

LEGISLATIVE REPORT TO THE SSDCC

Presented by Chris Doolin
Robert P. Jones & Associates
June 13, 2013

BACKGROUND ON SMALL DISTRICT ISSUES

Challenges faced by small and rural school districts

- The **low tax base** impacts funds available for instruction and capital outlay needs;
- **Access to Technology and High-Speed Internet** - limited, or non-existent, in certain areas;
- **Administrative Resources** – to manage the planning and implementation of complex state and federal initiatives - – End- of Course Exams; Common Core Standards and STEM
- **Transportation costs** in sparsely populated areas- long distances, large areas; and,
- **Obtaining Grants - harder to obtain** in smaller districts.

Programs Supporting Small School Districts

- **Sparsity funding** is provided to offset to economy of scale issues;
- **Regional Consortium Service Organization** have provided important training and program assistance to small, rural districts;
- **Special Facility Construction** funding to address construction projects where districts demonstrate critical need and insufficient revenues; and
- **Compression and Equalization of millage** provisions is provided within the Florida Education Funding Program.

Major Actions on Legislative Priorities and Major Issues

- **Sparsity Supplement** - Funding Increased by \$10 million
 - FAU was not included in the Sparsity formula.
- **Regional Educational Consortia** – Funding Restored at \$1.445 million additional funding was provided to PAEC Distant Learning (\$300,000)
- **Special Facility Construction** funding –
 - Glades Project funded for first year
 - Dixie County Project did not received funding
- **Rural Technology Funding** – Funding Provided to Rural Districts
 - \$6 million appropriated to districts participating in the Regional Consortia program.
 - SB 1514 includes provision correcting list of entities receiving funding.

Legislation Impacting Small School Districts

- **Instructional Material Selection** - State Review Process Maintained allowing small districts multiple options to secure instructional materials.
- **Parental Empowerment Proposal** – Proposal did not pass - Authority left with Local School Districts
- **Proposal to transfer Public School Facilities to Charter Schools** - Proposal Did Not Pass – Control of Facilities left Under Control of Local School Districts
- **Restructuring of FHSAA** – Proposed Changes Did Not Pass!

Significant Actions Impacting Local Governments

- **Public Sector Employment Opportunities for Local Elected Officials** – Current Ability to Take Additional Employment in the Public Sector Protected
- **Public Meetings** must provide for public input.
- **Florida Retirement System** Modifications - Did Not Pass
- **Changes to Value Adjustment** Boards – Did Not Pass
- **Increased Sovereign Immunity Caps** – Did Not Pass
- **DOC Work squads/Prison Labor continued** – funding and language provided.
- **County Health Departments** - No structural changes occurred to Health Departments; funding for primary health care services in small counties are included in the budget.

Special Funding to Small Counties

- Small County Solid Waste Grants – funding increased \$600,000 to \$3 million.
- Fiscally Constrained Programs funded
 - Amendment 1 funded at \$23,750,000
 - Conservation Easement Provision – funded at \$250,000
 - Pretrial Detention – Juveniles – funded at \$3,883,853
- Small County Road Assistance - 27,661,567 (an increase of \$2 million)
- Small County Outreach Program - 49,205,899 (an increase of \$23 million)
- Small County Wastewater Treatment Grants - 23,301,810
- Florida Recreation Development Assistance Program – Small Projects list funded.
- Transportation Disadvantaged – Grants increased \$7 million to \$50,887,853
- Transportation Disadvantaged – Medicaid Services - \$61,351,633 – (\$4 million decrease)
- Disaster Preparedness Grants –\$5,856,802 (Increased by \$3.5 million)
- Emergency Management Grants – Funded at prior year level.
- Mosquito Control - Increased to \$2.6 million from \$1 million
- Payment in Lieu of Taxes Provisions for DOC sites restored

Background on
SPARSITY FUNDING

Although the Sparsity Supplement was one of the original components included in the design of the FEFP in 1973, funding was not appropriated until 1983. Each year since 1983, the Legislature has made an appropriation for the Sparsity Formula.

