

The Florida Senate
COMMITTEE MEETING EXPANDED AGENDA

EDUCATION PRE-K - 12
Senator Wise, Chair
Senator Bullard, Vice Chair

MEETING DATE: Tuesday, April 5, 2011
TIME: 1:15 —3:15 p.m.
PLACE: 301 Senate Office Building

MEMBERS: Senator Wise, Chair; Senator Bullard, Vice Chair; Senators Alexander, Benacquisto, and Montford

TAB	BILL NO. and INTRODUCER	BILL DESCRIPTION and SENATE COMMITTEE ACTIONS	COMMITTEE ACTION
1	SB 700 Siplin (Similar H 309)	Education; Authorizes district school boards to adopt resolutions that allow prayers of invocation or benediction at secondary school events. Provides legislative intent. Provides for severability.	ED 03/30/2011 Temporarily Postponed ED 04/05/2011 JU RC
2	SB 1584 Sobel (Identical H 1385)	Deaf and Hard-of-hearing Children; Creates the "Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Children's Education Bill of Rights." Provides findings and purpose. Recognizes the unique communication needs of deaf and hard-of-hearing children and encourages the development of a communication-driven and language-driven educational delivery system in the state. Requires the Department of Education to develop a communication model to become part of the individual education plan process for deaf and hard-of-hearing students.	ED 04/05/2011 BC
3	SB 1620 Flores (Compare H 7197)	K-12 Educational Instruction; Adds statewide virtual providers to the list of public school choices. Authorizes the creation of a virtual charter school. Requires the virtual charter school to contract with an approved statewide virtual provider. Provides for funding of the virtual charter school. Provides for a blended-learning charter school. Provides that home education students may enroll in certain virtual education courses or courses offered in the school district in which they reside, etc.	ED 04/05/2011 BC

Consideration of proposed committee bill:

COMMITTEE MEETING EXPANDED AGENDA

Education Pre-K - 12

Tuesday, April 5, 2011, 1:15 —3:15 p.m.

TAB	BILL NO. and INTRODUCER	BILL DESCRIPTION and SENATE COMMITTEE ACTIONS	COMMITTEE ACTION
4	SPB 7234	District School Board Members; Removes provisions relating to base salary and additional compensation for a district school board member. Prohibits district school board members from receiving more than a \$100 stipend per school board meeting. Provides that the stipend does not constitute compensation for retirement purposes. Provides reimbursement for travel expenses. Prohibits district school board members from receiving any compensation while serving. Provides for application, etc.	

The Florida Senate
BILL ANALYSIS AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

(This document is based on the provisions contained in the legislation as of the latest date listed below.)

Prepared By: The Professional Staff of the Education Pre-K - 12 Committee

BILL: SB 700

INTRODUCER: Senator Siplin

SUBJECT: Education

DATE: March 24, 2011

REVISED: _____

	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR	REFERENCE	ACTION
1.	Brown	Matthews	ED	Pre-meeting
2.	_____	_____	JU	_____
3.	_____	_____	RC	_____
4.	_____	_____	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____	_____	_____

I. Summary:

This bill provides, on a permissive basis, authority for district school boards to adopt resolutions regarding student delivery of inspirational messages, including prayers, at secondary school level gatherings, such as at commencement.

If adopted, language is required to be included in the resolution, such as that the decision to use a prayer is at the option of student government; only students can deliver prayers; prayers are nonsectarian and nonproselytizing; and school personnel is precluded from participating in or influencing students in decisions to use prayers.

This bill creates an undesignated section of law in the Florida Statutes.

II. Present Situation:

On August 27, 2008, the American Civil Liberties Union filed a lawsuit in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida against the Santa Rosa County School District, alleging that prayers in school were state-sponsored and violative of the Establishment Clause and the no-aid provision of the state constitution.¹ On May 6, 2009, both parties entered a consent decree and the court issued an order which provided, in part, for permanent injunction against school officials from:

- Promoting, advancing, endorsing, or causing prayers in conjunction with school events;
- Planning, organizing, promoting, or sponsoring religious services;

¹ *Does v. School Board for Santa Rosa County, Florida* (Case Number 3:08-cv-361/MCR/EMT)

- Holding school events at a religious venue when an alternative venue is reasonably suitable that is not a religious venue; and
- Permitting school officials to promote personal religious beliefs.

Subsequent to the issuance of the consent decree, a contempt order was issued by the court against two school officials for violation of the decree, with possible punishment of jail time and fines.² On September 17, 2009, the court found the school officials not guilty.³ The consent decree remains, but has been recently challenged in U.S. District Court by plaintiff teachers and other staff, alleging violations of their First Amendment rights.⁴ On March 21, 2011, the court issued an order which grants, in part, a preliminary injunction enjoining the school board from enforcing school policies restricting employee participation in private religious service, including baccalaureate. The final hearing in the case is expected mid-summer.

The 2010 Legislature passed a bill which prohibits district school boards and administrative and instructional personnel from taking affirmative action, including entering into agreements that infringe First Amendment rights of personnel or students, unless waived in writing.⁵

III. Effect of Proposed Changes:

This bill authorizes, but does not require, district school boards to adopt resolutions regarding the delivery of inspirational messages, including prayers of invocation or benediction, at secondary school commencement exercises or other noncompulsory student assemblies.

If adopted, the resolution must include language that provides:

- The use of a prayer of invocation or benediction is at the discretion of the student government;
- Students will deliver all prayers;
- All prayers will be nonsectarian and nonproselytizing in nature; and
- School personnel may not participate in, or otherwise influence any student in determining whether to use prayers.

This bill identifies as its purpose the provision of the solemnization and memorialization of secondary school events and ceremonies, rather than to advance or endorse any religion or religious belief.

IV. Constitutional Issues:

A. Municipality/County Mandates Restrictions:

None.

² *Florida School Officials Get Jail Time*, www.cnn.com/2009/CRIME/09/17/florida.school.prayer (September 17, 2009); Last checked March 23, 2011.

³ *Lay, Freeman Not Guilty in School Prayer Case*; <http://www.northescambia.com/?p=10943>; Last checked March 23, 2011.

⁴ *Mary E. Allen v. School Board for Santa Rosa County, Florida* (N.D. U.S.D.C. 2011) (Case Number 3:10-cv-00142-MCR-CJK).

