Stricken language would be deleted from and underlined language would be added to present law. Act 1039 of the Regular Session

1	State of Arkansas As Engrossed: H3/14/11 H3/15/11 H3/17/11 S3/30/11
2	88th General Assembly A Bill
3	Regular Session, 2011HOUSE BILL 1901
4	
5	By: Representative Ingram
6	By: Senator Files
7	By: Education Committee - Senate
8	
9	For An Act To Be Entitled
10	AN ACT TO AMEND PUBLIC SCHOOL FUNDING AMOUNTS; TO
11	PROVIDE RESOURCES FOR EDUCATIONAL ADEQUACY; TO
12	DECLARE AN EMERGENCY; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.
13	
14	
15	Subtitle
16	TO AMEND PUBLIC SCHOOL FUNDING AMOUNTS
17	AND PROVIDE RESOURCES FOR EDUCATIONAL
18	ADEQUACY AND TO DECLARE AN EMERGENCY.
19	
20	
21	BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ARKANSAS:
22	
23	SECTION 1. DO NOT CODIFY. FINDINGS. <u>The General Assembly finds that:</u>
24	(1) In "A Report on Legislative Hearings for the 2010 Interim
25	Study on Educational Adequacy", the interim House Committee on Education and
26	the interim Senate Committee on Education found that the transportation
27	funding provided in foundation funding is sufficient to meet the State of
28	Arkansas's adequacy requirements with regard to student transportation. They
29	went on to recommend, however, a distribution of funding through an enhanced
30	transportation funding formula for certain school districts that may have
31	high transportation costs. The committees further recommended that money to
32	fund this new program be found by reducing, in part, a recommended increase
33	in foundation funding. The committees made clear in the 2010 interim study
34	report that this recommended enhanced transportation funding was found to be
35	over and above what was required for adequacy;
36	(2) In the previous biennium, in "A Report on Legislative



.

