

2006



**RESOURCE CARDS
ON CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS**

Table of Contents

Finance Data Card

Categorical Aid	1
Categorical Programs: State	2
Categorical Programs/NCLB: Federal	3
Facilities	4
Local Elections: General Obligation Bonds	5
Local Elections: Parcel Taxes	6
Rankings for California	7
Total Revenues for Education	8

Finance and General Background Card

Finance Background:

Budget Calendar	9
Proposition 13 and Gann Limit	10
Proposition 98	11
Revenue Limits for School Districts	12
Revenues for School Districts (Other Sources)	13
School Finance Chronology	14

General Background:

Charter Schools	15
Class Size Reduction	16
Data Collection and Reporting	17
Governance of Public Schools	18
Instructional Materials	19
Special Education	20

These cards give you fingertip access to the latest information about California's education system. They are separated into sections that cover related topics. Each tan section card includes references to more in-depth information found in EdSource full-length reports and shorter publications. (The shorter publications can generally be downloaded for free from our website.) You may order additional copies of these 2006 Resource Cards for \$8 each. Generous bulk discounts are also available. For ordering information, please contact the EdSource office at 650/917-9481 or go to our website: www.edsource.org

Performance/Students Card

Performance:

Accountability: State	21
High School Exit Exam	22
High School Graduation	23
No Child Left Behind (NCLB)	24
Program Improvement/Interventions	25
Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program	26
STAR Data	27

Students:

English Learners	28
Enrollments	29
Student Demographics	30

Staffing/Higher Education Card

Staffing:

Administrators in California	31
Collective Bargaining	32
Teacher Credential Requirements	33
Teacher Demographics	34
Teacher Quality	35

Higher Education:

College Eligibility	36
College Enrollments	37
Community Colleges	38

Index Inside Back Cover

*This publication is made possible through the generous support of **Joyce and Larry Stupski**, the **Noyce Foundation**, and the **Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation**.*

© 2006 by EdSource, Inc. All rights reserved. Revised March 2006.



Finance Data



<u>TOPIC</u>	<u>CARD</u>
Categorical Aid	1
Categorical Programs: State	2
Categorical Programs/NCLB: Federal	3
Facilities	4
Local Elections: General Obligation Bonds	5
Local Elections: Parcel Taxes	6
Rankings for California	7
Total Revenues for Education	8

For more information, see the following EdSource publications, which can be ordered by calling 650/917-9481 or by going online at: www.edsource.org

Rethinking How California Funds Its Schools (5/04)

School Finance 2005–06 (10/05)

* *School Finance Highlights 2005–06 (10/05)*

How California Ranks (11/05)

Understanding School Finance (1/00)

* *How California's Education Dollars Are Spent (10/01)*

* Can be downloaded for free from the EdSource website.

For data about every school and district in California:

See the Education Data Partnership (Ed-Data) website:

www.ed-data.k12.ca.us



Definition

Money from the state and federal government targeted to particular programs, such as K–3 Class Size Reduction, and to children with special needs, such as Special Education.

Funding

About one-third of total K–12 education funding comes from more than 85 state and federal categorical programs. (See cards 2 and 3 for a list of those programs.) The money is granted according to formulas, incentives, and reimbursements, often tied to districts' student demographics. Some programs require a local match, and some are competitively awarded. With differing student populations and abilities to compete for funds, districts vary substantially in the amount and percentage of categorical funding they receive.

“Con App”

The state allows districts to apply for about two dozen state and federal categorical programs with a consolidated application or “con app.” Most, if not all, districts use the “con app” to secure funding from at least some programs on the application. Programs on the “con app” tend to be on roughly the same timeline and include site-based programs, such as the federal Title I and the state Economic Impact Aid programs.

Local Obligations and Flexibility

In a departure from previous practice, Senate Bill 374 (O’Connell, 2001) increased the number of programs on the “con app” and streamlined districts’ planning requirements into a “Single Plan for Pupil Achievement.” The California Department of Education (CDE) monitors districts’ compliance with state and federal categorical program requirements via the “Coordinated Compliance Review” (CCR), which now takes into account districts’ academic performance and history of compliance with state and federal law.

If the CDE finds a district out of compliance with “con app” program requirements, the State Board of Education (SBE) can withhold funding. The SBE can also waive program requirements for a school if it has met annual academic performance goals or if a school’s participation in the state’s intervention program for underperforming schools is hindered by “con app” program requirements.