⁵ ch. 2010-214, L.O.F.; s. 1003.4505, F.S.

B. Public Records/Open Meetings Issues:

None.

C. Trust Funds Restrictions:

None.

D. Other Constitutional Issues:

The First Amendment to the Federal Constitution provides, in part:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof....

This provision is typically referred to as the Establishment Clause.

Section 3, Article I, of the State Constitution provides:

There shall be no law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting or penalizing the free exercise thereof....No revenue of the state or any political subdivision or agency thereof shall ever be taken from the public treasury directly or indirectly in aid of any church, sect, or religious denomination or in aid of any sectarian institution.

In 1962, the U.S. Supreme Court indicated that evidence of direct government compulsion is not required in an Establishment Clause case (as would generally be the case for Free Exercise claims.) In Engel v. Vitale, the court found impermissible daily prayer in schools, regardless of whether students were specifically and individually required to participate, on the basis that prayer in elementary and secondary schools carries particular risk of indirect coercion.⁶

In 1971, the U.S. Supreme Court established the seminal test to apply to these cases, in Lemon v. Kurtzman, which requires that the following be demonstrated for constitutionality:

- The statute must contain a secular purpose;
- The statute's principal or primary effect is one that neither advances nor inhibits religion; and
- The statute must not foster excessive government entanglement with religion.⁷

The last prong remains the critical focus of the test.⁸

⁶ *Engel v. Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421, 441-442 (1962).

⁷ 403 U.S. 602, 612-13 (1971).

⁸ John P. Cronan, *A Political Process Argument for the Constitutionality of Student-led, Student-initiated Prayer*, 18 YLLPR 503, 510 (2000).

In 1992, however, the Supreme Court did not apply the Lemon test to a case involving endorsement of nonsectarian prayer and emphasized, instead, indicia of whether government actions constituted a pervasive degree of involvement, commonly referred to as the Coercion Test.⁹ Here, that school officials decided themselves to have prayer at commencement, selected clergy, and influenced speech content by providing a pamphlet to the clergy with guidelines for nonsectarian prayer, the court determined, rose to the level of impermissible pervasive activity.¹⁰ Although asserted that attendance was voluntary, the very monumental nature of a graduation made student participation mandatory.

In Santa Fe Independent School District v. Doe, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that school district policy which authorized student-led, student-initiated invocations at football games did not constitute private speech.¹¹ In this case, the policy authorized student elections to determine whether invocations should be provided at games, and if so, who should deliver the invocation.¹² The District Court limited the policy to nonsectarian, nonproselytizing prayer. In finding the lower court's modified policy unconstitutional, the Supreme Court applied a hybrid Lemon/Lee test and determined that a policy that expressly authorizes prayer at all promotes religion, constitutes unlawful coercion, and is therefore facially unconstitutional:

Indeed, the only type of message expressly endorsed in the policy is an "invocation," a term which primarily describes an appeal for divine assistance.... Through its election scheme, the District has established a government mechanism that turns the school into a forum for religious debate.... It further empowers the student body majority.... to subject students of minority views to constitutionally improper messages.¹³

In 2001, in Adler v. State, the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals reviewed a Duval County school district policy that permitted a graduating student, elected by her class, to give a message unrestricted by the school,¹⁴ which specifically provided:

1. The use of a brief opening and/or closing message, not to exceed two minutes, at high school graduation exercises shall rest within the discretion of the graduating senior class;
2. The opening and/or closing message shall be given by a student volunteer, in the graduating senior class, chosen by the graduating senior class as a whole;
3. If the graduating senior class chooses to use an opening and/or closing message, the content of that message shall be prepared by the student

⁹ *Lee v. Weisman*, 505 U.S. 577, 578 (1992).

¹⁰ *Id.* at 578, 587.

¹¹ 530 U.S. 290 (2000).

¹² *Id.* at 297.

¹³ *Id.* at 291, 316.

¹⁴ 250 F.3d 1330 (11th Cir. 2001).

volunteer and...not be monitored or...reviewed by Duval County School Board, its officers or employees;
The purpose of these guidelines is to allow students to direct their own graduation message without monitoring or review by school officials.¹⁵

Here, the court held that as this policy was neutral on-its-face and did not involve any degree of state control, it was facially constitutional.¹⁶

Although it is difficult to gauge how this bill would be implemented in practice, it can be said that a Duval County-type policy, which authorizes a student message to be delivered at graduation but does not mention prayer, and prohibits school review of content, presents the strongest case for constitutionality. At the other end of the continuum, a school district policy which allows students to decide if they want a student-led prayer to be delivered at a school event similar to Santa Fe may be constitutionally suspect. Less certain outcomes exist for other factual combinations. That this bill references only the secondary, rather than the K-12 setting, is likely inconsequential.

V. Fiscal Impact Statement:

A. Tax/Fee Issues:

None.

B. Private Sector Impact:

None.

C. Government Sector Impact:

This bill authorizes, but does not require school boards to draft policies addressing inspirational messages. Therefore, any fiscal impact related to policy drafting and adoption is expected to be insignificant.

VI. Technical Deficiencies:

None.

VII. Related Issues:

None.

¹⁵ *Id.* at 1332.

¹⁶ *Id.* at 1333.

VIII. Additional Information:

- A. **Committee Substitute – Statement of Substantial Changes:**
(Summarizing differences between the Committee Substitute and the prior version of the bill.)

None.

- B. **Amendments:**

None.

This Senate Bill Analysis does not reflect the intent or official position of the bill's introducer or the Florida Senate.

The Florida Senate
BILL ANALYSIS AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

(This document is based on the provisions contained in the legislation as of the latest date listed below.)

Prepared By: The Professional Staff of the Education Pre-K - 12 Committee

BILL: SB 1584
INTRODUCER: Senator Sobel
SUBJECT: Deaf and Hard-of-hearing Children
DATE: March 31, 2011 **REVISED:** _____

	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR	REFERENCE	ACTION
1.	deMarsh-Mathues	Matthews	ED	Pre-meeting
2.	_____	_____	BC	_____
3.	_____	_____	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____	_____	_____

I. Summary:

The bill creates the "Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Children's Education Bill of Rights." It requires the Department of Education to develop model communication considerations for students who are deaf or hard-of-hearing. The model would become a part of the individual educational plan process for a student who is deaf or hard-of-hearing.

