



Committee on 21st Century Competitiveness

**Tuesday, January 22, 2008
9:00 AM - 11:20 AM
404 HOB**

**Marco Rubio
Speaker**

**David Simmons
Chair**



The Florida House of Representatives

Schools and Learning Council

Committee on 21st Century Competitiveness

Marco Rubio
Speaker

David Simmons
Chair

January 22, 2008

MEETING AGENDA

January 22, 2008

9:00 AM - 11:20 AM

404 HOB

- I. Call to Order
- II. Chairman's Remarks
- III. Presentations by the following:
 - Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability (OPPAGA)
 - David Summers
 - Rose Cook
 - Department of Education (DOE)
 - Linda Champion
 - Spessard Boatright
- IV. Panel Members
 - Florida Association of District School Superintendents (FADSS)
 - Joy Frank
 - Florida School Board Association (FSBA)
 - Ruth Melton
 - Florida Education Association (FEA)
 - Marshall Ogletree
 - Ron Meyer
 - Andy Ford
 - Department of Education
 - Lavan Dukes
- V. Closing Comments
- VI. Adjournment

CLASS SIZE REQUIREMENTS; FUNDING & COMPLIANCE

Class size requirements: In 2002, voters approved the constitutional Class Size Reduction Amendment.¹ The amendment requires the Legislature to fund: (1) a sufficient number of classrooms by the 2010 school year so that no more than a specified maximum number of students will be assigned to each teacher; and (2) the reduction of the average number of students in each classroom by at least two until the maximum number of students is achieved. The maximum number of students specified in the amendment is: (a) 18 students in grades PK-3; (b) 22 students in grades 4-8; and (c) 25 students in grades 9-12.

Section 1003.03(2), F.S., sets forth an implementation schedule for the amendment, which provides that class size, for purposes of determining district compliance with the reduction goals, shall be measured at the:

- District level for each of the three grade groupings during Fiscal Years (FYs) 2003-2006.
- School level for each of the three grade groupings in FYs 2006-2008.
- Individual classroom level for each of the three grade groupings in FY 2008-2009 and thereafter.

Statutory consequences for a district's failure to comply with class size reduction goals are:

- Beginning in FY 2003-2004, the Department of Education (DOE) is required to transfer a district's class size reduction operating funds to class size reduction fixed capital outlay (FCO) in an amount proportionate to the amount of class size reduction not accomplished.²
- Beginning in FY 2005-2006, districts are required to implement one of the following policies in the following school year: (a) year-round schools; (b) double sessions; (c) rezoning; or (d) changing instructional staff loads and scheduling, deploying certified district employees to classrooms, or operating beyond normal school days and hours.³
- Beginning in FY 2006-2007, the DOE must develop a constitutional compliance plan for the district that includes, but is not limited to, the redrawing of school

¹ Section 1, Article IX of the Florida Constitution.

² Section 1003.03(4)(a), F.S.

³ Section 1003.03(4)(b), F.S.

attendance zones to maximize use of facilities while minimizing additional use of transportation.⁴

Funding: Section 1011.685, F.S., creates an operating categorical fund for class size reduction. Districts are authorized to use such funding for: (a) reduction of class size in any lawful manner if the district has not met reduction goals; or (b) any lawful expenditure if reduction goals have been met with priority to be given to increasing teacher salaries and implementing differentiated-pay provisions. For FYs 2003-2008, the Legislature appropriated a total of \$7.75 billion in class size reduction operating funds with \$2.7 billion of that amount most recently appropriated for FY 2007-2008. Please see Excel Attachment entitled, "Class Size Reduction Funding History" for additional appropriation history.

Section 1013.735, F.S., creates the Classrooms for Kids Program, which authorizes FCO dollars appropriated to the program to be distributed to districts based on a specified formula. Districts may spend these funds on the construction, renovation, or repair of educational facilities, or the purchase of relocatables, which are in excess of projects or relocatables identified in the district's five-year work program adopted before March 15, 2003. For FYs 2003-2008, the Legislature appropriated a total of \$2.5 billion in class size reduction FCO funds with \$650 million of that amount most recently appropriated for FY 2007-2008. Please see Excel Attachment entitled, "Class Size Reduction Funding History" for additional appropriation history.

District compliance: For the 2006-2007 school year:

- School-wide class size averages were not in compliance with current statutory requirements to reduce average class size by two students from the 2005-2006 school year:
 - In 111 traditional schools in 32 counties for grades PK-3; 54 traditional schools in 19 counties for grades 4-8; and 23 traditional schools in 15 counties for grades 9-12. Please see PDF Attachment entitled, "Number of Traditional Schools Not in Compliance."
 - In 53 charter schools in 19 counties for grades PK-3; 53 charter schools in 15 counties for grades 4-8; and 6 charter schools in four counties for grades 9-12. Please see PDF Attachment entitled, "Number of Charter Schools Not in Compliance."
- Individual class-based measurements were not yet in compliance with the constitutional maximums set for the 2010-2011 school year:
 - In 284 traditional schools in 34 counties for grades PK-3; 151 traditional schools in 20 counties for grades 4-8; and 32 traditional schools in 16 counties

⁴ Section 1003.03(4)(c), F.S.

for grades 9-12. Please see PDF Attachment entitled, "Number of Traditional Schools Not in Compliance."

- o In 81 charter schools in 22 counties for grades PK-3; 62 charter schools in 17 counties for grades 4-8; and 7 charter schools in five counties for grades 9-12. Please see PDF Attachment entitled, "Number of Charter Schools Not in Compliance."

Transfers from operating to FCO: During the four FYs between 2003 and 2007, the DOE, as required by statute, has transferred almost \$8.4 million in district class size reduction operating funds to district class size reduction FCO. The bulk of this transfer, \$5,318,921, occurred in FY 2006-2007. During this FY, the operating funds of 27 counties were transferred to FCO with the smallest transfer being \$722 for Seminole County and the largest being \$1,766,907 for Orange County. Please see Excel Attachment entitled, "History of Transfers from Operating to Fixed Capital Outlay Due to Non-Compliance."

2006-07 District-Wide Class Size Average

District	PK-3	4-8	9-12	Over Constitutional Average		
				18.00 PK-3	22.00 4-8	25.00 9-12
1 Alachua	17.01	18.24	21.54			
2 Baker	16.09	20.25	19.22			
3 Bay	16.33	18.35	20.77			
4 Bradford	16.18	18.21	20.09			
5 Brevard	16.89	19.83	22.46			
6 Broward	17.06	20.47	24.21			
7 Calhoun	14.36	15.57	14.78			
8 Charlotte	16.14	19.19	22.24			
9 Citrus	13.22	17.94	21.37			
10 Clay	15.90	18.03	19.89			
11 Collier	17.00	18.88	22.61			
12 Columbia	16.11	17.93	20.84			
13 Miami-Dade	18.52	20.52	23.23	0.52		
14 DeSoto	17.33	20.22	22.73			
15 Dixie	16.02	17.08	19.04			
16 Duval	16.53	18.34	21.69			
17 Escambia	16.12	18.95	21.41			
18 Flagler	16.27	19.14	21.11			
19 Franklin	16.21	21.22	17.05			
20 Gadsden	18.79	18.95	20.52	0.79		
21 Gilchrist	15.05	18.19	18.85			
22 Glades	15.22	18.30	17.13			
23 Gulf	16.21	18.53	18.05			
24 Hamilton	15.69	17.69	20.23			
25 Hardee	16.41	17.88	21.23			
26 Hendry	16.60	20.09	20.59			
27 Hernando	16.28	18.94	21.53			
28 Highlands	16.45	18.08	19.56			
29 Hillsborough	14.97	18.59	23.03			
30 Holmes	16.41	17.83	18.47			
31 Indian River	16.82	20.18	22.20			
32 Jackson	16.05	18.31	18.88			
33 Jefferson	15.81	20.78	16.10			
34 Lafayette	16.77	20.28	20.83			
35 Lake	17.03	19.53	22.50			
36 Lee	17.10	19.94	22.66			
37 Leon	17.04	19.37	21.51			
38 Levy	16.90	17.92	19.90			
39 Liberty	16.97	18.97	25.94			0.94
40 Madison	16.22	18.09	17.61			
41 Manatee	18.02	19.40	21.19	0.02		
42 Marion	15.29	17.52	18.16			
43 Martin	16.69	18.50	22.98			
44 Monroe	17.04	18.27	20.89			
45 Nassau	16.56	20.65	20.79			
46 Okaloosa	16.88	18.60	22.08			
47 Okeechobee	16.91	20.08	19.97			
48 Orange	17.18	19.06	22.44			
49 Osceola	17.15	19.81	22.68			
50 Palm Beach	16.83	19.73	22.81			
51 Pasco	12.44	18.24	21.11			
52 Pinellas	16.08	19.69	21.20			
53 Polk	16.71	18.87	22.14			
54 Putnam	17.14	18.34	21.49			
55 St. Johns	17.28	19.38	22.35			
56 St. Lucie	18.45	20.84	20.68	0.45		
57 Santa Rosa	16.81	19.67	22.93			
58 Sarasota	16.80	19.55	21.69			
59 Seminole	16.62	19.30	22.20			
60 Sumter	16.38	18.24	18.61			
61 Suwannee	15.84	20.64	23.46			
62 Taylor	16.95	19.28	18.49			
63 Union	16.88	19.64	15.27			
64 Volusia	16.41	18.77	20.60			
65 Wakulla	17.91	18.67	19.96			
66 Walton	16.69	18.97	19.09			
67 Washington	17.72	21.47	21.47			

State

16.95

19.41

22.19

4

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

NUMBER OF TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS NOT IN COMPLIANCE WITH CLASS SIZE REQUIREMENTS IN 2006-07

	Grades PK-3		Grades 4-8		Grades 9-12		All Grades - Unduplicated Schools		Total Schools in District
	Not in Compliance with Current Statutes ¹	Not in Compliance with Constitutional Cap of 18	Not in Compliance with Current Statutes ¹	Not in Compliance with Constitutional Cap of 22	Not in Compliance with Current Statutes ¹	Not in Compliance with Constitutional Cap of 25	Not in Compliance with Current Statutes ¹	Not in Compliance with Constitutional Caps	
	-1-								
1 Alachua	5	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	44
2 Baker	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
3 Bay	2	2	1	1	1	1	4	4	36
4 Bradford	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
5 Brevard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
6 Broward	9	13	6	6	3	3	17	21	234
7 Calhoun	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
8 Charlotte	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
9 Citrus	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	21
10 Clay	3	3	0	0	1	1	4	4	37
11 Collier	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	51
12 Columbia	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	14
13 Miami-Dade	1	128	1	76	4	9	6	155	326
14 DeSoto	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
15 Dixie	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
16 Duval	13	13	0	0	1	1	14	14	163
17 Escambia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
18 Flagler	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
19 Franklin	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	5
20 Gadsden	5	5	2	2	0	0	6	6	18
21 Gilchrist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
22 Glades	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	3
23 Gulf	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
24 Hamilton	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	5
25 Hardee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
26 Hendry	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	12
27 Hernando	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
28 Highlands	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
29 Hillsborough	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	217
30 Holmes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
31 Indian River	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
32 Jackson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
33 Jefferson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
34 Lafayette	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
35 Lake	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	39
36 Lee	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	80
37 Leon	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	46
38 Levy	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	13
39 Liberty	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	6
40 Madison	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
41 Manatee	13	21	4	5	0	0	16	23	58
42 Marion	1	2	2	2	0	0	3	4	50
43 Martin	1	1	1	1	0	0	2	2	27
44 Monroe	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
45 Nassau	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
46 Okaloosa	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	41
47 Okeechobee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
48 Orange	22	27	10	12	3	6	31	39	190
49 Osceola	4	4	2	2	2	2	7	7	44
50 Palm Beach	0	14	3	7	1	1	4	21	182
51 Pasco	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
52 Pinellas	7	7	12	20	0	0	18	24	142
53 Polk	3	4	1	1	0	1	4	6	113
54 Putnam	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	2	19
55 St. Johns	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	31
56 St. Lucie	0	11	0	7	0	0	0	13	42
57 Santa Rosa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
58 Sarasota	1	1	1	1	0	0	2	2	46
59 Seminole	2	3	3	3	1	1	6	7	65
60 Sumter	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
61 Suwannee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
62 Taylor	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	9
63 Union	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
64 Volusia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
65 Wakulla	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	9
66 Walton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
67 Washington	1	1	1	1	0	0	2	2	7
State	111	284	54	151	23	32	177	386	3,038

1. Assumes a requirement to reduce class size by 2 from 2005-06

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

NUMBER OF CHARTER SCHOOLS NOT IN COMPLIANCE WITH CLASS SIZE REQUIREMENTS IN 2006-07

	Grades PK-3		Grades 4-8		Grades 9-12		All Grades - Unduplicated Schools		Total Schools in District
	Not in Compliance with Current Statutes ¹	Not in Compliance with Constitutional Cap of 18	Not in Compliance with Current Statutes ¹	Not in Compliance with Constitutional Cap of 22	Not in Compliance with Current Statutes ¹	Not in Compliance with Constitutional Cap of 25	Not in Compliance with Current Statutes ¹	Not in Compliance with Constitutional Caps	
	-1-								
1 Alachua	1	2	1	1	0	0	2	2	14
2 Baker	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Bay	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3
4 Bradford	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
5 Brevard	1	2	0	1	0	0	1	2	13
6 Broward	17	21	14	18	1	1	26	30	45
7 Calhoun	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8 Charlotte	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9 Citrus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 Clay	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11 Collier	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
12 Columbia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13 Miami-Dade	11	17	17	20	3	3	23	29	57
14 DeSoto	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15 Dixie	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16 Duval	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	4
17 Escambia	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	8
18 Flagler	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
19 Franklin	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
20 Gadsden	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
21 Gilchrist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22 Glades	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
23 Gulf	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24 Hamilton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25 Hardee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26 Hendry	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27 Hernando	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
28 Highlands	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
29 Hillsborough	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
30 Holmes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
31 Indian River	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
32 Jackson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
33 Jefferson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
34 Lafayette	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
35 Lake	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	11
36 Lee	4	6	3	3	0	0	5	7	13
37 Leon	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
38 Levy	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
39 Liberty	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
40 Madison	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
41 Manatee	1	2	2	2	0	1	3	4	8
42 Marion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
43 Martin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
44 Monroe	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	3
45 Nassau	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
46 Okaloosa	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	2	3
47 Okeechobee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
48 Orange	1	2	2	2	0	0	2	3	18
49 Osceola	4	4	3	3	0	0	4	4	9
50 Palm Beach	0	4	1	1	0	0	1	4	42
51 Pasco	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	6
52 Pinellas	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	6
53 Polk	2	5	2	2	0	0	3	5	23
54 Putnam	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
55 St. Johns	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
56 St. Lucie	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
57 Santa Rosa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
58 Sarasota	1	3	2	2	0	0	3	4	9
59 Seminole	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
60 Sumter	1	1	2	2	0	0	2	2	3
61 Suwannee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
62 Taylor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
63 Union	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
64 Volusia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
65 Wakulla	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
66 Walton	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	2
67 Washington	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State	53	81	53	62	6	7	88	112	358

