

SENATE AMENDMENTS

2nd Printing

By: Eissler, Oliveira, Guillen, et al.

H.B. No. 2814

A BILL TO BE ENTITLED

AN ACT

relating to a pilot project for language immersion in English and another language in certain school districts and charter schools.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF TEXAS:

SECTION 1. Chapter 29, Education Code, is amended by adding Subchapter J to read as follows:

SUBCHAPTER J. LANGUAGE IMMERSION PILOT PROJECT

Sec. 29.351. ESTABLISHMENT OF PILOT PROJECT. The commissioner shall establish a pilot project under which the agency examines language immersion programs and the effect of those programs on a student's ability to advance to high school, graduate from high school, or prepare for college course work or postgraduation employment. The commissioner shall select to participate in the pilot project established under this subchapter:

(1) school districts; and

(2) campuses for which a charter is granted under Subchapter C, Chapter 12.

Sec. 29.352. PILOT PROJECT ADMINISTRATION. (a) The commissioner shall establish a procedure and adopt criteria for the agency to administer the pilot project.

(b) In adopting criteria under this section, the commissioner shall require the agency to select only school districts or campuses that:

(1) demonstrate parent, teacher, and community

1 support for a language immersion program;

2 (2) will commit to:

3 (A) a language immersion program in English and a
4 language other than English as selected by the district for a
5 minimum of three years in elementary grades; and

6 (B) a requirement that the English immersion
7 component of the program will comprise at least 50 percent of the
8 average instructional time;

9 (3) will offer in secondary grades at least one
10 language program in addition to the language other than English
11 used in the language immersion program provided under Subdivision
12 (2); and

13 (4) demonstrate the potential for expanding the
14 programs provided under Subdivisions (2) and (3) across primary and
15 secondary grades, including:

16 (A) incorporating the program provided under
17 Subdivision (2) in kindergarten; and

18 (B) offering the program provided under
19 Subdivision (3) for four years in high school.

20 (c) The agency shall require a school district or campus
21 selected under this subchapter to provide annual self-evaluations
22 of progress toward language immersion program goals.

23 Sec. 29.353. PILOT PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION. (a) The
24 commissioner by rule shall require a school district or campus to
25 limit activities of the language immersion program during the first
26 year of the program to:

27 (1) planning activities, including:

1 (A) hiring and training teachers and other
2 professional development activities as determined by the
3 commissioner; and

4 (B) acquiring adequate instructional and
5 technological materials in each program language, including
6 software; and

7 (2) expanding or improving existing language
8 immersion programs.

9 (b) The commissioner by rule shall develop procedures to
10 assign a technical assistance team that includes university faculty
11 with expertise in language learning to assist participating school
12 districts and campuses in program development, implementation, and
13 assessment.

14 Sec. 29.354. SCHOOL DISTRICT OR CAMPUS SELECTION. (a) The
15 agency shall select school districts and campuses to participate in
16 the pilot project using the criteria provided by Section 29.352(b)
17 and based on the readiness of the district or campus to incorporate
18 language immersion programs into classrooms as demonstrated by the
19 past performance of the district or campus relating to language
20 instruction.

21 (b) In selecting participants, the agency shall consider
22 geographic diversity.

23 (c) The agency shall select not more than 10 school
24 districts and not more than 30 campuses to participate in the pilot
25 project.

26 (d) A school district or campus that applies for the
27 expansion of an existing language immersion program is eligible for

1 a grant under this subchapter.

2 Sec. 29.355. PILOT PROJECT FUNDING. (a) To implement the
3 pilot project, the agency may use only undedicated and unobligated
4 money from the general revenue fund for purposes of the pilot
5 project.

6 (b) The agency may not spend an amount more than \$5 million
7 per year for the language immersion pilot project under this
8 subchapter. The spending limitation imposed by this subsection
9 does not apply to an expenditure made by the commissioner under
10 Section 29.356(c).