Assembly Bill (AB) 825 (Firebaugh, 2004) streamlines the number of categorical programs. In 2005–06, 26 categorical programs were consolidated into six block grants: Pupil Retention, School Safety, Teacher Credentialing, Professional Development, Targeted Instructional Improvement, and School and Library Improvement. Each block grant may be spent for any of the purposes authorized in the programs that were consolidated, though some additional conditions apply. The affected programs represent about 18% of the state’s total annual categorical spending.

AB 825 authorizes districts to transfer up to 15% of funds from four of the block grants to any other categorical program for which a district is eligible. (No transfers from Pupil Retention or Teacher Credentialing block grants will be allowed.) Districts will be able to use these transferred funds to increase spending in any categorical program by up to 20%, thus allowing districts the flexibility to adjust program funding locally. Prior to transferring funds, a district or county office must discuss doing so at a public meeting.

Sunset

Categorical programs typically have “sunset” or expiration clauses to encourage legislators to periodically review them. However, some categorical programs are created because of forces outside the Legislature, such as court orders or decisions. Funding for those programs continues even if legislators allow the pertinent laws and regulations to sunset.

STATE CATEGORICAL PROGRAM FUNDING, 2005-06

(As approved in the 2005-06 state budget adopted in July 2005.)

Millions	Millions
Special Education	Teacher Credentialing Block Grant*
\$2,890	\$88
Class Size Reduction (K-3)	(includes Beginning Teachers Support and Assessment or BTSA)
1,676	Pupil Retention Block Grant*
Child Care and Development	87
1,391	(includes Supplemental Instruction, 10th Grade Counseling, Dropout-
Targeted Instructional Improvement Block Grant*	prevention Programs, etc.)
876	Student Assessment.....
(includes Targeted Instructional Improvement Grants and	86
Supplemental Grants)	Charter School Block Grants.....
Adult Education	62
617	English Language Acquisition Program
(includes \$15.3 million for Adult Education in Correctional Facilities)	58
Economic Impact Aid	California School Age Families Education (CalSAFE)
587	53
Pupil Transportation.....	School Safety Block Grant
516	53
Library Improvement Block Grant*	Gifted and Talented Education (GATE)
422	46
(includes Library Materials and School Improvement Programs)	Community Day Schools
Regional Occupational Centers and Programs (ROCPs).....	42
381	Math and Reading Professional Development
Instructional Materials	32
361	Instructional Support
Summer School/Supplemental Instruction.....	30
291	Partnership Academies
Deferred Maintenance	23
268	Tobacco Use Prevention Education
Professional Development Block Grant*	19
249	School Safety Consolidated Competitive Grant*
(includes Instructional Time and Staff Development, Intersegmental	16
Programs, and Teaching as a Priority)	(includes School Safety Grants, School Community Policing
High Priority Schools Grant Program	Partnership Act, School Community Violence Prevention, etc.)
239	Education Technology.....
Class Size Reduction, Grade 9	16
110	Apprenticeship Program
Child Nutrition.....	11
97	FCMAT (Fiscal Crisis & Management Assistance Team)
Year-round Education Grants	11
88	Foster Youth Services
	10
	Early Mental Health
	10

Note: Additional programs are funded for less than \$10 million.

* New state categorical block grants

Federal categorical funding makes up almost 13% of California’s total K–12 education funding in 2005–06. Much of it comes from programs created by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. The 2001 ESEA reauthorization—which became law in 2002—is called the “No Child Left Behind” Act (NCLB). It modifies the original ESEA, as have previous reauthorizations. NCLB increases the federal focus on educationally disadvantaged pupils, including English learners and students who live in poverty. The law also emphasizes a standards-based reform agenda including: high academic standards for all students; extra support to help students and schools meet those standards; and greater accountability for the results, particularly as measured by student performance on standardized tests. NCLB also provides funds to prepare, train, recruit, and retain high quality teachers; support innovative programs, such as charter schools; and create before- and after-school programs.

FEDERAL CATEGORICAL PROGRAM FUNDING, 2005–06

NCLB Programs

	Millions
ESEA Title I – Extra Support for Students who Live in Poverty.....	\$2,017
Basic Grants	1,727
Reading First	152
Migrant Education.....	125
Homeless Children Education	9
Advanced Placement Fee Waiver	4
ESEA Title II – Improving Teacher and Administrator Quality	410
Improving Teacher Quality (referred to as Part A)	322
Education Technology	64
Math and Science Partnership Grants	24
ESEA Title IV – 21st Century Schools*	222
After-school Programs.....	181
Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities	41
ESEA Title III – English Learners and Immigrant Students	148
ESEA Title V – Innovative Programs	51
Comprehensive School Reform Program	30
Innovative Programs	21
ESEA Title VI – Assessment Funding	33

Other Federal Programs

	Millions
Child Nutrition	\$1,617
Special Education	1,149
Child Care and Development Programs (includes CalWORKs).....	963
Vocational Education	138
Adult Education	79
Charter Schools	30

Note: Additional programs are funded for less than \$10 million.
Derived from California Department of Education (CDE) data.