1. Assumes a requirement to reduce class size by 2 from 2005-06

**Class Size Reduction
History of Transfers from Operating to Fixed Capital Outlay
Due to Noncompliance**

District	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	To Date
1 Alachua	0	0	0	0	0
2 Baker	0	0	0	0	0
3 Bay	0	0	0	(68,834)	(68,834)
4 Bradford	0	0	0	0	0
5 Brevard	0	0	0	(2,474)	(2,474)
6 Broward	0	0	0	(954,157)	(954,157)
7 Calhoun	0	0	0	0	0
8 Charlotte	0	0	0	0	0
9 Citrus	0	0	0	0	0
10 Clay	0	0	0	(37,392)	(37,392)
11 Collier	0	0	0	(2,573)	(2,573)
12 Columbia	0	0	0	0	0
13 Dade	(323,778)	0	0	(518,149)	(841,927)
14 De Soto	0	0	0	0	0
15 Dixie	0	0	0	0	0
16 Duval	0	0	0	(34,210)	(34,210)
17 Escambia	0	0	0	0	0
18 Flagler	(91,000)	(170,958)	0	0	(261,958)
19 Franklin	0	0	0	0	0
20 Gadsden	(21,452)	(239,147)	0	(4,294)	(264,893)
21 Gilchrist	0	0	0	0	0
22 Glades	0	0	0	0	0
23 Gulf	0	0	0	0	0
24 Hamilton	0	0	0	0	0
25 Hardee	(90,845)	0	0	0	(90,845)
26 Hendry	0	0	0	(35,956)	(35,956)
27 Hernando	0	(268,930)	0	0	(268,930)
28 Highlands	0	0	0	0	0
29 Hillsborough	0	0	0	0	0
30 Holmes	0	0	0	0	0
31 Indian River	0	0	0	0	0
32 Jackson	0	0	0	0	0
33 Jefferson	0	0	0	0	0
34 Lafayette	0	0	0	0	0
35 Lake	0	0	0	0	0
36 Lee	0	0	0	(37,685)	(37,685)
37 Leon	0	0	0	0	0
38 Levy	0	0	0	(7,392)	(7,392)
39 Liberty	0	0	0	0	0
40 Madison	0	0	0	0	0
41 Manatee	(67,858)	0	0	(596,123)	(663,981)
42 Marion	0	0	0	0	0
43 Martin	0	0	0	0	0
44 Monroe	0	0	0	(13,041)	(13,041)
45 Nassau	0	0	0	0	0
46 Okaloosa	(173,204)	0	0	0	(173,204)
47 Okeechobee	0	0	0	0	0
48 Orange	0	0	0	(1,766,907)	(1,766,907)
49 Osceola	0	0	0	(444,463)	(444,463)
50 Palm Beach	(636,324)	0	0	(59,831)	(696,155)
51 Pasco	0	0	0	(7,226)	(7,226)
52 Pinellas	0	0	0	(153,569)	(153,569)
53 Polk	0	0	0	(120,551)	(120,551)
54 Putnam	(75,487)	(164,128)	0	(7,151)	(246,766)
55 St. Johns	0	0	0	0	0
56 St. Lucie	0	0	(496,059)	0	(496,059)
57 Santa Rosa	0	(93,202)	0	0	(93,202)
58 Sarasota	0	0	0	(20,623)	(20,623)
59 Seminole	0	0	0	(722)	(722)
60 Sumter	0	0	0	(193,466)	(193,466)
61 Suwannee	0	(21,100)	0	0	(21,100)
62 Taylor	0	0	0	0	0
63 Union	0	(1,203)	0	0	(1,203)
64 Volusia	0	0	0	0	0
65 Wakulla	0	0	0	0	0
66 Walton	0	(103,934)	0	0	(103,934)
67 Washington	0	(14,117)	0	(19,220)	(33,337)
68 Washington Special	0	0	0	0	0
69 FAMU Lab School	0	0	0	0	0
70 FAU Lab School	0	0	0	(139,269)	(139,269)
71 FSU Broward	0	0	0	(18,983)	(18,983)
72 FSU Leon	0	0	0	0	0
73 UF Lab School	0	0	0	(54,660)	(54,660)
74 Fla Virtual School	0	0	0	0	0
Total	(1,479,948)	(1,076,719)	(496,059)	(5,318,921)	(8,371,647)

CLASS SIZE CASE LAW

Only one case, *Advisory Opinion to the Attorney General re Florida's Amendment to Reduce Class Size*,¹ has addressed the class size requirements of Art. IX, s. 1 of the Florida Constitution in any substantively meaningful manner. In this case, the Florida Supreme Court held that the provision did not violate Florida's constitutional single subject requirements. In reaching this conclusion, the Court found that the ballot initiative:

- Dealt with a single subject, i.e., the reduction of class size. The fact that it required the Legislature to fund the reduction did not constitute logrolling, but rather permissibly provided the details of how the initiative is to be implemented.²
- Did not substantially alter or perform multiple functions of state government because it did not specify a certain percentage of the budget or a specific amount to be spent on reducing class size.³
- Did not substantially alter the functions of local school boards. According to the Court:

Although, as a result of the amendment, the Legislature may choose to fund the building of new schools to achieve the maximum classroom size set as a goal of the proposed amendment, this is not the only method of ensuring that the number of students meets the numbers set forth in the amendment. Rather than restricting the Legislature, the proposed amendment gives the Legislature latitude in designing ways to reach the class size goal articulated in the ballot initiative, and places the obligation to ensure compliance on the Legislature, not the local school boards.⁴

Additionally, the Court held that the ballot title and summary clearly stated the initiative's purpose and was sufficiently accurate and informative.⁵

¹ *Advisory Opinion to the Attorney General re Florida's Amendment to Reduce Class Size*, 816 So.2d 580 (2002).

² *Id.* at 583.

³ *Id.* at 584.

⁴ *Id.* at 584-585.

⁵ *Id.* at 585.

Briefs and Other Related Documents

Supreme Court of Florida.
ADVISORY OPINION TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL re Florida's Amendment to Reduce
Class Size.
No. SC01-2421.
April 25, 2002.

Original Proceeding-Advisory Opinion to the Attorney General.
Robert A. Butterworth, Attorney General, and Louis F. Hubener, III, Assistant *581
Attorney General, Tallahassee, FL, Presentor.

Mark Herron, Tallahassee, Florida, Counsel for Coalition to Reduce Class Size; and Pamela
L. Cooper, Tallahassee, FL, Counsel for Florida Education Association, Proponents.

Steven J. Uhlfelder, Susan L. Kelsey, and Jennifer Parker La Via of Holland & Knight LLP,
Tallahassee, FL, Counsel for Citizens for Budget Fairness, Opponents.

PER CURIAM.

The Attorney General has petitioned this Court for an advisory opinion as to the validity
of a proposed citizen initiative amendment to the Florida Constitution, submitted by an
organization called the Coalition to Reduce Class Size. We have jurisdiction. See art. IV, §
10; art V, § 3(b)(10), Fla. Const.

The proposed initiative petition amends article IX, section 1 of the Florida Constitution,
which relates to public education. The ballot title of the proposed amendment is:
"Florida's Amendment to Reduce Class Size." The summary for the proposed amendment
provides:

Proposes an amendment to the State Constitution to require that the Legislature provide
funding for sufficient classrooms so that there be a maximum number of students in
public school classrooms for various grade levels; requires compliance by the beginning
of 2010 school year; requires the Legislature, and not local school districts, to pay for the
costs associated with reduced class size; prescribes a schedule for phased-in funding to
achieve the required maximum class size.

The full text of the proposed amendment, as indicated in underlining, provides:

Article IX, Section 1, Florida Constitution, is amended to read:

Section 1. Public Education.-

The education of children is a fundamental value of the people of the State of Florida. It
is, therefore, a paramount duty of the state to make adequate provision for the education
of all children residing in its borders. Adequate provision shall be made by law for a
uniform, efficient, safe, secure, and high quality education and for the establishment,
maintenance, and operation of institutions of higher learning and other education
programs that the needs of the people may require. *To assure that children attending
public schools obtain a high quality education, the legislature shall make adequate
provision to ensure that, by the beginning of the 2010 school year, there are sufficient
number of classrooms so that:*

1. The maximum number of students who are assigned to each teacher who is teaching in public school classrooms for pre-kindergarten through grade 3 does not exceed 18 students;
2. The maximum number of students who are assigned to each teacher who is teaching in public school classrooms for grades 4 through 8 does not exceed 22 students;
3. The maximum number of students who are assigned to each teacher who is teaching in public school classrooms for grades 9 through 12 does not exceed 25 students.

The class size requirements of this subsection do not apply to extracurricular classes. Payment of the costs associated reducing class size to meet these requirements is the responsibility of the state and not of local school districts. Beginning with the 2003-2004 fiscal year, the legislature shall provide sufficient funds to reduce the average number of students in each classroom by at least two students per year until the *582 maximum number of students per classroom does not exceed the requirements of this subsection.

In determining the validity of initiative petitions, this Court is limited to a review of the following two legal issues: (1) whether the petition satisfies the single-subject requirement of article XI, section 3, of the Florida Constitution; and (2) whether the ballot title and summary are printed in clear and unambiguous language pursuant to section 101.161, Florida Statutes (2001). See Advisory Opinion to the Attorney Gen. re Fla. Transp. Initiative for Statewide High Speed Monorail, Fixed Guideway or Magnetic Levitation Sys., 769 So.2d 367, 368 (Fla.2000). As we have previously stated, our "duty is to uphold the proposal unless it can be shown to be 'clearly and conclusively defective.'" Advisory Opinion to the Attorney Gen. re Tax Limitation, 673 So.2d 864, 867 (Fla.1996) (quoting Floridians Against Casino Takeover v. Let's Help Florida, 363 So.2d 337, 339 (Fla.1978)). In evaluating the propriety of the initiative petition, the Court does not review the merits of the proposed constitutional amendment, and does not decide whether the Legislature should more appropriately address the subject matter of the proposed amendment. See High Speed Monorail, 769 So.2d at 369. Moreover, other constitutional challenges are not justiciable in this type of proceeding. See Advisory Opinion to the Attorney Gen.-Limited Political Terms in Certain Elective Offices, 592 So.2d 225, 227 (Fla.1991).

Single Subject Requirement

Article XI, section 3 of the Florida Constitution provides in pertinent part that proposed amendments based on citizen initiative petitions "shall embrace but one subject and matter directly connected therewith." Two reasons exist for the single-subject requirement. The primary reason for the single-subject requirement is to prevent what is known as "logrolling," which is "a practice whereby an amendment is proposed which contains unrelated provisions, some of which electors might wish to support, in order to get an otherwise disfavored provision passed." High Speed Monorail, 769 So.2d at 369 (quoting Advisory Opinion to the Attorney General re Limited Casinos, 644 So.2d 71, 73 (Fla.1994)). To comply with this single-subject requirement, a proposed amendment must manifest a "logical and natural oneness of purpose." See Fine v. Firestone, 448 So.2d 984, 990 (Fla.1984).

The Citizens for Budget Fairness, a group who opposes this ballot initiative, contends that the amendment engages in blatant logrolling because it requires voters who may favor a reduction in class size in Florida to also vote for whatever unspecified and unlimited

expenditure of State funds may be necessary to construct or purchase additional classrooms for public schools. We disagree.

In Advisory Opinion to the Attorney General-Save Our Everglades, 636 So.2d 1336, 1340 (Fla.1994), this Court struck down a ballot initiative seeking to "restore the Everglades" by compelling the sugar industry to fund the restoration. The Court explained that the initiative "embodies precisely the sort of logrolling that the single-subject rule was designed to foreclose," because although a majority of voters may consider cleaning up the Everglades to be a laudatory goal, many may disagree with having the sugar industry fund such a cleanup. *Id.* at 1341. Therefore, because the ballot initiative would force voters to choose all or nothing, the Court held that the amendment violated the single-subject rule. *See id.*; *see also Advisory Opinion to the Attorney Gen. re Right of Citizens to Choose Health Care Providers*, 705 So.2d 563, 565 (Fla.1998) *583 (holding that health care ballot amendment impermissibly combined two distinct subjects by banning limitations on health care provider choices imposed by law and by prohibiting private parties from entering into contracts that would limit health care provider choice, thereby providing voters with an "all or nothing" choice).

In contrast to *Save Our Everglades* and *Health Care Providers*, in Limited Casinos, 644 So.2d at 73, this Court rejected the argument that a ballot initiative that would amend the State constitution to authorize gambling casinos constituted impermissible logrolling. The Court held that the proposal did not combine subjects in such a manner as to force voters to accept one proposition they might not support in order to vote for one they favor. *See id.* We explained that "[a]lthough the petition contains details pertaining to the number, size, location, and type of facilities, we find that such details only serve to provide the scope and implementation of the initiative petitions." *Id.*; *see also Advisory Opinion to the Attorney General re Stop Early Release of Prisoners*, 661 So.2d 1204, 1206 (Fla.1995) (holding that ballot initiative concerning the early release of prisoners that contained a provision pertaining to life sentences did not constitute logrolling, but merely provided "detail as to how the proposed amendment will be implemented in cases where life sentences are imposed").

In this case, the ballot initiative deals with a single subject-the reduction of class size. The fact that the ballot initiative requires the Legislature to fund this reduction does not constitute the impermissible logrolling engaged in by the ballot initiatives in *Save Our Everglades* and *Health Care Providers*, but rather provides the details of how the ballot initiative will be implemented, as in *Limited Casinos* and *Stop Early Release of Prisoners*. Therefore, we conclude that the ballot initiative does not engage in logrolling.

A second reason for the single-subject requirement is to prevent a single constitutional amendment from substantially altering or performing the functions of multiple aspects of government. *See High Speed Monorail*, 769 So.2d at 369. As we explained in *High Speed Monorail*:

Article XI, section 3 "protects against multiple 'precipitous' and 'cataclysmic' changes in the constitution by limiting to a single subject what may be included in one amendment proposal." The single-subject requirement is a "rule of restraint" that was "placed in the constitution by the people to allow the citizens, by initiative petition, to propose and vote on singular changes in the functions of our governmental structure."

Id. (citation omitted). However, this Court also has observed that it is "difficult to conceive of a constitutional amendment that would not affect other aspects of the government to some extent." *Id.* (quoting Limited Casinos, 644 So.2d at 74).

We conclude that the proposed citizens' initiative does not create such "precipitous" or "cataclysmic" changes in the functions of multiple branches of government as to render the initiative clearly and conclusively defective. In High Speed Monorail, 769 So.2d at 370, we rejected a single-subject challenge to a statewide high-speed monorail system, explaining that the amendment "may have broad ramifications for this State, but it only deals with one subject and it does not substantially alter or perform multiple functions of government." In that case, we distinguished Advisory Opinion to the Attorney General re Requirement for Adequate Public Education Funding, 703 So.2d 446, 450 (Fla.1997), in which the Court struck down a proposed constitutional amendment requiring that forty percent of state appropriations, *584 not including lottery proceeds or federal funds, be allocated to education. See High Speed Monorail, 769 So.2d at 370. The Court in High Speed Monorail explained:

Although the proposed amendment does not point to a specific tax or fee from which the revenues for the project would come, it also does not require the Legislature to spend a specific percentage of the budget or even a specific amount on the development of this system. Additionally, assuming the amendment would place some restrictions or limits on the veto power regarding the budget for money to build the high speed ground rail system, we do not find this to be the type of "precipitous" or "cataclysmic" change prohibited by the single subject restriction. Such a restriction, unlike the adequate public funding amendment, would not in any event "substantially alter" the Governor's powers or "perform multiple functions of government." Indeed, it appears that the branches of government are left with wide discretion in determining the details of the project.

Id. at 370-71.

As in High Speed Monorail, the proposed amendment in this case does not specify a certain percentage of the budget or a specific amount to be spent on reducing class size. Therefore, we conclude that the proposed amendment does not substantially alter or perform multiple functions of State government.

Regarding the opponent's argument that the proposed ballot initiative substantially alters the functions of the local school boards, article IX, section 4(b), of the Florida Constitution currently delineates the constitutional duties of school boards as follows:

The school board shall operate, control and supervise all free public schools within the school district and determine the rate of school district taxes within the limits prescribed herein.

The proponent of the ballot initiative contends that the initiative will not substantially alter or perform the functions of the school board to "operate, control or supervise all free public schools within the school district." The proponent maintains that the ballot initiative will not force the district school boards to construct new classrooms or schools in accordance with any particular model or educational theory. Rather, the proponent claims, the proposed ballot initiative simply furthers the already established legislative goal contained in section 236.687, Florida Statutes (2001), which provides:

It shall be the goal of the Legislature ... that each elementary school in the school district beginning with kindergarten through grade three class sizes not exceed 20 students, with a ratio of one full-time equivalent teacher per 20 students; except that only in the case of critically low-performing schools as identified by the Commissioner of Education, the goal in kindergarten through grade three shall be a ratio of one full-time equivalent teacher per 15 students.

Therefore, the proponent argues that only the Legislature, in the manner in which it provides funding for school classrooms, will be required to act as a result of this amendment.

We agree that the proposed amendment does not substantially alter or perform the functions of the local school board. Although, as a result of the amendment, the Legislature may choose to fund the building of new schools to achieve the maximum classroom size set as a goal of the proposed amendment, this is not the only method of ensuring that the number of students meets the numbers set forth in the amendment. Rather than restricting the Legislature, the proposed amendment *585 gives the Legislature latitude in designing ways to reach the class size goal articulated in the ballot initiative, and places the obligation to ensure compliance on the Legislature, not the local school boards. Accordingly, for all these reasons we conclude that this proposed initiative does not violate the single subject limitation.

Section 101.161

We also conclude that the language of the title and ballot summary of the proposed constitutional amendment comports with section 101.161(1), Florida Statutes (2001). Section 101.161(1) provides, in pertinent part:

Whenever a constitutional amendment or other public measure is submitted to the vote of the people, the substance of such amendment ... shall be printed in clear and unambiguous language on the ballot

.... [T]he substance of the amendment ... shall be an explanatory statement, not exceeding 75 words in length, of the chief purpose of the measure. The ballot title shall consist of a caption, not exceeding 15 words in length, by which the measure is commonly referred to or spoken of.