This bill creates an undesignated section of law.

II. Present Situation:

Exceptional Education

Federal law requires states to make a free appropriate public education available to all children with disabilities residing in the state between the ages of 3 and 21, inclusive, including children with disabilities who have been suspended or expelled from school.¹ As the state educational agency, the Department of Education (DOE) must exercise general supervision over all educational programs for children with disabilities in the state, including all programs administered by other state or local agencies, and ensure that the programs meet the educational standards of the state educational agency.²

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) programs and services are provided by federal, state, and local funds. Under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA), federal special education funds are distributed through state grant programs and discretionary grant

¹ 20 U.S.C. § 1400 et. seq., as amended by P.L. 108-446.

² 34 C.F.R. s. 300.149

programs. Part B of the law, the main program, authorizes grants to state and local education agencies to offset part of the costs of the education needs of children with disabilities, ages 3 through 21. It also authorizes pre-school state grants for children with disabilities, ages 3 through 5. Part C authorizes infant and toddler state grants for early intervention services, for infants and toddlers with disabilities from birth through 36 months.³

Beginning with the 1997-1998 school year, districts were required to complete a matrix of services for every exceptional student at least annually to calculate school district funding based on the intensity of services provided to ESE students.⁴ In 2000, the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) for ESE programs was revised to require a matrix for exceptional students funded at the highest level of need, support levels 4 and 5.⁵

Consistent with the services identified through the IEP or IFS, a matrix of services is used to determine which one of two cost factors would apply to each eligible exceptional education student and the support level needed. The matrix document contains checklists of services in each of the five domains (curriculum and learning environment; social/emotional behavior; independent functioning; health care; and communication) and a special considerations section. The sum of these domain ratings and any special considerations points corresponds to one of the two cost factors.

Children with Hearing Impairments

In the fall of 2010, 3,586 students were identified as deaf or hard-of-hearing.⁶ Children with disabilities, including those who are deaf or hard-of-hearing, may receive ESE services if they meet specific requirements. Educational options for students with hearing impairments have expanded significantly in the last 30 years in that students are increasingly attending traditional schools and being educated in general education classrooms.⁷ Other developments have changed the classroom experiences of students with hearing impairments in the last three decades as well, including the evolution of implant technology and technologies such as visual or text communication devices and speech-to-print software.

In developing an IEP, the IEP team considers the child's strengths, the concerns of the parents for enhancing the education of their child, the results of the initial evaluation or most recent evaluation of the child, the academic, developmental, and functional needs of the child, as well as special factors.⁸

³ Part C is administered by the Florida Department of Health (DOH), pursuant to s. 391.308, F.S.

⁴ Section 43, ch. 97-307, L.O.F.

⁵ ch. 2000-171, L.O.F. Pursuant to s. 1011.62(1)(c), F.S., the Commissioner of Education must specify a matrix of services and intensity levels to be used by districts in the determination of the two weighted cost factors. Levels 1 through 3 represent the lowest level of service. For these students, school districts receive an ESE Guaranteed Allocation in addition to the base funding in the FEFP. The matrix is also used to determine the support levels for these students.

⁶ DOE, March 28, 2011, DOE State Student Information Database, Survey 2.

⁷ *The Secondary School Experiences and Academic Performance of Students With Hearing Impairments*, U.S. Department of Education Institute of Education Sciences National Center for Special Education Research, February 2011.

⁸ 20 U.S.C. § 1414(d)(3)(A) and (B).

III. Effect of Proposed Changes:

The bill creates the "Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Children's Education Bill of Rights" that incorporates provisions in state and federal law and rule for placement in the least restrictive educational environment, instructional quality, participation in extracurricular services and athletics, and the delivery of transition services.

Under the bill, the Department of Education (DOE) would develop a model "communication considerations for students who are deaf or hard-of-hearing" to become a part of the IEP process. As written, the sentence is unclear. It appears that the intent is to identify communication factors to be considered when developing the IEP. For a child who is deaf or hard of hearing, current law requires that the IEP team consider special factors: the child's language and communication needs, opportunities for direct communications with peers and professional personnel in the child's language and communication mode, academic level, and full range of needs, including opportunities for direct instruction in the child's language and communication mode.⁹

The DOE would disseminate the model to school districts and provide training, as determined by the agency.

States with a Deaf or Hard of Hearing Bill of Rights include Delaware, Georgia, and New Mexico.¹⁰

IV. Constitutional Issues:

A. Municipality/County Mandates Restrictions:

None.

B. Public Records/Open Meetings Issues:

None.

C. Trust Funds Restrictions:

None.

V. Fiscal Impact Statement:

A. Tax/Fee Issues:

None.

B. Private Sector Impact:

None.

⁹ 20 U.S.C. s. 1414(d)(3)(B)(iv) and Rule 6A-6.03028(3)(g)9., F.A.C.

¹⁰ 14 Del.C. § 3112, Ga. Code Ann., § 20-2-152.1, and N. M. S. A. 1978, § 28-11C-2,

C. Government Sector Impact:

The DOE indicates that implementation of this bill would require rule amendment, specifically to Rule 6A-6.03028, F.A.C., Provision of Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) and Development of Individual Educational Plans for Students with Disabilities. The DOE would have to expend some resources in model plan development. Dissemination to school districts statewide would probably result in little, if any, fiscal impact. The provision of training appears permissive, and therefore, fiscal impact is indeterminate.

VI. Technical Deficiencies:

The bill uses the terms “deaf and hard-of-hearing” and “deaf or hard-of-hearing” interchangeably. To be consistent with federal and state law, the term “deaf and hard-of-hearing” should be changed to “deaf or hard-of-hearing.”¹¹ On line 33, the word “deaf” should be changed to “Deaf.”

VII. Related Issues:

None.

VIII. Additional Information:**A. Committee Substitute – Statement of Substantial Changes:**
(Summarizing differences between the Committee Substitute and the prior version of the bill.)

None.

B. Amendments:

None.

This Senate Bill Analysis does not reflect the intent or official position of the bill’s introducer or the Florida Senate.

¹¹ See s. 1003.01(3)(a), F.S. and 20 U.S.C. § 1414(d)(3)(B)(iv).