11 (c) To supplement the funding for the pilot project, the
12 agency may use any gift, grant, or donation given for the pilot
13 project. The agency may solicit and accept a gift, grant, or
14 donation of any kind from any source, including from a foundation,
15 private entity, governmental entity, or institution of higher
16 education, for the implementation of the pilot project.

17 (d) Funds for the pilot project may not be used for the
18 construction of a building or other facility.

19 (e) The agency shall use funds under this subchapter for:

20 (1) teacher training in implementing the language
21 immersion programs;

22 (2) hiring technical support staff for school
23 districts or campuses participating in the pilot project; and

24 (3) purchasing technology-based instructional
25 materials and resources.

26 Sec. 29.356. PILOT PROJECT GRANTS. (a) From amounts
27 appropriated to the agency, including foundation school program

1 funds, the commissioner shall award grants to school districts and
2 campuses that participate in the program. A grant under this
3 section must be in an amount sufficient to pay the costs to the
4 district or campus of participating in the program, as determined
5 by the commissioner. A determination of the commissioner under
6 this subsection is final and may not be appealed.

7 (b) During the 2007-2008 school year, the commissioner may
8 award grants to school districts and campuses under this section
9 only for the purpose of planning activities described by Section
10 29.355(e) in an amount not to exceed five percent of the total
11 amount required to fully implement the pilot program for the
12 2008-2009 school year.

13 (c) To expand language learning opportunities for all
14 public school students and school district or campus employees,
15 including students and employees in school districts or campuses
16 not participating in the pilot project, the commissioner shall
17 enter into a contract to license language-learning software using
18 language immersion methods. Expenditures under this subsection
19 must be sufficient to support language learning opportunities for a
20 maximum of one million public school students and employees for a
21 maximum of three years. The commissioner shall make the software
22 available online to public school students and employees across the
23 state not later than January 1, 2008. The commissioner may not
24 spend more than \$4 million each year to comply with this subsection.

25 Sec. 29.357. COMMUNITY EDUCATIONAL PIPELINE PROGRESS
26 TEAM. (a) Each participating school district or campus shall
27 establish a community educational pipeline progress team to assist

1 in developing and implementing the language immersion pilot
2 project.

3 (b) The board of trustees of a participating school district
4 or of a school district in which a participating campus is located
5 shall appoint individuals to the team. The team may be composed of:

6 (1) educators;

7 (2) district-level administrators;

8 (3) community leaders;

9 (4) parents of students who attend a participating
10 campus; and

11 (5) any other individual the board finds appropriate.

12 (c) The team shall develop an academic improvement plan that
13 describes the manner in which the pilot project should be
14 implemented in the participating school district or campus. In
15 developing the academic improvement plan, the team shall consider:

16 (1) the educational problems in the district or at the
17 campus that could be mitigated through the implementation of the
18 pilot project; and

19 (2) the technological and nontechnological resources
20 that are necessary to ensure successful implementation of the pilot
21 project.

22 (d) The team shall recommend to the board of trustees the
23 manner in which the pilot project funds should be used to implement
24 the academic improvement plan developed under Subsection (c).
25 Annually, the team may recommend to the board any necessary changes
26 in the academic improvement plan. The agency must approve the
27 academic improvement plan or any changes to the plan before

1 disbursing pilot project funds to the board.

2 (e) The board of trustees of each district participating in
3 the pilot project shall provide an annual progress report to the
4 agency not later than August 1 of each year that the district or
5 campus is participating in the pilot project. The report must state
6 in detail the type of plan used in the district or at the campus and
7 the effect of the pilot project on the district or campus,
8 including:

9 (1) any effect on the academic progress of students
10 who are participating in a pilot project, as measured by
11 performance on assessment instruments, including assessment
12 instruments administered under Section 39.023;

13 (2) if applicable, a comparison of student progress at
14 a campus or in a classroom in a school district or campus that is
15 participating in the pilot project as compared to student progress
16 at a campus or in a classroom in that same district or campus that is
17 not participating in the pilot project;