Section 101.161(1) requires that the ballot title and summary "state in clear and unambiguous language the initiative's primary purpose." Advisory Opinion to the Attorney Gen. re People's Property Rights Amendments Providing Compensation for Restricting Real Property Use May Cover Multiple Subjects, 699 So.2d 1304, 1307 (Fla.1997). Furthermore, the ballot title and summary must be accurate and informative. See Advisory Opinion to the Attorney Gen. re Term Limits Pledge, 718 So.2d 798, 803 (Fla.1998). The purpose of section 101.161 is "to provide fair notice of the content of the proposed amendment so that the voter will not be misled as to its purpose, and can cast an intelligent and informed ballot." *Id.* Finally, the ballot title and summary may not be read in isolation, but must be read together in determining whether the ballot information properly informs the voters. See Tax Limitation, 673 So.2d at 868.

The title of this initiative is "Florida's Amendment to Reduce Class Size." The ballot summary makes clear that the Legislature is responsible for providing funding to reduce the number of students in public school classrooms in various grade levels. Thus, when read together, the ballot title and summary clearly inform voters of the amendment's chief purpose, and provide an accurate description of the amendment. Moreover, the summary does not omit any material information and is not misleading.

Both the Attorney General and the Citizens for Budget Fairness contend that the ballot title and summary are defective because they fail to inform voters that an exception to

the Legislature's mandate to fund smaller classroom sizes exists for "extracurricular classes." However, this Court has explained that "the title and summary need not explain every detail or ramification of the proposed amendment." Advisory Opinion to the Attorney Gen. re Prohibiting Public Funding of Political Candidates' Campaigns, 693 So.2d 972, 975 (Fla.1997). In other words, "the ballot summary is not required to include all possible effects ... nor 'to explain in detail what the proponents hope to accomplish.'" Tax Limitation, 673 So.2d at 868. We conclude that the ballot title and summary are not defective despite the fact that the ballot summary does not inform voters of the exception for "extracurricular classes," because the primary purpose of the amendment—the legislative funding of reduced classroom size—is adequately disclosed in the ballot title and summary. *586 Therefore, we conclude that the ballot initiative complies with section 101.161(1).

Accordingly, there is no bar to placing the proposed amendment on the ballot.

It is so ordered.

WELLS, C.J., and SHAW, ANSTEAD, PARIENTE, LEWIS, and QUINCE, JJ., concur.

HARDING, J., concurs with an opinion.

HARDING, J., concurring.

I dissented from the majority's opinion in Advisory Opinion to the Attorney General re Florida Transportation Initiative for Statewide High Speed Monorail, Fixed Guideway or Magnetic Levitation System, 769 So.2d 367 (Fla.2000), because I believed that citizens' initiative amendment violated the single subject requirement of article XI, section 3 of the Florida Constitution based upon its effect upon multiple branches of state government. See *id.* at 371-72 (Harding, J., dissenting). This Court had previously ruled that a citizens' initiative amendment aimed at public education funding violated the single subject requirement because it affected both the Legislature's appropriation function and the Governor's veto power. See Advisory Opinion to the Attorney Gen. re Requirement for Adequate Public Educ. Funding, 703 So.2d 446 (Fla.1997). In High Speed Monorail, I found the precedent of Public Education Funding to be controlling and required a finding that the high-speed transportation amendment also violated the single subject requirement. See High Speed Monorail, 769 So.2d at 372 (Harding, J., dissenting). However, I was alone in my opposition to the high-speed transportation system amendment on that basis. The majority of the Court found the high-speed transportation amendment to be distinguishable because "the branches of government are left with wide discretion in determining the details and funding of the project." *Id.* at 371. Based upon the majority's decision in High Speed Monorail, I can find no basis to say that the proposed amendment at issue in this case is defective based upon a single subject violation.

While the instant proposed amendment may not be the model of clarity, I agree with the majority that the term "extracurricular classes" does not render the ballot title and summary defective. See majority op. at 585. Opponents of this amendment argue that it is misleading because the summary does not mention an exception to the class size restrictions for "extracurricular classes" and does not define that term in the text of the amendment. However, as the majority notes, the title and summary need not explain

every detail or ramification of a proposed amendment. *See id.* Further, although the term is not defined in the amendment itself, most individuals have a common understanding of the activities or classes that would be considered "extracurricular." Such organized student activities as athletics, band, and student government are connected with school, yet are "not part of the required curriculum" or fall outside the scope of the regular curriculum. *Webster's New World Dictionary* 218 (2d ed.1983). These "extracurricular classes" would be exempt from the class size requirements. Any failure to define this exception with more specificity does not render the proposed amendment "clearly and conclusively defective." *Advisory Opinion to Attorney Gen. re Tax Limitation, 673 So.2d 864, 867 (Fla.1996).*

Fla.,2002.

Article IX. Education
Section 1. Public Education

(Underlining indicates text relevant to class size requirements.)

(a) The education of children is a fundamental value of the people of the State of Florida. It is, therefore, a paramount duty of the state to make adequate provision for the education of all children residing within its borders. Adequate provision shall be made by law for a uniform, efficient, safe, secure, and high quality system of free public schools that allows students to obtain a high quality education and for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of institutions of higher learning and other public education programs that the needs of the people may require. To assure that children attending public schools obtain a high quality education, the legislature shall make adequate provision to ensure that, by the beginning of the 2010 school year, there are a sufficient number of classrooms so that:

(1) The maximum number of students who are assigned to each teacher who is teaching in public school classrooms for prekindergarten through grade 3 does not exceed 18 students;

(2) The maximum number of students who are assigned to each teacher who is teaching in public school classrooms for grades 4 through 8 does not exceed 22 students; and

(3) The maximum number of students who are assigned to each teacher who is teaching in public school classrooms for grades 9 through 12 does not exceed 25 students.

The class size requirements of this subsection do not apply to extracurricular classes. Payment of the costs associated with reducing class size to meet these requirements is the responsibility of the state and not of local school districts. Beginning with the 2003-2004 fiscal year, the legislature shall provide sufficient funds to reduce the average number of students in each classroom by at least two students per year until the maximum number of students per classroom does not exceed the requirements of this subsection.

(b) Every four-year old child in Florida shall be provided by the State a high quality pre-kindergarten learning opportunity in the form of an early childhood development and education program which shall be voluntary, high quality, free, and delivered according to professionally accepted standards. An early childhood development and education program means an organized program designed to address and enhance each child's ability to make age appropriate progress in an appropriate range of settings in the development of language and cognitive capabilities and emotional, social, regulatory and moral capacities through education in basic skills and such other skills as the

Legislature may determine to be appropriate.

(c) The early childhood education and development programs provided by reason of subparagraph (b) shall be implemented no later than the beginning of the 2005 school year through funds generated in addition to those used for existing education, health, and development programs. Existing education, health, and development programs are those funded by the State as of January 1, 2002 that provided for child or adult education, health care, or development.

1003.03. Maximum class size

(1) Constitutional class size maximums.--Pursuant to s. 1, Art. IX of the State Constitution, beginning in the 2010-2011 school year:

(a) The maximum number of students assigned to each teacher who is teaching core-curricula courses in public school classrooms for prekindergarten through grade 3 may not exceed 18 students.

(b) The maximum number of students assigned to each teacher who is teaching core-curricula courses in public school classrooms for grades 4 through 8 may not exceed 22 students.

(c) The maximum number of students assigned to each teacher who is teaching core-curricula courses in public school classrooms for grades 9 through 12 may not exceed 25 students.

(2) Implementation.--

(a) Beginning with the 2003-2004 fiscal year, each school district that is not in compliance with the maximums in subsection (1) shall reduce the average number of students per classroom in each of the following grade groupings: prekindergarten through grade 3, grade 4 through grade 8, and grade 9 through grade 12, by at least two students each year.

(b) Determination of the number of students per classroom in paragraph (a) shall be calculated as follows:

1. For fiscal years 2003-2004 through 2005-2006, the calculation for compliance for each of the 3 grade groupings shall be the average at the district level.

2. For fiscal years 2006-2007 through 2007-2008, the calculation for compliance for each of the 3 grade groupings shall be the average at the school level.

3. For fiscal years 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and thereafter, the calculation for compliance shall be at the individual classroom level.

4. For fiscal years 2006-2007 through 2009-2010 and thereafter, each teacher assigned to any classroom shall be included in the calculation for compliance.

(c) The Department of Education shall annually calculate each of the three average class size measures defined in paragraphs (a) and (b) based upon the October student membership survey. For purposes of determining the baseline from which each district's average class size

must be reduced for the 2003-2004 school year, the department shall use data from the February 2003 student membership survey updated to include classroom identification numbers as required by the department.

(d) Prior to the adoption of the district school budget for 2004-2005, each district school board shall hold public hearings to review school attendance zones in order to ensure maximum use of facilities while minimizing the additional use of transportation in order to comply with the two-student-per-year reduction required in paragraph (a). School districts that meet the constitutional class size maximums described in subsection (1) are exempt from this requirement.

(3) Implementation options.--District school boards must consider, but are not limited to, implementing the following items in order to meet the constitutional class size maximums described in subsection (1) and the two-student-per-year reduction required in subsection (2):

(a) Adopt policies to encourage qualified students to take dual enrollment courses.

(b) Adopt policies to encourage students to take courses from the Florida Virtual School.

(c) 1. Repeal district school board policies that require students to have more than 24 credits to graduate from high school.

2. Adopt policies to allow students to graduate from high school as soon as they pass the grade 10 FCAT and complete the courses required for high school graduation.

(d) Use methods to maximize use of instructional staff, such as changing required teaching loads and scheduling of planning periods, deploying district employees that have professional certification to the classroom, using adjunct educators, or any other method not prohibited by law.

(e) Use innovative methods to reduce the cost of school construction by using prototype school designs, using SMART Schools designs, participating in the School Infrastructure Thrift Program, or any other method not prohibited by law.

(f) Use joint-use facilities through partnerships with community colleges, state universities, and private colleges and universities. Joint-use facilities available for use as K-12 classrooms that do not meet the K-12 State Regulations for Educational Facilities in the Florida Building Code may be used at the discretion of the district school board provided that such facilities meet all other health, life, safety, and fire codes.

(g) Adopt alternative methods of class scheduling, such as block scheduling.

(h) Redraw school attendance zones to maximize use of facilities while minimizing the additional use of transportation.

(i) Operate schools beyond the normal operating hours to provide classes in the evening or operate more than one session of school during the day.

(j) Use year-round schools and other nontraditional calendars that do not adversely impact annual assessment of student achievement.

(k) Review and consider amending any collective bargaining contracts that hinder the implementation of class size reduction.

(l) Use any other approach not prohibited by law.

(4) Accountability.--

(a) 1. Beginning in the 2003-2004 fiscal year, if the department determines for any year that a school district has not reduced average class size as required in subsection (2) at the time of the third FEFP calculation, the department shall calculate an amount from the class size reduction operating categorical which is proportionate to the amount of class size reduction not accomplished. Upon verification of the department's calculation by the Florida Education Finance Program Appropriation Allocation Conference and not later than March 1 of each year, the Executive Office of the Governor shall transfer undistributed funds equivalent to the calculated amount from the district's class size reduction operating categorical to an approved fixed capital outlay appropriation for class size reduction in the affected district pursuant to s. 216.292(2)(d). The amount of funds transferred shall be the lesser of the amount verified by the Florida Education Finance Program Appropriation Allocation Conference or the undistributed balance of the district's class size reduction operating categorical.

2. In lieu of the transfer required by subparagraph 1., the Commissioner of Education may recommend a budget amendment, subject to approval by the Legislative Budget Commission, to transfer an alternative amount of funds from the district's class size reduction operating categorical to its approved fixed capital outlay account for class size reduction if the commissioner finds that the State Board of Education has reviewed evidence indicating that a district has been unable to meet class size reduction requirements despite appropriate effort to do so. The commissioner's budget amendment must be submitted to the Legislative Budget Commission by February 15 of each year.

(b) Beginning in the 2005-2006 school year, the department shall determine by January 15 of each year which districts have not met the two-student-per-year reduction required in subsection (2) based upon a comparison of the district's October student membership survey for the current school year and the February 2003 baseline student membership survey. The department shall report such districts to the Legislature. Each district that has not met the two-student-per-year reduction shall be required to implement one of the following policies in the subsequent school year unless the department finds that the district comes into compliance based upon the February student membership survey:

1. Year-round schools;

2. Double sessions;

3. Rezoning; or

4. Maximizing use of instructional staff by changing required teacher loads and scheduling of planning periods, deploying school district employees who have professional certification to the classroom, using adjunct educators, operating schools beyond the normal operating hours to provide classes in the evening, or operating more than one session during the day.

A school district that is required to implement one of the policies outlined in subparagraphs 1.-4. shall correct in the year of implementation any past deficiencies and bring the district into compliance with the two-student-per-year reduction goals established for the district by the department pursuant to subsection (2). A school district may choose to implement more than one of these policies. The district school superintendent shall report to the Commissioner of Education the extent to which the district implemented any of the policies outlined in subparagraphs 1.-4. in a format to be specified by the Commissioner of Education. The Department of Education shall use the enforcement authority provided in s. 1008.32 to ensure that districts comply with the provisions of this paragraph.

(c) Beginning in the 2006-2007 school year, the department shall annually determine which districts do not meet the requirements described in subsection (2). In addition to enforcement authority provided in s. 1008.32, the Department of Education shall develop a constitutional compliance plan for each such district which includes, but is not limited to, redrawing school attendance zones to maximize use of facilities while minimizing the additional use of transportation unless the department finds that the district comes into compliance based upon the February student membership survey and the other accountability policies listed in paragraph (b). Each district school board shall

implement the constitutional compliance plan developed by the state board until the district complies with the constitutional class size maximums.

(5) Team-teaching strategies.--

(a) School districts may use teaching strategies that include the assignment of more than one teacher to a classroom of students and that were implemented before July 1, 2005. Effective July 1, 2005, school districts may implement additional teaching strategies that include the assignment of more than one teacher to a classroom of students for the following purposes only:

1. Pairing teachers for the purpose of staff development.
2. Pairing new teachers with veteran teachers.
3. Reducing turnover among new teachers.
4. Pairing teachers who are teaching out-of-field with teachers who are in-field.
5. Providing for more flexibility and innovation in the classroom.
6. Improving learning opportunities for students, including students who have disabilities.

(b) Teaching strategies, including team teaching, co-teaching, or inclusion teaching, implemented on or after July 1, 2005, pursuant to paragraph (a) may be implemented subject to the following restrictions:

1. Reasonable limits shall be placed on the number of students in a classroom so that classrooms are not overcrowded. Teacher-to-student ratios within a curriculum area or grade level must not exceed constitutional limits.
2. At least one member of the team must have at least 3 years of teaching experience.
3. At least one member of the team must be teaching in-field.
4. The teachers must be trained in team-teaching methods within 1 year after assignment.

(c) As used in this subsection, the term:

1. "Team teaching" or "co-teaching" means two or more teachers are assigned to a group of students and each teacher is responsible for all of the students during the entire class period. In order to be considered team teaching or co-teaching, each teacher is responsible for planning, delivering, and evaluating instruction for all students in the class or subject for the entire class period.

2. "Inclusion teaching" means two or more teachers are assigned to a group of students, but one of the teachers is responsible for only one student or a small group of students in the classroom.

The use of strategies implemented as outlined in this subsection meets the letter and intent of the Florida Constitution and the Florida Statutes which relate to implementing class size reduction, and this subsection applies retroactively. A school district may not be penalized financially or otherwise as a result of the use of any legal strategy, including, but not limited to, those set forth in subsection (3) and this subsection.

1011.685. Class size reduction; operating categorical fund

(1) There is created an operating categorical fund for implementing the class size reduction provisions of s. 1, Art. IX of the State Constitution. These funds shall be allocated to each school district in the amount prescribed by the Legislature in the General Appropriations Act.

(2) Class size reduction operating categorical funds shall be used by school districts for the following:

(a) To reduce class size in any lawful manner, if the district has not met the constitutional maximums identified in s. 1003.03(1) or the reduction of two students per year required by s. 1003.03(2).

(b) For any lawful operating expenditure, if the district has met the constitutional maximums identified in s. 1003.03(1) or the reduction of two students per year required by s. 1003.03(2); however, priority shall be given to increase salaries of classroom teachers as defined in s. 1012.01(2)(a) and to implement the differentiated-pay provisions detailed in s. 1012.22.