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|
| FY 83-84 | \$3,000,000 |
| FY 84-85 | \$4,726,287 |
| FY 85-86 | \$9,280,324 |
| FY 86-87 | \$15,000,000 |
| FY 87-88 | \$27,710,000 |
| FY 88-89 | \$30,000,000 |
| FY 89-90 | \$12,500,000 (1) |
| FY 90-91 | \$15,000,000 (2) |
| FY 91-92 | \$20,000,000 (2) |
| FY 92-93 | \$20,000,000 (3) |
| FY 93-94 | \$20,000,000 (3) |
| FY 94-95 | \$20,000,000 (3) |
| FY 95-96 | \$20,000,000 (4) |
| FY 96-97 | \$20,000,000 (4) |
| FY 97-98 | \$20,000,000 (4) |
| FY 98-99 | \$30,000,000 (4) |
| FY 99-00 | \$30,000,000 (4) |
| FY 00-01 | \$31,000,000 (4) |
| FY 01-02 | \$31,000,000 (4) |
| FY 02-03 | \$31,000,000 (4) |
| FY 03-04 | \$31,000,000 (4) |
| FY 04-05 | \$31,000,000 (5) |
| FY 05-06 | \$35,000,000 (6) |
| FY 06-07 | \$35,000,000 |
| FY 07-08 | \$39,191,698 |
| FY 08-09 | \$39,191,698 |
| FY 08-09-Rev. 3 rd calc. | \$38,345,157 (7) |
| FY 09-10 | \$35,822,046 (8) |
| FY 10-11 | \$35,754,378 |
| FY 11-12 | \$35,754,378 |
| FY 12-13 | \$35,754,378 |
| FY 13-13 | \$45,754,378 |

- (1) Legislature changed the District Cost Differential to bring districts below 1.0 to 1.0 and reduces Sparsity Funding to pay for cost of modifying DCD.
- (2) Legislature utilized a District Cost Differential based on highest DCD in the Judicial Circuit.
- (3) Legislature transposes DCD to reflect the lowest district at a Base of 1.0 and increases each district's DCD proportionately.
- (4) Legislature utilized the statutory District Cost Differential.
- (5) The Florida Legislature modified the calculation of the DCD to incorporate labor/salary costs as opposed to the traditional market basket of goods and services.
- (6) The Florida Legislature amended Florida Statutes 1011.62(6) to ensure that any district impacted negatively by the Wealth Adjustment that received less than the statewide average in per student funding could have the amount of the Wealth Adjustment modified to allow the district to receive additional funding up to the Statewide average per FTE.
- (7) Midyear budget reduction.
- (8) Reduction resulting from revenue downturn.

Background on Regional Consortium Service Organizations F.S. 1001.451

2013-14 –\$1,445,390

The Regional Consortium Service Organizations (RCSO) were an outcome of the early recognition that regional programming was a way for small and rural school districts and school boards to make advances in school improvement and provide a broader range of service through cooperative efforts.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS - F.S. 1001.451 includes specific standards and criteria for program delivery. Each of the regional consortium service organization that receive funding provide a full range of services to a larger number of students, minimizing duplication of services, and encouraging development of new programs and services. Each regional consortium service organization is required to provide, at a minimum, three of the following services: exceptional student education, teacher education centers, environmental education, federal grant procurement and coordination, data processing, health insurance, risk management insurance, staff development, purchasing, and planning and accountability.

The three Regional Consortium Service Organizations provide support to School Districts with 20,000 or fewer UWFTE through a regional delivery of service to improve student achievement through technical assistance and school improvement strategies.

The Panhandle Area Education Consortium (PAEC members include: Calhoun, FSU lab school, Franklin, Gadsden, Gulf, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Liberty, Madison, Taylor, Wakulla Walton, and Washington.)

The North East Area Education Consortium (NEFEC members include Baker, Bradford, Columbia, Dixie, Flagler, Gilchrist, Hamilton, Lafayette, Levy, Nassau, Putnam, Suwannee, Union, P.K. Yonge lab school, and the Florida School for the Deaf and Blind.)

The Heartland Education Consortium (HEC members include DeSoto, Hendry, Glades, Highlands, Hardee, and Okeechobee.)