18 (3) any elements of the pilot project that contribute
19 to improved student performance on assessment instruments
20 administered under Section 39.023 or any other assessment
21 instrument required by the agency;

22 (4) any cost savings or improved efficiency relating
23 to school personnel or the maintenance of school facilities;

24 (5) any effect on student attendance or dropout rates;

25 (6) any effect on student enrollment in high school;

26 (7) any effect on teacher performance or retention;

27 (8) any improvement in communications among students,

1 parents, teachers, and administrators;

2 (9) any improvement in parental involvement in the
3 education of the parent's child;

4 (10) any effect on community involvement and support
5 for the district or campus; and

6 (11) any increase in student proficiency in technology
7 that would help prepare students for becoming members of the
8 workforce.

9 Sec. 29.358. PARENT OPTION. The parent of a student may
10 prevent the student from participating in a language immersion
11 program under this subchapter.

12 Sec. 29.359. PILOT PROJECT EVALUATION. (a) The agency
13 shall perform an annual review of the language immersion pilot
14 project based on the reports the agency receives from the board of
15 trustees of participating school districts or campuses. The agency
16 shall include a summary of the review of the pilot project in the
17 comprehensive annual report required under Section 39.182.

18 (b) During the 2010-2011 school year, the agency shall
19 contract with one or more educational research centers to evaluate
20 the efficacy of the pilot project to determine whether the pilot
21 project should be continued. The cost of the evaluation may not
22 exceed \$250,000.

23 Sec. 29.360. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CHARTER CAMPUS
24 GOVERNING BODY. For purposes of this subchapter, the governing
25 body of a campus for which a charter is granted under Subchapter C,
26 Chapter 12, has the duties and responsibilities assigned to the
27 board of trustees of a school district under Sections 29.357 and

1 29.359.

2 Sec. 29.361. EXPIRATION. This subchapter expires September
3 1, 2011.

4 SECTION 2. This Act takes effect immediately if it receives
5 a vote of two-thirds of all the members elected to each house, as
6 provided by Section 39, Article III, Texas Constitution. If this
7 Act does not receive the vote necessary for immediate effect, this
8 Act takes effect September 1, 2007.

ADOPTED

MAY 22 2007

Lotay Spaw
Secretary of the Senate

removed under protest

By: _____

H.B. No. 2814

Substitute the following for H.B. No. 2814:

By: *Vander Pelt*

C.S. H.B. No. 2814

A BILL TO BE ENTITLED

AN ACT

relating to a pilot project in certain school districts for dual language education in English and another language.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF TEXAS:

SECTION 1. Subchapter A, Chapter 28, Education Code, is amended by adding Sections 28.0052, 28.0053, and 28.0054 to read as follows:

Sec. 28.0052. DUAL LANGUAGE EDUCATION PILOT PROJECT.

(a) The commissioner shall establish a pilot project in school districts selected by the commissioner under which the agency examines dual language education programs and the effect of those programs on a student's ability to graduate from high school.

(b) In selecting school districts under Subsection (a), the commissioner shall:

(1) select districts that will commit to operate a dual language education program:

(A) for at least three years; and

(B) on one or more district campuses selected by the commissioner that demonstrate a substantially equal enrollment of students with limited English proficiency and students whose primary language is English or, if a district does not have a campus with a sufficient number of limited English proficiency students to meet the equal enrollment standard, on one or more district campuses selected by the commissioner that will include the

1 enrollment of students with limited English proficiency, students
2 whose primary language is English, and bilingual students; and

3 (2) give preference to a district that:

4 (A) demonstrates the potential:

5 (i) for expanding the program through
6 middle school and high school; and

7 (ii) to offer at least one language program
8 in addition to the language other than English used in the pilot
9 program;

10 (B) will implement the program at the
11 kindergarten level; and

12 (C) demonstrates parent, teacher, and community
13 support for the program.

14 (c) The commissioner may select not more than 10 school
15 districts and not more than 30 campuses to operate a dual language
16 education program under this section.