The Florida Senate
BILL ANALYSIS AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

(This document is based on the provisions contained in the legislation as of the latest date listed below.)

Prepared By: The Professional Staff of the Education Pre-K - 12 Committee

BILL: SB 1620

INTRODUCER: Senator Flores

SUBJECT: Educational Instruction

DATE: April 4, 2011

REVISED: _____

	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR	REFERENCE	ACTION
1.	deMarsh-Mathues	Matthews	ED	Pre-meeting
2.	_____	_____	BC	_____
3.	_____	_____	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____	_____	_____

I. Summary:

The bill revises the current framework and funding for virtual instruction in Florida. The bill:

- Provides for the participation of statewide virtual providers, virtual charter schools, and blended-learning charter schools;
- Revises the role of school district virtual instruction programs;
- Requires the online administration of all statewide assessments;
- Requires the Department of Education to develop an evaluation process for part-time virtual instruction providers;
- Revises the qualifications of instructional personnel; and
- Requires students entering the ninth grade in 2011-2013 and thereafter to take at least one online course in order to meet high school graduation requirements.

This bill substantially amends sections 163.3180, 1002.20, 1002.33, 1002.34, 1002.37, 1002.41, 1002.45, 1003.02, 1003.03, 1003.428, 1008.22, 1011.61, 1011.68, 1012.57, and 1013.62 and creates 1003.07 of the Florida Statutes.

II. Present Situation:

Virtual Instruction

The Florida Virtual School (FLVS) offers individual course enrollments to all Florida students in grades 6 through 12, including public school, private school, and home education students.¹ School districts are required to provide students with access to enroll in courses available through the FLVS during or after the normal school day and through summer school enrollment.

¹ s. 1002.37, F.S.

Virtual education is also provided through school district virtual instruction programs (VIP).² Each school district is required to provide a full-time VIP program for students in kindergarten through grade 12 and a full-time or part-time virtual instruction program for students in grades 9 through 12 enrolled in dropout prevention and academic intervention programs, Department of Juvenile Justice programs, core-curricula courses to meet class size requirements, or community colleges.³

For the 2009-2010 school year, less than one percent (21,176 full-time equivalent or FTE) of the total final FTE (2,629,327 FTE) were in virtual education. Of the 21,176 FTE in virtual education, 2,575 FTE were in the virtual instruction (VIP) program and 18,601 FTE were in the Florida Virtual School's traditional program and a safety net program (18,451 FTE and 150 FTE, respectively).⁴

Charter Schools

Charter schools are public schools formed through the creation of a new school or the conversion of an existing public school.⁵ A charter, or the written contractual agreement between the sponsor and applicant, establishes the terms and conditions of operation.⁶ Florida ranked third in the nation both in the number of charter schools and in charter school enrollment in 2009-2010, with more than 137,000 students enrolled in 410 charter schools in 43 districts.⁷

III. Effect of Proposed Changes:

Virtual Education Framework

Beginning with the 2009-2010 school year, each school district was required to establish its own virtual instruction program (VIP).⁸ Each school district is now permitted to contract with the FLVS or one or more virtual instruction providers approved by the DOE; establish an FLVS franchise; or participate in multi-district agreements to provide virtual instruction services. In addition, districts may operate their own VIP program and may contract with the providers specified in law or other entities to provide segments of their program.⁹ Multidistrict agreements may be executed by regional consortiums on behalf of their member districts.¹⁰ Finally, a charter school may enter into a joint agreement with the school district in which it is located to have its students participate in the VIP program.

Under the bill, a district would be permitted rather than required to offer a virtual instruction program. Districts would still be able to operate their own programs, enter into agreements with

² s. 1002.45(1)(a), F.S.

³ s. 1002.45(1)(b)2., F.S.

⁴ E-mail, DOE, January 12, 2011, on file with the committee.

⁵ s. 1002.33(1), F.S.

⁶ s. 1002.33(6)(h), F.S.

⁷ DOE, August 2010. *See*

https://www.floridaschoolchoice.org/information/charter_schools/files/fast_facts_charter_schools.pdf.

⁸ ch. 2008-147, L.O.F.

⁹ *See* DOE, *School District Virtual Instruction Program (2010-2011) Questions and Answers #9*, available at:

<http://www.fldoe.org/schools/virtual-schools/pdf/DistrictVIP-FAQ.pdf>.

¹⁰ s. 1002.45(1)(c), F.S.

other districts, and contract with approved providers. Charter schools would be permitted to enter into a joint agreement with the school district for the charter school to be an approved provider.

Statewide providers approved by the DOE would offer full-time virtual education¹¹ to students in kindergarten through grade 12 and part-time virtual education to students in grades 6-12.¹² Currently, approved providers may offer virtual instruction under contracts with districts. With the exception of the traditional FLVS program, current law does not permit an approved provider participating in the VIP program to independently provide virtual instruction.

Blended-learning Charter Schools

Existing charter schools are sponsored by a district school board or a state university, in which case the charter school was converted from a lab school to a charter lab school.¹³ With the exception of the charter lab schools, district school boards review and approve charter school applications.¹⁴ Sponsors are responsible for monitoring the charter school, reviewing revenues and expenditures, and ensuring innovation and consistency with state education goals, including the state accountability system.¹⁵

Under the bill, full-time virtual charter schools are subject to the same application process as are other charter schools, must contract with a statewide virtual provider, and may only serve their charter school students in the school district in which the charter is granted. They are not subject to the provisions related to facilities and transportation. However, it is unclear as to whether they are subject to other charter school provisions.

The bill also permits “blended-learning charter schools,” which combine traditional classroom instruction with online offerings, to offer online instruction; however, the schools may only offer this instruction to their students.

Providers

Current providers that wish to participate in the VIP program must be approved by the DOE. Under the bill, providers that are approved for the 2011-2012 school year would continue to provide virtual instruction under the current requirements until the 2012-2013 school year. To be approved after that date, all providers must have courses that meet the standards of the International Association for K-12 Online Learning (iNACOL) or the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB)¹⁶ and have the requisite curriculum plan and a method for determining if a student has satisfied high school graduation requirements.¹⁷ Providers are prohibited from charging tuition or student registration fees.