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS
REPORT OF COST OF CONSTRUCTION

NEW CONSTRUCTION
ALL SCHOOLS

CALENDAR YEAR 2006
Construction Contract Awarded Between 1/01/06 and 12/31/06
Designed/Build Contracts are not Included

January 2006 Cost per student station limitation
Elem \$ 17,952
Mid \$ 19,386
High \$ 25,181

Type	DISTRICT	FACILITY NAME	STUDENT STATIONS	TEACHER STATIONS	NO. OF CLSRMS GRADE K-5	NO. OF CLSRMS GRADE 6-8	NO. OF CLSRMS GRADE 9-12	NET SQUARE FEET	GROSS SQUARE FEET	LEGAL AND ADM. COST	ARCHITECT AND ENGINEER FEES	SITE IMPROV. COST	CONTRACT COST	FURNITURE AND EQUIPMENT	TOTAL FACILITY COST	TOTAL COST PER STUDENT STATION	HURRICANE SHELTER	SITE COST	PUBLIC UTILITIES COST	SITE DRAINAGE AND/OR RETENTION AREA COST	PUBLIC ROAD ACCESS COST	ENVIRON. PROBLEM COST	TOTAL PLANT COST	AWARD DATE	CONST. CONTRACT COST PER STUDENT STATION	PLANT COST PER STUDENT STATION	COST PER SQUARE FOOT	REVENUE CODES	Comment	
3=Hi	Nassau	Hi Sch BBB(Yulee Hi)	1,280	75	-	1	51	132,993	181,522	\$ -	\$ 1,566,477	\$ 3,832,000	\$ 19,605,036	\$ 1,953,602	\$ 26,957,115	\$ 21,000	\$ 1,200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 143,627	\$ 408,325	\$ -	\$ 28,709,067		\$ 15,316	\$ 22,429	\$ 158.16	3,13,17,19		
1=Ele	Orange	Vista Lakes Elem	828	48	48	-	-	70,413	97,483	\$ 2,079	\$ 452,457	\$ 2,917,847	\$ 10,113,856	\$ 1,020,000	\$ 14,506,239	\$ 17,500	\$ -	\$ 8,464	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,514,703		\$ 12,215	\$ 17,530	\$ 148.89	18		
1=Ele	Orange	Wyndham Lakes Elm	828	48	48	-	-	70,413	97,483	\$ 1,006	\$ 453,652	\$ 2,406,291	\$ 11,291,439	\$ 1,045,142	\$ 15,197,530	\$ 18,000	\$ 624,350	\$ 12,877	\$ 14,043	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,846,800		\$ 13,637	\$ 19,141	\$ 162.58	18		
1=Ele	Orange	Millenia Elementary	828	48	48	-	-	70,413	97,225	\$ -	\$ 530,323	\$ 5,174,955	\$ 9,893,976	\$ 1,088,000	\$ 16,687,254	\$ 20,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 27,666	\$ 33,108	\$ -	\$ 700,000	\$ -	\$ 20,448,028		\$ 11,949	\$ 24,696	\$ 210.32	18,19		
1=Ele	Orange	Castle Creek Elem	828	48	48	-	-	70,413	97,483	\$ 18,727	\$ 4,657,484	\$ 10,409,238	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 16,610,132	\$ 18,000	\$ 534,300	\$ 71,050	\$ -	\$ 355,498	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17,570,990		\$ 12,572	\$ 21,221	\$ 180.25	18		
1=Ele	Orange	Wolf Lake Elementary	864	51	45	-	-	70,413	97,483	\$ -	\$ 493,500	\$ 2,320,965	\$ 9,700,314	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 13,514,779	\$ 18,000	\$ 982,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 135,264	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,632,843		\$ 11,227	\$ 16,936	\$ 150.11	18,19		
1=Ele	Orange	Stone Lakes Elem	828	48	48	-	-	70,413	97,483	\$ -	\$ 16,786	\$ 2,072,766	\$ 14,741,525	\$ 1,026,600	\$ 17,857,677	\$ 18,000	\$ 545,000	\$ 87,014	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 32,195	\$ -	\$ 18,821,866		\$ 17,804	\$ 22,369	\$ 190.00	19		
2=Orange	Orange	Avalon Middle	1,233	51	-	51	-	130,730	168,937	\$ 37,458	\$ -	\$ 5,614,426	\$ 23,112,156	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 30,564,040	\$ 30,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 30,564,040		\$ 18,745	\$ 24,788	\$ 180.92	19		
2=Orange	Orange	Wolf Lake Middle	1,233	51	-	51	-	130,869	168,843	\$ 50,504	\$ 1,132,326	\$ 9,284,734	\$ 16,581,328	\$ 1,799,700	\$ 26,848,592	\$ 30,000	\$ 982,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 90,553	\$ 50,504	\$ -	\$ 29,972,449		\$ 13,448	\$ 24,309	\$ 177.52	13,19		
2=Orange	Orange	South Creek Middle	1,250	52	-	52	-	131,727	168,844	\$ 23,525	\$ 1,148,565	\$ 6,060,584	\$ 18,916,296	\$ 1,799,622	\$ 27,946,594	\$ 30,000	\$ 990,000	\$ 16,018	\$ -	\$ 232,690	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 29,167,302		\$ 15,133	\$ 23,350	\$ 172.87	18,18		
1=Osceola	Osceola	Chestnut Elem. "G"	1,110	63	59	-	-	118,948	124,839	\$ 205,213	\$ 507,029	\$ 325,927	\$ 12,397,470	\$ 1,691,437	\$ 15,127,076	\$ 18,000	\$ 158,643	\$ 293,450	\$ 655,117	\$ 710,067	\$ 32,370	\$ -	\$ 16,976,723		\$ 11,169	\$ 15,294	\$ 135.99	13,18,19		
1=Palm Beach	Palm Beach	Elbridge Gale Elem	964	65	50	-	-	91,313	122,926	\$ -	\$ 343,582	\$ 3,258,000	\$ 12,673,775	\$ 1,029,900	\$ 17,305,257	\$ 18,000	\$ 348,500	\$ 212,475	\$ 869,300	\$ 87,319	\$ 203,310	\$ -	\$ 19,060,744		\$ 13,147	\$ 19,773	\$ 155.06			
3=Palm Beach	Palm Beach	Seminole Ridge High	2,631	105	-	-	95	274,913	390,486	\$ -	\$ 2,367,405	\$ 5,100,000	\$ 42,268,738	\$ 3,708,646	\$ 53,444,788	\$ 50,000	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 1,859,597	\$ -	\$ 350,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 58,354,385		\$ 16,066	\$ 22,180	\$ 149.44			
1=Pasco	Pasco	Gulf Highlands Elm G	762	45	45	-	-	73,514	103,061	\$ -	\$ 436,240	\$ -	\$ 14,096,984	\$ 1,012,500	\$ 15,545,724	\$ 18,000	\$ 1,103,282	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 426,204	\$ -	\$ 17,075,220		\$ 18,500	\$ 22,408	\$ 165.68	16,19		
1=Pasco	Pasco	Oakstead Elem L	762	45	45	-	-	74,175	107,745	\$ -	\$ 376,570	\$ -	\$ 12,774,967	\$ 1,012,500	\$ 14,164,037	\$ 18,000	\$ 961,557	\$ -	\$ 5,500	\$ -	\$ 311,522	\$ 61,942	\$ 15,504,558		\$ 16,765	\$ 20,347	\$ 143.90	19		
2=Pasco	Pasco	Dr. John Long Midd C	1,273	75	-	61	-	141,219	173,070	\$ -	\$ 729,687	\$ -	\$ 23,729,496	\$ 1,943,000	\$ 26,402,183	\$ 30,000	\$ 1,378,101	\$ 134,200	\$ 68,000	\$ 1,341,772	\$ 133,156	\$ -	\$ 29,447,412		\$ 18,641	\$ 23,132	\$ 170.15	16,19		
2=Pasco	Pasco	Paul R. Smith Middle	1,273	75	-	61	-	141,219	173,070	\$ -	\$ 730,985	\$ -	\$ 21,917,890	\$ 1,943,000	\$ 24,591,875	\$ 30,000	\$ 1,434,351	\$ -	\$ 18,514	\$ -	\$ 733,275	\$ -	\$ 26,778,015		\$ 17,218	\$ 21,035	\$ 154.72	16,19		
3=Pinellas	Pinellas	Oak Park School	679	28	-	-	-	43,463	61,735	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,687,686	\$ 832,115	\$ 12,519,701	\$ 18,000	\$ 3,710,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,229,701		\$ 17,213	\$ 23,902	\$ 262.89	6,17		
2=St. Lucie	St. Lucie	Westgate K-8 School	1,942	69	30	39	-	233,342	243,420	\$ 11,898	\$ 2,302,938	\$ 2,873,164	\$ 20,418,979	\$ 8,235,373	\$ 33,842,352	\$ 30,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 238,650	\$ -	\$ 321,228	\$ 70,000	\$ -	\$ 36,043,230		\$ 10,514	\$ 18,560	\$ 148.07	18,19		
1=Santa Rosa	Santa Rosa	New Holley Navarre	848	49	49	-	-	113,354	124,203	\$ -	\$ 793,728	\$ 160,959	\$ 11,940,409	\$ 546,731	\$ 13,441,827	\$ 18,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,441,827		\$ 14,081	\$ 15,851	\$ 108.22	13,17,19	
1=Sarasota	Sarasota	Lamarque Elementary	970	76	67	-	-	105,902	164,765	\$ 78,548	\$ 1,381,088	\$ 3,754,618	\$ 16,185,934	\$ 2,052,137	\$ 23,452,325	\$ 24,000	\$ 1,828,550	\$ 1,245,793	\$ 1,548,761	\$ -	\$ 816,887	\$ -	\$ 28,892,316		\$ 16,687	\$ 29,786	\$ 175.35	3,6,12,17,19		
1=Seminole	Seminole	Crystal Lake Elem.	1,042	27	27	-	-	77,350	113,193	\$ 101,870	\$ 417,110	\$ 1,678,075	\$ 10,531,016	\$ 1,178,000	\$ 13,906,071	\$ 18,000	\$ 98,429	\$ 10,000	\$ 24,231	\$ 49,394	\$ 141,750	\$ 40,387	\$ 14,270,262		\$ 10,107	\$ 13,695	\$ 126.07	4,6,18,19		
2=Seminole	Seminole	Chiles Middle	1,764	77	-	77	-	138,381	201,007	\$ 101,600	\$ 950,000	\$ 1,407,000	\$ 16,434,332	\$ 1,755,000	\$ 20,647,932	\$ 20,000	\$ 132,410	\$ 1,102,200	\$ 91,660	\$ 79,540	\$ 85,600	\$ 11,822	\$ 22,151,164		\$ 9,317	\$ 12,557	\$ 110.20	17,19		
1=Suwannee	Suwannee	Suwannee Elementary	784	44	44	-	-	81,132	99,708	\$ -	\$ 433,801	\$ 2,393,431	\$ 10,654,100	\$ 573,238	\$ 14,054,569	\$ 18,000	\$ 340,930	\$ 800,000	\$ 370,560	\$ 201,725	\$ 474,350	\$ 57,325	\$ 16,299,459		\$ 13,589	\$ 20,790	\$ 163.47	2,3,11,14,17		
1=Volusia	Volusia	Manatee Cove Elem.	750	42	39	-	-	77,345	99,674	\$ -	\$ 606,085	\$ 1,358,368	\$ 8,947,160	\$ 1,365,000	\$ 12,276,613	\$ 18,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 159,000	\$ -	\$ 469,472	\$ 919,000	\$ -	\$ 14,324,085		\$ 11,930	\$ 19,099	\$ 143.71	19		
3=Volusia	Volusia	New Smyrna Boh Hi	2,481	100	-	-	100	239,469	317,327	\$ -	\$ 1,498,250	\$ 2,080,504	\$ 33,254,058	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 41,332,812	\$ 40,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 2,850,749	\$ -	\$ 1,623,188	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 46,306,749		\$ 13,403	\$ 18,665	\$ 145.93	19		
3=Volusia	Volusia	Mainland High Sch	2,592	100	-	-	99	240,102	345,153	\$ -	\$ 2,651,000	\$ 2,052,549	\$ 46,515,644	\$ 4,682,000	\$ 55,901,193	\$ 50,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 977,000	\$ -	\$ 1,158,103	\$ 78,704	\$ -	\$ 58,615,000		\$ 17,946	\$ 22,614	\$ 169.82	19		
3=Osceola	Osceola	Saint Cloud Elem "H"	1,110	63	59	-	-	118,948	124,839	\$ 139,766	\$ 357,540	\$ 819,491	\$ 11,839,911	\$ 1,713,646	\$ 14,870,354	\$ 18,000	\$ 153,475	\$ 457,612	\$ 164,429	\$ 596,167	\$ 777,397	\$ -	\$ 17,019,434		\$ 10,667	\$ 15,333	\$ 136.33	18,19,20		

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS
REPORT OF COST OF CONSTRUCTION

NEW CONSTRUCTION CALENDAR YEAR 2006
ALL SCHOOLS Construction Contract Awarded Between 1/01/06 and 12/31/06
DESIGN BUILD Designed/Build Contracts are not included

January 2006
Elem \$ 17,952
Mid \$ 19,386
High \$ 25,181

Type	DISTRICT	FACILITY NAME	STUDENT STATIONS	TEACHER STATIONS	NO. OF CLSRMS K-5	NO. OF CLSRMS 6-8	NO. OF CLSRMS 9-12	NET SQUARE FEET	GROSS SQUARE FEET	LEGAL AND ADM. COST	ARCHITECT AND ENGINEER FEES	SITE IMPROV. COST	FURNITURE AND EQUIPMENT COST	TOTAL FACILITY COST	TOTAL COST PER STUDENT STATION	HURRICANE SHELTER COST	SITE COST	PUBLIC UTILITIES COST	SITE DRAINAGE AND/OR RETENTION AREA COST	PUBLIC ROAD ACCESS COST	ENVIRON. PROBLEM COST	TOTAL PLANT COST	CONST. CONTRACT COST PER STUDENT STATION	PLANT COST PER STUDENT STATION	COST PER SQUARE FOOT	REVENUE CODES	Comments		
2	Broward	Pine Ridge Educ Cntr	200	21	4	9	8	40,798	57,442	\$ -	\$ 195,397	\$ 230,051	\$ 8,821,931	\$ 1,313,145	\$ 10,560,524	\$ 52,803	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 52,790	\$ 179,303	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,792,617	\$ 44,110	\$ 53,963	\$ 187.89	3,17,19		
0	Hillsborough	Downtown Parking	-	-	-	-	-	164,561	221,532	\$ 122,589	\$ 244,800	\$ 305,857	\$ 4,920,559	\$ -	\$ 5,593,805	\$ -	\$ 2,306,709	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,295	\$ 88,718	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,039,527	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	\$ 36.29	17,18	No Student Station
3	Indian River	Gifford Alternative Ctr	327	16	1	3	13	33,718	33,718	\$ -	\$ 88,447	\$ 6,390	\$ 7,447,343	\$ 745,552	\$ 8,267,732	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,267,732	\$ 22,775	\$ 25,345	\$ 245.80	18		
1	Jackson	Coleen Annex	131	8	8	-	-	10,080	12,619	\$ 436	\$ 165,146	\$ -	\$ 2,187,177	\$ 50,240	\$ 2,402,959	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,696	\$ 18,344	\$ 190.43	19		
3	St. Lucie	Treasure Coast Hi	2,588	54	-	-	54	340,259	352,591	\$ 190,080	\$ 2,461,474	\$ 6,121,201	\$ 47,539,638	\$ 6,372,581	\$ 62,604,974	\$ 24,211	\$ 650,000	\$ 121,600	\$ 695,000	\$ 350,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 64,501,574	\$ 18,369	\$ 24,923	\$ 182.94	3,6,18,19		
3	Washington	Vernon High School	525	32	-	2	21	84,713	93,000	\$ -	\$ 978,247	\$ -	\$ 13,779,320	\$ 584,965	\$ 15,342,532	\$ 29,122	\$ -	\$ 117,187	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,459,719	\$ 26,246	\$ 29,447	\$ 166.23	2,3,11,17,19	
1	Polk	Lake Marion Creek	1,226	75	75	-	-	109,161	144,183	\$ -	\$ 19,005	\$ -	\$ 11,224,926	\$ 997,576	\$ 12,241,509	\$ 9,985	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,241,509	\$ 9,156	\$ 9,985	\$ 84.90	19	
Total																													
40	Elem Average		40	855	46	41	3	-	76,353	99,794	121,574	634,074	995,627	12,146,824	1,159,657	15,059,765	77,775	759,920	827,172	188,850	501,352	189,521	73,369	17,599,939	-	14,376	20,433	188	
15	Mid Average		15	1,357	63	8	47	1	129,046	165,854	191,369	1,105,311	1,865,166	20,590,427	2,355,494	26,107,766	21,122	1,098,170	1,222,574	226,809	507,565	299,321	518,453	29,980,658	-	17,052	24,073	188	
23	High Average		23	1,575	66	4	4	52	176,865	217,703	126,493	1,343,145	1,835,826	26,413,844	2,683,847	32,403,154	22,259	850,392	2,667,406	246,785	619,455	307,184	26,098	37,120,475	-	17,763	24,041	178	
	State Average		26	1,262	58	18	18	18	127,421	161,117	146,479	1,027,510	1,565,539	19,717,698	2,066,333	24,523,559	20,259	902,828	1,572,384	220,815	542,781	265,342	205,973	28,233,691	-	16,397	22,849	185	