17 (d) The commissioner by rule shall, except as provided by
18 Subsection (e), require a district to limit activities of the dual
19 language education program during the first year of the program to
20 planning activities, including:

21 (1) hiring and training teachers and ensuring teacher
22 certification;

23 (2) establishing parental and community support for
24 the program; and

25 (3) acquiring adequate learning materials in both
26 program languages.

27 (e) A program that applies for the expansion or improvement

1 of an existing dual language education program is eligible for
2 funding under the pilot project only to the extent authorized by the
3 commissioner in compliance with Subsection (c). An existing dual
4 language education program is not subject to the limitations on
5 activities imposed under Subsection (d).

6 (f) Funding provided for a dual language education program
7 may be used by a district for classroom materials.

8 (g) The agency shall report to the legislature describing
9 the agency's activities under the pilot project, the effect of the
10 project on grade-level completion and high school graduation rates,
11 and the recommendations arising from the project. The agency shall
12 submit an interim report under this subsection not later than
13 January 1, 2011, and a final report not later than January 1, 2013.

14 (h) This section expires August 1, 2013.

15 Sec. 28.0053. DUAL LANGUAGE EDUCATION PILOT PROJECT:
16 COMMUNITY EDUCATIONAL PIPELINE PROGRESS TEAM. (a) Each school
17 district or campus participating in the dual language education
18 pilot project under Section 28.0052 shall establish a community
19 educational pipeline progress team to assist in developing and
20 implementing the dual language education pilot project.

21 (b) The board of trustees of a participating school district
22 or of a school district in which a participating campus is located
23 shall appoint individuals to the team. The team must include
24 educators, district-level administrators, and parents of students
25 who attend a participating campus. The team may include community
26 leaders and any other persons identified by the board of trustees as
27 having research-based knowledge regarding second-language

1 learning.

2 (c) The team shall develop an academic improvement plan that
3 describes the manner in which the pilot project should be
4 implemented in the participating school district or campus. In
5 developing the academic improvement plan, the team shall consider:

6 (1) the educational problems in the district or at the
7 campus that could be mitigated through the implementation of the
8 pilot project; and

9 (2) the technological and nontechnological resources
10 that are necessary to ensure successful implementation of the pilot
11 project.

12 (d) The team shall recommend to the board of trustees the
13 manner in which the pilot project funds should be used to implement
14 the academic improvement plan developed under Subsection (c).
15 Annually, the team may recommend to the board any necessary changes
16 in the academic improvement plan. The agency must approve the
17 academic improvement plan or any changes to the plan before
18 disbursing pilot project funds to the board.

19 (e) The board of trustees of each district participating in
20 the pilot project shall provide an annual progress report to the
21 agency not later than August 1 of each year that the district or
22 campus is participating in the pilot project. The report must state
23 in detail the type of plan used in the district or at the campus and
24 the effect of the pilot project on the district or campus,
25 including:

26 (1) any effect on the academic progress of students
27 who are participating in a pilot project, as measured by

1 performance on assessment instruments, including assessment
2 instruments administered under Section 39.023;

3 (2) if applicable, a comparison of student progress at
4 a campus or in a classroom in a school district or campus that is
5 participating in the pilot project as compared to student progress
6 at a campus or in a classroom in that same district or campus that is
7 not participating in the pilot project;

8 (3) any effect on student attendance or dropout rates;

9 (4) any effect on student enrollment in high school;

10 (5) any effect on teacher performance or retention;

11 (6) any improvement in communications among students,
12 parents, teachers, and administrators;

13 (7) any improvement in parental involvement in the
14 education of the parent's child;

15 (8) any effect on community involvement and support
16 for the district or campus; and

17 (9) any increase in student proficiency in technology
18 that would help prepare students for becoming members of the
19 workforce.

20 (f) This section expires August 1, 2013.

