Florida School Boards Association
The voice of education in Florida.

FLORIDA SENATE AND HOUSE BUDGET PROPOSALS
2020-2021 FISCAL YEAR

Over the past week, the Florida Senate and House both released their proposed budgets for the 2020 – 2021 fiscal year. This is the beginning of the process that occurs each year to build Florida's budget. The passage of the General Appropriations Act (GAA) is the only work that must be accomplished in order for the legislative session to end. If the two chambers cannot come to agreement on the allocation of funds by the last day of the 60-day Session, the Session is either extended until a budget can be agreed upon or a special session is called where the House and Senate must return and approve a budget. The release of the budgets is in keeping with the timeline necessary to end this session on time.

In addition to the release of the General Appropriations Act, each chamber has introduced an implementing bill. As the name implies, the implementing bill contains language to guide the implementation of the requirements in the GAA. Items in the GAA and the implementing bill are in effect only until June 30, 2021. Additionally, each chamber has introduced conforming bills that propose permanent changes to Florida Statute to conform law to the items in the GAA. Lastly, each chamber has introduced substantive legislation to change the employer contribution rate for the Florida Retirement (FRS). The GAA, Implementing, Conforming, and FRS Rate legislation must be agreed upon by the House and Senate and dictates the budget for the coming fiscal year.

As required by Florida statute, each chamber has produced and made available a document that displays the calculations used by the Florida Legislature in making appropriations for the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP). This document shows the district-by-district appropriations allocation for all programs in the FEFP. This is a valuable document for communicating with the members of your delegation.

The district-by-district documents are available by clicking the links below.

Senate District-by-District: Senate - Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)

House District-By-District: House - Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)

Now that the proposed budgets have been released, each chamber will discuss, debate, amend and approve each budget. It is important to note that the total amount of money that has been allocated to Education as well as to other subcommittees will not change and any amendments by members must be balanced. For an amendment to be balanced, the member proposing the amendment must identify, within the same subcommittee, the specific appropriation line item number and source of funding within that line item, and the amount to be taken to fund their amendment. The funding for any additional new projects that are amended into the budget are taken from other areas of education. Once the budgets are amended and approved, the chambers will be prepared for the budget conference process to begin. Now is the time to communicate with your delegation about their proposed budgets and about the needs of your district.

This document focuses on items in the budget proposals that will have the greatest impact on school districts. Specifically:

- Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) and Base Student Allocation (BSA)
- Funding for Student Enrollment Growth
- Florida Retirement System (FRS) Rate Changes
- Best and Brightest Bonus Program
- Digital Classrooms Allocation – House Proposed Elimination
- Total Funds Compression Adjustment – House Proposed Elimination
- Changes to the District Cost Differential (DCD) formula – House Proposal
- The House and Senate Teacher Salary Proposals

THE FLORIDA EDUCATION FINANCE PROGRAM (FEFP) AND THE BASE STUDENT ALLOCATION (BSA)

The Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) was adopted by the legislature in 1973. It was devised to meet the constitutional requirement for a uniform system of free public education and the allocation model is based on individual student participation in educational programs. It is a formula that drives the largest portion of school districts' operating budgets.

The Base Student Allocation (BSA) is a component within the FEFP and it is the base amount prescribed by the legislature and used to calculate the funding of FEFP. To calculate the student driven FEFP formula, you begin with Unweighted Full Time Equivalent (UFTE) student enrollment. Because the formula is driven by students' participation in education programs and some programs are more costly than others, the student enrollment (UFTE) is multiplied by a program cost factor that is designed to basically capture the increased cost of certain programs or age groups. A Weighted Full Time Equivalent (WFTE) enrollment number is determined by the calculation of UFTE enrollment multiplied by the program cost factor. The total WFTE in each district is then multiplied by the BSA and the District Cost Differential (DCD).

In this year's budget, the House proposed an increase in the BSA of $50 per WFTE, which generates about $159,129,979 of increased funding for 3,182,599.57 WFTE students statewide. The Senate proposed a BSA increase of $40.17 per WFTE or about $127,845,025 of increased funding statewide.

