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Florida State Board of Education
2007-08 Education Budget Request
K-20 Education Mission and Goals

Section 1008.31, Florida Statutes, establishes the mission and goals of Florida’s K-20 education system:

**Mission:**

“Increase the proficiency of all students within one seamless, efficient system, by allowing them the opportunity to expand their knowledge and skills through learning opportunities and research valued by students, parents, and communities.”

**Goals:**

1. **Highest Student Achievement**
2. **Seamless Articulation and Maximum Access**
3. **Skilled Workforce and Economic Development**
4. **Quality Efficient Services**

**SBE Strategic Plan:**

The SBE’s 8 Strategic Imperatives operationalize the K-20 mission and goals.
2005-06 Gains in Goal 1: Highest Student Achievement

• Florida again improved overall student learning proficiency in grades 3-10 Reading and Math:
  – Reading overall + 53% in 2005  ➔ 57% in 2006
  – Math overall + 59% in 2005  ➔ 61% in 2006

• Record numbers of Florida students are taking the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and Advanced Placement (AP) exams:
  – More than 94,600 2006 high school graduates took the SAT (63% of total graduates)
    • Minority student participation increased from 39% in 1999 to 44% in 2006
    • African-American students comprise 14% of test takers (11% nationally)
    • Hispanic students comprise 21% of test takers (11% nationally)
  – Florida had greatest increase in the nation in the number of students taking AP exams (78,000 students)
    • Increase in AP test takers has increased 162% since 1999
    • African American student participation increased 239%
    • Hispanic student participation increased 230%
2005-06 Gains in Goal 1: Highest Student Achievement (continued)

• Florida continues to close the achievement gap by increasing the number and percent of students achieving at or above grade level in reading and math:
  – Reading (from 2001 to 2006)
    • African-American students up from 26% to 39%
    • Hispanic students up from 35% to 50%
  – Math (from 2001 to 2006)
    • African-American students up from 26% to 41%
    • Hispanic students up from 41% to 56%

• 107,000 (48%) of Florida’s 4-year old children enrolled in the VPK Program during its first year.

• Florida’s community colleges lead the nation in the annual number of Associate degrees produced (over 63,000).

• Nearly 30,000 teachers were recruited for new positions in Florida’s K-12 classrooms.

• Over 4,800 K-12 administrators participated in leadership professional development.
2005-06 Gains in Goal 2: Seamless Articulation and Maximum Access

- The 2006 Florida Legislature and State Board of Education realized a banner year in “Setting and Aligning Academic Standards” in several ways that shape the future of Florida’s education system:
  - Established a cycle of revision of Sunshine State Standards aligning: review of standards, adoption of instructional materials, revision of performance assessments, and educator professional development requirements.
  - Unprecedented Middle School Reform, including: promotion requirements; intensified remediation requirements; career/postsecondary future planning; and access to high school courses while still in middle school.
  - Unprecedented High School Reform provisions: requiring schools to identify and allow student selection of “Majors” and “Minors” in careers and fields of student interest; increased math requirements; and increased reaching and math remediation for struggling students.
  - Established the Florida Schools of Excellence Commission expanding State Board of Education ability to authorize charter schools in the state.
2005-06 Gains in Goal 2: Seamless Articulation and Maximum Access
(continued)

• Targeted improvements in high school student success and advancement:
  – Public high school graduation rate from 71.9% to 73.5%.
  – Rate of high school standard diploma graduates continuing to postsecondary education from 63.7% to 64.6%.

• Florida charter schools both increased in quantity (to over 300) and improved in quality:
  – The percentage of all charter schools earning a grade “A” or “B” improved from 51.3% to 69.5%.
  – Charter school students enrolled in “A” and “B” charter schools improved from 59.9% to 77.4%.
2005-06 Gains in Goal 3: Skilled Workforce and Economic Development

- Targeted improvements in adult and career education credential attainment:
  - Adult General Education Programs (GED) from 36.2% to 36.5%.
  - Career-Technical Certificate Programs from 69.1% to 70.3%.

- Focused State Board of Education and Legislative policy to assist students in early career choices and opportunities:
  - Required the statewide implementation of career academies/small learning communities in high school
  - Created the Ready to Work Certification program
  - Requiring middle and high school students to complete planned programs of study around career interests (over 55,400 students created a personal planner using FACTS.org)

- Improved (from 74.6% to 75%) the percent of certificate and college credit workforce program completers placed in Florida employment.
2005-06 Gains in Goal 4: Quality Efficient Services

• With Legislative and State Board of Education leadership, Florida adopted educator performance pay policies and independent school accountability provisions:

  – The **STAR Plan performance pay program** to reward at least 25% of the highest performing public school teachers in the state, including an allocation of **$147.5 million** for the STAR Program.