As Engrossed: H3/14/11 H3/15/11 H3/17/11 S3/30/11

found that student transportation may be a necessary component for providing students with an equitable opportunity for an adequate education to the extent that a student would not otherwise be able to realize this opportunity but for such transportation being provided by the state. Analyzing what portion of student transportation is required for adequacy purposes is a highly complex, fact-intensive study. It requires analysis of many factors such as student characteristics, bus routes taken, route miles, and a myriad of other factors. Nonetheless, it is clear from "The Resource Allocation of Foundation Funding for Arkansas School Districts," August 23, 2008, Bureau of Legislative Research, and the 2010 interim study report that the evidence gathered by the committees demonstrated that the amount of revenue provided in foundation funding is sufficient to fund the overall adequacy needs of all school districts: (3) The 2010 interim study report recommends, essentially. removing a portion of transportation funding contained in the resource matrix used to determine necessary foundation funding levels, and using those funds to provide revenue for transportation funding formula and the resource matrix on which the foundation funding formula is based have served the state well since they were first used. The formula and the matrix provide a clear. transparent, and easy to understand method for analyzing state funding needs for districts, while allowing districts the flexibility to use such finds to more closely meet unique district needs. The committees' recommendation that the General Assembly depart from this approach jeopardizes this method for determining and meeting school district adequacy needs, a method that the Supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly, the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula and the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended	1	Hearings for the 2008 Interim Study on Educational Adequacy", the committees
students with an equitable opportunity for an adequate education to the extent that a student would not otherwise be able to realize this opportunity but for such transportation being provided by the state. Analyzing what portion of student transportation is required for adequacy purposes is a highly complex, fact-intensive study. It requires analysis of many factors such as student characteristics, bus routes taken, route miles, and a myriad of other factors. Nonetheless, it is clear from "The Resource Allocation of Foundation Funding for Arkansas School Districts," August 23, 2008, Bureau of Legislative Research, and the 2010 interim study report that the evidence gathered by the committees demonstrated that the amount of revenue provided iin foundation funding is sufficient to fund the overall adequacy needs of all school districts: (3) The 2010 interim study report recommends, essentially. removing a portion of transportation funding levels, and using those funds to provide revenue for transportation to some, but not all, school districts for a program that is not required to maintain educational adequacy; and (4) The foundation funding formula is based have served the state well since they were first used. The formula and the matrix provide a clear. transparent, and easy to understand method for analyzing state funding needs for districts, while allowing districts the flexibility to use such funds to more closely meet unique district adequacy needs, a method that the Supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly. the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula and the resource matrix upon which it is shult should be maintained and declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in the central Assembly finds and determines that the foundation fundin	2	
 but for such transportation being provided by the state. Analyzing what portion of student transportation is required for adequacy purposes is a highly complex, fact-intensive study. It requires analysis of many factors such as student characteristics, bus routes taken, route miles, and a myriad of other factors. Nonetheless, it is clear from "The Resource Allocation of Foundation Funding for Arkansas School Districts," August 23, 2008, Bureau of Legislative Research, and the 2010 interim study report that the evidence gathered by the committees demonstrated that the amount of revenue provided in foundation funding is sufficient to fund the overall adequacy needs of all school districts: (3) The 2010 interim study report recommends, essentially, removing a portion of transportation funding contained in the resource matrix used to determine necessary foundation funding levels, and using those funds to provide revenue for transportation to some, but not all, school districts for a program that is not required to maintain educational adequacy; and which the foundation funding formula is based have served the state well since they were first used. The formula and the matrix provide a clear, transparent, and easy to understand method for analyzing state funding needs for districts, while allowing districts the flexibility to use such funds to more closely meet unique district needs. The committees' recommendation that the General Assembly depart from this approach jeopardizes this method for determining and meeting school district adequacy needs, a method that the Supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly, the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding for	3	
 portion of student transportation is required for adequacy purposes is a highly complex, fact-intensive study. It requires analysis of many factors such as student characteristics, bus routes taken, route miles, and a myriad of other factors. Nonetheless, it is clear from "The Resource Allocation of Foundation Funding for Arkansas School Districts," August 23, 2008, Bureau of Legislative Research, and the 2010 interim study report that the evidence gathered by the committees demonstrated that the amount of revenue provided in foundation funding is sufficient to fund the overall adequacy needs of all school districts; (3) The 2010 interim study report recommends, essentially. removing a portion of transportation funding contained in the resource matrix used to determine necessary foundation funding levels, and using those funds to provide revenue for transportation to some, but not all, school districts for a program that is not required to maintain educational adequacy; and which the foundation funding formula is based have served the state well since they were first used. The formula and the matrix provide a clear, transparent, and easy to understand method for analyzing state funding needs for districts, while allowing districts the flexibility to use such funds to more closely meet unique district needs. The committees' recommendation that the General Assembly depart from this approach jeopardizes this method for determining and meeting school district adequacy needs, a method that the Supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly, the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula and the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained	4	extent that a student would not otherwise be able to realize this opportunity