Class Size Reduction										
2003-04 thru 2006-07 Surveys										
District	Year	Appropriated Class Size Reduction Operating Funds	Core Amount (\$) of Salaries & Benefits	Non-Core Amount (\$) of Salaries & Benefits	Charter School Payments (\$)	Salary and Benefit Increases (\$) for Existing Teachers	Dollars (\$) Held in Reserve to Ensure Future Compliance	Other Budgeted Uses Amount (\$)	Total from Survey	Difference Between Total Allocation Amount Itemized
Alachua	2006-07	21,830,628.00	6,419,310.00	0.00	0.00	4,991,016.00	0.00	10,420,302.00	21,830,628.00	0.00
	2005-06	15,409,039.00	4,825,824.00	0.00	676,623.00	3,750,000.00	0.00	6,156,592.00	15,409,039.00	0.00
	2004-05	10,007,007.00	2,875,000.00	0.00	0.00	3,850,000.00	0.00	3,282,007.00	10,007,007.00	0.00
	2003-04	4,846,848.00	1,400,000.00	0.00	0.00	1,100,000.00	0.00	2,346,848.00	4,846,848.00	0.00
Baker	2006-07	3,644,177.00	2,100,000.00	150,000.00	0.00	1,394,177.00	0.00	0.00	3,644,177.00	0.00
	2005-06	2,501,160.00	1,850,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	651,160.00	2,501,160.00	0.00
	2004-05	1,570,009.00	900,000.00	0.00	0.00	670,009.00	0.00	0.00	1,570,009.00	0.00
	2003-04	745,564.00	375,000.00	0.00	0.00	370,564.00	0.00	0.00	745,564.00	0.00
Bay	2006-07	20,247,071.00	8,778,572.00	0.00	802,710.00	0.00	0.00	10,665,789.00	20,247,071.00	0.00
	2005-06	14,825,686.00	8,994,381.00	0.00	558,242.00	2,965,183.00	0.00	2,307,880.00	14,825,686.00	0.00
	2004-05	9,438,579.00	2,557,351.00	0.00	0.00	871,270.00	777,584.00	5,232,374.00	9,438,579.00	0.00
	2003-04	4,487,813.00	504,000.00	0.00	0.00	1,633,312.00	0.00	2,350,501.00	4,487,813.00	0.00
Bradford	2006-07	2,678,713.00	416,445.00	0.00	10,942.10	2,251,326.00	0.00	0.00	2,678,713.10	-0.10
	2005-06	1,913,570.00	354,500.00	0.00	8,292.55	1,550,777.00	0.00	0.00	1,913,569.55	0.45
	2004-05	1,305,572.00	458,875.00	0.00	3,388.00	0.00	0.00	843,309.00	1,305,572.00	0.00
	2003-04	674,930.00	150,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	524,930.00	0.00	674,930.00	0.00
Brevard	2006-07	58,112,052.00	21,198,473.83	920,467.34	2,773,117.00	19,039,390.20	1,205,934.54	12,974,669.29	58,112,052.21	-0.21
	2005-06	41,507,774.00	16,864,327.00	0.00	1,514,925.00	16,294,535.00	543,033.00	6,290,954.00	41,507,774.00	0.00
	2004-05	27,116,534.00	15,634,795.75	0.00	0.00	5,378,745.62	1,139,564.75	0.00	22,153,106.12	4,963,427.88
	2003-04	12,748,601.00	7,179,030.00	0.00	0.00	5,407,571.00	0.00	162,000.00	12,748,601.00	0.00
Broward	2006-07	215,440,195.00	165,126,048.00	0.00	12,404,703.00	3,140,775.02	34,768,669.00	0.00	215,440,195.02	-0.02
	2005-06	158,385,201.00	132,455,153.00	0.00	8,125,802.00	0.00	17,804,246.00	0.00	158,385,201.00	0.00
	2004-05	104,961,423.00	96,601,878.00	0.00	4,853,118.00	1,933,024.00	1,573,403.00	0.00	104,961,423.00	0.00
	2003-04	52,590,484.00	47,549,749.00	0.00	2,412,939.00	0.00	2,627,796.00	0.00	52,590,484.00	0.00

Class Size Reduction										
2003-04 thru 2006-07 Surveys										
District	Year	Appropriated Class Size Reduction Operating Funds	Core Amount (\$) of Salaries & Benefits	Non-Core Amount (\$) of Salaries & Benefits	Charter School Payments (\$)	Salary and Benefit Increases (\$) for Existing Teachers	Dollars (\$) Held in Reserve to Ensure Future Compliance	Other Budgeted Uses Amount (\$)	Total from Survey	Difference Between Total Allocation Amount Itemized
Calhoun	2006-07	1,670,947.00	1,134,430.00	0.00	0.00	479,552.00	0.00	56,965.00	1,670,947.00	0.00
	2005-06	1,204,924.00	424,636.50	3,032.40	0.00	777,255.10	0.00	0.00	1,204,924.00	0.00
	2004-05	771,783.00	199,870.00	0.00	0.00	320,840.23	0.00	251,072.77	771,783.00	0.00
	2003-04	360,821.00	104,302.00	0.00	0.00	256,519.00	0.00	0.00	360,821.00	0.00
Charlotte	2006-07	13,370,849.00	11,317,028.00	174,000.00	0.00	1,879,821.00	0.00	0.00	13,370,849.00	0.00
	2005-06	9,328,418.00	7,480,000.00	0.00	0.00	1,848,418.00	0.00	0.00	9,328,418.00	0.00
	2004-05	6,441,069.00	4,500,000.00	0.00	0.00	1,941,069.00	0.00	0.00	6,441,069.00	0.00
	2003-04	3,036,025.00	2,142,000.00	0.00	0.00	894,025.00	0.00	0.00	3,036,025.00	0.00
Citrus	2006-07	11,848,851.00	7,531,874.00	3,314,024.00	19,000.00	0.00	983,953.00	0.00	11,848,851.00	0.00
	2005-06	8,280,742.00	4,765,850.00	0.00	0.00	2,000,000.00	1,514,892.00	0.00	8,280,742.00	0.00
	2004-05	5,330,394.00	3,572,085.00	0.00	0.00	890,000.00	0.00	868,309.00	5,330,394.00	0.00
	2003-04	2,559,649.00	2,042,336.40	0.00	0.00	517,312.60	0.00	0.00	2,559,649.00	0.00
Clay	2006-07	27,992,126.00	25,990,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,002,126.00	27,992,126.00	0.00
	2005-06	18,809,413.00	16,723,673.53	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,085,739.47	18,809,413.00	0.00
	2004-05	11,336,301.00	10,736,400.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	599,901.00	11,336,301.00	0.00
	2003-04	5,131,905.00	5,131,905.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5,131,905.00	0.00
Collier	2006-07	36,008,438.00	16,746,516.00	0.00	469,141.00	17,891,516.00	0.00	901,265.00	36,008,438.00	0.00
	2005-06	25,823,741.00	13,621,300.00	0.00	304,965.00	11,160,052.00	0.00	737,424.00	25,823,741.00	0.00
	2004-05	16,379,837.00	7,889,400.00	0.00	0.00	7,481,575.00	0.00	1,008,862.00	16,379,837.00	0.00
	2003-04	7,645,450.00	5,310,017.00	0.00	0.00	2,272,931.00	0.00	62,502.00	7,645,450.00	0.00
Columbia	2006-07	7,516,188.00	3,429,421.00	94,982.00	0.00	2,151,603.00	1,830,182.00	10,000.00	7,516,188.00	0.00
	2005-06	5,279,909.00	3,024,000.00	10,000.00	0.00	2,245,909.00	0.00	0.00	5,279,909.00	0.00
	2004-05	3,390,652.00	1,736,815.75	0.00	0.00	1,403,000.00	0.00	250,836.25	3,390,652.00	0.00
	2003-04	1,640,108.00	1,074,432.00	0.00	0.00	425,000.00	130,676.00	10,000.00	1,640,108.00	0.00

Class Size Reduction										
2003-04 thru 2006-07 Surveys										
District	Year	Appropriated Class Size Reduction Operating Funds	Core Amount (\$) of Salaries & Benefits	Non-Core Amount (\$) of Salaries & Benefits	Charter School Payments (\$)	Salary and Benefit Increases (\$) for Existing Teachers	Dollars (\$) Held in Reserve to Ensure Future Compliance	Other Budgeted Uses Amount (\$)	Total from Survey	Difference Between Total Allocation Amount Itemized
Dade	2006-07	280,456,093.00	204,810,425.00	0.00	14,768,610.00	60,877,058.00	0.00	0.00	280,456,093.00	0.00
	2005-06	210,082,494.00	160,042,378.00	0.00	7,354,563.00	42,685,553.00	0.00	0.00	210,082,494.00	0.00
	2004-05	142,396,781.00	96,712,988.00	0.00	0.00	45,683,793.00	0.00	0.00	142,396,781.00	0.00
	2003-04	72,362,063.00	46,398,149.00	0.00	-0.00	25,963,914.00	0.00	0.00	72,362,063.00	0.00
DeSoto	2006-07	3,865,326.00	846,854.00	0.00	0.00	1,623,271.00	350,000.00	1,045,201.00	3,865,326.00	0.00
	2005-06	2,736,866.00	791,093.00	0.00	0.00	767,093.00	332,459.00	846,221.00	2,736,866.00	0.00
	2004-05	1,814,246.00	488,812.75	0.00	0.00	418,298.75	0.00	907,134.50	1,814,246.00	0.00
	2003-04	882,395.00	183,055.00	0.00	0.00	496,564.00	140,776.00	62,000.00	882,395.00	0.00
Dixie	2006-07	1,588,382.00	930,530.00	0.00	0.00	210,000.00	0.00	447,852.00	1,588,382.00	0.00
	2005-06	1,119,632.00	750,802.00	0.00	0.00	368,830.00	0.00	0.00	1,119,632.00	0.00
	2004-05	739,789.00	150,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	589,789.00	739,789.00	0.00
	2003-04	369,848.00	112,000.00	0.00	0.00	257,848.00	0.00	0.00	369,848.00	0.00
Duval	2006-07	101,594,613.00	87,043,296.00	0.00	391,419.00	4,719,936.00	3,539,962.00	5,900,000.00	101,594,613.00	0.00
	2005-06	71,726,201.00	61,744,504.00	0.00	455,639.00	5,900,000.00	3,626,058.00	0.00	71,726,201.00	0.00
	2004-05	47,120,122.00	37,049,362.02	0.00	0.00	1,293,543.10	5,452,122.00	3,325,094.88	47,120,122.00	0.00
	2003-04	22,358,764.00	22,358,764.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	22,358,764.00	0.00
Escambia	2006-07	31,574,723.00	25,160,552.00	776,983.00	722,963.00	4,472,000.00	0.00	442,225.00	31,574,723.00	0.00
	2005-06	23,122,491.00	20,281,996.00	759,458.00	456,129.00	1,298,577.00	0.00	326,331.00	23,122,491.00	0.00
	2004-05	15,069,891.00	14,517,026.00	0.00	402,865.00	0.00	0.00	150,000.00	15,069,891.00	0.00
	2003-04	7,271,824.00	5,000,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,271,824.00	0.00	7,271,824.00	0.00
Flagler	2006-07	9,135,214.00	8,999,432.84	0.00	135,781.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9,135,213.84	0.16
	2005-06	5,830,674.00	5,830,674.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5,830,674.00	0.00
	2004-05	3,372,468.00	3,372,468.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,372,468.00	0.00
	2003-04	1,394,933.00	1,394,933.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,394,933.00	0.00

Class Size Reduction										
2003-04 thru 2006-07 Surveys										
District	Year	Appropriated Class Size Reduction Operating Funds	Core Amount (\$) of Salaries & Benefits	Non-Core Amount (\$) of Salaries & Benefits	Charter School Payments (\$)	Salary and Benefit Increases (\$) for Existing Teachers	Dollars (\$) Held in Reserve to Ensure Future Compliance	Other Budgeted Uses Amount (\$)	Total from Survey	Difference Between Total Allocation Amount Itemized
Franklin	2006-07	918,348.00	124,000.00	0.00	182,694.00	404,234.47	0.00	207,420.00	918,348.47	-0.47
	2005-06	700,288.00	0.00	0.00	105,581.00	185,563.00	0.00	409,144.00	700,288.00	0.00
	2004-05	461,511.00	0.00	0.00	57,392.00	165,291.72	0.00	238,827.28	461,511.00	0.00
	2003-04	225,888.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	225,888.00	225,888.00	0.00
Gadsden	2006-07	4,779,321.00	4,422,621.00	0.00	129,608.00	227,092.00	0.00	0.00	4,779,321.00	0.00
	2005-06	3,391,869.00	3,320,051.00	0.00	71,818.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,391,869.00	0.00
	2004-05	2,257,481.00	2,257,481.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,257,481.00	0.00
	2003-04	1,112,114.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,112,114.00	1,112,114.00	0.00
Gilchrist	2006-07	2,155,703.00	1,389,420.00	179,280.00	0.00	587,003.00	0.00	0.00	2,155,703.00	0.00
	2005-06	1,514,704.00	1,028,587.00	136,117.00	0.00	350,000.00	0.00	0.00	1,514,704.00	0.00
	2004-05	992,283.00	849,815.00	0.00	0.00	142,468.00	0.00	0.00	992,283.00	0.00
	2003-04	462,537.00	453,143.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9,394.00	462,537.00	0.00
Glades	2006-07	868,403.00	868,403.24	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	868,403.24	-0.24
	2005-06	699,588.00	572,282.00	0.00	0.00	127,306.00	0.00	0.00	699,588.00	0.00
	2004-05	403,617.00	317,325.12	0.00	0.00	6,500.00	39,665.64	40,126.24	403,617.00	0.00
	2003-04	183,205.00	183,205.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	183,205.00	0.00
Gulf	2006-07	1,609,808.00	772,700.00	0.00	0.00	525,000.00	312,108.00	0.00	1,609,808.00	0.00
	2005-06	1,124,233.00	340,000.00	43,750.00	0.00	450,000.00	140,546.00	149,937.00	1,124,233.00	0.00
	2004-05	737,584.00	175,000.00	0.00	0.00	462,836.00	0.00	99,748.00	737,584.00	0.00
	2003-04	344,792.00	87,359.00	0.00	0.00	257,433.00	0.00	0.00	344,792.00	0.00
Hamilton	2006-07	1,448,357.00	179,144.00	0.00	0.00	1,230,611.00	38,602.00	0.00	1,448,357.00	0.00
	2005-06	1,008,495.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	905,909.00	102,586.00	0.00	1,008,495.00	0.00
	2004-05	676,934.00	35,000.00	0.00	0.00	307,669.00	0.00	334,265.00	676,934.00	0.00
	2003-04	329,565.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	329,565.00	0.00	0.00	329,565.00	0.00

