

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET BOARD
Austin, Texas

FISCAL NOTE, 80TH LEGISLATIVE REGULAR SESSION

April 11, 2007

TO: Honorable Rob Eissler, Chair, House Committee on Public Education

FROM: John S. O'Brien, Director, Legislative Budget Board

IN RE: HB2183 by Geren (Relating to public school safety and the safety plan of a campus.), **As Introduced**

Estimated Two-year Net Impact to General Revenue Related Funds for HB2183, As Introduced: a negative impact of (\$396,494) through the biennium ending August 31, 2009.

The bill would make no appropriation but could provide the legal basis for an appropriation of funds to implement the provisions of the bill.

General Revenue-Related Funds, Five-Year Impact:

Fiscal Year	Probable Net Positive/(Negative) Impact to General Revenue Related Funds
2008	(\$205,747)
2009	(\$190,747)
2010	(\$190,747)
2011	(\$190,747)
2012	(\$190,747)

All Funds, Five-Year Impact:

Fiscal Year	Probable Savings/(Cost) from GENERAL REVENUE FUND 1
2008	(\$205,747)
2009	(\$190,747)
2010	(\$190,747)
2011	(\$190,747)
2012	(\$190,747)

Fiscal Year	Change in Number of State Employees from FY 2007
2008	3.0
2009	3.0
2010	3.0
2011	3.0
2012	3.0

Fiscal Analysis

The bill requires school districts to submit information to the Texas Education Agency upon the first,

second, and third expulsion of any student from a campus for a serious offense as defined in TEC 37.007 (a) (2). Upon the second such expulsion the commissioner of education is required to review any safety plan adopted by the campus, and upon the third such expulsion, the commissioner is required to develop, monitor, and review a campus safety plan on a quarterly basis.

Methodology

According to the Texas Education Agency, in 2006 there were 98 campuses with 3 or more expulsions for the offenses referenced in the bill. Assuming those figures continue, the agency estimates they will require three new full-time equivalent (FTE) staff to review and monitor the campus safety plans quarterly and make the determination on whether control of the safety plan could be granted to the school district. The agency assumes that travel for on-site monitoring and review would be paid by the school district in question.

Local Government Impact

The bill stipulates that costs associated with implementing the school safety plan established by the Commissioner are the responsibility of the school district in which the campus is located. It is assumed that costs associated with TEA staff travel to districts for any necessary monitoring would be borne by the district.

Source Agencies: 701 Central Education Agency

LBB Staff: JOB, JSp, UP