Major Sources of Facility Funds

State bonds Recently voters have approved three large state bonds—\$6.7 billion in 1998, \$11.4 billion in 2002, and \$10 billion in 2004—for new construction and modernization of K–12 schools. Local districts generally must provide matching funds.

Local general obligation bonds School districts may issue school construction bonds and levy property taxes to pay for them with voter approval. Since 2001 districts can choose whether to seek two-thirds approval or 55% approval (with added accountability provisions). Prior to 2001, districts needed two-thirds approval. (See cards 5 and 13.)

From 2001 through 2005, 288 districts sought 55% voter approval, and 249 (86%) of those elections succeeded. From 1986 through 2005, 927 districts sought two-thirds voter approval, and 511 (55%) were successful. Altogether, 1,215 general bond elections were held during that time, and 760 (63%) passed. Local bond elections generated a total of \$31.7 billion between 1998 and 2005.

Other types of bonds Since 1983 school districts have been able to tax just a portion of their districts by establishing a Mello-Roos Community Facility District. Two-thirds voter approval is required. Since 1998 school districts can establish a School Facility Improvement District (SFID), which also taxes just a portion of the district. In July 2001 the voter-approval threshold for SFIDs was expanded so that districts can seek either two-thirds approval or 55% approval with added accountability provisions. (See Card 13.)

From 1983 through 2005, 62 Mello-Roos elections were held, and 30 (48%) succeeded. From 1998 through 2005, 25 SFID elections were held. Of the 14 under the two-thirds requirement, three (21%) passed. Of the 11 under the 55% requirement, 10 (91%) passed.

Developer fees School districts have the authority to levy developer fees on residential and commercial construction or reconstruction. The money may be used only for school facilities, including portable

classrooms. The State Allocation Board adjusts the fees for inflation in even-numbered years. For 2006 and 2007 the maximum was set at 42 cents per square foot on commercial construction and \$2.63 on residential construction.

Projected Need

Enrollment growth Although some districts are facing declining enrollment, the California Department of Finance predicts that over the next five years the number of K–8 students in the state will increase at a rate of about 2,800 a year while high school students will increase by about 8,589 a year.

New classrooms and modernization The Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) projects that the state will need more than 32,000 new classrooms to meet the needs of close to 850,000 students from 2005 to 2010. In addition, almost 1.2 million students are in classrooms that are more than 25 years old. OPSC projects that more than 44,000 of those classrooms will need modernization over the next five years. OPSC bases its estimates on 25 students per K–6 classroom and 27 students per 7–12 classroom.

Multitrack, year-round schools Some schools operate on a multitrack, year-round calendar in order to maximize facility capacity, but the number of schools on this calendar has been declining steadily in recent years.

MULTITRACK, YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION

Year	No. of Schools	Enrollment
2004–05	751	804,189
2003–04	809	884,250
2002–03	916	978,133

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)

See: Voter Guide: *Proposition 55*, EdSource (1/04)

Data: CDE

California Department of Finance (DOF)
Office of Public School Construction (OPSC)
School Services of California, Inc.

See below for successful 2005 bond measures, based on the best available information. To find out about each district's election history, go to: www.ed-data.k12.ca.us

55% VOTE

District	Amount	Date	Yes Vote
Big Oak Flat-Groverland USD	\$9,300,000	11/05	67.60%
Bonsall Union ESD	\$17,000,000	11/05	65.60%
Carmel USD	\$21,500,000	11/05	73.67%
Castro Valley USD	\$44,000,000	11/05	63.58%
Chawanakee USD	\$9,000,000	11/05	57.00%
El Tejon USD	\$7,120,000	11/05	56.13%
Glendora USD	\$41,310,000	11/05	63.09%
Howell Mountain ESD	\$2,900,000	11/05	70.61%
Kings River Union ESD	\$850,000	11/05	65.65%
Livingston Union ESD	\$10,000,000	11/05	67.38%
Los Angeles USD	\$3,985,000,000	11/05	66.09%
Lost Hills Union ESD	\$6,200,000	11/05	60.34%
Morongo USD	\$48,150,000	11/05	56.94%
Newport-Mesa USD	\$282,000,000	11/05	56.10%
Owens Valley USD	\$2,600,000	11/05	56.32%
Palos Verdes Peninsula USD	\$30,000,000	11/05	70.78%
Palos Verdes Peninsula USD	\$10,000,000	11/05	66.99%
Pioneer Union ESD	\$7,500,000	11/05	65.24%
Reed Union ESD	\$13,000,000	11/05	70.19%
Riverbank ESD	\$15,200,000	11/05	65.29%
San Carlos ESD	\$38,000,000	11/05	62.90%
Stockton City USD	\$120,000,000	11/05	69.42%
West Contra Costa USD	\$400,000,000	11/05	56.85%
Woodside ESD	\$12,000,000	11/05	68.50%