REGIONAL CONSORTIA FUNDING HISTORY

Funding Levels Back To FY 95-96

| |
|--|
| 2013-14 Funding - \$1,445,390 |
| 2012-13 Funding - \$1,445,390 - Vetoed |
| 2011-12 Funding - \$1,445,390 |
| 2010-11 Funding - \$1,611,465 |
| 2009-10 Funding - \$1,611,465 |
| 2008-09 Funding - \$1,660,750 |
| 2007-08 Funding - \$1,750,000 |
| 2006-07 Funding - \$1,750,000 |
| 2005-06 Funding - \$1,700,000 |
| 2004-05 Funding - \$825,000 |
| 2003-04 Funding - \$775,000 |
| 2002-03 Funding - \$775,000 |
| 2001-02 Funding - \$750,000 |
| 2000-01 Funding - \$750,000 |
| 1999-00 Funding - \$750,000 |
| 1998-99 Funding - \$750,000 |
| 1997-98 Funding - \$750,000 |
| 1996-97 Funding - \$750,000 |
| 1995-96 Funding - \$550,000 |
| 1994-95 Funding - \$750,000 |

Educational Technology Funding

District Bandwidth Support- \$11,328,468

Funds in Specific Appropriation 102A are provided for the acquisition of additional bandwidth capacity as determined from the results of the 2012-2013 Department of Education Technology Resources Survey and needed to ensure that, in conjunction with their Federal e-rate funding, schools have adequate bandwidth capacity for the implementation and usage of instructional technology and the administration of online assessments. The additional bandwidth capacity may be procured from the Department of Management Services contract number DMS 08-09-061 or through any other e-rate compliant competitive procurement or service substitution process. The calculation of funds provided for the additional bandwidth capacity for the 2013-2014 fiscal year are incorporated by reference in Senate Bill 1502. The calculations are the basis for the funds provided in Specific Appropriation 102A. If the Department of Education, in collaboration with the Department of Management Services when appropriate, confirms that a school's or district's network is unable to support the additional bandwidth capacity for the 2013-2014 fiscal year, the school is authorized to use its portion of the funds provided for in Specific Appropriation 102A to purchase the network infrastructure necessary to ensure its compliance with the standard used to complete the calculations incorporated by reference in Senate Bill 1502. *If the district is a member of one of the statutorily-established regional consortium service organizations, the school should work with the appropriate regional consortium service organization in the identification and acquisition of the required network infrastructure.* The Department of Education shall submit a report on the status of each school's allocation no later than January 31, 2014, to the chairs of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee.

Technology Transformation Grants for Rural School Districts - \$6,000,000

Funds in Specific Appropriation 102A for Technology Transformation Grants for Rural School Districts shall be provided to the following school districts for purposes of establishing a wireless network or enhancing an existing wireless network. *No later than August 1, 2013, the Department of Education shall publish any required wireless specifications necessary to ensure that districts can implement and use instructional technology and administer online assessments.* Each school district must work with the appropriate regional consortium service organization established pursuant to s. 1001.451, Florida Statutes, in the design of its wireless network and the acquisition of the associated infrastructure to include access points, switches, cabling, controllers and installation costs. If a school district has funds remaining after establishing or enhancing its wireless network, it is authorized to use such funds to purchase the network infrastructure necessary to ensure its compliance with the standard used to complete the calculations for the additional bandwidth funded in Specific Appropriation 102A for the District Bandwidth Support. The Department of Education shall submit a report on the status of each school district's allocation no later than January 31, 2014, to the chairs of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee.

Florida Retirement System

Florida's counties and School Districts are required, by Statute, to be part of the Florida Retirement System (FRS), and have been such since 1971. Elected officials, county and public school district employees, and the employees of the constitutional offices (sheriffs, property appraisers, tax collectors, clerks and supervisors of elections), make up a substantial portion of the FRS members. The Legislature controls all aspects of the FRS, including benefit levels, contribution rates, retirement age, and vesting periods. Counties and School Districts contribute funds to the FRS based on the number of employees they have in each retirement class and the accrual rates for those classes.

The FRS was a 100% employer-contribution system, until the Legislature required employees contribute three percent of their salary in the 2011 legislative session. The Legislature eliminated the cost of living adjustment for the next five years and reduced the accrual rate for Deferred Retirement Option Program. Other significant changes were made for new employees enrolled in the FRS after July 1, 2011 include an increased retirement age, years of service, and average final compensation.

For the most part from 1998 to 2009 the FRS enjoyed favorable investments returns and managed to remain fully funded. However unfavorable investment returns in 2007-2009 and the utilization of surplus assets for rate reduction and benefit funding eroded the actuarial surplus and created an unfunded actuarial liability (UAL). Although Milliman Inc., the state actuary, recommended funding the unfunded liabilities the Legislature declined to do until 2012. Last year, the Legislature passed HB 5005 which significantly increased the rates for the UAL effective July 1, 2013. Then during the 2013 session the Legislature passed SB 1810 which made modifications to the rates again – but the changes were minor compared to those passed in 2012. Copies of the both bill analyses, as well as, the state actuary report upon which the rate adjustments were based appear below.