¹¹ The terms “virtual education” and “virtual instruction” are used interchangeably throughout the bill.

¹² Currently, part-time instruction is limited to students in grades nine through 12 in dropout prevention and academic intervention programs, core courses to meet class size requirements, or community colleges.

¹³ s. 1002.33(5)(a), F.S. A community college may work with the school district or school districts in its designated service area to develop charter schools that offer secondary education, pursuant to s. 1002.33(5)(b) 4., F.S.

¹⁴ s. 1002.33(5)(b) and (6)(g), F.S.

¹⁵ s. 1002.33(5)(b), F.S.

¹⁶ *National Standards of Quality for Online Courses*, iNACOL, updated August 2010, and *Standards for Quality Online Courses*, SREB, November 2006. See

<http://www.inacol.org/research/nationalstandards/NACOL%20Standards%20Quality%20Online%20Courses%202007.pdf> and http://publications.sreb.org/2006/06T05_Standards_quality_online_courses.pdf.

¹⁷ Lines 546-547 require the DOE to approve providers. Lines 766-767 require the State Board of Education to do so.

Assessments

The bill requires the online administration of all statewide assessments, including end-of-course assessments, beginning in the 2014-2015 school year. According to the DOE, Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR) is currently in a computer-based format.¹⁸ Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers Consortium (PARCC) assessments will all be computer based.¹⁹ There are some grade levels of the FCAT 2.0 in reading and mathematics that will be computer based. Additionally, end-of-course assessments in Algebra I, geometry, biology I, U.S. history, and civics will be computer-based.

Current law requires students enrolled in a VIP program to take state assessments within the school district in which the student resides.²⁰ Districts must provide the student with access to the district's testing facilities. Lines 672-676 and 747-751 expand that obligation to include students in statewide virtual programs and virtual charter schools. The DOE notes that these students would not be enrolled in the district, as is the case for the vast majority of students in the current virtual programs or schools.²¹

Funding

Under current law, funding is based solely on successful completion. In the FEFP, the traditional FLVS funding is currently based on credit successfully completed. Credit completed by a student in excess of the minimum required for that student for high school graduation is not eligible for funding.²² Six credits equal one full-time equivalent (FTE) student. A student who completes less than six credits is a fraction of an FTE student. Half-credit completions are included in determining an FTE student.²³

District VIP programs are funded through the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP).²⁴ Students in full-time kindergarten through grade five programs are funded based on program completion and promotion to the next grade-level.²⁵ Full and part-time students in grades six through 12 are funded on a credit completion basis. Funding is only received if the course is successfully completed.²⁶ Six credits equal one full-time equivalent (FTE) student. Half credit completions are included in determining an FTE student.²⁷ For the VIP program, districts may

¹⁸ E-mail, DOE, April 1, 2011.

¹⁹ The U.S. Department of Education awarded Race to the Top assessment funds to PARCC for the development of a K-12 assessment system aligned to the Common Core State Standards in English language arts and mathematics. PARCC was awarded an additional grant to support the states participating in PARCC in successfully transitioning to Common Core State Standards and next generation assessments. Florida is part of the partnership. See http://www.fldoe.org/news/2010/2010_09_29.asp.

²⁰ s. 1002.45(6)(b), F.S.

²¹ DOE draft analysis of SB 1620, April 1, 2011, on file with the committee.

²² s. 1002.37(3)(a), F.S.

²³ ss. 1002.37(3)(a) and 1011.61(1)(c)1.b.(V), F.S.

²⁴ s. 1002.45(7), F.S.

²⁵ s. 1011.61(1)(c)1.b.(III), F.S.

²⁶ A "successful completion" for students in grades K-5 is completion of a basic education program and promotion to a higher grade level. "Successful completion" for students in grades 6-12 is based on course credits earned for high school students or course completions with a passing grade for middle school students. See DOE, *School District Virtual Instruction Program (2010-2011) Questions and Answers #37 and #38*, available at: <http://www.fldoe.org/schools/virtual-schools/pdf/DistrictVIP-FAQ.pdf>.

²⁷ s. 1011.61(1)(c)1.b.(IV), F.S.

only earn one FTE per student, per regular school year and they are not eligible for summer school FTE funding.²⁸

If a district contracts with a provider, FEFP funding flows to the district and the provider is paid by the district pursuant to the terms of the contract.²⁹ The district retains FEFP funds in excess of the negotiated contract price. Districts may use FEFP funds to provide equipment or Internet access to students under appropriate circumstances.³⁰

The bill revises the manner in which virtual instruction is funded:

- All full-time virtual programs would be funded based on “seat time” (80 percent) and successful completions (10 percent per semester);
- All part-time virtual options (individual online courses) would be funded solely on performance (successful completions); and
- The FLVS would serve and receive funding for students in grade K-5.

If a student is required to earn a credit to generate funding, the virtual provider would presumably not receive funding for that student, unless he or she passes the required state assessment.

Additionally, students in full-time programs could not be reported for more than 1.0 FTE. Each successfully completed credit earned through an online course from a district other than the district in which the student resides would be calculated as 1/6 FTE.

Accountability

Current full-time private providers that participate in the VIP program receive a school grade or school improvement rating based upon the aggregated assessment scores of all students served by the provider statewide.³¹ The performance of part-time students in grades 9 through 12 are not included for purposes of school grades or school improvement ratings. Instead, their performance is included for school grading or school improvement rating purposes by the nonvirtual school providing the student’s primary instruction.³²

The bill requires the DOE to develop an evaluation process for part-time providers of virtual instruction, which must include the percentage of students making learning gains, successfully passing end-of-course assessments, and taking and scoring a three or higher on Advanced Placement course exams. It is unclear as to the reason for not including other exams, such as

²⁸ DOE, Office of Funding and Financial Reporting, *FTE General Instructions* (2010-2011), available at: <http://www.fldoe.org/fefp/pdf/1011FTEInstructions.pdf>.

²⁹ DOE, *School District Virtual Instruction Program (2010-2011) Questions and Answers #51 and 52*, available at: <http://www.fldoe.org/schools/virtual-schools/pdf/DistrictVIP-FAQ.pdf>. Pursuant to s. 1002.45(7)(c), F.S., community colleges may not count the student enrollment for Community College Program Funding.