  – **Differentiated pay policy** for Instructional Personnel and administrators that must at least recognize additional job responsibilities, school demographics, critical shortage areas and level of job performance difficulties.

  – **Scholarship Accountability** and **Charter School Accountability** provisions tightening local and state responsibilities related to the regulation, oversight and support of independent schools.
2005-06 Gains in Goal 4: Quality Efficient Services (continued)

- Improved DOE accountability for customer response and outreach activities:
  - About 30,000 customer inquiries to DOE during 2005-06 at 98.6% response-by-deadline rate
    - 24,300 inquiries through Commissioner’s Office
    - 3,400 media calls through Communications Office
    - 1,370 legislator and constituent inquiries through Governmental Relations Office
  - Over 16,000 customer feedback responses at 4.31 overall rating out of 5.0
    - 4.46% rating in Courtesy
    - 4.36% rating in Quality
    - 4.25% rating in Timeliness
    - 4.34% rating in Accuracy

- Ongoing DOE continuous improvement and quality control efforts:
  - Graduated second group of “rising-leaders” through the Commissioner’s Leadership Class.
  - Implemented a new “Zero-Based Budgeting” approach for Department operating budgets based on targeting and accomplishing SBE strategic goals and priority projects.
  - TaxWatch awarded 22 Davis Productivity awards to DOE staff, including an agency award for the Commissioner’s Performance Evaluation and a second agency award for Hurricane Response.
  - Continued integration of SBE “Eight to Be Great!” strategic priorities into performance workplans and evaluations of all DOE employees.
K-12 Legislative Initiatives

• Voluntary Prekindergarten Funds
• Florida Education Finance Program
  – Extraordinary Expenses – Fuel and Utilities Adjustment
  – Extraordinary Expenses – Property Insurance Premiums
  – Move the K-8 Virtual School into the FEFP funding formula
• Class Size Reduction
K-12 Legislative Initiatives

• Education Innovation Initiatives
  – Secondary School Reform
  – Sunshine State Standards
  – Florida Center for Mathematics and Science Research
  – William Cecil Golden Professional Development Program
  – Instructional Innovation – Digital Divide
• Assistance to Low Performing Schools
• College Reach Out Program
Voluntary Prekindergarten Education Program
2006-07 Appropriations for VPK FTE

2005-06 Data
• 220,857 – Estimated Total Number of Four-Year-Olds
• 147,235 – Planning Estimate (66.67%)
• 108,744 – Children Enrolled in School-Year and Summer Programs (49%)

2006-07 Data
• 222,198 - Estimated Total Number of Four-Year-Olds
• 144,228 – Planning Estimate (64.91%)
• 98,133 – Children Enrolled as of October 12, 2006 (44%)

2006-07 Appropriation
• 144,228 FTE
• $2,560 (Base Student Allocation (BSA))
• 5% Administrative Costs
• District Cost Differential (DCD)

\[
144,228 \times $2,560 \times 5\% \times DCD = $388,100,000 \\
(BSA \text{ increase of 2.4%})
\]
2006-07 Early Learning Standards and Accountability

Appropriation - $2,000,000

Provider Services
• VPK Regional Facilitators
• Printing and Distribution of Standards
• Curricula Approval and Research Support
• Parent Guide and Training
• Professional Development for Teachers (in the areas of vocabulary and language development, English language learners, and children with special needs)

Accountability
• VPK Improvement Process and Supports for Providers Not Meeting the Readiness Rate
2007-08 Request for VPK FTE

Data
• 225,831 - Estimated Total Number of Four-Year-Olds*
• 158,078 - Planning Estimate for VPK (70%)*

2007-08 Legislative Budget Request
• 158,078 FTE
• $2,657 (Base Student Allocation (BSA) (increase of 3.79%)
• 5% Administrative Costs
• District Cost Differential (DCD)

$$158,078 \times \$2,657 \times 5\% \times DCD = \$441,640,814$$
(total increase of 13.8%)
2007-08 Summary of Early Learning Request

$441,640,814  FTE for VPK (Transfer to AWI)
$2,975,000  Standards and Accountability
$1,633,624  FLKRS
$1,031,400  Career and Technical Education
$226,000  Gwen Cherry Center