highly complex, fact-intensive study. It requires analysis of many factorssuch as student characteristics, bus routes taken, route miles, and a myriadof other factors. Nonetheless, it is clear from "The Resource Allocation ofFoundation Funding for Arkansas School Districts," August 23, 2008, Bureau ofLegislative Research, and the 2010 interim study report that the evidencegathered by the committees demonstrated that the amount of revenue providedin foundation funding is sufficient to fund the overall adequacy needs of allschool districts;in foundation funding is sufficient to funding contained in the resource matrixused to determine necessary foundation funding levels, and using those fundsto provide revenue for transportation to some, but not all, school districtsfor a program that is not required to maintain educational adequacy; andwhich the foundation funding formula is based have served the state wellsince they were first used. The formula and the matrix provide a clear,transparent, and easy to understand method for analyzing state funding needsfor districts, while allowing districts the flexibility to use such funds tosucre closely meet unique district needs. The committees' recommendation thatthe General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formulaand the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained anddeclines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended inthe tresource matrix upon which it is built should be maintainedfor districts upon thich it is built should be maintained anddeclines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach re	5	but for such transportation being provided by the state. Analyzing what
 such as student characteristics, bis routes taken, route miles, and a myriad of other factors. Nonetheless, it is clear from "The Resource Allocation of Foundation Funding for Arkansas School Districts," August 23, 2008, Bureau of Legislative Research, and the 2010 interim study report that the evidence gathered by the committees demonstrated that the amount of revenue provided in foundation funding is sufficient to fund the overall adequacy needs of all school districtsi (3) The 2010 interim study report recommends, essentially, removing a portion of transportation funding contained in the resource matrix used to determine necessary foundation funding levels, and using those funds to provide revenue for transportation to some, but not all, school districts for a program that is not required to maintain educational adequacy; and (4) The foundation funding formula and the resource matrix on which the foundation funding formula is based have served the state well since they were first used. The formula and the matrix provide a clear, transparent, and easy to understand method for analyzing state funding needs for districts, while allowing districts the flexibility to use such funds to more closely meet unique district needs. The committees' recommendation that the General Assembly depart from this approach jeopardizes this method for determining and meeting school district adequacy needs, a method that the supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly, the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula and the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in the 2010 interim study report. 	6	portion of student transportation is required for adequacy purposes is a
9of other factors. Nonetheless, it is clear from "The Resource Allocation of10Foundation Funding for Arkanasa School Districts," August 23, 2008, Bureau of11Legislative Research, and the 2010 interim study report that the evidence12gathered by the committees demonstrated that the amount of revenue provided13in foundation funding is sufficient to fund the overall adequacy needs of all14school districts:15(3)16removing a portion of transportation funding contained in the resource matrix17used to determine necessary foundation funding levels, and using those funds18to provide revenue for transportation to some, but not all, school districts19for a program that is not required to maintain educational adequacy; and20(4)The foundation funding formula and the resource matrix onwhich the foundation funding formula is based have served the state well21since they were first used. The formula and the matrix provide a clear,22transparent, and easy to understand method for analyzing state funding needs23for districts, while allowing districts the flexibility to use such funds to24supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly,25the General Assembly depart from this approach is purpoach recommended in26the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and27declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in28the 2010 interim study report.29SECTION 2. Arkansas Code § 6-20-2305(a)	7	highly complex, fact-intensive study. It requires analysis of many factors
10Foundation Funding for Arkansas School Districts," August 23, 2008, Bureau of11Legislative Research, and the 2010 interim study report that the evidence12gathered by the committees demonstrated that the amount of revenue provided13in foundation funding is sufficient to fund the overall adequacy needs of all14school districts:15(3) The 2010 interim study report recommends, essentially,16removing a portion of transportation funding contained in the resource matrix17used to determine necessary foundation funding levels, and using those funds18to provide revenue for transportation to some, but not all, school districts19for a program that is not required to maintain educational adequacy; and20(4) The foundation funding formula and the resource matrix on21which the foundation funding formula is based have served the state well22since they were first used. The formula and the matrix provide a clear,23transparent, and easy to understand method for analyzing state funding needs24for districts, while allowing districts the flexibility to use such funds to25more closely meet unique district needs. The committees' recommendation that26the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula29suppreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly,29the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula30ad the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and31declines to adopt the enhanced	8	such as student characteristics, bus routes taken, route miles, and a myriad
