

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET BOARD  
Austin, Texas

FISCAL NOTE, 82ND LEGISLATIVE REGULAR SESSION

February 28, 2011

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

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

**IN RE: SB596** by Shapiro (Relating to transition planning for a public school student receiving special education services.), **As Introduced**

**Estimated Two-year Net Impact to General Revenue Related Funds** for SB596, As Introduced: a negative impact of (\$2,256,942) through the biennium ending August 31, 2013.

General Revenue-Related Funds, Five-Year Impact:

Fiscal Year	Probable Net Positive/(Negative) Impact to General Revenue Related Funds
2012	(\$1,553,753)
2013	(\$703,189)
2014	(\$377,813)
2015	(\$377,813)
2016	(\$377,813)

All Funds, Five-Year Impact:

Fiscal Year	Probable Savings/(Cost) from General Revenue Fund 1	Change in Number of State Employees from FY 2011
2012	(\$1,553,753)	2.0
2013	(\$703,189)	2.0
2014	(\$377,813)	2.0
2015	(\$377,813)	2.0
2016	(\$377,813)	2.0

Fiscal Analysis

This bill is related to transition planning for a public school student receiving special education services.

The bill would require that transition planning for a public school student receiving special education services begin by the time the student reached age 14 and include social and recreational goals in the student’s individualized education program (IEP).

The bill would require the Texas Education Agency (TEA) to develop new indicators for the Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS) regarding the preparation by school districts of students enrolled in special education programs for their transition to life outside the public school system.

The new indicators for the PBMAS include:

- (1) the percentage of students at least 16 years of age who had an IEP that included both

postsecondary employment or education and training goals and identified services to help students meet these goals,

- (2) the percentage of students at least 16 years of age who had at least one meeting in the preceding 12 months with a representative of a state health and human services agency that provides employment or long-term services and supports for adults with disabilities,
- (3) the percentage of students who left secondary school in the preceding 12 months with IEPs in effect at the time and who had at least one meeting during the 12 months before departure with a representative of a state health and human services agency that provides employment or long-term services and supports for adults with disabilities,
- (4) the percentage of students who left secondary school in the preceding 12 months with IEPs in effect at the time and who, during the 12 months after departure, held competitive or supported employment positions for at least six months or attended postsecondary education and training programs for at least one semester.

The bill would apply beginning with the 2011–2012 school year or immediately if passed with the necessary voting margins.

## **Methodology**

TEA would be required to develop four new PBMAS indicators regarding the preparation of students enrolled in special education programs for transition to life outside the public school system. TEA would be required to report on the activities of other state agencies and to report new details about student IEPs, which would require new data collection.

According to TEA, data collection for three of the PBMAS indicators would need to be collected directly from state agencies, including state health and human services agencies, institutions of higher education and the workforce commission, in order to ensure completeness and accuracy of the information. Based on this assumption, the TEA indicates that a new system would be required to collect data for the new indicators which would interface with the existing automated PBMAS.

TEA estimates costs would include two agency full-time equivalent (FTE) positions and eight contractor positions to develop and maintain the new system. TEA estimates costs for two new Programmer V full-time equivalent (FTE) positions beginning at \$61,254 per position in fiscal year 2012. Contracting costs are estimated at \$1,106,600 for eight contractor positions, including one business analyst, four developers, two developers/testers, and a technical l writer. Estimates include 12,720 hours of effort at hourly rates ranging from \$80 to \$90.

In fiscal year 2013, the number of contractor positions would decrease from eight to five positions and contract hours of effort totaling 4,590 are estimated at \$410,550. Beginning in fiscal year 2014, the number of contractor positions required will decrease to one position each fiscal year 2014 through 2016 and contract hours of effort totaling 1,140 would cost an estimated \$102,638 per year.

Other operating costs for cubicle, phone, PC lease, and supplies are estimated at \$16,000 each for eight contractor and two FTE agency positions for fiscal year 2012. Estimated operating costs for each fiscal year 2013 through 2016 total \$8,000 for each contractor or FTE position.

Development and maintenance of the new system would require new hardware and software licensing. Equipment purchases and leasing costs are estimated at \$116,697 in FY 2012, \$40,000 in FY 2013 and \$24,000 each year thereafter.

## **Technology**

According to TEA, a new system for collection of data on the new indicators would require development separate from the existing automated PBMAS. The new system would interface with existing systems, including the PEIMS, to gather required data.

Technology costs include contract position costs and costs incurred to lease or purchase new hardware and software.

## **Local Government Impact**

The TEA assumes school districts would be required to provide transition planning for students receiving special education services beginning at age 14 instead of at age 16. Separate social and recreational goals would be required for IEPs. New data collection and reporting would be required by school districts.

Administrative rules that were in place until November 2007 required transition planning to begin at age 14. School districts not providing transition services for students at age 14 would incur some administrative costs to begin transition planning for students at age 14 instead of age 16. Reducing the age to 14 to begin transition planning could add as many as 75,000 to 80,000 additional students to the transition process. The required transition planning is already in place for some of these students based on previous requirements; however, participation data are not available.

Administrative costs for school districts would vary depending on current implementation of transition plans and revisions to IEPs.

**Source Agencies:** 701 Central Education Agency

**LBB Staff:** JOB, LXH, JGM, JW