$447,506,838
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
FEFP Historical Data
# FEFP Historical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Tax Roll</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>2,328,851.08</td>
<td>$674,898,325,364</td>
<td>$11,187,912,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>2,388,755.80</td>
<td>$729,695,487,646</td>
<td>$11,945,469,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>2,453,549.71</td>
<td>$805,016,872,212</td>
<td>$12,209,943,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>2,497,968.51</td>
<td>$885,304,012,717</td>
<td>$13,034,185,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>2,609,593.94</td>
<td>$1,110,955,654,200</td>
<td>$15,027,546,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>2,641,121.29</td>
<td>$1,315,213,529,382</td>
<td>$16,255,241,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>2,689,973.81</td>
<td>$1,648,441,698,038</td>
<td>$18,307,107,220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2006-07 K-12 Public School Investment

- 2,689,974 Students
- $18,264,071,151
- $6,789.68 per student
2007-08 FEFP Strategic Investment

- 2,722,143 Students
  - 30,785 Increase
- $20,158,296,872
- Provide $7,405.30 per student
  - 8.8% increase of over $600 per student
# 2007-08 Proposed Investment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highlights</th>
<th>(in millions)</th>
<th>(% change)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Size Reduction Allocation</td>
<td>$714.28</td>
<td>33.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESE Guaranteed Allocation</td>
<td>$62.59</td>
<td>5.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Academic Instruction</td>
<td>$32.08</td>
<td>4.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Instruction Allocation</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
<td>23.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Differentiated Pay</td>
<td>$15.10</td>
<td>10.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary Expense – Property Insurance Premiums</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary Expense – Fuel &amp; Utilities Adjustment</td>
<td>$25.70</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Transportation</td>
<td>$14.35</td>
<td>2.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
K-12 Education

Educator Quality
Student Achievement
2007-08 Legislative Budget Request
K-12 Funding Summary

• Educator Quality
  – Recruitment and Retention - $1,500,000
  – Performance Pay (STAR) - $162,600,000
  – Bonuses for NBTS (Dale Hickam) - $102,191,178
  – William Cecil Golden Professional Development Program for School Leaders (DELTA) - $4,000,000
  – Instructional Innovation – Digital Educators - $1,450,000
  – Educator Liability Insurance - $1,400,000
Expected Results

*Educator Quality*

- Ensure that every classroom is staffed by a qualified teacher
- Increase the number of highly effective teachers
- Increase retention of highly effective teachers
- Reduce the time to obtain licensure and conduct investigations
- Produce more effective school leaders
2007-08 Legislative Budget Request
K-12 Funding Summary

• Student Achievement
  – School and Instructional Enhancements - $10,178,028
  – Review and Revise Sunshine State Standards - $1,400,000
  – Instructional Materials - $3,900,000
  – Parent Outreach: Supplemental Education Services - $50,000
  – Secondary Reform - $13,500,000
  – Mathematics and Science Research Center - $3,000,000
  – College Reach Out Program - $4,799,990

• Family and Community Involvement
  – Mentoring/Student Assistance Initiatives - $20,170,000
  – School District Matching Grants - $4,000,000
Expected Results

Student Achievement

• Increase the level of rigor of the SSS
• Increase academic expectations for all students
• Increase the relevance of the high school experience
• Increase number of high school graduates
• Increase parental and community involvement
• Decrease the number of high school drop outs
2007-08 Proposed Budget
Just Read, Florida!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006-07 Appropriation</th>
<th>2007-08 SBE Request</th>
<th>$ Increase</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEFP</td>
<td>111,800,000</td>
<td>137,800,000</td>
<td>26,000,000</td>
<td>23.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-FEFP</td>
<td>18,500,000</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>8.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>58,043,873</td>
<td>58,043,873</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188,343,873</td>
<td>215,843,873</td>
<td>27,500,000</td>
<td>14.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact of 2007-08 Funding

• State dollars will provide:
  – Free tuition for 25,000 teachers for reading endorsement training
  – Site-based professional development support for 400 struggling schools
  – Training for all K-12 reading coaches and principals
  – Training for content area and elective teachers
  – Training for 500,000 parents
  – Reduced retraining efforts through support to Educator Preparation Institutes

• FEFP dollars will provide additional funding to continue expansion of Just Read, Florida! efforts into middle and high schools including:
  – Assessments
  – Professional development
  – Research-based instructional materials
  – The potential for 2,500 reading coaches K-12 (+400 2006-07)
# 2007-08 K-12 Proposed Budget Investment Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K-12</th>
<th>2006-07 Appropriation</th>
<th>2007-08 SBE Request</th>
<th>2007-08 Request Increase over 2006-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Grants/K-12 Programs – FEFP State and Local</td>
<td>18,264,071,151</td>
<td>20,158,296,872</td>
<td>1,894,225,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grants K-12 Programs</td>
<td>2,084,648,221</td>
<td>2,122,518,089</td>
<td>37,869,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Non-FEFP &amp; Technology</td>
<td>513,193,080</td>
<td>501,491,655</td>
<td>(11,701,425)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total K-12 State and Local</td>
<td>20,861,912,452</td>
<td>22,782,306,616</td>
<td>1,920,394,164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.21%
Fixed Capital Outlay
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remodeling/</td>
<td>$223.2</td>
<td>$194.8</td>
<td>$188.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$860.5</td>
<td>$295.0</td>
<td>$316.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,083.7</td>
<td>$489.8</td>
<td>$504.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2007-08 PECO
LBR by Divisions of Education