³⁰ s. 1002.45(3)(d), F.S.

³¹ s. 1002.45(8), F.S. This is the first year for school grades under the VIP program and not all of the FLVS franchises and approved providers received a school grade. Ten districts identified themselves as franchises that had full-time VIP students. For 2009-2010, only one franchise (Broward Virtual Education) received a school grade. According to the DOE, the other districts did not report enough full-year-enrolled eligible students with FCAT scores to meet the sample size criteria for a school grade. Four of the eight private providers received a school grade. See *Virtual Instruction Programs*, Senate Interim Report 2011-215, October 2010.

³² *Id.*

industry certification exams. The bill also permits the DOE to develop a standard of success for part-time providers and use school grades as a benchmark. There is no comparable provision in the bill for full-time providers to be assessed on the same criteria as part-time providers.

The DOE would disclose on its website information related to virtual schools, programs, and providers. Although the bill requires part-time providers to be evaluated on specific criteria, it does not require this information to be disclosed.

The grounds for terminating a full-time provider 's contract are revised. Under current law, a provider's contract is terminated if the provider receives a school grade of "D" or "F" or a school improvement rating of "Declining" for two years in a four-year period. The bill provides that the contract is terminated if the provider receives a "D" or an "F, "with an exception. The State Board of Education may extend the eligibility of a provider that receives a "D" for one year if a school improvement plan is submitted to the DOE. Presumably, the provider would be able to continue to operate under the current contract for an additional year. Otherwise, the period of disqualification would be two years rather than one year.

Instructional Personnel

School districts may currently issue adjunct certificates for part-time teaching positions, pursuant to district school board rules, to an applicant who meets specific requirements for state-certified instructional personnel and who has expertise in the subject area to be taught.³³ Adjunct certificates are valid for five years and are renewable.³⁴

Under the bill, adjunct certificates would be used to enhance the diversity of course offerings rather than to reduce teacher shortages. The bill provides for legislative intent to issue certificates to individuals in other states, but does not explicitly require districts to do so. The validity period for the adjunct certificate would be the term of the contract between the district and the educator rather than five years.

Statewide virtual providers would be able to employ or contract with not only Florida-certified teachers, but also with those who hold a certificate in another state or who hold National Board Certification or American Board Certification. If the term "National Board Certification" means National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), it should be changed to reflect this reference. This provision does not contemplate allowing providers to employ or contract with an individual who demonstrates subject area expertise.

The DOE notes that if other than a Florida-certified teacher is assigned as the teacher of record for a core academic subject, he or she will not meet federal Highly-Qualified Teacher requirements, which mandate that the teacher hold a Florida state-issued certificate.³⁵

High School Graduation

Students entering the ninth grade in 2011-2012 and thereafter would be required to take at least one online course in order to meet high school graduation requirements. The requirement could

³³ s. 1012.57(1), F.S. Applicants must meet the requirements in s. 1012.56(2)(a)-(f) and (10), F.S., and demonstrate sufficient subject area mastery through passage of a subject area test.

³⁴ *Id.*

³⁵ DOE draft analysis of SB 1620, April 1, 2011, on file with the committee. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 7801(23)(A).

be met if the student has taken an online course in grades six through eight or participates as a dually enrolled student in an online course offered by a postsecondary institution.³⁶

Student Eligibility and Access

The FLVS currently offers virtual education for students in grades six through 12.³⁷ The law requires that enrollment priority be given to students who need expanded access to courses in order to meet their educational goals, such as home education students, students in inner-city and rural high schools that do not have access to advanced courses, and students seeking accelerated access to a high school diploma.³⁸

Currently, enrollment in a school district VIP program is open to any student residing in the district who meets at least one of the following criteria: attendance at a Florida public school during the prior year and was reported for funding during the October and February Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) surveys; is the dependent child of a member of the military who transfers into Florida with his or her parent from another state or country within 12 months of seeking enrollment in a district virtual instruction program; was enrolled in a district VIP program during the prior school year; or has a sibling who is currently enrolled in the VIP program and that sibling was enrolled in the VIP program at the end of the prior school year.³⁹

Under the bill, public, private and home school students would be eligible to participate in a part-time or full-time statewide virtual program. The bill permits students to enroll part-time in all virtual programs throughout the school year. Additionally, a uniform enrollment period is required.

Other

The bill codifies the elements of high quality digital learning (e.g., student access, customized learning, and high quality instruction.), which were recommended by the Digital Learning Council.⁴⁰

The bill directs the Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability or an independent research organization to evaluate the best methods of implementing part-time virtual education to students in kindergarten through grade 5.

IV. Constitutional Issues:

A. Municipality/County Mandates Restrictions:

None.

B. Public Records/Open Meetings Issues:

None.

³⁶ The bill limits the dual enrollment option to state colleges, as opposed to community colleges.

³⁷ ss. 1002.37 and 1011.61(1)(c)1.b.(V), F.S. FLVS refers to the grades 6–12 traditional supplemental model as its “classic” offering. See <http://www.flvs.net/areas/aboutus/Documents/16%20page%20Legislative.pdf>.

³⁸ s. 1002.37(1)(b), F.S.

³⁹ s. 1002.45(5), F.S.

⁴⁰ *Digital Learning Now!*, Foundation for Excellence in Education, December 1, 2010.

C. Trust Funds Restrictions:

None.

V. Fiscal Impact Statement:

A. Tax/Fee Issues:

None.

B. Private Sector Impact:

A provider would no longer be required to have an administrative office and staff in Florida. The bill allows the DOE to charge each provider fees to cover the costs associated with the review of statewide providers and the content of courses offered by part-time providers.

C. Government Sector Impact:

Currently, full-time and part-time virtual instruction program FTE, including the FLVS, is based on promotion to a higher grade or successful course completion. Students who are not promoted or who do not complete a virtual education course do not earn FTE or funding. Under the bill, full-time VIP students would earn FTE based on seat-time and a percentage of promotions or successful completions. The number of students who would earn FTE and funding through full-time enrollment is unknown.

