

STORAGE NAME: h0805.edk

DATE: February 19, 1999

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
AS REVISED BY THE COMMITTEE ON
EDUCATION K-12
ANALYSIS**

BILL #: HB 805 (PCB CU 99-03)

RELATING TO: College Reach-Out Program

SPONSOR(S): Committee on Colleges & Universities; Rep. Casey and others

COMPANION BILL(S): None

ORIGINATING COMMITTEE(S)/COMMITTEE(S) OF REFERENCE:

- (1) COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES YEAS 6 NAYS 0
 - (2) EDUCATION K-12
 - (3)
 - (4)
 - (5)
-

I. SUMMARY:

The College Reach-Out Program (CROP), established in statute by the 1989 Legislature, was created to encourage economically and educationally disadvantaged students who would otherwise be unlikely to pursue a college education to seek and complete a postsecondary education. The goals of the program include:

- (1) Motivating students to pursue a postsecondary education;
- (2) Developing students' basic learning skills;
- (3) Strengthening students' and parents' understanding of the benefits of postsecondary education; and
- (4) Fostering academic, personal, and career development through supplemental instruction.

Statutory provisions relating to the program are scheduled for repeal effective July 1, 1999, and must be reviewed by the Legislature prior to that time. The House of Representatives Committee on Colleges & Universities has reviewed the program and recommends reenactment of the statutory provisions relating to the program.

This bill reenacts statutory provisions relating to the College Reach-Out Program.

The reenactment of statutory provisions relating to the College Reach-Out Program should have no fiscal impact.

II. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS:

A. PRESENT SITUATION:

The College Reach-Out Program (CROP) is a statewide competitive grant program that was established for the purpose of encouraging economically and educationally disadvantaged students who would be unlikely to pursue a college education to seek and complete a postsecondary education. The program seeks to achieve the following objectives:

- (1) Motivate students to pursue a postsecondary education;
- (2) Develop students' basic learning skills;
- (3) Strengthen students' and parents' understanding of the benefits of postsecondary education; and
- (4) Foster academic, personal, and career development through supplemental instruction.

Funding for CROP is provided in the General Appropriations Act. Since 1994, CROP has received annual appropriations as follows: FY 94-95, \$2.4 million; FY 95-96, \$2.4 million; FY 96-97, \$2.4 million; FY 97-98, \$2.4 million; and FY 98-99, \$2.6 million.

CROP is administered through the Department of Education Office of Postsecondary Education Coordination (OPEC). The department is assisted by a statutorily mandated advisory committee, the Advisory Council. Each Spring, OPEC sends out a Request for Proposal to institutions eligible to participate in CROP. Funds provided by the Legislature are allocated to projects based on recommendations by the Advisory Council to the Department of Education. Currently, 27 community colleges, 10 state universities, and four independent institutions receive CROP funding.

Current law requires the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission (PEPC) to produce an annual assessment of the effectiveness of CROP. As part of that annual assessment, institutions participating in CROP must submit to PEPC an end-of-year report which includes: a detailed listing of expenditures and institutional matching funds; a listing of students participating by grade level, race, and sex; a statement of how the program addresses the four program goals; a description and analysis of program characteristics and activities critical to program success; a description of the cooperation received from other units or organizations; and an explanation of the program's outcomes, including student performance.

Statutory provisions relating to CROP are scheduled for repeal effective July 1, 1999, and must be reviewed by the Legislature prior to that time. The purpose of the review is to determine the extent to which the program has effectively achieved the goals set by the Legislature. The House of Representatives Committee on Colleges and Universities has conducted the requisite review.

Information received during the course of the committee review indicates that CROP currently serves over 8,000 students, grades 6-12, from 52 counties providing a variety of academic enrichment activities which include: career and personal counseling;

tutoring; homework assistance; computer training; summer activities; and community involvement. To participate in CROP projects, students must be both economically and academically disadvantaged (pursuant to guidelines developed by PEPC). CROP participants reportedly attain a higher GPA, receive a greater number of standard diplomas, and enroll in postsecondary institutions at a higher rate than a random sample of the general student population.