TWO-THIRDS VOTE*

District	Amount	Date	Yes Vote
Big Pine USD	\$2,200,000	3/05	68.33%
Delano Joint Union HSD	\$55,000,000	11/05	72.65%
Galt Joint Union HSD	\$29,200,000	11/05	71.00%
Keyes Union SD	\$5,000,000	3/05	73.68%
Ukiah USD	\$43,000,000	11/05	67.96%

* See Card 4 for an explanation of the difference between measures that require 55% and two-thirds voter approval.

Data: EdSource
School Services of California, Inc.

Local Elections: Parcel Taxes (Two-thirds Vote)

Card 6

Successful parcel tax elections in 2004 and 2005, based on the best available information, are listed below.

District	Date	Yes Vote
Acalanes Union HSD \$189/parcel-6 yrs; Programs	3/05	75.02%
Albany City USD \$250/parcel, \$.05 sq. ft. nonres.-7 yrs	11/05	68.53%
Alum Rock Union ESD \$100/parcel-5 yrs; Repair, expand facilities	11/04	68.86%
Belmont-Redwood Shores ESD \$96/parcel-10 yrs; Programs, small classes, teachers	11/04	66.72%
Berkeley USD 9.7¢/sq. ft. res., 14.7¢ sq. ft. comm., \$50 unimproved parcel-2 yrs; Programs	11/04	72.10%
Brisbane ESD \$96/parcel-6 yrs; Staff, small classes, materials	3/05	69.85%
Burlingame ESD \$104/parcel-6 yrs; Small classes, teachers, programs	11/04	78.27%
*Cambrian ESD \$63/parcel-renewal 6/05-6/09; Staff, programs, small classes	3/04	74.06%
Campbell Union HSD \$85/parcel-5 yrs; Small classes, teachers, programs, safety	11/04	67.51%
Dixie ESD \$245/parcel-8 yrs; Programs, staff	4/04	80.18%
Fremont Union HSD \$98/parcel-6 yrs; Programs, staff	11/04	67.11%
La Honda-Pescadero USD \$100/parcel-7 yrs; Programs, staff	11/05	72.40%
Larkspur ESD \$289/parcel-6 yrs; Small classes, programs, staff	3/05	76.08%
Las Virgenes Valley USD \$98/parcel-4 yrs; Programs, small classes, materials	3/04	71.35%
Livermore Valley USD \$120/parcel-5 yrs; Staff, small classes, programs	11/04	71.60%
*Loma Prieta Joint Union ESD \$150/parcel-renewal 6/04-6/08; Continue Gann Limit increase	3/04	64.38%
Mill Valley ESD \$406/parcel-renewal 7/06-7/14, 5% annual increase; Libraries, small classes	11/04	77.72%
Moraga ESD \$325/parcel-6 yrs; Small classes, staff	3/04	66.80%
Mountain View-Whisman ESD \$75-\$600 (based on sq. ft.)/parcel-5 yrs; Small schools/classes, staff	3/04	69.91%
Novato USD \$155/parcel-6 yrs; Program, small classes, staff	3/05	75.08%
Oak Park USD \$197/parcel-5 yrs; Programs, staff	3/04	81.30%