21 Sec. 28.0054. CONTRACT FOR LANGUAGE LEARNING SOFTWARE. (a)
22 To expand language learning opportunities for all public school
23 students and school district or campus employees, including
24 students and employees in school districts or campuses not
25 participating in the dual language education pilot project
26 established under Section 28.0052, the commissioner shall enter
27 into a contract to license language learning software using

1 language immersion methods.

2 (b) Expenditures under this section must be sufficient to
3 support language learning opportunities for a maximum of one
4 million public school students and employees for a maximum of three
5 years. The commissioner shall make the software available online
6 to public school students and employees across the state not later
7 than January 1, 2008. A campus participating in the pilot project
8 established under Section 28.0052 may have access to the software.

9 (c) The commissioner may not spend more than \$4 million each
10 year to comply with this section.

11 (d) A school district may not use the language learning
12 software to supplant a bilingual education, English as a second
13 language, or dual language education program.

14 (e) Not later than January 1, 2013, the commissioner shall
15 report to the legislature on the utilization and effectiveness of
16 the language learning software.

17 (f) This section expires August 1, 2013.

18 SECTION 2. This Act takes effect immediately if it receives
19 a vote of two-thirds of all the members elected to each house, as
20 provided by Section 39, Article III, Texas Constitution. If this
21 Act does not receive the vote necessary for immediate effect, this
22 Act takes effect September 1, 2007.

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET BOARD
Austin, Texas

FISCAL NOTE, 80TH LEGISLATIVE REGULAR SESSION

May 18, 2007

TO: Honorable Florence Shapiro, Chair, Senate Committee on Education

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

IN RE: HB2814 by Eissler (relating to a pilot program in certain school districts for dual language education in English and another language.), **Committee Report 2nd House, Substituted**

Estimated Two-year Net Impact to General Revenue Related Funds for HB2814, Committee Report 2nd House, Substituted: a negative impact of (\$10,998,362) 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	(\$4,828,831)
2009	(\$6,169,531)
2010	(\$6,108,516)
2011	(\$2,175,183)
2012	(\$2,175,183)

All Funds, Five-Year Impact:

Fiscal Year	Probable Savings/(Cost) from GENERAL REVENUE FUND 1
2008	(\$4,828,831)
2009	(\$6,169,531)
2010	(\$6,108,516)
2011	(\$2,175,183)
2012	(\$2,175,183)

Fiscal Year	Change in Number of State Employees from FY 2007
2008	2.0
2009	2.0
2010	1.0
2011	1.0
2012	1.0

Fiscal Analysis

The bill would create a dual language education pilot project including not more than 30 campuses in

10 districts statewide. School districts participating in the pilot project would be required to participate for at least three years, with the first year being a planning year. The bill would require the Texas Education Agency (TEA) to make periodic reports on the effectiveness of the pilot program.

The bill would direct the Commissioner to enter into a contract to license language-learning software using the language immersion methods by January 1, 2008. The bill requires expenditures for this subsection to be sufficient to support language learning opportunities for a maximum of one million students and employees for a maximum of three years. The bill would limit expenditures for this purpose to \$4 million annually.

Methodology

TEA estimates start-up costs for dual-language programs at \$512 per student served on average. The average per pupil cost for on-going operations of a dual language program is estimated at about \$525 per student, with smaller programs experiencing relatively greater per pupil costs and larger programs experiencing relatively lesser per pupil costs.

Based on \$512 average per pupil start-up costs and \$525 average per pupil operations costs and assuming that 130 students are served per campus on not more than 30 campuses in 10 districts each year, the cost of funding the dual language pilot program grant awards is estimated at about \$1.99 million in FY2008 and \$2.04 million in each subsequent year. Costs may vary according to program size.

It is estimated that 2.0 FTEs would be required at TEA to administer the pilot program in the first two years of implementation. In the subsequent years, through the August 1, 2013 expiration of the pilot period, it is estimated that 1.0 FTE would be required to administer the program. Associated administrative costs are estimated at about \$132,031 in fiscal year 2008, \$122,031 in fiscal year 2009, and about \$61,016 in each subsequent year through 2013. It is estimated that the evaluation required by the bill would cost of \$200,000 allocated across the three-year period between 2011 and 2013.