Class Size Reduction										
2003-04 thru 2006-07 Surveys										
District	Year	Appropriated Class Size Reduction Operating Funds	Core Amount (\$) of Salaries & Benefits	Non-Core Amount (\$) of Salaries & Benefits	Charter School Payments (\$)	Salary and Benefit Increases (\$) for Existing Teachers	Dollars (\$) Held in Reserve to Ensure Future Compliance	Other Budgeted Uses Amount (\$)	Total from Survey	Difference Between Total Allocation Amount Itemized
Hardee	2006-07	3,855,838.00	3,804,507.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	51,331.00	3,855,838.00	0.00
	2005-06	2,687,711.00	2,636,971.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	21,290.00	29,450.00	2,687,711.00	0.00
	2004-05	1,773,631.00	1,759,406.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	14,225.00	1,773,631.00	0.00
	2003-04	873,354.00	123,119.00	0.00	0.00	675,040.00	75,195.00	0.00	873,354.00	0.00
Hendry	2006-07	5,753,890.00	4,172,764.00	0.00	0.00	364,456.00	0.00	1,216,670.00	5,753,890.00	0.00
	2005-06	4,143,557.00	2,988,319.00	0.00	0.00	1,104,266.00	50,972.00	0.00	4,143,557.00	0.00
	2004-05	2,722,895.00	2,026,419.00	0.00	0.00	652,755.00	43,721.00	0.00	2,722,895.00	0.00
	2003-04	1,352,260.00	1,203,682.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	148,578.00	1,352,260.00	0.00
Hernando	2006-07	17,019,169.00	15,961,469.00	0.00	83,229.00	974,471.00	0.00	0.00	17,019,169.00	0.00
	2005-06	11,525,626.00	11,470,084.00	0.00	55,542.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	11,525,626.00	0.00
	2004-05	7,102,217.00	6,072,247.72	0.00	0.00	65,544.00	759,616.28	204,809.00	7,102,217.00	0.00
	2003-04	3,215,358.00	1,900,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,300,358.00	15,000.00	3,215,358.00	0.00
Highlands	2006-07	9,472,460.00	8,935,983.00	0.00	51,773.00	0.00	0.00	484,704.00	9,472,460.00	0.00
	2005-06	6,547,968.00	5,679,080.00	0.00	29,715.00	0.00	0.00	839,173.00	6,547,968.00	0.00
	2004-05	4,230,556.00	4,230,556.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,230,556.00	0.00
	2003-04	1,991,840.00	1,991,840.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,991,840.00	0.00
Hillsborough	2006-07	154,292,054.00	122,219,374.84	0.00	2,250,502.00	28,110,555.00	1,711,622.00	0.00	154,292,053.84	0.16
	2005-06	109,290,152.00	106,904,350.00	0.00	2,385,802.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	109,290,152.00	0.00
	2004-05	69,382,643.00	61,073,244.00	0.00	1,109,232.51	6,700,166.49	0.00	500,000.00	69,382,643.00	0.00
	2003-04	32,794,905.00	29,124,830.00	0.00	423,347.00	0.00	0.00	3,246,728.00	32,794,905.00	0.00
Holmes	2006-07	2,320,193.00	789,646.40	0.00	0.00	1,250,298.60	0.00	280,248.00	2,320,193.00	0.00
	2005-06	1,686,016.00	594,270.00	0.00	0.00	331,070.00	56,712.00	703,964.00	1,686,016.00	0.00
	2004-05	1,090,224.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	108,000.00	0.00	982,224.00	1,090,224.00	0.00
	2003-04	547,026.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	547,026.00	0.00	0.00	547,026.00	0.00

Class Size Reduction										
2003-04 thru 2006-07 Surveys										
District	Year	Appropriated Class Size Reduction Operating Funds	Core Amount (\$) of Salaries & Benefits	Non-Core Amount (\$) of Salaries & Benefits	Charter School Payments (\$)	Salary and Benefit Increases (\$) for Existing Teachers	Dollars (\$) Held in Reserve to Ensure Future Compliance	Other Budgeted Uses Amount (\$)	Total from Survey	Difference Between Total Allocation Amount Itemized
Indian River	2006-07	13,549,600.00	7,547,382.00	262,975.00	700,689.00	4,431,020.00	0.00	607,534.00	13,549,600.00	0.00
	2005-06	9,320,486.00	5,730,000.00	300,000.00	483,766.00	1,966,459.00	0.00	840,261.00	9,320,486.00	0.00
	2004-05	6,089,514.00	3,600,725.00	0.00	368,320.00	1,121,359.00	0.00	999,110.00	6,089,514.00	0.00
	2003-04	2,862,496.00	1,476,505.00	0.00	167,676.00	757,903.00	0.00	460,412.00	2,862,496.00	0.00
Jackson	2006-07	5,428,637.00	2,688,233.00	0.00	0.00	1,258,779.00	1,481,625.00	0.00	5,428,637.00	0.00
	2005-06	3,891,310.00	1,695,931.00	43,532.00	0.00	1,422,367.00	729,480.00	0.00	3,891,310.00	0.00
	2004-05	2,441,617.00	690,017.32	0.00	0.00	1,490,921.00	260,678.68	0.00	2,441,617.00	0.00
	2003-04	1,201,313.00	119,000.00	0.00	0.00	802,000.00	0.00	280,313.00	1,201,313.00	0.00
Jefferson	2006-07	908,940.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	864,780.00	0.00	44,160.00	908,940.00	0.00
	2005-06	641,653.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	423,850.00	0.00	217,803.00	641,653.00	0.00
	2004-05	467,233.00	456,483.00	0.00	0.00	10,750.00	0.00	0.00	467,233.00	0.00
	2003-04	244,841.00	244,841.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	244,841.00	0.00
Lafayette	2006-07	762,179.00	591,891.17	0.00	0.00	154,618.00	0.00	15,670.00	762,179.17	-0.17
	2005-06	539,495.00	381,102.00	0.00	0.00	152,729.00	0.00	5,664.00	539,495.00	0.00
	2004-05	343,276.00	110,541.00	0.00	0.00	232,735.00	0.00	0.00	343,276.00	0.00
	2003-04	170,992.00	110,541.00	0.00	0.00	60,451.00	0.00	0.00	170,992.00	0.00
Lake	2006-07	30,152,751.00	25,933,473.00	0.00	3,269,806.00	949,472.00	0.00	0.00	30,152,751.00	0.00
	2005-06	20,694,616.00	18,546,524.00	0.00	2,148,092.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	20,694,616.00	0.00
	2004-05	12,761,768.00	11,549,424.00	0.00	1,212,344.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12,761,768.00	0.00
	2003-04	5,829,832.00	4,741,739.00	0.00	507,960.00	0.00	580,133.00	0.00	5,829,832.00	0.00
Lee	2006-07	63,247,748.00	54,882,239.00	0.00	5,322,757.00	2,751,734.00	725,165.00	-434,147.00	63,247,748.00	0.00
	2005-06	42,762,884.00	39,570,849.00	0.00	3,080,881.00	855,147.00	51,942.00	-795,935.00	42,762,884.00	0.00
	2004-05	25,862,920.00	23,472,397.00	0.00	1,353,479.00	209,221.00	627,577.00	200,246.00	25,862,920.00	0.00
	2003-04	11,881,410.00	11,000,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	381,410.00	500,000.00	11,881,410.00	0.00

Class Size Reduction										
2003-04 thru 2006-07 Surveys										
District	Year	Appropriated Class Size Reduction Operating Funds	Core Amount (\$) of Salaries & Benefits	Non-Core Amount (\$) of Salaries & Benefits	Charter School Payments (\$)	Salary and Benefit Increases (\$) for Existing Teachers	Dollars (\$) Held in Reserve to Ensure Future Compliance	Other Budgeted Uses Amount (\$)	Total from Survey	Difference Between Total Allocation Amount Itemized
Leon	2006-07	25,630,900.00	17,285,258.00	0.00	424,679.00	3,511,822.00	4,409,140.77	0.00	25,630,899.77	0.23
	2005-06	18,008,417.00	13,498,959.21	0.00	162,177.00	3,597,280.79	750,000.00	0.00	18,008,417.00	0.00
	2004-05	11,753,371.00	9,405,792.00	0.00	0.00	2,347,579.00	0.00	0.00	11,753,371.00	0.00
	2003-04	5,565,213.00	3,600,000.00	0.00	0.00	1,965,213.00	0.00	0.00	5,565,213.00	0.00
Levy	2006-07	4,570,260.00	1,718,005.00	0.00	120,844.00	1,475,086.00	529,925.00	726,400.00	4,570,260.00	0.00
	2005-06	3,271,171.00	1,550,314.00	0.00	73,966.00	779,270.00	867,621.00	0.00	3,271,171.00	0.00
	2004-05	2,078,655.00	611,319.00	0.00	0.00	850,000.00	0.00	617,336.00	2,078,655.00	0.00
	2003-04	997,858.00	308,346.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	689,512.00	997,858.00	0.00
Liberty	2006-07	1,178,561.00	730,469.71	0.00	0.00	448,091.00	0.00	0.00	1,178,560.71	0.29
	2005-06	791,522.00	266,765.47	0.00	0.00	300,000.00	224,756.53	0.00	791,522.00	0.00
	2004-05	568,565.00	240,000.00	0.00	0.00	100,000.00	228,565.00	0.00	568,565.00	0.00
	2003-04	260,264.00	82,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	178,264.00	0.00	260,264.00	0.00
Madison	2006-07	2,137,752.00	1,509,328.69	67,671.00	0.00	560,752.00	0.00	0.00	2,137,751.69	0.31
	2005-06	1,590,457.00	120,076.46	0.00	0.00	1,079,285.49	291,095.03	100,000.00	1,590,456.98	0.02
	2004-05	1,071,976.00	273,468.00	0.00	0.00	225,000.00	158,472.00	415,036.00	1,071,976.00	0.00
	2003-04	533,806.00	100,000.00	0.00	0.00	433,806.00	0.00	0.00	533,806.00	0.00
Manatee	2006-07	32,820,727.00	19,954,452.00	0.00	1,133,417.00	11,060,197.00	672,661.00	0.00	32,820,727.00	0.00
	2005-06	23,539,945.00	16,663,950.00	467,760.00	985,206.00	614,179.00	0.00	4,808,850.00	23,539,945.00	0.00
	2004-05	15,205,498.00	12,017,500.00	0.00	681,931.00	2,506,067.00	0.00	0.00	15,205,498.00	0.00
	2003-04	7,251,986.00	6,850,980.00	0.00	300,000.00	0.00	0.00	101,006.00	7,251,986.00	0.00
Marion	2006-07	31,841,850.00	25,997,855.00	0.00	188,286.00	5,655,709.00	0.00	0.00	31,841,850.00	0.00
	2005-06	22,297,017.00	18,166,926.00	0.00	132,935.00	3,548,528.00	448,628.00	0.00	22,297,017.00	0.00
	2004-05	14,393,017.00	12,245,702.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,147,315.00	0.00	14,393,017.00	0.00
	2003-04	6,875,196.00	4,004,835.00	0.00	0.00	2,870,361.00	0.00	0.00	6,875,196.00	0.00

Class Size Reduction										
2003-04 thru 2006-07 Surveys										
District	Year	Appropriated Class Size Reduction Operating Funds	Core Amount (\$) of Salaries & Benefits	Non-Core Amount (\$) of Salaries & Benefits	Charter School Payments (\$)	Salary and Benefit Increases (\$) for Existing Teachers	Dollars (\$) Held in Reserve to Ensure Future Compliance	Other Budgeted Uses Amount (\$)	Total from Survey	Difference Between Total Allocation Amount Itemized
Martin	2006-07	14,371,235.00	3,822,000.00	1,612,000.00	137,105.00	2,271,128.00	250,000.00	6,279,002.00	14,371,235.00	0.00
	2005-06	10,169,466.00	2,334,679.00	0.00	188,527.00	2,932,722.00	0.00	4,713,538.00	10,169,466.00	0.00
	2004-05	6,597,251.00	1,426,000.00	0.00	0.00	1,878,716.00	3,182,535.00	110,000.00	6,597,251.00	0.00
	2003-04	3,200,680.00	832,000.00	0.00	0.00	2,168,000.00	110,680.00	90,000.00	3,200,680.00	0.00
Monroe	2006-07	6,483,127.00	4,151,853.66	0.00	212,078.95	2,119,194.39	0.00	0.00	6,483,127.00	0.00
	2005-06	4,959,549.00	2,470,422.00	0.00	141,933.00	1,795,350.00	0.00	551,844.00	4,959,549.00	0.00
	2004-05	3,355,818.00	3,355,818.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,355,818.00	0.00
	2003-04	1,796,013.00	737,806.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,058,206.59	0.00	1,796,013.00	0.00
Nassau	2006-07	8,487,314.00	3,871,391.24	0.00	0.00	412,945.00	194,213.00	4,008,765.00	8,487,314.24	-0.24
	2005-06	5,843,449.00	3,451,285.00	0.00	0.00	2,185,164.00	150,000.00	57,000.00	5,843,449.00	0.00
	2004-05	3,693,112.00	2,536,384.00	0.00	0.00	1,009,128.00	0.00	147,600.00	3,693,112.00	0.00
	2003-04	1,746,315.00	1,686,315.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	60,000.00	0.00	1,746,315.00	0.00
Okaloosa	2006-07	22,928,010.00	16,549,933.00	583,574.00	858,540.00	3,617,980.00	155,200.00	1,162,783.00	22,928,010.00	0.00
	2005-06	16,762,853.00	11,946,034.00	501,370.00	642,364.00	849,656.00	635,268.00	2,188,161.00	16,762,853.00	0.00
	2004-05	10,943,703.00	7,908,776.00	0.00	388,069.00	0.00	624,776.00	2,022,082.00	10,943,703.00	0.00
	2003-04	5,313,704.00	4,809,094.00	0.00	192,548.00	0.00	293,176.00	18,886.00	5,313,704.00	0.00
Okeechobee	2006-07	5,563,563.00	3,956,137.00	463,003.00	0.00	1,144,423.00	0.00	0.00	5,563,563.00	0.00
	2005-06	3,977,964.00	3,520,776.00	457,188.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,977,964.00	0.00
	2004-05	2,594,706.00	2,480,706.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	114,000.00	0.00	2,594,706.00	0.00
	2003-04	1,238,137.00	619,000.00	0.00	0.00	382,231.00	236,906.00	0.00	1,238,137.00	0.00
Orange	2006-07	144,361,879.00	100,453,967.00	0.00	2,716,127.00	41,191,785.00	0.00	0.00	144,361,879.00	0.00
	2005-06	102,244,041.00	100,963,023.00	0.00	1,281,018.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	102,244,041.00	0.00
	2004-05	65,256,800.00	41,701,920.00	0.00	0.00	11,929,421.00	4,347,048.00	7,278,411.00	65,256,800.00	0.00
	2003-04	29,740,758.00	11,248,109.00	0.00	0.00	18,492,649.00	0.00	0.00	29,740,758.00	0.00

Class Size Reduction											
2003-04 thru 2006-07 Surveys											
District	Year	Appropriated Class Size Reduction Operating Funds	Core Amount (\$) of Salaries & Benefits	Non-Core Amount (\$) of Salaries & Benefits	Charter School Payments (\$)	Salary and Benefit Increases (\$) for Existing Teachers	Dollars (\$) Held in Reserve to Ensure Future Compliance	Other Budgeted Uses Amount (\$)	Total from Survey	Difference Between Total Allocation Amount Itemized	
Osceola	2006-07	41,729,849.00	20,820,447.00	0.00	3,693,790.00	9,971,957.00	0.00	7,243,655.00	41,729,849.00	0.00	
	2005-06	28,486,528.00	13,796,088.00	0.00	2,542,675.00	8,564,381.00	0.00	3,583,384.00	28,486,528.00	0.00	
	2004-05	17,190,952.00	8,970,048.00	0.00	1,460,669.00	418,054.00	0.00	6,342,181.00	17,190,952.00	0.00	
	2003-04	7,694,506.00	6,773,385.00	0.00	584,272.00	0.00	0.00	336,849.00	7,694,506.00	0.00	
Palm Beach	2006-07	140,477,070.00	130,518,362.00	0.00	5,899,134.00	4,059,574.00	0.00	0.00	140,477,070.00	0.00	
	2005-06	103,666,981.00	98,533,410.00	0.00	5,133,571.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	103,666,981.00	0.00	
	2004-05	68,339,231.00	64,974,871.00	0.00	3,364,360.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	68,339,231.00	0.00	
	2003-04	32,747,059.00	32,184,324.00	0.00	562,735.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	32,747,059.00	0.00	
Pasco	2006-07	50,225,650.00	47,223,006.00	0.00	691,599.00	2,311,045.00	0.00	0.00	50,225,650.00	0.00	
	2005-06	34,617,736.00	34,088,927.00	0.00	528,809.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	34,617,736.00	0.00	
	2004-05	21,358,593.00	19,186,001.00	0.00	0.00	517,069.00	1,655,523.00	0.00	21,358,593.00	0.00	
	2003-04	9,973,508.00	9,973,508.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9,973,508.00	0.00	
Pinellas	2006-07	88,029,861.00	26,500,000.00	0.00	600,565.00	23,200,000.00	0.00	37,729,296.00	88,029,861.00	0.00	
	2005-06	64,082,203.00	18,800,000.00	0.00	430,070.00	13,700,000.00	0.00	31,152,133.00	64,082,203.00	0.00	
	2004-05	42,532,507.00	13,800,000.00	0.00	0.00	11,500,000.00	0.00	17,232,507.00	42,532,507.00	0.00	
	2003-04	20,933,459.00	8,800,000.00	0.00	0.00	7,300,000.00	0.00	4,833,459.00	20,933,459.00	0.00	
Polk	2006-07	72,066,489.00	42,204,553.00	0.00	7,122,286.00	22,739,650.00	0.00	0.00	72,066,489.00	0.00	
	2005-06	49,166,392.00	27,253,181.00	0.00	4,834,381.00	16,696,923.00	0.00	381,907.00	49,166,392.00	0.00	
	2004-05	30,657,034.00	16,511,558.00	0.00	0.00	9,173,076.00	1,656,396.00	3,316,004.00	30,657,034.00	0.00	
	2003-04	14,225,342.00	10,908,079.00	0.00	979,158.00	0.00	0.00	2,338,105.00	14,225,342.00	0.00	
Putnam	2006-07	9,012,119.00	2,167,465.00	0.00	59,792.00	4,630,008.00	0.00	2,154,854.00	9,012,119.00	0.00	
	2005-06	6,448,571.00	0.00	0.00	59,792.00	1,864,524.00	0.00	4,524,255.00	6,448,571.00	0.00	
	2004-05	4,177,756.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,177,756.00	4,177,756.00	0.00	
	2003-04	2,050,289.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,050,289.00	2,050,289.00	0.00	