Total Appropriation $1,083,700,000
Less off-the-top $37,479,366

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>K-12</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>SUS</th>
<th>CFK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-Yr Average IN</td>
<td>44.02%</td>
<td>25.24%</td>
<td>30.74%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PECO for CFK</td>
<td>$460,546,323</td>
<td>$264,066,088</td>
<td>$321,608,223</td>
<td>$1,046,220,634</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Class Size - Estimated Cost of Construction *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 Years</th>
<th>Required Number of New Classrooms Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08 thru 2010-11</td>
<td>6,918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Cost**  
$2,876,352,301

* No capacity assigned to Leased/Rented Relocatables
Classrooms for Kids

• Prior Appropriations
  - 2003-2004 $600,000,000
  - 2004-2005 $100,000,000
  - 2005-2006 $83,400,000
  - 2006-2007 $1,100,000,000

• 2007-2008 Request $2,876,352,301

• 2007-08 / 2010-11 $2,876,352,301

• Total 2003-04/2010-11 $4,759,752,301
# K-12 Class Size Reduction

## Total Operating and Capital Costs to Implement through 2010-11

**DOE Current Policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2003/04</th>
<th>2004/05</th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
<th>8 Yr Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>468,198,634</td>
<td>468,198,634</td>
<td>468,198,634</td>
<td>468,198,634</td>
<td>468,198,634</td>
<td>468,198,634</td>
<td>468,198,634</td>
<td>468,198,634</td>
<td>3,745,589,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>503,992,582</td>
<td>503,992,582</td>
<td>503,992,582</td>
<td>503,992,582</td>
<td>503,992,582</td>
<td>503,992,582</td>
<td>503,992,582</td>
<td>503,992,582</td>
<td>3,527,948,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>535,008,480</td>
<td>535,008,480</td>
<td>535,008,480</td>
<td>535,008,480</td>
<td>535,008,480</td>
<td>535,008,480</td>
<td>535,008,480</td>
<td>535,008,480</td>
<td>3,210,050,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>644,030,875</td>
<td>644,030,875</td>
<td>644,030,875</td>
<td>644,030,875</td>
<td>644,030,875</td>
<td>644,030,875</td>
<td>644,030,875</td>
<td>644,030,875</td>
<td>3,220,154,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>714,276,005</td>
<td>714,276,005</td>
<td>714,276,005</td>
<td>714,276,005</td>
<td>714,276,005</td>
<td>714,276,005</td>
<td>714,276,005</td>
<td>714,276,005</td>
<td>2,857,104,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>670,848,549</td>
<td>670,848,549</td>
<td>670,848,549</td>
<td>670,848,549</td>
<td>670,848,549</td>
<td>670,848,549</td>
<td>670,848,549</td>
<td>670,848,549</td>
<td>2,012,545,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>733,814,864</td>
<td>733,814,864</td>
<td>733,814,864</td>
<td>733,814,864</td>
<td>733,814,864</td>
<td>733,814,864</td>
<td>733,814,864</td>
<td>733,814,864</td>
<td>1,467,629,728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
<th>FCO Costs</th>
<th>TOTAL to Implement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>468,198,634</td>
<td>600,000,000</td>
<td>1,068,198,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>972,191,216</td>
<td>100,000,000</td>
<td>1,072,191,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>1,507,199,696</td>
<td>83,400,000</td>
<td>1,590,599,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>2,151,230,571</td>
<td>1,100,000,000</td>
<td>3,251,230,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>2,865,506,576</td>
<td>2,876,352,301</td>
<td>5,741,858,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>3,536,355,125</td>
<td>4,270,169,989</td>
<td>5,577,517,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>4,270,169,989</td>
<td>5,077,517,287</td>
<td>9,347,687,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>5,077,517,287</td>
<td>733,814,864</td>
<td>5,811,332,151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Operating Costs: 20,848,369,094

Total FCO Costs: 4,759,752,301

Total to Implement: 25,608,121,395
Charter School
PECOS Capital Outlay Allocation

• Based on the 1.8% CPI -- New Construction increased for K-12 for 2006-07 to 2007-08 including the PECO used for CSR in allocating percentages.