The bill would direct the Commissioner to enter into a contract to license language-learning software using language immersion methods by January 1, 2008. The bill would limit these expenditures to \$4 million annually. TEA indicates that prorated costs in FY2008 would be \$2.7 million, assuming that implementation begins in January 2008. Costs of \$4.0 million per year would be anticipated for fiscal years 2009 and 2010. The bill would limit expenditures to a maximum of three years; so no costs would be expect beyond FY2010.

Local Government Impact

School districts would be eligible to apply to participate in the dual language pilot program and would be assumed to receive funds associated with participation. Participating school districts would be required to establish a community education pipeline progress team to develop and implement the pilot project and would be required to submit annual progress reports to TEA.

Source Agencies: 701 Central Education Agency

LBB Staff: JOB, JSc, JSp, UP

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET BOARD
Austin, Texas

FISCAL NOTE, 80TH LEGISLATIVE REGULAR SESSION

May 2, 2007

TO: Honorable Florence Shapiro, Chair, Senate Committee on Education

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

IN RE: HB2814 by Eissler (Relating to a pilot project for language immersion in English and another language in certain school districts and charter schools.), **As Engrossed**

Estimated Two-year Net Impact to General Revenue Related Funds for HB2814, As Engrossed: a negative impact of (\$12,008,105) 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	(\$3,008,105)
2009	(\$9,000,000)
2010	(\$9,000,000)
2011	(\$5,250,000)
2012	\$0

All Funds, Five-Year Impact:

Fiscal Year	Probable Savings/(Cost) from <i>GENERAL REVENUE FUND</i> 1
2008	(\$3,008,105)
2009	(\$9,000,000)
2010	(\$9,000,000)
2011	(\$5,250,000)
2012	\$0

Fiscal Year	Change in Number of State Employees from FY 2007
2008	1.0
2009	1.0
2010	1.0
2011	1.0
2012	0.0

Fiscal Analysis

The bill would require the Commissioner of Education to establish a 3-year language immersion pilot

project in not more than 10 school districts and not more than 30 campuses. The Commissioner would be directed to provide funding to participating school districts and campuses sufficient to cover costs of participating in the pilot. The bill would require that participating districts and campuses establish community education pipeline progress teams made up of educators, administrators, parents, and community leaders to develop and implement the pilot project. Participating districts and campuses would be required to submit annual self-reports of progress under the program, and the Texas Education Agency (TEA) would be required to perform an annual review of the pilot project based on information received through district self-reporting. The bill directs that total funding for the language immersion pilot project not exceed \$5 million per year. Grants awarded in the first year would be limited to grants for planning purposes and may not exceed 5 percent of the amount required for full implementation.

The bill would direct the Commissioner to enter into a contract to license language-learning software using language immersion methods by January 1, 2008. The bill requires expenditures for this subsection of the bill to be sufficient to support language learning opportunities for a maximum of one million students and employees for a maximum of three years. The bill would limit expenditures to \$4 million annually.

The bill directs the agency to contract with education research centers for an evaluation of the pilot project in the 2010-2011 school year. The contracted amount may not exceed \$250,000.

The pilot program would expire at the end of FY2011.

Methodology

The bill stipulates that total funding for the language immersion pilot project may not exceed \$5 million in General Revenue per year. The bill stipulates that planning grants in FY2008 may not exceed 5 percent of the cost of total implementation, or \$250,000 in General Revenue. TEA indicates that one additional FTE would be required to implement the program at a cost of \$58,105 in General Revenue annually. It is assumed that after the first year, the agency would award the difference between administrative costs and the \$5 million cap as grants to districts for a total annual cost of \$5 million in FY2009, FY2010, and FY2011.