All decisions regarding the Florida Retirement System are made by the Florida Legislature. Local Governments participating in the FRS cannot establish individual contribution rates, but simply pay the contribution rates established by the Legislature.

2012 & 2013 FRS Changes

[Milliman Actuarial Report - July 1, 2012](#) 

[2012 Legislative Session - HB 5005 Bill Analysis](#)

[2013 Legislative Session: SB 1810 Bill Analysis](#) 

Additional Resources

[Setting the 2010-2011 Employer Contribution Rates for the Florida Retirement System.pdf](#) 

Employer Contribution Rates for FRS - Changes made in SB 1810 and HB 5005

SB 1810 was passed and signed by the Governor on May 20, 2013. The bill is the annual conforming bill that adjusts employer contribution rates to the FRS based on the annual actuarial report and recommendations of the state actuary, Milliman, Inc.

SB 1810 modified employer contribution rates for 2013 - some were increased and some were decreased depending on the membership class.

The significant rate increases were passed during the 2012 session in HB 5005. In 2012, the rates were increased to fund the amortization of the unfunded actuarial liability (UAL) of the FRS, which had not been funded for several years due to the state of the economy. These increased rates have been in statute for the past year but are effective July 1, 2013. They were established to ensure the actuarial soundness of the fund. It is the rates passed during the 2012 session to fund the UAL that are estimated to have the significant impact on FY 13-14 budgets.

FRS Contribution Rates (SB 1810 / HB 5005): Modifies employer contribution rates. County Employer Contribution Rates change as follows:

- o Employer **normal** contribution rates for each membership class of FRS (Defined Benefit and Defined Investment) are amended as follows:

| Class | New Normal Rate | Old Normal Rate |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Regular | 3.53% | 3.55% |
| Special Risk | 11% | 11.01% |
| Special Risk | 4.17% | 3.94% |
| Administrative Support | | |
| Elected Officers (legislators) | 6.52% | 6.51% |
| Elected Officers (judges) | 10.05% | 10.02% |
| Elected Officers (county officers) | 8.44% | 8.36% |
| Senior Management | 4.81% | 4.84% |
| DROP | 4.63% | 4.33% |

- o To address **unfunded actuarial liabilities** (UAL) of the system, the bill amends the current 2013 employer contribution rates for each membership class of FRS as follows:

| Class | New 2013 UAL Rate | Old 2013 UAL Rate | 2012 UAL Rate |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| Regular | 2.19% | 2.02% | 0.49% |
| Special Risk | 6.83% | 7.03% | 2.75% |
| Special Risk | 30.56% | 27.04% | 0.83% |
| Administrative Support | | | |
| Elected Officers (legislators) | 24.85% | 27.18% | 0.88% |
| Elected Officers (judges) | 17% | 16.38% | 0.77% |
| Elected Officers (county officers) | 23.36% | 23.01% | 0.73% |
| Senior Management | 12.27% | 11.25% | 0.32% |
| DROP | 7.01% | 6.21% | 0.00% |

Millage Authority Compared from 06-07 through 13-14

| | 06-07 | 07-08 | 08-09 | 09-10 | 10-11 | 11-12 | 12-13 | 13-14 |
|--|--------------|--------------|---|--|---|--|--|------------------|
| Required Local Effort F.S. 1011.62(4) | 5.01 | 4.843 | 5.136 (.25 shifted from 2.0 Capital Outlay) | 5.288 | 5.380 | 5.446 | 5.295 | 5.295 |
| Maximum DLE F.S. 1011.71(1)– Compression provided up to State Wide Average | .51 | .51 | .498 | .748 (Includes a shift of .25 from Capital Outlay) | .748 | .748 F.S. 1011.71(1) | .748 | .748 |
| Additional Discretionary Local Effort If per student millage generates less than \$100 – the district received funding to Provide Up to \$100 per FTE | .25 | .25 | .25 | .0 (Note - .25 previously authorized – shifted to RLE. RLE reflects increase of .178 due to statewide value of .25 without compression) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Super Majority Board Approved Millage –No Cap on Value Generated. (compressed provide up to State Wide Average per FTE) | - | - | - | .25 1. Levied by Super Majority Vote of Board 2. Can be used in either Operational or Capital Outlay. 3. If used in Capital Outlay – the district does not receive Compression to State Wide Average if value of .25 is less than State Wide Average). | .25 1. Levied by Super Majority Vote of Board 2. Must have referendum to continue into 11-12. 3. Can be used in either Operational or Capital Outlay. 4. If used in Capital Outlay – the district does not receive Compression to State Wide Average if value of .25 is less than State Wide Average). | 0 1. Only School Districts where the .25 was approved by Referendum in Nov. of 2010 may continue to levy the .25 millage for 11-12 and 12-13. F.S. 1011.71(3) | 0 1. Only School Districts where the .25 was approved by Referendum in Nov. of 2010 may continue to levy the .25 millage for 11-12 and 12-13. F.S. 1011.71(3) | No Change |
| Total Millage in FEFP | 5.77 | 5.603 | 5.884 | 6.286 | 6.378 | 6.294 | 6.043 | 6.043 |
| Capital Outlay Millage Authority F.S. 1011.71(2) | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.75 (.25 shifted to RLE) | 1.50 (.25 shifted to DLE) | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 |
| Special Facility Districts Required Payback (F.S. 1013.64(2)(a)) from Capital Outlay Millage (F.S. 1011.71(2)) | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |

Value of School Ad Valorem Millage for 1.5 mills

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| Statewide Total Value of 1.5 Mill | \$ 2,075,439,212 |
|--|-------------------------|

| School District | Value of 1.5 Mill Levy | School District | Value of 1.5 Mill Levy |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| Miami-Dade | 299,076,742 | Santa Rosa | 12,453,185 |
| Broward | 202,691,449 | Flagler | 11,006,889 |
| Palm Beach | 198,671,398 | Sumter | 10,994,913 |
| Orange | 129,517,303 | Nassau | 10,582,277 |
| Hillsborough | 101,348,903 | Highlands | 7,700,266 |
| Collier | 90,419,112 | Putnam | 5,669,504 |
| Pinellas | 90,280,824 | Columbia | 3,938,145 |
| Lee | 85,096,730 | Franklin | 2,932,875 |
| Duval | 82,244,009 | Levy | 2,847,261 |
| Sarasota | 63,024,612 | Hendry | 2,682,607 |
| Brevard | 41,783,079 | Okeechobee | 2,532,901 |
| Volusia | 40,289,661 | Suwannee | 2,409,233 |
| Polk | 39,915,774 | Jackson | 2,393,501 |
| Seminole | 39,612,057 | Hardee | 2,346,184 |
| Manatee | 38,096,886 | DeSoto | 2,295,507 |
| Pasco | 33,703,004 | Gulf | 2,273,114 |
| Monroe | 29,185,207 | Gadsden | 2,242,789 |
| St. Johns | 28,116,847 | Wakulla | 1,874,939 |
| Martin | 27,167,304 | Taylor | 1,868,785 |
| Osceola | 26,629,242 | Bradford | 1,381,413 |
| Lake | 26,082,305 | Washington | 1,380,964 |
| Marion | 24,757,407 | Baker | 1,317,294 |
| St. Lucie | 24,073,730 | Hamilton | 1,123,618 |
| Bay | 23,125,059 | Madison | 1,001,709 |
| Escambia | 22,992,435 | Gilchrist | 983,327 |
| Leon | 22,936,683 | Jefferson | 880,327 |
| Okaloosa | 22,195,260 | Glades | 880,150 |
| Indian River | 21,015,634 | Dixie | 752,776 |
| Charlotte | 20,152,324 | Holmes | 695,700 |
| Alachua | 19,082,428 | Calhoun | 608,397 |
| Walton | 16,814,661 | Union | 374,517 |
| Citrus | 15,132,350 | Liberty | 371,115 |
| Clay | 13,855,996 | Lafayette | 357,209 |
| Hernando | 13,199,405 | | |