When the BSA is increased, it generates higher funding in the Base FEFP. The funds in the Base FEFP are separate from categorical funding and FEFP funds have rarely been earmarked for specific purposes. This is why the funding generated by the BSA has sometimes been referred to as flexible or unencumbered funds.

However, it is important to note that these flexible or unencumbered funds must pay for certain increases in expenses and a BSA that is too low may not generate enough funding for those cost increases. For example, the increase in the BSA pays for items like utility or health insurance increases as well as general inflationary cost increases. In this particular budget cycle, the Florida Retirement System (FRS) rate increases are larger than anticipated and therefore will consume a good portion of the proposed increase of the BSA. In years past, the Legislature has sometimes provided a separate line-item funding for FRS rate increases but neither chamber has proposed a separate line item to fund this unusually large rate increase so the cost of this increase must be paid from the increase in the BSA. Additionally, any time a proposal is made that is either unfunded or underfunded, dollars from the Base FEFP must be used for those costs. This is also true of categoricals that are underfunded. For example, cuts in the Reading and Transportation categoricals were never restored after the recession ended therefore those costs continue to be paid for by the funds in the Base FEFP.

The total proposed increase of the Base FEFP by the Senate is $325,000,344 and the total proposed increase by the House is $371,441,102. These proposed amounts are not all additional funds per student.

FUNDING FOR STUDENT ENROLLMENT GROWTH

Both chambers added funds to the Base FEFP to pay for increased student enrollment referred to as workload increase. About $197,968,822 of each total increase in Base FEFP funding pays for the cost of an enrollment growth of 31,215.90 new UFTE students, based on their conversion to 46,259.91 WFTE students.

As stated earlier, the total increase of the Base FEFP in the budget proposals is not all flexible, unencumbered funds. The growth portion of the increase in the Base FEFP pays for the increased cost of student enrollment. This increase in the Base FEFP reflects only the increase that some districts will receive in their Base FEFP simply due to having increased student enrollment.

The House and Senate used the same growth of 46,259.91 WFTE to calculate the funds for enrollment growth. The 46,259.91 WFTE students were funded at the current year BSA of $4,279.49 to pay for Base FEFP growth. That growth costs $197,968,822.

In addition to the workload increase funded in the Base FEFP, workload increases were provided in most but not all of the FEFP categoticals for enrollment growth. Both chambers propose workload funding for the ESE Guaranteed Allocation, the Supplemental Academic Instruction Allocation, Instructional Materials, and for Student Transportation.

Florida Retirement System (FRS) Rate Changes

Both chambers have released their FRS Appropriations bills (HB 5007 and SB 7044) that present the rate changes that employers are required to pay for the FRS benefits of their employees. The FRS employer rates are set annually based on the results of FRS actuarial studies. Recent studies stated that the returns assumed from the FRS investment portfolio were excessively optimistic and needed to be reduced to an assumed annual rate of return of 6.5%. As a result, the employer rates include an unusually large increase for this fiscal year.

The staff analyses that accompanied the legislation, Senate Bill 7044 and House Bill 5007 include fiscal impact statements. The statements project that the rate increases would cost all FRS employers about $404.5 million and would cost district school boards about $232.7 million.

As discussed earlier in this document, there are no specific appropriations in the K-12 education budgets proposed by either chamber to provide additional revenue to pay for the cost of the FRS employer rate increase. The increase in the BSA is the only proposed source of new, additional revenue that could be used for the rate increase. Remember that the House proposed an increase of $50 per WFTE and the Senate proposed an increase of $40.17 per WFTE in the BSA. The total funds associated with that increase in the House was about $159,129,979, and in the Senate the amount was about $127,845,025. This clearly shows that the additional new funds proposed in the BSA of either chamber will not cover the cost of the FRS rate increase. In order to pay only the cost of the rate changes, a BSA increase of about $73.12 is needed.