The bill would direct the Commissioner to enter into a contract to license language-learning software using language immersion methods by January 1, 2008. The bill requires expenditures for this subsection of the bill to be sufficient to support language learning opportunities for a maximum of one million students and employees for a maximum of three years. The bill would limit these expenditures to \$4 million annually. The Texas Education Agency indicates that prorated costs in FY2008 would total \$2.7 million, assuming that implementation begins in January 2008. Costs of \$4.0 million per year would be anticipated in fiscal years 2009 and 2010. No costs for language-learning software are estimated for FY2011 because the bill appears to limit expenditures to a maximum of three years.

The cost of the evaluation conducted by TEA in FY2011 would be \$250,000 in General Revenue, and for purposes of this estimate it is assumed that the directed expenditure is in excess of the \$5 million program limitation.

Local Government Impact

Participating school districts would be required to establish a community education pipeline progress team to develop and implement the pilot program and would be required to submit annual progress reports to TEA. Participating school districts would receive grant funding to support implementation of the pilot program.

Source Agencies: 701 Central Education Agency

LBB Staff: JOB, JSp, UP, JSc

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET BOARD
Austin, Texas

FISCAL NOTE, 80TH LEGISLATIVE REGULAR SESSION

April 9, 2007

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

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

IN RE: **HB2814** by Eissler (relating to a language immersion pilot project in certain school districts.), **Committee Report 1st House, Substituted**

Estimated Two-year Net Impact to General Revenue Related Funds for HB2814, Committee Report 1st House, Substituted: a negative impact of (\$12,008,105) 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	(\$3,008,105)
2009	(\$9,000,000)
2010	(\$9,000,000)
2011	(\$5,250,000)
2012	\$0

All Funds, Five-Year Impact:

Fiscal Year	Probable Savings/(Cost) from GENERAL REVENUE FUND 1
2008	(\$3,008,105)
2009	(\$9,000,000)
2010	(\$9,000,000)
2011	(\$5,250,000)
2012	\$0

Fiscal Year	Change in Number of State Employees from FY 2007
2008	1.0
2009	1.0
2010	1.0
2011	1.0
2012	0.0

Fiscal Analysis

The bill would require the Commissioner of Education to establish a 3-year language immersion pilot

5
-1072

project in not more than 10 school districts and not more than 30 elementary schools. The Commissioner would be directed to provide funding to participating school districts sufficient to cover costs of participating in the pilot. The bill would require that participating districts establish community education pipeline progress teams made up of educators, administrators, parents, and community leaders to develop and implement the pilot project. Participating districts would be required to submit annual self-reports of progress under the program, and the Texas Education Agency (TEA) would be required to perform an annual review of the pilot project based on information received through district self-reporting. The bill directs that total funding for the language immersion pilot project not exceed \$5 million per year. Grants awarded in the first year would be limited to grants for planning purposes and may not exceed 5 percent of the amount required for full implementation.

The bill would direct the Commissioner to enter into a contract to license language-learning software using language immersion methods by January 1, 2008. The bill requires expenditures for this subsection of the bill to be sufficient to support language learning opportunities for a maximum of one million students and employees for a maximum of three years. The bill would limit expenditures to \$4 million annually.

The bill directs the agency to contract with education research centers for an evaluation of the pilot project in the 2010-2011 school year. The contracted amount may not exceed \$250,000.

The pilot program would expire at the end of FY2011.

Methodology

The bill stipulates that total funding for the language immersion pilot project may not exceed \$5 million in General Revenue per year. The bill stipulates that planning grants in FY2008 may not exceed 5 percent of the cost of total implementation, or \$250,000 in General Revenue. TEA indicates that one additional FTE would be required to implement the program at a cost of \$58,105 in General Revenue annually. It is assumed that after the first year, the agency would award the difference between administrative costs and the \$5 million cap as grants to districts for a total annual cost of \$5 million in FY2009, FY2010, and FY2011.