• 2006-07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$53,083,974</td>
<td>$54,039,458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage 1.8%
Increase $955,511
2007-08
K-12 Career and Specialized Learning Academies

$25 Million  50/50 Matching Program with School Districts

To remodel and equip up to 200 existing classrooms and/or laboratories to support this K-12 initiative.
## Summary of FCO Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>2006-07 Appropriation</th>
<th>2007-08 Request</th>
<th>2007-08 Request $ and % Increase over 2006-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida School for the Deaf and Blind Capital Projects</td>
<td>11,465,690</td>
<td>13,861,719</td>
<td>20.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Blind Services - Capital Projects</td>
<td>1,125,000</td>
<td>8,185,000</td>
<td>627.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Broadcasting Projects</td>
<td>1,329,307</td>
<td>15,432,647</td>
<td>1060.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance, Repair, Renovation, and Remodeling</td>
<td>302,000,000</td>
<td>223,200,000</td>
<td>-26.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Facility Construction Account</td>
<td>27,531,199</td>
<td>13,794,701</td>
<td>-49.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational-Technical Facilities</td>
<td>946,878</td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td>185.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career and Specialized Learning Academies 50/50 Match</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint-Use Facilities Projects</td>
<td>6,550,044</td>
<td>4,185,826</td>
<td>-36.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Recommended Needs - Public Schools</td>
<td>242,405,295</td>
<td>241,817,742</td>
<td>-0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Mill equivalent funding for Developmental Research Schools</td>
<td>3,676,872</td>
<td>4,935,063</td>
<td>34.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College Projects</td>
<td>358,839,136</td>
<td>243,305,292</td>
<td>-32.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUS Projects</td>
<td>420,335,323</td>
<td>287,282,010</td>
<td>-31.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School Class-Size Reduction Construction</td>
<td>1,100,000,000</td>
<td>2,876,352,301</td>
<td>161.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>958,783,164</td>
<td>1,021,580,000</td>
<td>6.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms First and 1997 School Capital Outlay Bond Programs</td>
<td>167,885,407</td>
<td>167,693,967</td>
<td>-0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size Reduction - Debt Service - Lottery Capital Outlay</td>
<td>100,310,506</td>
<td>50,454,706</td>
<td>-49.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District and Community College</td>
<td>21,100,000</td>
<td>21,800,000</td>
<td>3.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College Facilities Matching Program</td>
<td>35,008,007</td>
<td>42,427,562</td>
<td>21.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUS Projects - Construction Cost Increase</td>
<td>56,543,246</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUS Facility Enhancement Challenge Grants</td>
<td>55,971,620</td>
<td>205,852,100</td>
<td>267.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fixed Capital Outlay</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,871,806,694</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,469,860,636</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.27%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2007-08 Fixed Capital Outlay Request

- 0.78% Off the Top Allocations
- 3.78% Distribution to K-12
- 0.69% Distribution to CC
- 8.45% Distribution to SUS
- 4.51% Classrooms for Kids Program
- 5.90% Spending Authority for Debt Service
- 22.74% Spending Authority for Administration of Programs
- 52.76% Community College Facilities Matching Program
- 43% SUS Facilities Matching Program
Class Size
The Constitutional Amendment

Limits Class Sizes

November 2002 establishing, by the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year, the maximum number of students in core-curricula courses assigned to a teacher in each of the following three grade groups:

- 18 students in Prekindergarten through Grade 3.
- 22 students in Grades 4 through 8
- 25 students in Grades 9 through 12
Section 1003.03(2), Florida Statutes,

**Implements the Constitutional Amendment by Establishing measures for Compliance.**

- Establishes a baseline based on data from the February 2003 student membership survey.
- Establishes a method of measuring compliance and schedule for implementation.
- Establishes requirements of those districts found to be non-compliant.
Section 1003.03(2), Florida Statutes,

**Schedule for Implementation of Compliance with the Constitutional Amendment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Compliance Measured at</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003-04 to 2005-06</td>
<td>District-Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07 &amp; 2007-08</td>
<td>School-Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09 &amp; After</td>
<td>Classroom-Level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPLEMENTATION OPTIONS

– Dual enrollment
– Florida Virtual School
– Repeal policies requiring more than 24 credits for graduation
– Adopt policies to allow graduation after passing the grade 10 FCAT and completing the necessary courses
– Maximize use of instructional staff
– Reduce the cost of school construction
IMPLEMENTATION OPTIONS

– Joint-use facilities
– Alternative methods of class scheduling
– Redraw school attendance zones
– Operate schools beyond the normal operating hours
– Use year-round schools and other nontraditional calendars
– Review and consider amending any collective bargaining contracts
– Any other approach not prohibited by law
ACCOUNTABILITY – CLASS SIZE

• Beginning in 2005-2006, DOE must report to the Legislature by January 1 of each year districts that have not met the two-student-per-year reduction.