11Legislative Research, and the 2010 interim study report that the evidence12gathered by the committees demonstrated that the amount of revenue provided13in foundation funding is sufficient to fund the overall adequacy needs of all14school districts:15(3) The 2010 interim study report recommends, essentially,16removing a portion of transportation funding contained in the resource matrix17used to determine necessary foundation funding levels, and using those funds18to provide revenue for transportation to some, but not all, school districts19for a program that is not required to maintain educational adequacy; and20(4) The foundation funding formula and the resource matrix on21which the foundation funding formula is based have served the state well23since they were first used. The formula and the matrix provide a clear,24transparent, and easy to understand method for analyzing state funding needs25more closely meet unique district needs. The committees' recommendation that26the General Assembly depart from this approach jeopardizes this method for27determining and meeting school district adequacy needs, a method that the28Supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly,29the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula30and the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and31declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in33the 2010 interim study report.<	9	of other factors. Nonetheless, it is clear from "The Resource Allocation of
12gathered by the committees demonstrated that the amount of revenue provided13in foundation funding is sufficient to fund the overall adequacy needs of all14school districts:15(3) The 2010 interim study report recommends, essentially,16removing a portion of transportation funding contained in the resource matrix17used to determine necessary foundation funding levels, and using those funds18to provide revenue for transportation to some, but not all, school districts19for a program that is not required to maintain educational adequacy; and20(4) The foundation funding formula and the resource matrix on21which the foundation funding formula is based have served the state well23since they were first used. The formula and the matrix provide a clear,24transparent, and easy to understand method for analyzing state funding needs25more closely meet unique district needs. The committees' recommendation that26the General Assembly depart from this approach jeopardizes this method for27determining and meeting school district adequacy needs, a method that the28Supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly,29the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula30and the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and31declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in33the 2010 interim study report.34SECTION 2. Arkansas Code § 6-20-2305(a)(2), concerning public school<	10	Foundation Funding for Arkansas School Districts," August 23, 2008, Bureau of
 in foundation funding is sufficient to fund the overall adequacy needs of all school districts; (3) The 2010 interim study report recommends, essentially, removing a portion of transportation funding contained in the resource matrix used to determine necessary foundation funding levels, and using those funds to provide revenue for transportation to some, but not all, school districts for a program that is not required to maintain educational adequacy; and (4) The foundation funding formula and the resource matrix on which the foundation funding formula and the matrix provide a clear, since they were first used. The formula and the matrix provide a clear, transparent, and easy to understand method for analyzing state funding needs for districts, while allowing districts the flexibility to use such funds to more closely meet unique district adequacy needs, a method that the Supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly, the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula and the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in the 2010 interim study report. 	11	Legislative Research, and the 2010 interim study report that the evidence
14school districts;15(3) The 2010 interim study report recommends, essentially,16removing a portion of transportation funding contained in the resource matrix17used to determine necessary foundation funding levels, and using those funds18to provide revenue for transportation to some, but not all, school districts19for a program that is not required to maintain educational adequacy; and20(4) The foundation funding formula and the resource matrix on21which the foundation funding formula is based have served the state well22since they were first used. The formula and the matrix provide a clear,23transparent, and easy to understand method for analyzing state funding needs24for districts, while allowing districts the flexibility to use such funds to25more closely meet unique district needs. The committees' recommendation that26the General Assembly depart from this approach jeopardizes this method for27determining and meeting school district adequacy needs, a method that the28Supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly,29the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula30and the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and31declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in32the 2010 interim study report.33sterring amounts, is amended to read as follows:	12	gathered by the committees demonstrated that the amount of revenue provided
 (3) The 2010 interim study report recommends, essentially, removing a portion of transportation funding contained in the resource matrix used to determine necessary foundation funding levels, and using those funds to provide revenue for transportation to some, but not all, school districts for a program that is not required to maintain educational adequacy; and (4) The foundation funding formula and the resource matrix on which the foundation funding formula is based have served the state well since they were first used. The formula and the matrix provide a clear, transparent, and easy to understand method for analyzing state funding needs for districts, while allowing districts the flexibility to use such funds to more closely meet unique district needs. The committees' recommendation that the General Assembly depart from this approach jeopardizes this method for determining and meeting school district adequacy needs, a method that the Supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly, the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula and the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in the 2010 interim study report. 	13	in foundation funding is sufficient to fund the overall adequacy needs of all
