districts – reduced state funding, but also possible reduction in costs to educate those students §167.151.6 p.20</u>	Unknown or (Unknown)	Unknown or (Unknown)	Unknown or (Unknown)	Unknown or (Unknown)
<u>Costs - to install AEDs in public schools - §160.482.4(3) p.8</u>	\$0	(Unknown, Could exceed \$1,204,000)	\$0	\$0
<u>Costs – AED maintenance and repairs - §160.482.4(3) p.8</u>	\$0	\$0	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
<u>Costs – First aid, CPR, AED training - §160.482.6 & §167.624 p.8</u>	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
<u>Costs - anti-intruder door locks on all interior doors, bullet-resistant window film and concealment material for doors with windows and sidelights - §160.663 p.13</u>	\$0 to (Unknown, Could exceed \$6,157,500)	\$0 to (Unknown, Could exceed \$6,157,500)	\$0 to (Unknown, Could exceed \$6,157,500)	\$0 to (Unknown, Could exceed \$6,157,500)
<u>Costs – training, instruction, and education - §170.315 p.26</u>	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
<u>Costs – administrative/training costs for Parent Bill of Rights - §160.1053 p.15</u>	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2029)
<u>Costs – Legal defense under Educators' Bill of Rights – §160.1054 p.15</u>	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<u>Costs – administrative/training costs to develop policies and procedures - §160.1055 p.15</u>	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<u>Costs - for cost of bleeding control kits and school personnel training - §160.485 p.8</u>	\$0 to (Could exceed \$1,759,700)	\$0 or (Could exceed \$100,000)	\$0 or (Could exceed \$100,000)	\$0 or (Could exceed \$100,000)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND CHARTER SCHOOLS	Unknown or (Unknown)	Unknown or (Unknown)	Unknown or (Unknown)	Unknown or (Unknown)

*Oversight notes the transfer in from federal funds and costs to school districts for lead remediation net to zero.

FISCAL IMPACT – Small Business

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

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This proposal creates provisions relating to safe school environments.

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

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Office of the Secretary of State
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules
Oversight Division
Department of Health and Senior Services
Department of Natural Resources
Washington School District
Department of Public Safety - Office of the Director
Department of Public Safety - Fire Safety
Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol
Attorney General's Office
Department of Mental Health
Department of Corrections
Department of Social Services
Missouri Office of Prosecution Services
Office of the State Courts Administrator
Phelps County Sheriff's Office
Kansas City Police Department
St. Louis County Police Department
Branson Police Department
Eureka Fire Protection District
Henry County R-1 School District
Maries County R-1 School District
Washington School District
Crane R-III School District
Wheaton School District
Gasconade Co. R-1 School District
Concordia R-II School District
Attorney General's Office
Missouri House of Representatives
Missouri Senate



Julie Morff
Director
April 14, 2025



Jessica Harris
Assistant Director
April 14, 2025