• Districts that have not met the two-student-per-year reduction will be required to implement one of the following policies in the subsequent school year:
  – 1. Year-round schools;
  – 2. Double sessions;
  – 3. Rezoning; or
ACCOUNTABILITY – CLASS SIZE

- A school district that is required to implement one of the policies must correct in the year of implementation any past deficiencies and bring the district into compliance with the two-student-per-year reduction goals established for the district by the department.
- The district superintendent must report to the Commissioner the extent to which the district implemented any of the policies.
- The Department of Education shall use statutory enforcement authority to ensure that districts comply with the provisions.
- Beginning in the 2006-2007 school year, the department shall annually determine which districts do not meet the requirements.
ACCOUNTABILITY – CLASS SIZE

• DOE shall develop a constitutional compliance plan for each such district which includes:
  – Redrawing school attendance zones.

• Each district school board shall implement the constitutional compliance plan developed by the state board until the district complies with the constitutional class size maximums.
2006 Legislation – HB 7087
Team-Teaching Strategies

• Teaching strategies implemented on or after July 1, 2005, may be implemented subject to the following restrictions:
  – 1. Reasonable limits shall be placed on the number of students in a classroom so that classrooms are not overcrowded. Teacher-to-student ratios within a curriculum area or grade level must not exceed constitutional limits.
  – 2. At least one member of the team must have at least 3 years of teaching experience.
  – 3. At least one member of the team must be teaching in-field.
  – 4. The teachers must be trained in team-teaching methods within 1 year after assignment.
Team-Teaching Implementation Plan

- Occupancy governed by Florida Fire Code
- Curriculum area and grade-level class size averages must meet constitutional caps
- 2005-06 School-Level Class Size Averages have been adjusted per new law.
- Class Size Website will be updated to include each districts’ team-teaching strategies.
Team-Teaching

• Team Teaching is an umbrella term and includes
  – Co-teaching
  – Inclusion, i.e., In class one-on-one
Team-Teaching Co-Teachers

• If two or more teachers are assigned to a group of students and each of the teachers is responsible for ALL of the students during the ENTIRE period span indicated on the schedule, then all of the teachers should be coded “C” and the total number of students (unduplicated) will be divided by the number of teachers marked with a “C.”
Team-Teaching
In Class One-on-One

• If two teachers are assigned to one term/classroom/period, but one of them is only responsible for one student or a small group of students in the classroom, the primary teacher should be coded “S” (Self-Contained) and the other teacher or teachers should be assigned to the students for whom he or she is responsible and coded “I” (In Class One-On-One).
DOE Class Size Technical Assistance

- May 2006 – school-level averages provided to every superintendent
- June 2006 – FSFOA and DOE Data Base Conferences
- August 2006 – adjusted school-level averages provided to every superintendent
- September 2006 – 3 test class size processing runs prior to membership survey
- October 2006 – team-teaching website available
Web Application: Class Size Online

• Select **School Year** and **Survey**
• All schools in your district are provided in a drop down menu
• For each school, there is a list of every **FISH, Term, Period combination**. Main Course, Core Course, and Main Grade are displayed
• For each FISH/Term/Period combination, **Course**, Section, Facility Type, and whether the course is Excluded is displayed
• For each **Course** taught in the FISH/Term/Period, Teacher, Scheduling Method and # of Students by Grade is displayed
Trends in Class Size Reduction Updated with Preliminary 2006-07 Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades PK-3</th>
<th>Grades 4-8</th>
<th>Grades 9-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>20.54</td>
<td>24.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.98</td>
<td>18.16</td>
<td>24.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.16</td>
<td>17.01</td>
<td>23.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.01</td>
<td>19.45</td>
<td>22.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.01</td>
<td>19.45</td>
<td>22.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Grades PK-3
- Grades 4-8
- Grades 9-12
Percent of Classrooms Over Class Size Cap

Traditional Schools

*Preliminary counts based on class size processing as of 11/03/06
Percent of Classrooms Over Class Size Cap

Charter Schools

*Preliminary counts based on class size processing as of 11/03/06
Traditional Schools in Compliance (Reduce by Two or Meet Caps)

*Preliminary counts based on class size processing as of 11/03/06
Charter Schools in Compliance (Reduce by Two or Meet Caps)

Charter Schools

*Preliminary counts based on class size processing as of 11/03/06*
Preliminary Transfer Calculation
Traditional Schools