Class Size Reduction										
2003-04 thru 2006-07 Surveys										
District	Year	Appropriated Class Size Reduction Operating Funds	Core Amount (\$) of Salaries & Benefits	Non-Core Amount (\$) of Salaries & Benefits	Charter School Payments (\$)	Salary and Benefit Increases (\$) for Existing Teachers	Dollars (\$) Held in Reserve to Ensure Future Compliance	Other Budgeted Uses Amount (\$)	Total from Survey	Difference Between Total Allocation Amount Itemized
St. Johns	2006-07	20,993,265.00	30,095,110.00	0.00	106,315.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30,201,425.00	-9,208,160.00
	2005-06	14,201,993.00	7,624,573.00	1,870,000.00	0.00	4,707,420.00	0.00	0.00	14,201,993.00	0.00
	2004-05	8,680,036.00	10,498,580.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-1,818,544.00	8,680,036.00	0.00
	2003-04	3,980,540.00	3,700,000.00	0.00	0.00	118,540.00	0.00	162,000.00	3,980,540.00	0.00
St. Lucie	2006-07	29,938,986.00	30,453,178.00	0.00	0.00	852,873.00	-1,367,065.00	0.00	29,938,986.00	0.00
	2005-06	19,792,052.00	11,025,024.00	0.00	0.00	4,844,428.00	2,500,000.00	1,422,600.00	19,792,052.00	0.00
	2004-05	12,074,504.00	10,296,894.30	0.00	0.00	514,844.72	0.00	1,262,764.98	12,074,504.00	0.00
	2003-04	5,646,884.00	3,946,884.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,700,000.00	5,646,884.00	0.00
Santa Rosa	2006-07	18,498,058.00	18,335,099.33	90,254.00	0.00	72,705.00	0.00	0.00	18,498,058.33	-0.33
	2005-06	13,124,582.00	12,811,855.71	0.00	48,755.00	0.00	0.00	263,971.29	13,124,582.00	0.00
	2004-05	8,330,828.00	6,858,565.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,472,263.00	8,330,828.00	0.00
	2003-04	3,934,430.00	3,068,963.88	0.00	0.00	865,466.12	0.00	0.00	3,934,430.00	0.00
Sarasota	2006-07	33,687,369.00	32,106,873.00	0.00	1,580,496.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	33,687,369.00	0.00
	2005-06	23,828,029.00	22,433,382.00	0.00	1,136,121.00	0.00	0.00	258,526.00	23,828,029.00	0.00
	2004-05	15,298,308.00	13,691,780.00	0.00	0.00	1,606,528.00	0.00	0.00	15,298,308.00	0.00
	2003-04	7,253,800.00	6,522,772.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	731,028.00	0.00	7,253,800.00	0.00
Seminole	2006-07	52,046,781.00	21,737,781.00	0.00	430,996.00	29,878,004.00	0.00	0.00	52,046,781.00	0.00
	2005-06	37,457,865.00	14,566,189.00	0.00	318,927.00	22,572,749.00	0.00	0.00	37,457,865.00	0.00
	2004-05	23,603,326.00	10,557,496.00	0.00	0.00	13,045,830.00	0.00	0.00	23,603,326.00	0.00
	2003-04	11,059,490.00	7,310,089.00	0.00	100,150.00	2,933,784.00	0.00	715,467.00	11,059,490.00	0.00
Sumter	2006-07	5,446,636.00	2,866,838.86	0.00	1,270,932.00	1,308,865.00	0.00	0.00	5,446,635.86	0.14
	2005-06	3,856,576.00	1,904,724.00	0.00	860,974.00	1,081,703.00	0.00	9,175.00	3,856,576.00	0.00
	2004-05	2,389,531.00	956,832.00	0.00	525,696.00	683,871.00	0.00	223,132.00	2,389,531.00	0.00
	2003-04	1,117,757.00	510,000.00	0.00	200,000.00	407,757.00	0.00	0.00	1,117,757.00	0.00

Class Size Reduction										
2003-04 thru 2006-07 Surveys										
District	Year	Appropriated Class Size Reduction Operating Funds	Core Amount (\$) of Salaries & Benefits	Non-Core Amount (\$) of Salaries & Benefits	Charter School Payments (\$)	Salary and Benefit Increases (\$) for Existing Teachers	Dollars (\$) Held in Reserve to Ensure Future Compliance	Other Budgeted Uses Amount (\$)	Total from Survey	Difference Between Total Allocation Amount Itemized
Suwannee	2006-07	4,223,279.00	2,447,258.00	0.00	0.00	190,571.00	0.00	1,585,450.00	4,223,279.00	0.00
	2005-06	3,006,433.00	2,022,021.00	0.00	0.00	718,412.00	266,000.00	0.00	3,006,433.00	0.00
	2004-05	1,883,426.00	1,397,942.00	0.00	0.00	485,484.00	0.00	0.00	1,883,426.00	0.00
	2003-04	920,838.00	862,535.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	58,303.00	0.00	920,838.00	0.00
Taylor	2006-07	2,300,218.00	149,952.00	0.00	0.00	888,234.00	739,557.00	522,475.00	2,300,218.00	0.00
	2005-06	1,609,872.00	32,329.00	0.00	0.00	410,181.00	70,282.00	1,097,080.00	1,609,872.00	0.00
	2004-05	1,105,012.00	71,025.00	0.00	0.00	413,563.00	0.00	620,424.00	1,105,012.00	0.00
	2003-04	546,992.00	35,100.00	0.00	0.00	511,892.00	0.00	0.00	546,992.00	0.00
Union	2006-07	1,686,519.00	839,514.00	0.00	0.00	46,403.00	481,248.00	319,354.00	1,686,519.00	0.00
	2005-06	1,191,416.00	977,035.00	0.00	0.00	32,972.00	0.00	181,409.00	1,191,416.00	0.00
	2004-05	722,564.00	452,805.79	0.00	0.00	22,290.89	211,467.32	36,000.00	722,564.00	0.00
	2003-04	350,298.00	350,298.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	350,298.00	0.00
Volusia	2006-07	50,430,049.00	44,960,764.00	3,776,052.00	375,033.00	0.00	0.00	1,318,200.00	50,430,049.00	0.00
	2005-06	36,104,609.00	23,846,514.00	178,350.00	230,000.00	11,849,745.00	0.00	0.00	36,104,609.00	0.00
	2004-05	23,673,571.00	14,293,017.54	0.00	0.00	8,088,650.00	1,054,156.00	237,747.46	23,673,571.00	0.00
	2003-04	11,101,550.00	4,600,000.00	0.00	0.00	6,501,550.00	0.00	0.00	11,101,550.00	0.00
Wakulla	2006-07	3,851,482.00	2,124,274.00	0.00	62,883.00	912,608.00	0.00	751,717.00	3,851,482.00	0.00
	2005-06	2,644,676.00	1,644,134.00	0.00	50,687.00	949,855.00	0.00	0.00	2,644,676.00	0.00
	2004-05	1,655,758.00	1,121,222.00	0.00	0.00	534,536.00	0.00	0.00	1,655,758.00	0.00
	2003-04	788,069.00	630,000.00	0.00	0.00	158,069.00	0.00	0.00	788,069.00	0.00
Walton	2006-07	4,785,446.00	4,368,678.00	263,420.00	153,348.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,785,446.00	0.00
	2005-06	3,466,690.00	2,538,000.00	271,000.00	112,000.00	170,000.00	375,690.00	0.00	3,466,690.00	0.00
	2004-05	2,139,093.00	1,600,000.00	0.00	0.00	539,093.00	0.00	0.00	2,139,093.00	0.00
	2003-04	1,029,052.00	403,225.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	625,827.00	1,029,052.00	0.00

Class Size Reduction										
2003-04 thru 2006-07 Surveys										
District	Year	Appropriated Class Size Reduction Operating Funds	Core Amount (\$) of Salaries & Benefits	Non-Core Amount (\$) of Salaries & Benefits	Charter School Payments (\$)	Salary and Benefit Increases (\$) for Existing Teachers	Dollars (\$) Held in Reserve to Ensure Future Compliance	Other Budgeted Uses Amount (\$)	Total from Survey	Difference Between Total Allocation Amount Itemized
Washington	2006-07	2,576,688.00	1,280,064.00	214,940.00	0.00	0.00	788,139.00	293,545.00	2,576,688.00	0.00
	2005-06	1,842,099.00	987,722.58	88,226.18	0.00	0.00	761,203.67	4,946.57	1,842,099.00	0.00
	2004-05	1,157,633.00	465,076.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	420,545.07	272,011.39	1,157,633.00	0.00
	2003-04	561,355.00	369,208.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	192,147.00	0.00	561,355.00	0.00
Washington Special	2006-07	361,432.00	609,780.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-248,348.00	0.00	361,432.00	0.00
	2005-06	283,959.00	243,967.97	0.00	0.00	0.00	39,991.03	0.00	283,959.00	0.00
	2004-05	201,664.00	106,910.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	94,753.80	0.00	201,664.00	0.00
	2003-04	No Data								
	2006-07	2,099,860,409.00	1,515,072,105.81	12,943,625.34	72,327,690.05	343,737,174.68	53,552,493.31	111,435,480.29	2,109,068,569.48	-9,208,160.48 St Johns
	2005-06	1,502,393,699.00	1,132,365,779.43	5,129,783.58	47,711,265.55	207,731,576.38	32,354,751.26	77,100,542.33	1,502,393,698.53	0.47
	2004-05	973,044,160.00	708,643,217.80	0.00	15,780,863.51	152,200,184.52	26,569,484.54	64,886,981.75	968,080,732.12	4,963,427.88 Brevard
	2003-04	467,166,901.00	336,996,332.69	0.00	6,430,785.00	88,134,296.72	10,951,808.59	24,653,678.00	467,166,901.00	0.00
	2006-07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2005-06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2004-05	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2003-04	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

* Note for St. Johns from 2006-07 survey states district wanted to show a deficit because CSR funds were not sufficient.

EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES
Classrooms and Dollars Needed
Using Capacity Carrying Spaces Only
at 90 Percent Utilization

Base Year Adjusted to Meet Requirements by 2010-11

District	Total ClsRms Needed	Total Funding Needed	2007-08 TOTAL Classrooms for Kids	2007-08 TOTAL Classrooms for Kids	Net Total \$ Needed for Class Size Reduction
State	1,546	566,939,996	650,000,000	341,921,386	314,377,246
ALACHUA	-	-	5,727,637	-	-
BAKER	-	-	1,105,938	-	-
BAY	-	-	3,380,434	-	-
BRADFORD	-	-	524,422	-	-
BREVARD	-	-	7,059,949	-	-
BROWARD	-	-	22,505,759	-	-
CALHOUN	-	-	245,901	-	-
CHARLOTTE	-	-	2,910,824	-	-
CITRUS	-	-	7,455,967	-	-
CLAY	-	-	31,556,356	-	-
COLLIER	-	-	7,854,863	-	-
COLUMBIA	-	-	1,158,000	-	-
DADE	109	36,820,854	30,616,996	30,616,996	6,203,858
DESOTO	36	12,402,324	858,431	858,431	11,543,893
DIXIE	-	-	488,345	-	-
DUVAL	464	158,573,484	12,265,719	12,265,719	146,307,765
ESCAMBIA	-	-	4,061,135	-	-
FLAGLER	131	49,267,190	23,858,139	23,858,139	25,409,051
FRANKLIN	-	-	146,700	-	-
GADSDEN	-	-	2,694,027	-	-
GILCHRIST	-	-	434,718	-	-
GLADES	19	8,583,916	121,011	121,011	8,462,905
GULF	-	-	1,170,198	-	-
HAMILTON	-	-	576,688	-	-
HARDEE	-	-	1,884,896	-	-
HENDRY	-	-	742,656	-	-
HERNANDO	58	19,687,986	16,756,747	16,756,747	2,931,239
HIGHLANDS	-	-	5,674,283	-	-
HILLSBOROUGH	-	-	32,337,930	-	-
HOLMES	6	2,026,836	321,091	321,091	1,705,745
INDIAN RIVER	6	2,026,836	5,174,852	5,174,852	-
JACKSON	8	2,702,448	2,404,806	2,404,806	297,642
JEFFERSON	-	-	180,564	-	-
LAFAYETTE	1	445,852	617,911	617,911	-
LAKE	68	22,970,808	31,512,781	31,512,781	-
LEE	56	24,967,712	37,272,835	37,272,835	-
LEON	-	-	7,885,038	-	-
LEVY	-	-	2,009,988	-	-
LIBERTY	-	-	550,114	-	-
MADISON	-	-	253,926	-	-
MANATEE	-	-	3,886,852	-	-
MARION	-	-	15,850,264	-	-
MARTIN	-	-	5,956,614	-	-
MONROE	-	-	890,164	-	-
NASSAU	42	17,780,844	5,225,718	5,225,718	12,555,126
OKALOOSA	-	-	2,769,177	-	-
OKEECHOBEE	9	3,360,548	2,019,818	2,019,818	1,340,730
ORANGE	-	-	15,834,213	-	-
OSCEOLA	23	7,769,538	35,256,838	35,256,838	-
PALM BEACH	-	-	13,599,649	-	-
PASCO	224	93,557,630	37,066,223	37,066,223	56,491,407
PINELLAS	-	-	10,615,544	-	-
POLK	-	-	62,051,089	-	-
PUTNAM	-	-	1,276,612	-	-
ST JOHN'S	26	10,295,600	26,594,997	26,594,997	-
ST LUCIE	98	33,148,944	54,352,358	54,352,358	-
SANTA ROSA	21	9,362,892	7,387,260	7,387,260	1,975,632
SARASOTA	-	-	9,754,856	-	-
SEMINOLE	37	12,498,822	5,409,345	5,409,345	7,089,477
SUMTER	-	-	537,893	-	-
SUWANNEE	-	-	2,076,238	-	-
TAYLOR	-	-	322,980	-	-
UNION	1	445,852	647,206	647,206	-
VOLUSIA	-	-	10,079,213	-	-
WAKULLA	39	15,683,134	3,583,126	3,583,126	12,100,008
WALTON	26	8,863,542	954,324	954,324	7,909,218
WASHINGTON	8	2,702,448	1,422,802	1,422,802	1,279,646
FAU	10	3,420,720	49,938	49,938	3,370,782
FSU	12	4,632,718	-	-	4,632,718
FAMU	2	682,938	61,059	61,059	621,879
UF	6	2,257,580	109,055	109,055	2,148,525

Florida Association of District School Superintendents
208 South Monroe Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Flexibility in Class Size Reduction
Considerations

Assumptions

- Any statutory change must fully satisfy the constitutional language.
- The Legislature may have more flexibility than statutory language currently provides.
- Any change should be educationally sound.
- Any change should minimize disruptions for parents, students and teachers.
- Recommendations range from the most conservative to those considerations that recognize a broader definition of statutory flexibility within the context of the constitutional language.