removing a portion of transportation funding contained in the resource matrix used to determine necessary foundation funding levels, and using those funds to provide revenue for transportation to some, but not all, school districts for a program that is not required to maintain educational adequacy; and (4) The foundation funding formula and the resource matrix on which the foundation funding formula is based have served the state well since they were first used. The formula and the matrix provide a clear, transparent, and easy to understand method for analyzing state funding needs for districts, while allowing districts the flexibility to use such funds to more closely meet unique district needs. The committees' recommendation that the General Assembly depart from this approach jeopardizes this method for determining and meeting school district adequacy needs, a method that the Supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly, the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula and the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in the 2010 interim study report.	14	<u>school districts;</u>
used to determine necessary foundation funding levels, and using those funds to provide revenue for transportation to some, but not all, school districts for a program that is not required to maintain educational adequacy; and (4) The foundation funding formula and the resource matrix on which the foundation funding formula is based have served the state well since they were first used. The formula and the matrix provide a clear, transparent, and easy to understand method for analyzing state funding needs for districts, while allowing districts the flexibility to use such funds to more closely meet unique district needs. The committees' recommendation that the General Assembly depart from this approach jeopardizes this method for determining and meeting school district adequacy needs, a method that the Supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly, the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula and the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in the 2010 interim study report.	15	(3) The 2010 interim study report recommends, essentially,
18to provide revenue for transportation to some, but not all, school districts19for a program that is not required to maintain educational adequacy; and20(4) The foundation funding formula and the resource matrix on21which the foundation funding formula is based have served the state well22since they were first used. The formula and the matrix provide a clear,23transparent, and easy to understand method for analyzing state funding needs24for districts, while allowing districts the flexibility to use such funds to25more closely meet unique district needs. The committees' recommendation that26the General Assembly depart from this approach jeopardizes this method for27determining and meeting school district adequacy needs, a method that the28Supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly,29the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula30and the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and31declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in32the 2010 interim study report.3334SECTION 2. Arkansas Code § 6-20-2305(a)(2), concerning public school353637383434353536363738393434353536363738	16	removing a portion of transportation funding contained in the resource matrix
19for a program that is not required to maintain educational adequacy; and20(4) The foundation funding formula and the resource matrix on21which the foundation funding formula is based have served the state well22since they were first used. The formula and the matrix provide a clear,23transparent, and easy to understand method for analyzing state funding needs24for districts, while allowing districts the flexibility to use such funds to25more closely meet unique district needs. The committees' recommendation that26the General Assembly depart from this approach jeopardizes this method for27determining and meeting school district adequacy needs, a method that the28Supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly,29the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula30and the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and31declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in32the 2010 interim study report.3334SECTION 2. Arkansas Code § 6-20-2305(a)(2), concerning public school3536373839393030313233343535363637383939303031323334<	17	used to determine necessary foundation funding levels, and using those funds
(4) The foundation funding formula and the resource matrix on which the foundation funding formula is based have served the state well since they were first used. The formula and the matrix provide a clear, transparent, and easy to understand method for analyzing state funding needs for districts, while allowing districts the flexibility to use such funds to more closely meet unique district needs. The committees' recommendation that the General Assembly depart from this approach jeopardizes this method for determining and meeting school district adequacy needs, a method that the Supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly, the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula and the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in the 2010 interim study report.	18	to provide revenue for transportation to some, but not all, school districts
which the foundation funding formula is based have served the state well since they were first used. The formula and the matrix provide a clear, transparent, and easy to understand method for analyzing state funding needs for districts, while allowing districts the flexibility to use such funds to more closely meet unique district needs. The committees' recommendation that the General Assembly depart from this approach jeopardizes this method for determining and meeting school district adequacy needs, a method that the Supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly, the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula and the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in the 2010 interim study report.	19	for a program that is not required to maintain educational adequacy; and