Based on the findings from the review, the program appears to be successfully achieving the objectives set forth in s. 240.61, F.S. Accordingly, the House of Representatives Committee on Colleges & Universities recommends that the provisions of s. 240.61, F.S., relating to the College Reach-Out Program, be reenacted. In addition, given the annual review process already required by s. 240.61, F.S., the Committee recommends that the program not be designated for future mandatory review by the Legislature.

B. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

The provisions of s. 240.61, F.S., relating to the College Reach-Out Program are reenacted.

C. APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLES:

1. Less Government:

a. Does the bill create, increase or reduce, either directly or indirectly:

(1) any authority to make rules or adjudicate disputes?

No.

(2) any new responsibilities, obligations or work for other governmental or private organizations or individuals?

No.

(3) any entitlement to a government service or benefit?

No.

b. If an agency or program is eliminated or reduced:

(1) what responsibilities, costs and powers are passed on to another program, agency, level of government, or private entity?

N/A

(2) what is the cost of such responsibility at the new level/agency?

N/A

(3) how is the new agency accountable to the people governed?

N/A

2. Lower Taxes:

a. Does the bill increase anyone's taxes?

No.

b. Does the bill require or authorize an increase in any fees?

No.

c. Does the bill reduce total taxes, both rates and revenues?

No.

d. Does the bill reduce total fees, both rates and revenues?

No.

e. Does the bill authorize any fee or tax increase by any local government?

No.

3. Personal Responsibility:

a. Does the bill reduce or eliminate an entitlement to government services or subsidy?

No.

b. Do the beneficiaries of the legislation directly pay any portion of the cost of implementation and operation?

No.

4. Individual Freedom:

- a. Does the bill increase the allowable options of individuals or private organizations/associations to conduct their own affairs?

No.

- b. Does the bill prohibit, or create new government interference with, any presently lawful activity?

No.

5. Family Empowerment:

- a. If the bill purports to provide services to families or children:

- (1) Who evaluates the family's needs?

N/A

- (2) Who makes the decisions?

N/A

- (3) Are private alternatives permitted?

N/A

- (4) Are families required to participate in a program?

N/A

- (5) Are families penalized for not participating in a program?

N/A

- b. Does the bill directly affect the legal rights and obligations between family members?

No.

- c. If the bill creates or changes a program providing services to families or children, in which of the following does the bill vest control of the program, either through direct participation or appointment authority:

(1) parents and guardians?

N/A

(2) service providers?

N/A

(3) government employees/agencies?

N/A

D. STATUTE(S) AFFECTED:

Revives and readopts s. 240.61, F.S.

E. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS:

This section need be completed only in the discretion of the Committee.

III. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT:

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE AGENCIES/STATE FUNDS:

1. Non-recurring Effects:

N/A

2. Recurring Effects:

N/A

3. Long Run Effects Other Than Normal Growth:

N/A

4. Total Revenues and Expenditures:

N/A

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AS A WHOLE:

1. Non-recurring Effects:

N/A

2. Recurring Effects:

N/A

3. Long Run Effects Other Than Normal Growth:

N/A

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

1. Direct Private Sector Costs:

None

2. Direct Private Sector Benefits:

None

3. Effects on Competition, Private Enterprise and Employment Markets:

None

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

Reenactment of the statutory provisions relating to the College Reach-Out Program should have no fiscal impact.

IV. CONSEQUENCES OF ARTICLE VII, SECTION 18 OF THE FLORIDA CONSTITUTION:

A. APPLICABILITY OF THE MANDATES PROVISION:

This bill does not require counties or municipalities to spend funds or to take an action requiring the expenditure of funds.

B. REDUCTION OF REVENUE RAISING AUTHORITY:

This bill does not reduce the authority that municipalities or counties have to raise revenues in the aggregate.

C. REDUCTION OF STATE TAX SHARED WITH COUNTIES AND MUNICIPALITIES:

This bill does not reduce the percentage of a state tax shared with counties or municipalities.

STORAGE NAME: h0805.edk

DATE: February 19, 1999

PAGE 8

V. COMMENTS:

None.

VI. AMENDMENTS OR COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES:

None.

VII. SIGNATURES:

COMMITTEE ON Colleges & Universities:

Prepared by:

Staff Director:

Betty H. Tilton, Ph. D.

Betty H. Tilton, Ph. D.

AS REVISED BY THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION K-12:

Prepared by:

Staff Director:

Janifer J. Booher

Patricia Levesque