The bill would direct the Commissioner to enter into a contract to license language-learning software using language immersion methods by January 1, 2008. The bill requires expenditures for this subsection of the bill to be sufficient to support language learning opportunities for a maximum of one million students and employees for a maximum of three years. The bill would limit these expenditures to \$4 million annually. The Texas Education Agency indicates that prorated costs in FY2008 would total \$2.7 million, assuming that implementation begins in January 2008. Costs of \$4.0 million per year would be anticipated in fiscal years 2009 and 2010. No costs for language-learning software are estimated for FY2011 because the bill appears to limit expenditures to a maximum of three years.

The cost of the evaluation conducted by TEA in FY2011 would be \$250,000 in General Revenue, and for purposes of this estimate it is assumed that the directed expenditure is in excess of the \$5 million program limitation.

Local Government Impact

Participating school districts would be required to establish a community education pipeline progress team to develop and implement the pilot program and would be required to submit annual progress reports to TEA. Participating school districts would receive grant funding to support implementation of the pilot program.

Source Agencies: 701 Central Education Agency

LBB Staff: JOB, JSp, UP, JSc

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET BOARD
Austin, Texas

FISCAL NOTE, 80TH LEGISLATIVE REGULAR SESSION

March 26, 2007

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

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

IN RE: **HB2814** by Eissler (Relating to a language immersion pilot project in certain school districts.), **As Introduced**

Estimated Two-year Net Impact to General Revenue Related Funds for HB2814, As Introduced: a negative impact of (\$5,308,105) 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	(\$308,105)
2009	(\$5,000,000)
2010	(\$5,000,000)
2011	(\$5,250,000)
2012	\$0


All Funds, Five-Year Impact:

Fiscal Year	Probable Savings/(Cost) from GENERAL REVENUE FUND
2008	(\$308,105)
2009	(\$5,000,000)
2010	(\$5,000,000)
2011	(\$5,250,000)
2012	\$0

Fiscal Year	Change in Number of State Employees from FY 2007
2008	1.0
2009	1.0
2010	1.0
2011	1.0
2012	0.0

Fiscal Analysis

The bill would require the Commissioner of Education to establish a 3-year language immersion pilot


1 of 2

project in not more than 10 school districts and not more than 30 elementary schools. The Commissioner would be directed to provide funding to participating school districts sufficient to cover costs of participating in the pilot. The bill would require that participating districts establish community education pipeline progress teams made up of educators, administrators, parents, and community leaders to develop and implement the pilot project. Participating districts would be required to submit annual self-reports of progress under the program, and the Texas Education Agency (TEA) would be required to perform an annual review of the pilot project based on information received through district self-reporting. The bill directs that total funding for the language immersion pilot project not exceed \$5 million per year. Grants awarded in the first year would be limited to grants for planning purposes and may not exceed 5 percent of the amount required for full implementation.

The bill would direct the Commissioner to enter into a contract to license language-learning software using language immersion methods by January 1, 2008.

The bill directs the agency to contract with education research centers for an evaluation of the pilot project in the 2010-2011 school year. The contracted amount may not exceed \$250,000.

The pilot program would expire at the end of FY2011.

Methodology

The bill stipulates that total funding for the language immersion pilot project may not exceed \$5 million in General Revenue per year. The bill stipulates that planning grants in FY2008 may not exceed 5 percent of the cost of total implementation, or \$250,000 in General Revenue. TEA indicates that one additional FTE would be required to implement the program at a cost of \$58,105 in General Revenue annually. It is assumed that after the first year, the agency would award the difference between administrative costs and the \$5 million cap as grants to districts for a total annual cost of \$5 million in FY2009, FY2010, and FY2011.

The cost of the evaluation conducted by TEA in FY2011 would be \$250,000 in General Revenue, and for purposes of this estimate it is assumed that the directed expenditure is in excess of the \$5 million program limitation.

Local Government Impact

Participating school districts would be required to establish a community education pipeline progress team to develop and implement the pilot program and would be required to submit annual progress reports to TEA. Participating school districts would receive grant funding to support implementation of the pilot program.

Source Agencies: 701 Central Education Agency

LBB Staff: JOB, JSp, UP, JS