since they were first used. The formula and the matrix provide a clear, transparent, and easy to understand method for analyzing state funding needs for districts, while allowing districts the flexibility to use such funds to more closely meet unique district needs. The committees' recommendation that the General Assembly depart from this approach jeopardizes this method for determining and meeting school district adequacy needs, a method that the Supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly, the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula and the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in the 2010 interim study report. SECTION 2. Arkansas Code § 6-20-2305(a)(2), concerning public school funding amounts, is amended to read as follows:	20	(4) The foundation funding formula and the resource matrix on
transparent, and easy to understand method for analyzing state funding needs for districts, while allowing districts the flexibility to use such funds to more closely meet unique district needs. The committees' recommendation that the General Assembly depart from this approach jeopardizes this method for determining and meeting school district adequacy needs, a method that the Supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly, the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula and the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in the 2010 interim study report.	21	which the foundation funding formula is based have served the state well
for districts, while allowing districts the flexibility to use such funds to more closely meet unique district needs. The committees' recommendation that the General Assembly depart from this approach jeopardizes this method for determining and meeting school district adequacy needs, a method that the Supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly, the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula and the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in the 2010 interim study report. SECTION 2. Arkansas Code § 6-20-2305(a)(2), concerning public school funding amounts, is amended to read as follows:	22	since they were first used. The formula and the matrix provide a clear,
more closely meet unique district needs. The committees' recommendation that the General Assembly depart from this approach jeopardizes this method for determining and meeting school district adequacy needs, a method that the Supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly, the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula and the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in the 2010 interim study report. SECTION 2. Arkansas Code § 6-20-2305(a)(2), concerning public school funding amounts, is amended to read as follows:	23	transparent, and easy to understand method for analyzing state funding needs
26 the General Assembly depart from this approach jeopardizes this method for 27 determining and meeting school district adequacy needs, a method that the 28 Supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly, 29 the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula 30 and the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and 31 declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in 32 the 2010 interim study report. 33 34 SECTION 2. Arkansas Code § 6-20-2305(a)(2), concerning public school 35 funding amounts, is amended to read as follows:	24	for districts, while allowing districts the flexibility to use such funds to
27 determining and meeting school district adequacy needs, a method that the 28 Supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly, 29 the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula 30 and the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and 31 declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in 32 the 2010 interim study report. 33 34 SECTION 2. Arkansas Code § 6-20-2305(a)(2), concerning public school 35 funding amounts, is amended to read as follows:	25	more closely meet unique district needs. The committees' recommendation that
Supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly, the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula and the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in the 2010 interim study report. SECTION 2. Arkansas Code § 6-20-2305(a)(2), concerning public school funding amounts, is amended to read as follows:	26	the General Assembly depart from this approach jeopardizes this method for
29 <u>the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula</u> 30 <u>and the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and</u> 31 <u>declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in</u> 32 <u>the 2010 interim study report.</u> 33 34 <u>SECTION 2. Arkansas Code § 6-20-2305(a)(2), concerning public school</u> 35 funding amounts, is amended to read as follows:	27	determining and meeting school district adequacy needs, a method that the
30 and the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and 31 declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in 32 the 2010 interim study report. 33 34 SECTION 2. Arkansas Code § 6-20-2305(a)(2), concerning public school 35 funding amounts, is amended to read as follows:	28	Supreme Court found to be constitutional in 2004 and in 2007. Accordingly,
31 <u>declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in</u> 32 <u>the 2010 interim study report.</u> 33 34 <u>SECTION 2.</u> Arkansas Code § 6-20-2305(a)(2), concerning public school 35 funding amounts, is amended to read as follows:	29	the General Assembly finds and determines that the foundation funding formula
32 <u>the 2010 interim study report.</u> 33 34 SECTION 2. Arkansas Code § 6-20-2305(a)(2), concerning public school 35 funding amounts, is amended to read as follows:	30	and the resource matrix upon which it is built should be maintained and
 33 34 SECTION 2. Arkansas Code § 6-20-2305(a)(2), concerning public school 35 funding amounts, is amended to read as follows: 	31	declines to adopt the enhanced transportation funding approach recommended in
34 SECTION 2. Arkansas Code § 6-20-2305(a)(2), concerning public school 35 funding amounts, is amended to read as follows:	32	the 2010 interim study report.
35 funding amounts, is amended to read as follows:	33	
	34	SECTION 2. Arkansas Code § 6-20-2305(a)(2), concerning public school
36 (2)(A) For the 2009-2010 <u>2011-2012</u> school year, the foundation	35	funding amounts, is amended to read as follows:
	36	(2)(A) For the 2009–2010 <u>2011–2012</u> school year, the foundation