Best and Brightest Bonus Program

Both chambers are proposing the elimination of the Best and Brightest Teacher and Principal Bonus Program for the 2020-2021 fiscal year. The bonus program has been somewhat controversial since its inception and discussions have included that elimination of the program would help fund the new teacher salary allocation that appears in the FY 2020-2021 House and Senate proposed budgets.

The proposed Senate budget contains a $500 million Teacher Salary Increase Allocation and the proposed House budget contains a $650 million Salary Enhancement Supplement Allocation. It would make sense to assume that each chamber is intending to eliminate the Best and Brightest program and allocation and use those funds to assist in the creation of a new teacher salary program and allocation.

The Best and Brightest Bonus program is addressed by the Senate in multiple bills. Senate Bill 486 sponsored by Senator Rob Bradley, Chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee, permanently repeals the program. The Senate Implementing Bill, SB 2502 contains language that would suspend the allocation. for FY 2020-2021. This is done so that in the event that SB 486 that repeals the Best and Brightest program does not pass, the program would be suspended and the $284,500,000 would still be available for a new teacher salary program or for other purposes.

The House addressed the Best and Brightest program by including language to repeal the program in their proposed Implementing bill, HB 5101.

Digital Classrooms Allocation – House Proposed Elimination

This funding item was created to provide funding for the technology devices and infrastructure needed for public schools throughout Florida. The allocation was initially funded at $80 million, then reduced to $70 million in FY 2018-2019, $20 million in FY 2019-2020 and the House proposes to repeal it completely in 2020-2021. The Senate proposes to continue to provide $20 million for the Digital Classrooms Allocation. Because each district begins with a minimum allocation of $250,000, the elimination of this allocation has an unusually large impact on the average dollars per UFTE student in small districts.

Total Funds Compression Adjustment – House Proposed Elimination

This funding item was added to the FEFP to address the wide difference in per student funding among districts. It is calculated to bring the lowest funded districts closer to the statewide average dollars for UFTE student. The Senate FEFP proposes $52,119,565 for this FEFP item. The House FEFP proposes to repeal this FEFP item so no funding was proposed in their budget for this item.

This will be a negotiation issue between the two chambers. Current law provides for the expiration of the Compression Allocation on June 30, 2020. Senate Bill 62 contains language that would remove the expiration language and make the adjustment language permanent. SB 2502 contains language that moves the expiration date to June 30, 2021 so that if SB 62 is not approved, and SB 2502 passes , the Compression Adjustment Allocation would be extended for one more year. This is assuming that the language in SB 2502 that would extend the allocation for one more year is retained through the conferencing of the budget.

The House proposed the total repeal of the Funding Adjustment Allocation. Language that repeals the Allocation was placed in HB 5101, the House Education Budget Conforming bill.

The House's proposed elimination of the Total Funds Compression Adjustment and the Digital Classroom Allocation accounts for a difference of $72,119,565 between the House and Senate the FEFP proposals.

Changes to the District Cost Differential (DCD) Formula – House Proposal

The District Cost Differential (DCD) is a component of the FEFP that takes into account the differences in the cost of living expenses from district to district. It was designed to help equalize budgets by providing additional funding to districts where various costs are higher than in other districts.

In 2004, a legislative study of the DCD was released and the DCD was subsequently modified to take into consideration an "amenity" index, a factor which attempted to quantify the fact that people will accept higher living costs when an area offers unique and desirable professional, intellectual, and recreational opportunities. This policy change has been controversial and challenged since it was adopted

In this budget cycle, the House of Representatives has proposed a major change in the process used to calculate the DCD. The proposal is contained in the HB 5101. The House proposes to assign the responsibility for calculating the DCD to the Office of Economic and Demographic Research (EDR), the economic forecasting staff of the Legislature. Previously the DCD was calculated by economists on staff at the University of Florida's Bureau of Economic and Business Research. The new DCD is proposed to be calculated based on a Comparable Wage Index (CWI) – calculated as required by the language in the bill, rather than based on the Florida Price Level Index (FPLI). The language establishing the CWI is relatively complicated.

