#### **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS**

BILL #: HB 1073 School Employee Background Checks

SPONSOR(S): Rep. Domino

TIED BILLS: None IDEN./SIM. BILLS: SB 1254

REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR
1) Criminal Justice (Sub)		Cole	De La Paz
2) Public Safety and Crime Prevention			
3) Public Safety Appropriations (Sub)		-	
4) Appropriations			
5)			

#### **SUMMARY ANALYSIS**

The bill requires the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE) to conduct annual background check on all school employees by running the name, date of birth, and social security number of each employee through their criminal database. Recently hired employees who were subject to individual background checks within the last twelve months, would be exempt. The Department of Education (DOE) is required to provide the necessary information to FDLE for the background checks to be run.

The bill does not allow a fee to be charged for these checks.

The bill requires FDLE to promptly notify DOE of the name of any current school employee whose name is found in the criminal database. DOE is then required to notify the school district in which the employee works, and the district will take the appropriate action. The bill relieves FDLE and DOE of the responsibility to conduct any follow up investigations on any employees whose names are found in the database.

DOE currently has the information required in this bill and can provide it to FDLE. FDLE's system and DOE's system are not compatible, however. Every name, date of birth, and social security number will have to be entered manually once the information arrives at FDLE.

The bill only specifies school employees as falling under this background check requirement. DOE has all of the information required on the employees who work for each of the sixty seven school districts in one database. DOE does not readily have access to employees who work for Charter Schools, Department of Juvenile Justice programs, and employees of the Florida Virtual School. The employees of the aforementioned programs do not work for a particular district, but for the school or program.

DATE: h1073.pscp.doc March 10, 2003

#### **FULL ANALYSIS**

#### I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

#### A. DOES THE BILL:

1.	Reduce government?	Yes[]	No[]	N/A[X]
2.	Lower taxes?	Yes[]	No[]	N/A[X]
3.	Expand individual freedom?	Yes[]	No[]	N/A[X]
4.	Increase personal responsibility?	Yes[]	No[]	N/A[X]
5.	Empower families?	Yes[]	No[]	N/A[X]

For any principle that received a "no" above, please explain:

#### B. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

The bill creates a statute requiring FDLE to run annual background checks on school employees throughout the state. Initial background checks are now done on all new employees. These checks will provide a greater sense of security to parents that their children are in the care and custody of better screened personnel.

FDLE estimates it will have to hire at least five new employees to manually enter each of these names, dates of birth, and social security numbers and then conduct the background checks. The bill does not allow FDLE to charge a fee for this service.

#### C. SECTION DIRECTORY:

**Section 1:** Creates a statute requiring FDLE to conduct annual database checks for all school employees.

Section 2: Provides an effective date.

## **II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT**

## A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

#### 1. Revenues:

FDLE estimates it would lose approximately \$5,250 per year in fees that are normally charge to run background checks. There are expected to be approximately 350,000 checks that will have to be run annually. The current \$15 fee to run a background check will not be allowed to be charged by this bill.

# 2. Expenditures:

FDLE estimates an approximate cost of \$208.691 for the first year, \$212.253 the second year, and \$216.569 the third year to originally develop and maintain this program. There would be an initial cost of approximately \$5200 in programming costs. FDLE estimates it would have to hire at least five new Communication Liaisons in order to comply with the bill's mandate.

#### B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

#### 1. Revenues:

STORAGE NAME:

h1073.pscp.doc March 10, 2003 **PAGE**: 2

		None.
	2.	Expenditures:
		None.
C.	DIF	RECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:
		None.

#### D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

There is a large fiscal impact to FDLE in set up and operating costs.

#### III. COMMENTS

## A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

1. Applicability of Municipality/County Mandates Provision:

N/A

2. Other:

N/A

**B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:** 

N/A

#### C. DRAFTING ISSUES OR OTHER COMMENTS:

FDLE has suggested in their analysis of this bill that the Legislature create a system in which FDLE would maintain school district employee fingerprints on file, effective July 1, 2003. Once they Integrated Criminal History System is fully operational (FY 04/05), incoming arrests can be automatically searched against fingerprints in the database and DOE notified almost immediately after arrest. DOE currently mandates that all instructional personnel have fingerprints on file with FDLE. They institued a policy of a renewable 5-year teaching certificate several years ago and believe that they have captured most, if not all, of their teachers and aides by now. They estimate that approximately 60-70 percent of school employees are instructional personnel. Name checks are notoriously unreliable without fingerprint comparisons.

#### IV. AMENDMENTS/COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES

None.

STORAGE NAME:

h1073.pscp.doc March 10, 2003