

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS

BILL #: HB 9 Public School Attendance

SPONSOR(S): Negron

TIED BILLS: IDEN./SIM. BILLS: SB 1330

REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR
1) Pre-K through 12 (Sub)	5 Y, 0 N	Carlson	Bohannon
2) Education K-20			
3) Education Appropriations (Sub)			
4) Appropriations			
5)			

SUMMARY ANALYSIS

The bill raises the compulsory school attendance age from 16 to 17. It also raises the age at which a student in a juvenile justice residential or nonresidential facility can opt to pursue a high school diploma by taking the general educational development test from 16 to 17.

It will have a fiscal impact of approximately \$176,998,610 consisting of \$32,117,850 in operating expenses and \$144,880,760 in facilities expenses based on the increase in the number of high school students who will have to attend school.

This document does not reflect the intent or official position of the bill sponsor or House of Representatives.

STORAGE NAME: h0009a.edk.doc

DATE: March 24, 2003

FULL ANALYSIS

I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

A. DOES THE BILL:

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| 1. Reduce government? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Lower taxes? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Expand individual freedom? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Increase personal responsibility? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Empower families? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

The bill will change existing school attendance law and require students who are 17 years of age to attend school. This will require expenditure of approximately \$32,117,850. It may also increase the need for school facilities with a resulting fiscal impact of approximately \$144,880,760. The bill requires minors who might otherwise have left school to remain in school, thereby limiting their freedom of choice (assuming that their parents agree to their leaving school).

B. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

Current Law

Under current law, compulsory school attendance applies to children between the ages of 6 and 16. A student who reaches the age of 16 has the right to file a formal declaration of intent to terminate school enrollment if that declaration is signed by a parent. s. 1002.20, F.S.

Children within the age range of compulsory attendance must attend school regularly during the entire school term. s. 1003.21, F.S.

The Department of Education is required to notify students in juvenile justice residential or nonresidential facilities who attain the age of 16 of the provisions of law regarding compulsory attendance and make available the option of enrolling in a program to attain a high school diploma by taking the general educational development test prior to release from the facility.

According to the Department of Education, in 2001-2002, 6,430 students dropped out of school between their 16th and 17th birthdays.

HB 9

The bill amends ss. 1002.20, 1003.21 and 1003.51, F.S., to increase the compulsory school attendance age from 16 to 17. It also raises the age at which a student in a juvenile justice residential or nonresidential facility can opt to pursue a high school diploma by taking the general educational development test from 16 to 17.

According to the Department of Education, the bill may have a total fiscal impact of \$176,998,610 based on increased operating expenses and projected facilities expenses associated with the increase in the number of high school students who must attend school through the age of 17.

C. SECTION DIRECTORY:

Section 1. Amends s. 1002.20, F.S., relating to compulsory school attendance. Corrects a cross-reference.

Section 2. Amends s. 1003.21, F.S., relating to school attendance.

Section 3. Amends s. 1003.51, F.S., relating to public educational services.

II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues: None.
2. Expenditures: The bill would result in state formula funding increases of \$32,117,850, as explained in Section B below.

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues: None.
2. Expenditures: The Department of Education provided the following fiscal analysis:
State funding formulas for operating dollars would yield the following on a per-FTE student basis for an additional year of schooling of students who otherwise would have dropped out.

FEFP Base Funding	\$4,670
State Discretionary Equalization	19
Instructional Materials	91
Student Transportation	170
Technology	25
Teachers Lead	6
Teacher Training	14
State Total	\$4,995

The FEFP Base Funding is calculated using the last available program cost factor (1.372) for the Dropout Prevention Program since it is presumed that these students would be receiving services included in the Supplemental Academic Instruction allocation.

Operating expenditures for increasing the compulsory school attendance age to 17 are estimated to be \$32,117,850.

The Department also reports that the bill will result in increased need for facilities assuming that regular enrollment growth will utilize existing capacity. The facilities-related fiscal impact would be equal to the student station cost, adjusted for the utilization rate of 90%. The facilities impact cost of \$22,532 per student is calculated using the projected January, 2004 cost of \$20, 299 x 1.11.

The estimated facilities impact is \$144, 880, 760.

- C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR: The bill may have the incidental effect of reducing the number of 17 year olds who could enter the workforce full-time, assuming that they would have dropped out of school to begin working.
- D. FISCAL COMMENTS: According to the Department of Education, each class of dropout students costs the nation approximately \$200 billion during their lifetimes in lost earnings and unrealized tax revenues.

III. COMMENTS

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

1. Applicability of Municipality/County Mandates Provision: The bill does not require a county or city to expend funds or to take any action requiring the expenditure of funds.

2. Other: None.

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY: None.

C. DRAFTING ISSUES OR OTHER COMMENTS: None.

IV. AMENDMENTS/COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES

None.