The actual process of calculating the CWI is not really relevant to the school districts except to the extent that the district might be interested in those elements as a part of the legislative process. What is important to school districts is the calculated DCD that is the result of the formula and is applied to the district's calculations of the Base FEFP and the Class Size Reduction allocation. It should also be noted that the House phases the new DCD in over a three year period.

The implementation language is as follows:

"1. For the 2020-2021 fiscal year, the district cost differentials differential shall be calculated by adding each district's 2019 comparable wage index and the district's 2018 and 2017 price level indexes index as published in the Florida Price Level Index for the most recent 3 years and dividing the resulting sum by 3. The result for each district shall be multiplied by 0.008 and to the resulting product shall be added 0.200; the sum thus obtained shall be the cost differential for that district for that year.

2. For the 2021-2022 fiscal year, the district cost differentials shall be calculated by adding the district's 2019 and 2020 comparable wage indexes and the district's 2018 price level index as published in the Florida Price Level Index and dividing the resulting sum by 3. The result for each district shall be multiplied by 0.008 and to the resulting product shall be added 0.200.

3. Beginning in the 2022-2023 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, the district cost differentials shall be calculated by adding the most recent 3 years of comparable wage indexes for the district and dividing the resulting sum by 3. The result for each district shall be multiplied by 0.008 and to the resulting product shall be added 0.200."

If the district's DCD as calculated in the House FEFP run is higher as a result of the first year's implementation, it would seem reasonable that the larger DCD is related to the use of the wage index and that the district's DCD is likely to continue to increase as the new DCD is fully implemented. Likewise, if the district's DCD has gotten smaller with the first year's implementation, it seems logical that the district's DCD is likely to continue to get smaller through full implementation.

PROPOSED TEACHER SALARY ALLOCATIONS

Teacher salaries is a major issue in the Governor's proposed 2020 budget. Both the Senate and the House have included teacher salary increases in their proposals for the General Appropriations Act. The House also included teacher salary language in its education conforming bill, HB 5101, and the Senate included language in SB 62, which is a vehicle that also includes budget conforming language. The language included in the House and Senate bills is pasted below. The following information is an effort to provide a simplified explanation of the teacher salary language.

In Specific Appropriation (SA) 92 of SB 2500 the Senate provided $500 million for the Teacher Salary Increase Allocation pursuant to the new language the Senate inserted into Florida Statutes s.1011.62 (22) specifying how the funds are to be allocated to teachers. The statements of the funds available for teacher raises has a provision that states, "Appropriated funds also include associated employer costs." This means that the FICA and FRS payments associated with the raises are included in the $500 million. It is estimated that those employer costs will be about 17.7% of the total when the new FRS rates are incorporated into the costs. That would mean that about 82.3% of the appropriated funds, or about $411,500,000 would be available to be dispersed into the teacher salary schedule.

The Senate language divides its appropriation into two "buckets." The first is comprised of 80% of the total appropriation. The language directs districts to use that 80% as follows.

"Eighty percent of the total allocation is provided for school districts to increase the minimum salary for full-time classroom teachers as defined in section 1012.01(2)(a), plus certified prekindergarten teachers, but not including substitute teachers. The minimum salary goal shall be $47,500. Any eligible teacher whose annual salary is below the minimum salary goal, including first year teachers, shall be provided a salary or salary increase to the minimum that is achievable by the district's share of eighty percent of the total allocation of the funds provided. If a district achieves or is at or above the $47,500 minimum but has not increased the minimum salary by at least ten percent, the district shall use funds remaining from the eighty percent allocation to increase the minimum by at least ten percent."

The language establishes the goal of a minimum salary of $47,500 for each classroom teacher as defined in the bill. The districts are to use the first 80% of the funds to move the minimum salary for classroom teachers as close to that $47,500 as possible. If the district had a relatively high minimum salary and there is revenue remaining after achieving the $47,500 minimum salary, and the increase resulting from the application of the revenue to reach the minimum of $47,500 did not result in an increase of at least 10%, then the funds should be used to ensure that the raise resulting from the increase was at least 10%. It appears that the allocation of the first 80% of the funds must be distributed as mandated by law and is not subject to negotiations.