Value of School Ad Valorem Millage for .5 mills

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| Statewide Total Value of .5 Mill | \$ 691,813,071 |
|---|-----------------------|

| School District | Value of .5 Mill Levy | School District | Value of .5 Mill Levy |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Miami-Dade | 99,692,247 | Santa Rosa | 4,151,062 |
| Broward | 67,563,816 | Flagler | 3,668,963 |
| Palm Beach | 66,223,799 | Sumter | 3,664,971 |
| Orange | 43,172,434 | Nassau | 3,527,426 |
| Hillsborough | 33,782,968 | Highlands | 2,566,755 |
| Collier | 30,139,704 | Putnam | 1,889,835 |
| Pinellas | 30,093,608 | Columbia | 1,312,715 |
| Lee | 28,365,577 | Franklin | 977,625 |
| Duval | 27,414,670 | Levy | 949,087 |
| Sarasota | 21,008,204 | Hendry | 894,202 |
| Brevard | 13,927,693 | Okeechobee | 844,300 |
| Volusia | 13,429,887 | Suwannee | 803,078 |
| Polk | 13,305,258 | Jackson | 797,834 |
| Seminole | 13,204,019 | Hardee | 782,061 |
| Manatee | 12,698,962 | DeSoto | 765,169 |
| Pasco | 11,234,335 | Gulf | 757,705 |
| Monroe | 9,728,402 | Gadsden | 747,596 |
| St. Johns | 9,372,282 | Wakulla | 624,980 |
| Martin | 9,055,768 | Taylor | 622,928 |
| Osceola | 8,876,414 | Bradford | 460,471 |
| Lake | 8,694,102 | Washington | 460,321 |
| Marion | 8,252,469 | Baker | 439,098 |
| St. Lucie | 8,024,577 | Hamilton | 374,539 |
| Bay | 7,708,353 | Madison | 333,903 |
| Escambia | 7,664,145 | Gilchrist | 327,776 |
| Leon | 7,645,561 | Jefferson | 293,442 |
| Okaloosa | 7,398,420 | Glades | 293,383 |
| Indian River | 7,005,211 | Dixie | 250,925 |
| Charlotte | 6,717,441 | Holmes | 231,900 |
| Alachua | 6,360,809 | Calhoun | 202,799 |
| Walton | 5,604,887 | Union | 124,839 |
| Citrus | 5,044,117 | Liberty | 123,705 |
| Clay | 4,618,665 | Lafayette | 119,070 |
| Hernando | 4,399,802 | | |

A Review of FEFP Funding from 99-00 through for 12-13

| (1) Year | (2) State funding within the FEFP | (3) Local Funding within the FEFP | (4) Federal Funding within the FEFP | (5) Total Funding | | |
|-------------|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 99-00 | \$6,918,358,522 | \$4,269,553,580 | NA | \$11,187,912,102 | | |
| 00-01 | \$7,401,942,945 | \$4,543,526,312 | NA | \$11,945,469,257 | | |
| 01-02 | \$7,327,271,855 | \$4,882,671,612 | NA | \$12,209,943,467 | | |
| 02-03 | \$7,695,808,666 | \$5,338,377,065 | NA | \$13,034,185,731 | | |
| 03-04 | \$8,260,409,846 | \$5,776,691,992 | NA | \$14,037,101,838 | | |
| 04-05 | \$8,766,990,479 | \$6,260,556,290 | NA | \$15,027,546,769 | | |
| 05-06 | \$9,125,618,593 | \$7,129,622,543 | NA | \$16,255,241,136 | | |
| 06-07 | \$9,695,029,452 | \$8,370,937,262 | NA | \$17,989,051,919 | | |
| 07-08 | \$9,709,211,811 | \$9,042,132,786 | NA | \$18,751,344,667 | | |
| 08-09 | \$8,556,433,157 | \$9,363,451,861 | NA | \$17,919,885,018 | | |
| 09-10 | \$8,079,525,471 | \$9,002,863,782 | \$907,920,175 | \$17,990,309,428 | | |
| 10-11 | \$8,903,193,397 | \$8,216,789,058 | \$872,664,689 | \$17,992,647,144 | | |
| 11-12 | \$8,709,379,680 | \$7,872,211,416 | 0 | \$16,581,591,096 | | |
| 12-13 | \$9,544,792,796 | \$7,678,389,743 | 0 | \$17,223,182,539 | | |
| 13-14 | \$10,462,958,985 | \$7,814,674,508 | 0 | \$18,277,633,493 | | |
| (6) Year | (7) % of State Funding in FEFP | (8) % of local Funding in FEFP | (9) % of Federal \$ in FEFP | (10) Base Student Allocation | (11) Number of UFTE | (12) Total Funding Per UFTE |
| 99-00 | 61.84 | 38.16 | - | \$3,227.74 | 2,328,851.08 | \$4,804.05 |
| 00-01 | 61.96 | 38.04 | - | \$3,416.73 | 2,388,755.80 | \$5,000.71 |
| 01-02 | 60.01 | 39.99 | - | \$3,298.48 | 2,453,549.71 | \$4,976.44 |
| 02-03 | 59.04 | 40.96 | - | \$3,537.11 | 2,497,968.51 | \$5,217.92 |
| 03-04 | 58.86 | 41.15 | - | \$3,630.03 | 2,557,438.44 | \$5,488.73 |
| 04-05 | 58.34 | 41.66 | - | \$3,670.26 | 2,609,593.94 | \$5,758.57 |
| 05-06 | 56.14 | 43.86 | - | \$3,742.42 | 2,641,121,,29 | \$6,154.68 |
| 06-07 | 53.47 | 46.53 | - | \$3,981.61 | 2,638,331.10 | \$6,818.35 |
| 07-08 | 51.78 | 48.22 | - | \$4,079.74 | 2,631,277.10 | \$7,126.32 |
| 08-09 | 47.72 | 52.28 | - | \$3,886.14 | 2,618,006.46 | \$6,844.86 |
| 09-10 | 44.90 | 50.05 | 5.05 | \$3,630.62 | 2,629,282.97 | \$6,842.29 |
| 10-11 | 49.33 | 45.86 | 4.82 | \$3,623.76 | 2,642,091.49 | \$6,810.10 |
| 11-12 | 52.53 | 47.66 | 0 | \$3,479.22 | 2,663,743.54 | \$6,224.92 |
| 12-13 | 55.53 | 44.47 | 0 | \$3,582.98 | 2,701,751.84 | \$6,374.82 |
| 13-14 | 57.24 | 42.76 | 0 | \$3,752.30 | 2,696,270.71 | \$6,778.86 |