- Grades K-3: $22.6
- Grades 4-8: $9.5
- Grades 9-12: $7.3

Transfer in Millions of Dollars
Allocation Conference Decisions

• New schools (charter and traditional) use district average as school baseline
• Charter schools transfer calculation
• Bases for appeals
  – Unexpected student growth – use district percentage applied to each school
  – Inability to hire teachers
  – Charter schools – threat to going concern
Preliminary Transfer Calculation
Charter Schools

$8.5
$7.6
$0.7

Transfer in Millions of Dollars

Grades K-3  Grades 4-8  Grades 9-12
STAR – Special Teachers are Rewarded
STAR Basics

- $147.5 million is provided for the Special Teachers Are Rewarded performance pay plan (STAR Plan)
- District comprehensive STAR Plans due to the State Board of Education by December 31, 2006
- Implementation in 2006-07 school year, if plan is approved
STAR Basics

• Rewards teachers based upon their performance on critical factors, the primary one of which is improved student achievement
• Includes all instructional personnel as defined in s. 1012.01(2)(a) – (d), FS
• Includes instructional personnel in all K-12 schools in each district
• STAR implements performance pay in accordance with s. 1012.22, FS
STAR Timelines

• **December 31, 2006** – Deadline for submitting a comprehensive STAR Plan to the State Board for approval
• **March 1, 2007** – Deadline for submitting a revised STAR Plan in the event the State Board determines a plan needs revisions
• **March 19, 2007** – Last State Board meeting during which STAR plans may be approved.
• **April 1, 2007** – State Board determines allocation of STAR funds based upon approved plans. Recalculation of undistributed funds will be completed and those funds distributed as soon as possible after this date.
• **June 30, 2007** – Districts must encumber funds for bonus payments to STAR awardees. Payments must be made to eligible instructional personnel at the next regular payroll action.
District STAR Plan Requirements

- Include rewards for elementary, middle and high school instructional personnel
- Distribute awards of at least 5% of the base pay of the best performing 25% of instructional personnel
- Use any remaining funds to award additional instructional or school-based administrative personnel based upon the plan
- Distribute awards for approved charter school plans based on each school’s proportion of the district’s total K-12 based funding
- District allocation = its portion of the state total K-12 base funding
District Plans

- Fair, equitable, understandable and transparent
- Allows for all instructional personnel to be eligible for an award without an application
- Weights improved student achievement as at least 50% of the total evaluation score
- Designed to reward those teachers whose students show the greatest improved achievement
- Designed to reward individuals and not groups; and
- Utilizes a district-approved evaluation system with four to six levels of performance.
STAR Program Status

- Hillsborough’s STAR Plan approved October 17, 2006
- More than half of remaining districts have either submitted a draft plan for review or are in contact with their “STAR Buddy” at DOE
- [www.fldoe.org/STAR](http://www.fldoe.org/STAR)
  - Technical Assistance Papers
  - Approved District Plans
  - Value Table PowerPoint and Examples
  - Proviso Language
  - District STAR Allocations
Voluntary Prekindergarten Program
Topics

• 2005-06 & 2006-07 VPK Program
  – Statistics
  – Summer Program
District VPK Participation
as of 09/21/05

- Districts Ineligible, 8
- Districts Participating, 41
- Districts Not Participating, 18
2005-06 Percentages of Children Enrolled in School-Year VPK

0% to 25%, 3 Counties (5%)
26% to 50%, 41 Counties (61%)
51% to 75%, 19 Counties (28%)
76% to 100%, 2 Counties (3%)
101% to 136%, 2 Counties (3%)
2005-06 Statistics

220,857  -  Total Number of Four-Year-Olds
96,293  -  School-Year Participants
12,462  -  Summer Program Participants
108,755  (49% of Total Four-Year-Olds)
2005-06 Summer Program

Participation

- 12,462 – Summer Program (11%)
  - 71.8% - Public Schools (61/67 Districts)
  - 28.1% - Private Centers
  - < .1% - Family Child Care Homes
  - < .1% - Private Schools
2005-06 Percentages of Children Enrolled in Summer VPK

- **0% to 5%, 38 Counties (57%)**
- **6% to 10%, 21 Counties (31%)**
- **11% to 15%, 3 Counties (4.5%)**
- **16% to 20%, 3 Counties (4.5%)**
- **21% to 28%, 2 Counties (3%)**
Districts by Number of Summer VPK Classrooms
2005-06

- **36** Districts (Less than 5 Classrooms)
- **5** Districts (6 to 10 Classrooms)
- **11** Districts (11 to 25 Classrooms)
- **8** Districts (26 to 50 Classrooms)
- **7** Districts (51 to 111 Classrooms)
Summer VPK Evaluation: Provider Survey

- Total Responses: 494
- Total Counties Responding: 49
  - Total Private Provider Responses: 43
  - Total Public School Responses: 451
  - Total Center Director Responses: 37
  - Total District Administrator Responses: 48
  - Total Other Responses: 41
  - Total Principal Responses: 68
  - Total VPK Teacher Responses: 300
“Describe the most significant success you experienced.”