The remaining 20% of the Senate allocation is specified to be used as prescribed by SB 2500:

"Twenty percent of the total allocation, plus any remaining funds from the district's share of the eighty percent allocation, may be used to provide salary increases for all instructional personnel as defined in section 1012.01(2)(a)-(d), plus certified prekindergarten teachers, but not including substitutes. Teachers who receive an increase from the minimum salary allocation may also participate in the salary increase provided from the district's share of twenty percent of the total allocation."

A key word in this section is "may." The districts are authorized, but not required to use these funds to provide raises to the other instructional personnel identified in the statute cited. It should also be noted that the district "may" use some of these funds to provide raises to classroom teachers who benefitted from raises from the first bucket. One such use would be to provide relief from the compression of the salary schedule caused by the establishment of a minimum salary amount of up to $47,500. Because the language related to the remaining 20% is permissive, it appears that the use of this portion of the funds may be subject to negotiations with the districts' unions.

Another key component of the Senate language is the following:

"Appropriated funds also include associated employer costs. Districts shall transfer the minimum base salary and salary increase funds locally to the district postsecondary program for eligible adult education and certified technical education instructors."

First it is important to remember that about 17.7% of the salary allocation will not be available to provide raises to classroom teachers or other employees because of the need to pay for employer payroll taxes for FICA and to pay for employer required FRS rates.

Second, the requirement to transfer some of these funds from the General Fund into the Adult Postsecondary program has potential audit implications. If districts have to follow these requirements the question arises whether or not there is a comparability issue because funds are not required to be used to add raises for classroom teachers paid by federal funds. Work needs to be done to address this issue.

The HB 5001 provides a total of $650 million for the Teacher Salary Enhancement Supplement. The language in the House proposed GAA is presented below. It should be noted that nowhere in the House language in the GAA nor in the proposed House conforming bill is there any statement that the allocation includes funding for employer expenses. Employer expenses would include employer payroll taxes for FICA and the employer FRS charges. Together these costs are about 17.7%, assuming the new FRS rates are adopted beginning July 1, 2020. In addition, when reading the House language, it should be remembered that s.1012.01 (2) (a) states the following:

"INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL.—"Instructional personnel" means any K-12 staff member whose function includes the provision of direct instructional services to students. Instructional personnel also includes K-12 personnel whose functions provide direct support in the learning process of students. Included in the classification of instructional personnel are the following K-12 personnel:

(a) *Classroom teachers.*—Classroom teachers are staff members assigned the professional activity of instructing students in courses in classroom situations, including basic instruction, exceptional student education, career education, and adult education, including substitute teachers."

Unlike the Senate language, nowhere in the House language is there an exclusion for substitute teachers. The House language is as follows:

"From the funds provided in Specific Appropriations 8 and 92 for the Salary Enhancement Supplement established pursuant to section 1011.62, Florida Statutes, $500 million is provided for each school district to increase the minimum base salary for a full-time classroom teacher, as defined in section 1012.01(2)(a), Florida Statutes, to an amount that is achievable by the school district's portion of the $500 million; however, no school district is required to increase the minimum base salary to an amount that exceeds $50,000. School districts shall use their portion of the supplement to increase the minimum base salary for a beginning full-time classroom teacher while ensuring that no minimum base salary on the school district's salary schedule is less than the new minimum base salary for a beginning full-time classroom teacher. If a school district's salary schedule for a full-time classroom teacher has no minimum base salary below $50,000, any remaining funds may be used by the school district to provide salary and other compensation-related enhancements for instructional personnel as defined in section 1012.01(2), Florida Statutes and educational support employees as defined in section 1012.01(6), Florida Statutes.