Legislators Representing Small School Districts

(Districts with 24,000 Students or less)

Senate Districts

15 Senate Districts Include Small School Districts

| | |
|---|---|
| Senate District 1 – Don Gaetz | Holmes, Jackson, Walton, and Washington |
| Senate District 3 – Bill Montford | Calhoun, Franklin, Gadsden, Gulf, Hamilton, Jefferson, Liberty, Madison, Taylor, and Wakulla |
| Senate District 4 – Aaron Bean | Nassau |
| Senate District 5 – Charlie Dean | Baker, Citrus, Columbia, Dixie, Gilchrist, Lafayette, Levy, Suwannee, and Union |
| Senate District 6 – John Thrasher | Flagler, and Putnam |
| Senate District 7 – Rob Bradley | Bradford |
| Senate District 11 – Alan Hays | Sumter |
| Senate District 16 – Thad Altman | Indian River |
| Senate District 18 - Wilton Simpson | Hernando and Sumter |
| Senate District 21 – Denise Grimsley | Highlands, Martin, and Okeechobee |
| Senate District 26 – Bill Galvano | Charlotte, DeSoto, Glades, Hardee, and Highlands |
| Senate District 28 – Nancy Detert | Charlotte |
| Senate District 30 – Lizbeth Benaquisto | Charlotte |
| Senate District 32 – Joe Negron | Indian River, and Martin |
| Senate District 39 – Dwight Bullard | Hendry and Monroe |

House Districts

18 House Districts Include Small School Districts

| | |
|---|---|
| House District 5 – Marti Coley | Holmes, Jackson, Walton, and Washington |
| House District 7 - Halsey Beshears | Calhoun, Franklin, Gulf, Jefferson, Lafayette, Liberty, Madison, Taylor, and Wakulla |
| House District 8 – Alan Williams | Gadsden |
| House District 10 – Elizabeth Porter | Baker, Columbia, Hamilton, and Suwannee |
| House District 11 – Janet Adkins | Nassau |
| House District 19 – Charles Van Zant | Bradford, Putnam, and Union |
| House District 21 – Keith Perry | Dixie, and Gilchrist |
| House District 22 – Charlie Stone | Levy |
| House District 24 – Travis Hutson | Flagler |
| House District 33 – Marlene O’Toole | Sumter |
| House District 34 – Jimmie Smith | Citrus and Hernando |
| House District 35 - Robert Schenck | Hernando |
| House District 54 – Debbie Mayfield | Indian River |
| House District 55 - Cary Pigman | Glades, Highlands, and Okeechobee |
| House District 56 – Ben Albritton | DeSoto, and Hardee |
| House District 80 - Matt Hudson | Hendry |
| House District 82 – Mary Lynn Magar | Martin |
| House District 120–Holly Merrill Raschein | Monroe |