- 59% indicated that children's growth and readiness for kindergarten was their most significant success
  
  “The growth of the children was incredible. They are much more prepared for kindergarten.”

- 26% considered the Summer VPK program an overall success
  
  “Parents, students, and teachers said they liked the program and want it to continue.”

- 4% thought parent satisfaction was one of their major successes

- 11% stated teacher satisfaction was their most significant success
“What were the biggest challenges you faced…?"

- Required Paper Work: 23%
- Sufficient Start-up Time: 22%
- Materials: 18%
- Scheduling: 18%
- Substitutes: 19%
2006-07 District VPK Participation as of 10/25/06

- Districts Ineligible, 1 (1.5%)
- Districts Not Participating, 14 (20.9%)
- Districts Participating, 52 (77.6%)
2006-07 Statistics

- 222,199 - Total Number of Four-Year-Olds
- 101,136 - School-Year Participants (46%)
Contact Information

Office of Early Learning
Florida Department of Education
(850) 245-0445
everylearning@fldoe.org
Educational Facilities
Growth Management Senate Bill 260 Implementation
School Planning - Status

- Incentivized interlocal agreement program—40 counties
- Pilot school facilities—6 communities
- TA documents
  - Proportionate Share Mitigation for Public School Concurrency
  - Establishing LOS Standards for School Concurrency
  - Best Practices Guide
  - Model School Concurrency Management Ordinance
  - Model Proportionate Share Mitigation Ordinance
  - Model Development Agreement (for prop share)
- Comprehensive plan amendments reviewed for coordination with school board
School Planning - Implementation

• Establishing service areas
  – Adjacency requirement—travel distance and time (Walton County)
• Uniform level of service standards
  – Lowest common denominator
  – Can’t tier individual schools
  – Long-term concurrency management system
• Use of long-term concurrency management systems (CMS)
  – Sarasota County
• Adoption of financially feasible school facilities work plans into comp plans
  – Meeting LOS standards for first 5 years
  – Hillsborough County
• Charter schools
  – Inclusion
  – Building standards
Schools – Next Steps

• 2008 deadline for updating interlocal agreements and adopting public school facilities elements

• Penalty for failure to adopt—prohibition on adopting CPAs that increase density

• Additional workshops this year
Charter School Capital Outlay Funding
Eligibility for Capital Outlay Funds

- Section 1013.62(1), F.S.
- The charter school must:
  - Have been in operation for 3 or more years, be an expanded feeder pattern school of another school currently receiving capital funds, or have SACS accreditation.
  - Be approved by its sponsoring school district;
  - Serve students in facilities not provided by the sponsoring school district;
  - Have financial stability for future operations;
  - Have satisfactory student achievement grades;
Eligibility for Capital Outlay Funds, cont.

- Have entered into a written agreement with the sponsoring district that includes provisions for the reversion of any unencumbered funds, equipment, and property to the school board or state; and,

- Not be a charter school converted from school district facilities.
  - However, a conversion school is still eligible for PECO maintenance, repair, and renovation funds through allocations to the sponsoring school district.
- Also, the department requires that a Charter School Capital Outlay Plan be submitted for each fiscal year allocation.
Uses of Capital Outlay Funds

• **Section1013.62(2), F.S.**
  – Purchase of real property;
  – Construction of school facilities;
  – Purchase, lease-purchase, or lease of permanent or relocatable school facilities;
  – Purchase of vehicles to transport students to and from the charter school; or
  – Renovation, repair, and maintenance of school facilities the charter school owns or is purchasing through a lease-purchase option or long-term lease of 5 years or longer.
Proposed Legislative Changes for Educational Facilities During the 2007 Session
5 Year Survey – 5 Year Work Plan

• **Proposal:**

  • Align the educational plant survey and the 5-year workplan
Renting/Leasing Relocatables

• Proposal:
• No longer allow any renewals of leases or rental agreements for relocatable classrooms that do not meet requirements for long-term use.
Depreciation of Non-Combustible Relocatables

• Proposal:
  • Increase the expected life of relocatable and modular facilities constructed with noncombustible materials from 20 to 35 years
Charter School - COFTE

• **Issue:**

• How should we count COFTE for private (non-school district operated) charter schools that have a hybrid or other type agreement that allows them to rent or lease or otherwise use space that is owned or maintained by a public school district?
This presentation will be available online at:

http://www.firn.edu/doe/cefo/budget.htm