From the funds provided in Specific Appropriations 8 and 92 for the Salary Enhancement Supplement established pursuant to section 1011.62, Florida Statutes, $150 million is provided for each school district to provide salary and other compensation-related enhancements for full-time classroom teachers, as defined in section 1012.01(2)(a), Florida Statutes, who did not receive an increase as a result of the school district's increase to the minimum base salary pursuant to section 1011.62, Florida Statutes."

In addition to the language in the proposed House GAA, there is also language related to the Salary Enhancement Supplement included in HB 5101, the House proposed education conforming bill. Lines 261-296 creates a new (8) of s. 1011.62 of Florida Statutes, as a part of the law that prescribes the FEFP. The section of the bill is provided below:

(8) SALARY ENHANCEMENT SUPPLEMENT.—The Legislature may annually provide in the Florida Education Finance Program a salary enhancement supplement to assist school districts in their recruitment and retention of classroom teachers and other instructional and educational support staff. The amount of the supplement shall be specified in the General Appropriations Act and shall be allocated to each school district based on each school district's proportionate share of the state's total unweighted full-time equivalent student enrollment.

(a)1. For fiscal year 2020-2021, each school district shall use its portion of the supplement as specified in the General Appropriations Act to increase the minimum base salary for a classroom teacher, as defined in s. 1012.01(2)(a). The term "minimum base salary" means the annual base salary that a full-time classroom teacher receives before payroll deductions and excluding supplements, as defined in s. 1012.22(1)(c).

2. For fiscal year 2020-2021, each school district shall use its portion of the supplement as specified in the General Appropriations Act to provide salary and compensation related enhancements for full-time classroom teachers, as defined in s.1012.01(2)(a), who did not receive an increase under 281 subparagraph 1.

(b) Beginning in fiscal year 2021-2022 and subject to legislative appropriation, each school district shall use its portion of the supplement as specified in the General Appropriations Act to increase the minimum base salary for a classroom teacher, as defined in s. 1012.01(2)(a), by at least 75 percent of the largest salary adjustment made by the school district for a classroom teacher who is rated as highly effective, as determined by the classroom teacher's performance evaluation under s. 1012.34. If a school district has any remaining funds after complying with the 75 percent increase to the minimum base salary, such funds shall be used to provide salary and compensation related enhancements for instructional personnel, as defined in s. 1012.01(2), or educational support employees, as defined in s. 1012.01(6).

The language in the House conforming bill ties the second year of any subsequent appropriation back to the district performance-based salary schedule required by law.

The House and the Senate also differ on how the funds are to be distributed to school districts. SB 62 directs the funds to be distributed to school districts based on each district's share of the Base FEFP funding. The House language requires that the funds be distributed based on the district's share of UFTE enrollment. The difference between the methods of distribution has implications for districts because the calculation of the Base FEFP incorporates the DCD, which would increase and decrease funds for the salary allocation accordingly.

CAPITAL OUTLAY ISSUES

The House and the Senate differ about public school capital outlay issues. Both SB 2500 and HB 5001 provide $169,600,000 for charter school capital outlay funding. Neither bill provides any state capital outlay PECO funding for district operated public schools.

SB 62 contains language related to charter school capital outlay issues, including language that requires that "personal enrichment" provisions included in the bill are met as one of the conditions for charter schools to qualify for capital outlay funding. That language is pasted presented below:

"(c) A charter school additionally is not eligible for a funding allocation unless the chair of the governing board and the chief administrative officer of the charter school annually certify under oath that the funds will be used solely and exclusively for constructing, renovating, leasing, purchasing, financing or improving charter school facilities that are:

1. Owned by a school district, political subdivision of the state, municipality, Florida College System institution, or state university; or

2. Owned by an organization, qualified as an exempt organization under s.501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, or a tax support organization under section 509 of the Internal Revenue Code, whose articles of incorporation specify that upon the organization's dissolution, the subject property, subject to any indebtedness secured thereby and the satisfaction of the organization's other debts, will be transferred as indicated in the articles of incorporation to: 1

a. Another such exempt organization, including one organized for educational purposes.