Under the bill, virtual education programs will receive funding similar to the FLVS. According to the DOE, the impact on funding is indeterminate.⁴¹

Beginning with students entering grade 9 in the 2011-2012 school year, the bill requires at least one course be taken online. Under the bill, part-time enrollment in VIP programs would continue to be funded based on course completions. The DOE notes the impact on funding is not known.⁴²

School districts report FTE for funding once per semester (October and February surveys). According to the DOE, the accommodation of quarterly funding would involve additional reporting or revised criteria to earn the seat-time funding for the virtual programs.⁴³ Additional reporting requirements would place an additional burden on traditional public schools and charter schools.⁴⁴

The performance funding for the first semester is based on successful completion of the semester, while the performance funding for the second semester is based on successful completion of the full year. The DOE notes that this would preclude performance funding

⁴¹ DOE draft analysis of SB 1620, on file with the committee.

⁴² *Id.*

⁴³ *Id.*

⁴⁴ *Id.*

for a student who was enrolled the second semester only and successfully completes the second semester or is promoted.

The bill allows home education and private school students to participate in all virtual education options, increasing the number of public school students. In 2009-2010 there were 62,567 home school students and 313,291 private school students in Florida.⁴⁵ The number of home school and private school students who would enroll in virtual programs is not known.

Removing the cap on the number of FLVS credits that may be taken for high school graduation may have a fiscal impact.

The bill removes the current student eligibility requirements, including the prior public school attendance provision, which mitigates state costs by limiting the participation of those students who would not ordinarily go to public schools. Removing this requirement may have a fiscal impact.

The bill authorizes FLVS to serve and receive funding for students in grades K-5. The number of students who would enroll in grades K-5 through the FLVS is not known.

The bill requires the State Board of Education to establish a process to review and approve the content of each part-time course in grade levels six through 12 that is offered by a statewide provider of virtual education. According to the DOE, approving individual online courses is labor-intensive. The bill permits the DOE to charge fees to cover the cost of the review of content and the qualifications of statewide providers; however, it does not specify a range of fees that may be charged.

According to the DOE, the additional responsibilities for the DOE and the State Board and duties relating to the approval for individual online courses, an annual evaluation of all part-time options, and accountability for more online programs and providers will require additional resources.⁴⁶

The bill prohibits school district virtual programs from continuing to receive class size funding. According to the DOE, this would make funding more consistent across virtual programs, but would decrease the funding substantially for the district virtual programs.

Charter school sponsors could withhold an administrative fee of up to two percent for virtual charter schools. Based on the FLVS 2010-2011 per student funding amount of \$5,186, sponsors would be allowed to withhold \$104 in administrative fees per student.⁴⁷

VI. Technical Deficiencies:

School districts are currently required to provide computers, related equipment, and Internet access when appropriate; however, providers are not required to do so.⁴⁸ If the intent of the bill is

⁴⁵ DOE draft analysis, April 1, 2011, on file with the committee.

⁴⁶ *Id.*

⁴⁷ *Id.*

to subject both districts and providers to this requirement, the stricken words “when appropriate” on line 661 should be restored to current law to be consistent with lines 603. The word “participants” on line 607 should be changed to “students.” There are several references in the bill to “core curricular standards” (see for example lines 650-652). It is unclear as to whether or not this refers to the common core standards for English/language arts and mathematics adopted by the State Board of Education on July 27, 2010. If so, the term “common core state standards” should be used. On lines 605 and 663, the bill refers to eligibility for free and reduced price lunch. For clarity, it should reference free or reduced-price school lunches under the National School Lunch Act. On lines 672-676, the requirements for districts to provide access to district testing facilities is redundant (see lines 747-751). Lines 839-854 repeat lines 816-831. On line 1404, the amended cross reference is incorrect.

VII. Related Issues:

None.

VIII. Additional Information:

A. Committee Substitute – Statement of Substantial Changes:
(Summarizing differences between the Committee Substitute and the prior version of the bill.)

None.

B. Amendments:

None.

This Senate Bill Analysis does not reflect the intent or official position of the bill’s introducer or the Florida Senate.

⁴⁸ s. 1002.45(3)(d), F.S.



915072

LEGISLATIVE ACTION

Senate	.	House
	.	
	.	
	.	
	.	
	.	

The Committee on Education Pre-K - 12 (Wise) recommended the following:

Senate Amendment (with title amendment)

Delete lines 56 - 96
and insert:

1001.395 District school board members; stipend;
reimbursement for travel expenses; compensation.-

(1) District school board members may not receive more than a \$100 stipend per school board meeting, which does not constitute compensation for purposes of retirement. The maximum stipend per school board member may not exceed \$2400 per year. District school board members may receive reimbursement for travel expenses in accordance with s. 1001.39. District school



915072

13 board members shall otherwise serve without compensation. Each
 14 member of the district school board shall receive a base salary,
 15 the amounts indicated in this section, based on the population
 16 of the county the district school board member serves. In
 17 addition, compensation shall be made for population increments
 18 over the minimum for each population group, which shall be
 19 determined by multiplying the population in excess of the
 20 minimum for the group times the group rate. The product of such
 21 calculation shall be added to the base salary to determine the
 22 adjusted base salary. The adjusted base salaries of district
 23 school board members shall be increased annually as provided for
 24 in s. 145.19.
 25

Pop. Group	County		Base Salary	Group Rate
	Pop. Range			
	Minimum	Maximum		
I	0	9,999	\$5,000	\$0.08330
II	10,000	49,999	5,833	0.020830
III	50,000	99,999	6,666	0.016680
IV	100,000	199,999	7,500	0.008330
V	200,000	399,999	8,333	0.004165



915072

33 VI 400,000 999,999 9,166 0.001390

34 VII 1,000,000 10,000 0.000000

35
36 ~~(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of this section or s.~~
37 ~~145.19, district school board members may reduce their salary~~
38 ~~rate on a voluntary basis.~~

39 ~~(3) Notwithstanding the provisions of this section and s.~~
40 ~~145.19, for the 2010-2011 fiscal year, the salary of each~~
41 ~~district school board member shall be the amount calculated~~
42 ~~pursuant to subsection (1) or the district's beginning salary~~
43 ~~for teachers who hold baccalaureate degrees, whichever is less.~~

44 Section 4. The amendments made by this act to ss. 145.19,
45 1001.39, and 1001.395, Florida Statutes, apply to district
46 school board members elected or reelected in the general
47 election of 2012 and thereafter.