2

03-04-2011 13:02:57 CLR174

As Engrossed: H3/14/11 H3/15/11 H3/17/11 S3/30/11

1	funding amount is equal to five thousand nine hundred five dollars (\$5,905)
2	six thousand one hundred forty-four dollars (\$6,144) multiplied by the school
3	district's average daily membership for the previous school year.
4	(B) For the 2010-2011 <u>2012-2013</u> school year, the
5	foundation funding amount is equal to six thousand twenty-three dollars
6	(\$6,023) six thousand two hundred sixty-seven dollars (\$6,267) multiplied by
7	the school district's average daily membership for the previous school year.
8	(C)(i) In accordance with the state's desire to foster
9	educational excellence, in addition to the amounts determined by the General
10	Assembly to be constitutionally adequate pursuant to subdivisions (a)(2)(A)
11	and (B) of this section, and in addition to the funds distributed to school
12	districts pursuant to subdivisions (a)(2)(A) and (B) of this section, each
13	school district shall receive an amount equal to thirty-five dollars (\$35.00)
14	multiplied by the school district's average daily membership for the previous
15	school year.
16	(ii) The Department of Education shall distribute
17	the additional funding provided by this subdivision (a)(2)(C) in eleven (11)
18	monthly payments from funds appropriated by law and available for
19	distribution as state foundation funding aid.
20	(iii) The General Assembly has determined that the
21	funding provided by this subdivision (a)(2)(C), which is known as "Enhanced
22	Educational Funding", is in addition to, and in excess of, the amount of
23	funds necessary to provide an adequate education as required by the Arkansas
24	Constitution.
25	(iv) Enhanced Educational Funding is available from
26	a combination of fortunate economic factors, conservative budgeting of all
27	state government, and the favorable forecast of state revenues. As a result,
28	the enhanced component of Enhanced Educational Funding cannot be ensured and
29	may not be relied on beyond the 2009-2010 school year.
30	
31	SECTION 3. Arkansas Code § 6-20-2305(b)(2) through (b)(4)(B)(ii)(a),
32	concerning categorical funding for public schools, is amended to read as
33	follows:
34	(2)(A)(i) Beginning with the 2007–2008 <u>For the 2011–2012</u> school
35	year, alternative learning environment funding shall be four thousand sixty-
36	three dollars (\$4,063) four thousand one hundred forty-five dollars (\$4,145)

3

03-04-2011 13:02:57 CLR174

1 multiplied by the number of identified alternative learning environment 2 students enrolled during the previous school year. 3 (ii) For the 2012-2013 school year and each school 4 year thereafter, alternative learning environment funding shall be four thousand two hundred twenty-eight dollars (\$4,228) multiplied by the number 5 6 of identified alternative learning environment students enrolled during the 7 previous school year. 8 (iii) Funding for students in alternative learning 9 environments shall be distributed based on rules promulgated by the State 10 Board of Education. 11 (B)(i) Beginning with the 2007-2008 school year, secondary 12 vocational area center funding shall be three thousand two hundred fifty 13 dollars (\$3,250) multiplied by the number of students enrolled in a secondary 14 vocational area center during the previous school year. 15 (ii) Funding for students in secondary vocational 16 area centers shall be distributed based on rules promulgated by the State 17 Board of Career Education. 18 (3)(A) Beginning with the 2007-2008 For the 2011-2012 school 19 year, funding for students who are identified as English-language learners 20 shall be two hundred ninety-three dollars (\$293) two hundred ninety-nine 21 dollars (\$299) for each identified English-language learner. 22 (B) For the 2012-2013 school year and each school year 23 thereafter, funding for students who are identified as English-language learners shall be three hundred five dollars (\$305) for each identified 24 25 English-language learner. 26 (C) Funding for English-language learners shall be 27 distributed to school districts for students who have been identified as not 28 proficient in the English language based upon a state-approved English 29 proficiency assessment instrument. 30 (C) (D) Funds allocated for English-language learners to 31 school districts under this subchapter shall be expended only for eligible activities as identified in current rules promulgated by the State Board of 32 33 Education and are a supplement to funding for national school lunch students 34 provided in subdivision (b)(4) of this section. 35 (4) (A) Beginning with the 2009-2010 school year, national 36 National school lunch state categorical funding for each identified national