b. A school district or other political subdivision of the state.

c. A municipality.

d. A Florida College System institution.
e. A state university; or
3. Owned by and leased from, at a fair market value, a person or entity that is not an affiliated party of the charter school. For purposes of this subparagraph, the term “affiliated party of the charter school” means the applicant for the charter school pursuant to s. 1002.33; the governing board of the charter school or a member of the governing board; the charter school principal; an individual employed by the charter school; or a relative, as defined in s. 1002.33(24)(a)2., of a charter school governing board member, a charter school principal or a charter school employee.
(3) If the school board levies the discretionary millage authorized in s. 1011.71(2), and the state funds appropriated for charter school capital outlay in any fiscal year are less than $165 million ~~the average charter school capital outlay 1299 funds per unweighted full-time equivalent student for the 2018-1300 2019 fiscal year, multiplied by the estimated number of charter school students for the applicable fiscal year, and adjusted by 1302 changes in the Consumer Price Index issued by the United States 1303 Department of Labor from the previous fiscal year, the school students for the applicable fiscal year, and adjusted by 1302 changes in the Consumer Price Index issued by the United States 1303 Department of Labor from the previous fiscal year,~~ the department shall use the following calculation methodology to determine the amount of revenue that a school district must distribute to each eligible charter school…”

The methodology that follows in statute is the same one that has been in place.

The House and the Senate also treat funding for Special Facilities projects differently.

In SB 2500, the Senate provides the following Special Facilities projects. HB 5001 only provides the funds noted above for the third year of the Gilchrist County project.

“25 FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY SPECIAL FACILITY CONSTRUCTION ACCOUNTFROM PUBLIC EDUCATION CAPITAL OUTLAY AND DEBT SERVICE TRUST FUND: $41,304,151
Funds in Specific Appropriation 25 are nonrecurring and shall be allocated in accordance with section 1013.64(2), Florida Statutes, as follows:

Gilchrist (3rd and final year)............$7,205,344
Baker (1st of 3 years).......................$8,504,580
Bradford (1st of 3 years).................$13,178,063
Levy(1st of 3 years).......................$12,416,164”

Increased Total Potential FEFP Revenues vs New Required FEFP Expenses

As the House and Senate prepare to take up their respective General Appropriations bills it is useful to compare the total potential new FEFP funds provided by the House and the Senate with the new required expenses included by each chamber. The table below displays that information.

Item	House	Senate
Increase in Total Potential FEFP Revenue	$868,778,922	$762,800,566
Major Reductions in FEFP Programs[1]	$284,500,000	$284,500,000
Total Revenue Available	$1,153,288,922	$1,047,300,566
Cost of Growth in the Base FEFP WFTE X Base BSA	($197,968,822)	($197,968,822)
Cost of Teacher Salary Allocation	($650,000,000)	($500,000,000)
Additional Cost of Mental Health Allocation	($25,000,000)	($25,000,000)
Additional Cost of Class Size Reduction	($33,759,179)	($33,764,694)
Cost of FRS Employer Rate Increase	($232,700,000)	($232,700,000)
Total of New Required FEFP Expenses	($1,139,428,001)	($989,433,516)
Net Difference Between Revenue and Expenses	$13,860,921[2]	$57,867,050[2]

[1] House and Senate eliminated Best and Brightest bonus program and used the revenue to help pay salary increases.

[2] Sources of increased uncommitted new revenue include: Increase in revenue from .748 mill levy: $89,801,175, from .748 mill compression: $16,256,800 increase in BSA: House: $159,129,979, Senate: $127,845,025. Total unencumbered new revenue: House: $265,187,954; Senate: $233,903,000. These revenue sources help for the increase in FRS rates in districts that benefitted from the increases. Not all districts benefitted from these increases. There is also the restoration of proration for $29,419,812, However those funds were the result of an unanticipated enrollment increase in 2019-2020, and the cost of those students was paid for by reducing funding of other students. Therefore, in reality these funds already spent.