48
49
50 ===== T I T L E A M E N D M E N T =====

51 And the title is amended as follows:

52 Delete lines 8 - 14

53 and insert:

54 receiving more than a \$100 stipend per school board
55 meeting; capping the annual stipend; providing that
56 the stipend does not constitute compensation for
57 retirement purposes; providing reimbursement for
58 travel expenses; prohibiting district school board
59 members from receiving any compensation while serving;



915072

60
61

providing for application; providing an effective
date.

The Florida Senate
BILL ANALYSIS AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

(This document is based on the provisions contained in the legislation as of the latest date listed below.)

Prepared By: The Professional Staff of the Education Pre-K - 12 Committee

BILL: PCB 7234

INTRODUCER: Committee on Education Pre-K - 12

SUBJECT: District School Board Members

DATE: March 31, 2011 REVISED: _____

	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR	REFERENCE	ACTION
1.	Brown	Matthews	ED	Pre-meeting
2.	_____	_____	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____	_____	_____

I. Summary:

This bill caps district school board member compensation at a \$100 stipend per school board meeting and clarifies that this amount is not to be considered for retirement purposes. Travel reimbursement would still be authorized.

This bill substantially amends sections 145.19, 1001.39 and 1001.395, of the Florida Statutes.

II. Present Situation:

School Board Member Salary Calculations in Florida

School board members are paid through a formula that is based upon the county population of the district in which the member serves, as calculated in the following table:

Population Group	County Population Range (CPR) Minimum	CPR Maximum	Base Salary	Group Rate
I	0	9,999	\$5,000	\$0.08330
II	10,000	49,999	5,833	0.020830
III	50,000	99,999	6,666	0.016680
IV	100,000	199,999	7,500	0.008330
V	200,000	399,999	8,333	0.004165
VI	400,000	999,999	9,166	0.001390
VII	1,000,000		10,000	0.000000

As is reflected in the table, as the county population and correlating base salary increases, the group rate decreases.¹ Still, this generally means that larger districts provide larger salaries.

Florida law provides for base salaries to be annually adjusted based on a variety of factors.² For fiscal year 2010-2011 only, however, school board member salaries remain at either the base salary or are the district's beginning salary for a teacher with a baccalaureate degree, whichever is less, such that the annual increase authorized in s. 145.19, F.S., does not apply.³

For 2008-2009, the average salary of a school board member statewide was \$31,619, and for 2009-2010, the salary dropped to \$30,850. For 2009-2010, salaries in the state ranged from a low of \$22,300 in Liberty County to \$39,000 in Broward County for school board members.⁴

School Board Member Salaries in Other States

Through a survey commissioned by the National School Boards Association (NSBA), two-thirds of the 759 school board members who responded nationally indicated that they receive no salary for their service to the board. Almost 10 percent responded that they earn less than \$2,000 annually. Just 20 percent stated that they receive \$2,000 or more annually, and only 3.4 percent are paid \$10,000 or more. As provided above, no district in Florida paid their members less than \$20,000 annually in the past two fiscal years. Although approximately 20 percent of NSBA study participants indicated that they also receive a per-meeting stipend in addition to salary, of those that indicated that they receive stipends, it amounts to a median of just \$63 per meeting.⁵

A state-by-state legislative survey conducted originally by NSBA in 2001 and updated in 2007 revealed that a full 32 state legislatures do not authorize payment of any salary for school board member service. Only Florida is classified in the survey as a state in which school board members are paid as elected officials. A handful of states legislate the provision of health insurance or provide the opportunity to purchase group health insurance through the district. Seven states are not permitted expense reimbursement. The availability of stipends varies widely and is not capable of being reported in a meaningful fashion. Notably, even in one of the highest-cost-of-living areas of the country, New York City, board members earned just \$15,000 in 2007. The NSBA compiled the information from 45 states, with the remaining not addressing (permitting or prohibiting) school board member salaries, stipends, or reimbursements in law.⁶

III. Effect of Proposed Changes:

The cap of a \$100 stipend per school board meeting would constitute the entire salary and compensation of a school board member, other than travel expense reimbursement. This represents a marked departure from the current salary of school board members, although it

¹ s. 1001.395(1), F.S.

² s. 145.19, F.S.

³ s. 1001.395(3), F.S.

⁴ *Average Salaries for Selected Positions in Districts 1-67, 2008-09 and 2009-10*, 2009-10 Survey 3 data, February 8-12, 2010, as of August 13, 2010; *Average Salaries for Selected District-level Administrative Staff, 2009-10*, 2009-10 Survey 3 data, February 8-12, 2010, as of August 13, 2010.

⁵ Frederick M. Hess, National School Boards Association, *School Boards at the Dawn of the 21st Century* (pgs. 20-21, 2002).

⁶ *State Board Member Compensation*, NSBA (June 2007).

appears to be a move towards greater consistency with the manner in which school board members serve in other states.

Travel expense reimbursement would be expected to be minimal as it is anticipated that most, if not all, meetings are sited in the district.

This bill takes effect July 1, 2011, with provisions to apply to district school board members elected or reelected in 2012 and after.

IV. Constitutional Issues:

A. Municipality/County Mandates Restrictions:

None.

B. Public Records/Open Meetings Issues:

None.

C. Trust Funds Restrictions:

None.

V. Fiscal Impact Statement:

A. Tax/Fee Issues:

None.

B. Private Sector Impact:

None.

C. Government Sector Impact:

This bill would have a positive fiscal impact on revenue as it would represent a significant reduction in costs currently expended on school board member salaries across the state. According to the Department of Education, for fiscal year 2009-2010, Florida school districts spent almost \$10.9 million in school board member salaries. If meetings were held twice a month in every district, the \$100 stipend per meeting would equate to a total cost of \$900,000 on an annual basis. Subtracting this from the current amount spent on salaries represents a savings of \$10 million.

This bill would equalize school board member pay, through the adoption of a stipend per meeting, across all districts.

VI. Technical Deficiencies:

None.

VII. Related Issues:

None.

VIII. Additional Information:

A. Committee Substitute – Statement of Substantial Changes:

(Summarizing differences between the Committee Substitute and the prior version of the bill.)

None.

B. Amendments:

None.

This Senate Bill Analysis does not reflect the intent or official position of the bill's introducer or the Florida Senate.