4

03-04-2011 13:02:57 CLR174

1 school lunch student shall be as follows: 2 (i) For a school district in which ninety percent 3 (90%) or greater of the previous school year's enrolled students are national school lunch students, the amount of per-student national school lunch state 4 5 categorical funding shall be one thousand four hundred eighty eight dollars (\$1,488) one thousand five hundred eighteen dollars (\$1,518) for the 2011-6 7 2012 school year, and one thousand five hundred forty-nine dollars (\$1,549) 8 for the 2012-2013 school year and for each school year thereafter; 9 *(ii)* For school districts in which at least seventy 10 percent (70%) but less than ninety percent (90%) of the previous school 11 year's enrolled students are national school lunch students, the amount of 12 per-student national school lunch state categorical funding shall be nine 13 hundred ninety-two dollars (\$992) one thousand twelve dollars (\$1,012) for 14 the 2011-2012 school year, and one thousand thirty-three dollars (\$1,033) for 15 the 2012-2013 school year and for each school year thereafter; and 16 (iii) For school districts in which less than 17 seventy percent (70%) of the previous school year's enrolled students are 18 national school lunch students, the amount of per student national school lunch state categorical funding shall be four hundred ninety-six dollars 19 20 (\$496) five hundred six dollars (\$506) for the 2011-2012 school year, and five hundred seventeen dollars (\$517) for the 2012-2013 school year and each 21 22 school year thereafter. 23 (B)(i)(a) National school lunch state categorical funding 24 under this subdivision (b)(4) shall be based on the number of national school 25 lunch students for the immediately preceding school year determined under § 6-20-2303(12)(A). 26 27 (b) If the school district is participating under 42 U.S.C. § 1759a, funding under this subdivision (b)(4) is based on 28 29 the percentage determined in § 6-20-2303(12)(B) multiplied by the number of enrolled students for the immediately preceding school year. 30 31 (ii)(a) -Beginning with the 2009-2010 school year, if If a school district will receive in the current school year national school 32 33 lunch state categorical funding under subdivision (b)(4)(A) of this section 34 that is based on a different per-student amount of national school lunch 35 state categorical funding than the school district received in the 36 immediately preceding school year, due to a percentage change in national

5

03-04-2011 13:02:57 CLR174

HB1901

1 school lunch students, the department shall adjust the funding to the school 2 district in a transitional three-year period. 3 4 SECTION 4. Arkansas Code § 6-20-2305(b)(5), concerning categorical 5 funding for professional development in public schools, is amended to read as 6 follows: (5)(A) Beginning with school year 2007-2008 For the 2011-2012 7 8 school year, professional development funding shall be equal to an amount of 9 up to fifty dollars (\$50.00) fifty-one dollars (\$51.00) multiplied by the 10 school district's previous school year average daily membership. 11 (B) For the 2012-2013 school year and each school year 12 thereafter, professional development funding shall be equal to an amount of up to fifty-two dollars (\$52.00) multiplied by the school district's previous 13 14 school year average daily membership. 15 (C) Funding for professional development for teachers in 16 Arkansas public schools shall be used for professional development activities 17 and materials that improve the knowledge of teachers, administrators, and 18 paraprofessionals concerning effective instructional strategies, methods, and 19 skills for improving teaching practices and student academic achievement and 20 training for school bus drivers as outlined in rules promulgated by the State 21 Board of Education. 22 23 SECTION 5. EMERGENCY CLAUSE. It is found and determined by the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas that it is the state's 24 25 constitutional obligation to provide a general, suitable, and efficient free system of public schools in the state; that the public school funding 26 27 distribution changes in this act are needed to ensure that proper funding is provided to public schools and school districts; and that this act is 28 29 immediately necessary so that public schools and school districts will receive the amount of funding provided under this act for the 2011-2012 30 school year. Therefore, an emergency is declared to exist and this act being 31 immediately necessary for the preservation of the public peace, health, and 32 33 safety shall become effective on July 1, 2011. 34 35 /s/Ingram 36 APPROVED: 04/01/2011

6