Considerations

- Amend the current constitutional language – maintain student to teacher ratios at the school level with a firm cap of 5 above the applicable constitutional caps. (Joint Resolution)
- Delay implementation of the class-by-class levels by one year until 2009-2010. This will reduce pressure on the 2008-2009 FY budget, but does not provide the long term flexibility that is needed. If implementation is delayed, we should also incorporate flexibility. (Statutory)
- Establish a common definition for the maximum number of students assigned to any teacher. For example: “18” should be defined as the “average assigned to teachers across a grade level or subject area in a school does not exceed 18.9.” “18” is “18” until “19” is reached. (Statutory)
- Compliance with the constitutional provisions should be calculated/assessed once a year by using current FTE count dates. For example, during the October count, student to teacher ratios are calculated; if in compliance, no implications until next October; if not in compliance, district would have until February count to come into compliance. Language would clearly indicate that a school district remains in compliance even if the 19th student (elementary) shows up after the October and/or February count. (Statutory)
- Grant FTE funding for virtual education courses that are used specifically for compliance with the constitutional provisions when provided by the school district and the classes are operated by the school district. (Statutory)

- Charter school compliance should not adversely impact school district compliance. Moreover, district non-compliance should not adversely affect charter schools. If a school district remains responsible for compliance of all public schools within the district, including charter schools, then school districts must have the specific statutory authority to sanction, close, or reduce funding to charter schools relating to compliance. (Statutory)
- Eliminate all sanctions relating to compliance and replace with existing statutory enforcement authority contained in s. 1008.32, Florida Statutes. (Statutory)
- Constitutional language requires implementation based on students assigned to teachers. Therefore, the statutory reference to assignments must accurately reflect all core curricular assignments, including assignments to ESE teachers in inclusion situations, reading coaches, math coaches, etc. The methodology to calculate student to teacher ratios is a function of the Department of Education. (Statutory)
- Constitutional language does not delineate among district, school or classrooms as a way to measure compliance. The language seems to indicate that the maximum number of students “assigned” to each teacher does not exceed a specific cap. Implementation parameters and funding appropriately belongs to the Legislature. A school could be a unit of measurement since it is an acknowledged educational setting. Flexibility among classroom assignments is recognized and accepted within a school. Suggested language:

On the tenth day of school, there shall be assigned to each school sufficient teachers to insure that the number of students that may be assigned to each teacher in core curricular courses not exceed the applicable constitutional cap. At no time will the number of students actually assigned to a teacher teaching in public school classrooms in the core curricular courses exceed the applicable constitutional cap plus 5 students.

Issues:

Define “teacher” to include teaching units. This would require districts to schedule elementary students on a class-by-class basis, but grade level course numbers have been eliminated, so this should not be a complicated as in previous years.

Measure/calculate compliance during the October and/or February counts.

Establish corrective process for schools to meet student to teacher ratio requirements within a certain time period.

Provide flexibility for those schools that meet requirements.

FLORIDA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION, INC

203 South Monroe Street ~ Tallahassee, FL 32301

Phone: 850/414-2578 ~ Fax: 850/414-2585

www.fsba.org

PRESIDENT
JEANNE DOZIER
FORT MYERS

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DR. WAYNE BLANTON
TALLAHASSEE

***** For Discussion Purposes Only *****

Statutory and Policy Changes to Consider **to Provide Greater Flexibility in Class Size Reduction Compliance**

- Use a uniform methodology for determining the number of students assigned to a teacher that is similar to the methodology used to determine FEFP funding based on hours of instruction and full time equivalents (FTE). This would allow the time that a student spends in instruction that is not considered for class size purposes to be deducted from the number of hours that student is assigned to their classroom teacher.

Example: Doris, a 4th grade student, is assigned to Ms. Smith's class but spends one hour each day in physical education with Ms. Jones and one hour in Spanish with Ms. Brown. In this case, instead of being 1 FTE student assigned to Ms. Smith, Doris would be .60 FTE student assigned to Ms. Smith (.20 assigned to Ms. Jones, and .20 assigned to Ms. Brown)

- Apply a policy to round the class count to the next lower number. For example, if the class count is any number between 18 and 19, the class count would be considered to be 18.
- Calculate class sizes during the October count. If the school is in compliance at that time, no further action would take place. If the school is not in compliance, compliance must be achieved by the following October count. In any case, once compliance is achieved, the school would be considered to be in compliance regardless of enrollment fluctuations that may occur at any other time during the school year.
- Charter school class size compliance must not adversely impact school district compliance. Authorize the school districts to impose a variety of sanctions, including termination of the charter, on a charter school that is not in compliance with class size requirements.
- Repeal all currently existing statutory sanctions relating to class size reduction and replace with the existing enforcement authority specified in s. 1008.32, F.S. Under the provisions of this section, if a school district is able to demonstrate that it has taken all appropriate steps to comply with class size requirements, or is able to demonstrate that extenuating circumstances have prevented compliance, no sanctions should be applied.

RHMelton 1/18/08

NEW SUBSECTION TO SECTION 1003.03
Class Size – Exigent Flexibility Exception

(6) EXIGENT FLEXIBILITY EXCEPTION.--

(a) Beginning in the 2008-2009 fiscal year, and for each year thereafter, each school district shall utilize official estimates of projected student enrollment as of August 1 of each school year and make assignments in order to meet the constitutional class size maximums described in subsection (1) as determined at the classroom level for the school year.

(b) In the event of unexpected student enrollment growth after the school year begins, which will require a school district to take action to meet the constitutional class size maximums described in subsection (1), after the alternatives described in subsections (4) and (5) have been considered and implemented, and upon a district finding that further action to attain compliance is either not practical or would be educationally unsound and disruptive to students, a district may declare the need for an exigent flexibility exception.

1. Actions that shall be considered either not practical or educationally unsound and disruptive to students shall include, but not be limited to: the breakup of a classroom after the school year begins, establishing a new class at the school or transferring a student or students to another school in the district;

2. If an exigent flexibility exception is declared by a school district the following conditions shall apply:

A. The exigent flexibility exception shall expire at the end of the school year;

B. No individual classroom in a school which experiences unexpected enrollment growth requiring the declaration of an exigent flexibility exception shall exceed five students above the maximums described in subsection (1);

C. Notwithstanding subsection 6(b), if the unexpected enrollment growth results in

more than five students above the maximums described in subsection (1), the school district shall establish an additional class or take other permitted action to reduce the class size to the maximums described in subsection (1);

D. A school operating under an exigent flexibility exception shall not exceed the maximums described in subsection (1) at the school level for the school year;

E. A school district with a school operating under an exigent flexibility exception shall develop a plan to provide that each such school will be in full compliance with the maximums described in subsection (1) at the classroom level during the following school year.

3. A school district shall be considered to be in compliance with class size requirements when utilizing the exigent flexibility exception established in this subsection.

1003.03 Maximum class size.--

(1) CONSTITUTIONAL CLASS SIZE MAXIMUMS.--Pursuant to s. 1, Art. IX of the State Constitution, beginning in the 2010-2011 school year:

(a) The maximum number of students assigned to each teacher who is teaching core-curricula courses in public school classrooms for prekindergarten through grade 3 may not exceed 18 students.

(b) The maximum number of students assigned to each teacher who is teaching core-curricula courses in public school classrooms for grades 4 through 8 may not exceed 22 students.

(c) The maximum number of students assigned to each teacher who is teaching core-curricula courses in public school classrooms for grades 9 through 12 may not exceed 25 students.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.--

(a) Beginning with the 2003-2004 fiscal year, each school district that is not in compliance with the maximums in subsection (1) shall reduce the average number of students per classroom in each of the following grade groupings: prekindergarten through grade 3, grade 4 through grade 8, and grade 9 through grade 12, by at least two students each year.

(b) Determination of the number of students per classroom in paragraph (a) shall be calculated as follows:

1. For fiscal years 2003-2004 through 2005-2006, the calculation for compliance for each of the 3 grade groupings shall be the average at the district level.
2. For fiscal years 2006-2007 through 2007-2008, the calculation for compliance for each of the 3 grade groupings shall be the average at the school level.
3. For fiscal years 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and thereafter, the calculation for compliance

shall be at the individual classroom level.

4. For fiscal years 2006-2007 through 2009-2010 and thereafter, each teacher assigned to any classroom shall be included in the calculation for compliance.

(c) The Department of Education shall annually calculate each of the three average class size measures defined in paragraphs (a) and (b) based upon the October student membership survey. For purposes of determining the baseline from which each district's average class size must be reduced for the 2003-2004 school year, the department shall use data from the February 2003 student membership survey updated to include classroom identification numbers as required by the department.

(d) Prior to the adoption of the district school budget for 2004-2005, each district school board shall hold public hearings to review school attendance zones in order to ensure maximum use of facilities while minimizing the additional use of transportation in order to comply with the two-student-per-year reduction required in paragraph (a). School districts that meet the constitutional class size maximums described in subsection (1) are exempt from this requirement.

(3) IMPLEMENTATION OPTIONS.--District school boards must consider, but are not limited to, implementing the following items in order to meet the constitutional class size maximums described in subsection (1) and the two-student-per-year reduction required in subsection (2):

(a) Adopt policies to encourage qualified students to take dual enrollment courses.

(b) Adopt policies to encourage students to take courses from the Florida Virtual School.

(c)1. Repeal district school board policies that require students to have more than 24 credits to graduate from high school.

2. Adopt policies to allow students to graduate from high school as soon as they pass the

grade 10 FCAT and complete the courses required for high school graduation.

(d) Use methods to maximize use of instructional staff, such as changing required teaching loads and scheduling of planning periods, deploying district employees that have professional certification to the classroom, using adjunct educators, or any other method not prohibited by law.

(e) Use innovative methods to reduce the cost of school construction by using prototype school designs, using SMART Schools designs, participating in the School Infrastructure Thrift Program, or any other method not prohibited by law.

(f) Use joint-use facilities through partnerships with community colleges, state universities, and private colleges and universities. Joint-use facilities available for use as K-12 classrooms that do not meet the K-12 State Regulations for Educational Facilities in the Florida Building Code may be used at the discretion of the district school board provided that such facilities meet all other health, life, safety, and fire codes.

(g) Adopt alternative methods of class scheduling, such as block scheduling.

(h) Redraw school attendance zones to maximize use of facilities while minimizing the additional use of transportation.

(i) Operate schools beyond the normal operating hours to provide classes in the evening or operate more than one session of school during the day.

(j) Use year-round schools and other nontraditional calendars that do not adversely impact annual assessment of student achievement.

(k) Review and consider amending any collective bargaining contracts that hinder the implementation of class size reduction.

(l) Use any other approach not prohibited by law.

(4) ACCOUNTABILITY.--

(a)1. Beginning in the 2003-2004 fiscal year, if the department determines for any year that a school district has not reduced average class size as required in subsection (2) at the time of the third FEFP calculation, the department shall calculate an amount from the class size reduction operating categorical which is proportionate to the amount of class size reduction not accomplished. Upon verification of the department's calculation by the Florida Education Finance Program Appropriation Allocation Conference and not later than March 1 of each year, the Executive Office of the Governor shall transfer undistributed funds equivalent to the calculated amount from the district's class size reduction operating categorical to an approved fixed capital outlay appropriation for class size reduction in the affected district pursuant to s. 216.292(2)(d). The amount of funds transferred shall be the lesser of the amount verified by the Florida Education Finance Program Appropriation Allocation Conference or the undistributed balance of the district's class size reduction operating categorical.

2. In lieu of the transfer required by subparagraph 1., the Commissioner of Education may recommend a budget amendment, subject to approval by the Legislative Budget Commission, to transfer an alternative amount of funds from the district's class size reduction operating categorical to its approved fixed capital outlay account for class size reduction if the commissioner finds that the State Board of Education has reviewed evidence indicating that a district has been unable to meet class size reduction requirements despite appropriate effort to do so. The commissioner's budget amendment must be submitted to the Legislative Budget Commission by February 15 of each year.

(b) Beginning in the 2005-2006 school year, the department shall determine by January 15 of each year which districts have not met the two-student-per-year reduction required in subsection (2) based upon a comparison of the district's October student membership survey

for the current school year and the February 2003 baseline student membership survey. The department shall report such districts to the Legislature. Each district that has not met the two-student-per-year reduction shall be required to implement one of the following policies in the subsequent school year unless the department finds that the district comes into compliance based upon the February student membership survey:

1. Year-round schools;
2. Double sessions;
3. Rezoning; or
4. Maximizing use of instructional staff by changing required teacher loads and scheduling of planning periods, deploying school district employees who have professional certification to the classroom, using adjunct educators, operating schools beyond the normal operating hours to provide classes in the evening, or operating more than one session during the day.

A school district that is required to implement one of the policies outlined in subparagraphs 1.-4. shall correct in the year of implementation any past deficiencies and bring the district into compliance with the two-student-per-year reduction goals established for the district by the department pursuant to subsection (2). A school district may choose to implement more than one of these policies. The district school superintendent shall report to the Commissioner of Education the extent to which the district implemented any of the policies outlined in subparagraphs 1.-4. in a format to be specified by the Commissioner of Education. The Department of Education shall use the enforcement authority provided in s. 1008.32 to ensure that districts comply with the provisions of this paragraph.

(c) Beginning in the 2006-2007 school year, the department shall annually determine which districts do not meet the requirements described in subsection (2). In addition to enforcement authority provided in s. 1008.32, the Department of Education shall develop a constitutional compliance plan for each such district which includes, but is not limited to,

redrawing school attendance zones to maximize use of facilities while minimizing the additional use of transportation unless the department finds that the district comes into compliance based upon the February student membership survey and the other accountability policies listed in paragraph (b). Each district school board shall implement the constitutional compliance plan developed by the state board until the district complies with the constitutional class size maximums.

(5) TEAM-TEACHING STRATEGIES.--

(a) School districts may use teaching strategies that include the assignment of more than one teacher to a classroom of students and that were implemented before July 1, 2005. Effective July 1, 2005, school districts may implement additional teaching strategies that include the assignment of more than one teacher to a classroom of students for the following purposes only:

1. Pairing teachers for the purpose of staff development.
2. Pairing new teachers with veteran teachers.
3. Reducing turnover among new teachers.
4. Pairing teachers who are teaching out-of-field with teachers who are in-field.
5. Providing for more flexibility and innovation in the classroom.
6. Improving learning opportunities for students, including students who have disabilities.

(b) Teaching strategies, including team teaching, co-teaching, or inclusion teaching, implemented on or after July 1, 2005, pursuant to paragraph (a) may be implemented subject to the following restrictions:

1. Reasonable limits shall be placed on the number of students in a classroom so that classrooms are not overcrowded. Teacher-to-student ratios within a curriculum area or

grade level must not exceed constitutional limits.

2. At least one member of the team must have at least 3 years of teaching experience.
3. At least one member of the team must be teaching in-field.
4. The teachers must be trained in team-teaching methods within 1 year after assignment.

(c) As used in this subsection, the term:

1. "Team teaching" or "co-teaching" means two or more teachers are assigned to a group of students and each teacher is responsible for all of the students during the entire class period. In order to be considered team teaching or co-teaching, each teacher is responsible for planning, delivering, and evaluating instruction for all students in the class or subject for the entire class period.

2. "Inclusion teaching" means two or more teachers are assigned to a group of students, but one of the teachers is responsible for only one student or a small group of students in the classroom. The use of strategies implemented as outlined in this subsection meets the letter and intent of the Florida Constitution and the Florida Statutes which relate to implementing class size reduction, and this subsection applies retroactively. A school district may not be penalized financially or otherwise as a result of the use of any legal strategy, including, but not limited to, those set forth in subsection (3) and this subsection.

(6) EXIGENT FLEXIBILITY EXCEPTION.--

(a) Beginning in the 2008-2009 fiscal year, and for each year thereafter, each school district shall utilize official estimates of projected student enrollment as of August 1 of each school year and make assignments in order to meet the constitutional class size maximums described in subsection (1) as determined at the classroom level for the school year.

(b) In the event of unexpected student enrollment growth after the school year begins, which will require a school district to take action to meet the constitutional class size

maximums described in subsection (1), after the alternatives described in subsections (4) and (5) have been considered and implemented, and upon a district finding that further action to attain compliance is either not practical or would be educationally unsound and disruptive to students, a district may declare the need for an exigent flexibility exception.

1. Actions that shall be considered either not practical or educationally unsound and disruptive to students shall include, but not be limited to: the breakup of a classroom after the school year begins, establishing a new class at the school or transferring a student or students to another school in the district;

2. If an exigent flexibility exception is declared by a school district the following conditions shall apply:

A. The exigent flexibility exception shall expire at the end of the school year;

B. No individual classroom in a school which experiences unexpected enrollment growth requiring the declaration of an exigent flexibility exception shall exceed five students above the maximums described in subsection (1);

C. Notwithstanding subsection 6(b), if the unexpected enrollment growth results in more than five students above the maximums described in subsection (1), the school district shall establish an additional class or take other permitted action to reduce the class size to the maximums described in subsection (1);

D. A school operating under an exigent flexibility exception shall not exceed the maximums described in subsection (1) at the school level for the school year;

E. A school district with a school operating under an exigent flexibility exception shall develop a plan to provide that each such school will be in full compliance with the maximums described in subsection (1) at the classroom level during the following school year.

3. A school district shall be considered to be in compliance with class size requirements when utilizing the exigent flexibility exception established in this subsection.