District	Date	Yes Vote
Oakland USD \$195/parcel-5 yrs; Staff, programs, materials	3/04	74.50%
Petaluma City ESD \$75/parcel-4 yrs; Restore programs, small classes, staff	3/04	68.00%
Petaluma Joint Union HSD \$50/parcel-4 yrs; Libraries, small classes, programs	11/04	68.00%
Portola Valley ESD \$290/parcel-10 yrs; Programs, staff	3/04	73.06%
Ravenswood City ESD \$98/parcel-5 yrs; Staff, programs	3/04	74.34%
Ross Valley ESD \$244.70/parcel-8 yrs; Programs	3/05	82.99%
San Ramon Valley USD \$90/parcel-5 yrs; Teachers, small classes, programs	4/04	72.00%
Santa Cruz City ESD \$70/parcel-7 yrs; Teachers, programs, students at risk	11/05	80.10%
Santa Cruz City HSD \$28/parcel-7 yrs; Teachers, programs, students at risk	11/05	76.90%
Sebastopol Union ESD \$52/parcel-8 yrs; Programs	3/05	69.10%
Tahoe-Truckee USD \$98/parcel-7 yrs; Small classes, programs, staff	3/05	73.34%
Tamalpais Union HSD \$199.97/parcel-4 yrs; Programs, small classes	11/04	74.63%
Walnut Creek ESD \$82/parcel-6 yrs; Staff, small classes, technology	3/05	71.16%
West Contra Costa USD 7.2¢/sq. ft.-6 yrs; Small classes, staff, materials, programs	6/04	70.60%
Wilmar Union ESD \$45/parcel-4 yrs; Libraries, programs, small classes	3/04	70.00%

* This is a continuation of a Gann Appropriation Limit increase and only requires a majority approval.

Data: EdSource
School Services of California, Inc.



	California Rank in U.S.	California Average	U.S. Average	Top	Bottom
Teachers' salaries (2003-04)	3	\$56,444	\$46,752	\$57,337/Connecticut	\$33,236/South Dakota
Expenditures per pupil (2003-04)	29	\$7,584	\$8,248	\$13,317/District of Columbia	\$5,091/Utah
Public school revenue (2001-02) per \$1,000 personal income in 2002	28	\$46	\$47	\$60/Alaska	\$30/District of Columbia
Per capita personal income (2002)	12	\$32,845	\$30,804	\$46,407/District of Columbia	\$22,511/Mississippi

Note: The numbers in this table are based on fall enrollment data. The District of Columbia is included among the states.

Data: National Education Association's *Rankings & Estimates, 2004-05*

Ratio of Staff to 1,000 Pupils by Position, Fall 2003	California Rank in U.S.	U.S. Average	California Average	% of U.S. Average
Total school staff to students	50	89.9	68.4	76%
Professional (certificated) staff to students				
District officials/administrators	48	1.3	0.4	31%
School principals & asst. principals	50	3.4	2.1	62%
Teachers	49	63.1	48.3	77%
Guidance counselors	50	2.1	1.1	52%
Librarians	51	1.1	0.2	18%

Note: The numbers in this table are based on fall enrollment data. The District of Columbia is included among the states.

Data: National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)

TOTAL REVENUES FOR K-12 EDUCATION*

	2004-05 2004-05 Budget		2005-06 2005-06 Budget Act	
	(BILLIONS)		(BILLIONS)	
State Aid	\$34.4	57.7%	\$36.2	58.2%
Property Tax	13.0	21.8%	13.6	21.9%
Federal Aid	7.5	12.6%	7.5	12.1%
Local Miscellaneous	3.9	6.5%	3.9	6.3%
Lottery	0.8	1.3%	1.0	1.6%
Total	\$59.6		\$62.2	

* These figures were updated in January 2006. The percentages do not always add up to 100% because of rounding.

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)

Proposition 98 guarantees a certain level of state tax and property tax funding per kindergarten through community college student each year. (See Card 11.)

Sources of Revenue

State Aid: comes mostly from California sales and income taxes, including about \$3.5 billion in 2005–06 that was not counted toward the Proposition 98 guarantee.

Property Tax: is allocated to schools by the state. (Cities, counties, and other agencies also receive some local property tax revenues.) The 2005–06 total includes \$1.7 billion not counted toward the Proposition 98 guarantee.

Federal Aid: is earmarked for special purposes, most notably Child Nutrition, No Child Left Behind (NCLB), and Special Education.

Local Miscellaneous: includes such sources as community contributions, interest income, developer fees, cafeteria sales, and revenues from local parcel tax elections. (See Card 13.)

Lottery: is projected at about \$146 per student (based on average daily attendance) in 2005–06, with \$25 to be used only for instructional materials.

About two-thirds of K–12 education funding is for revenue limits, and one-third is for categorical aid, though the proportion can vary dramatically from district to district. Districts have very limited ways to supplement their revenue. (See Card 13.)

California State Lottery

In November 1984 voters approved the California State Lottery. A minimum of 34% of total lottery receipts must be distributed to public schools, colleges, and universities. The money is to supplement, not supplant, support for education. It must be used for the instruction of students with no funds spent for acquisition of real property, construction of facilities, financing of research, or any other noninstructional purpose. The lottery has provided between 1.5% and 3.8% of K–12 education revenues since 1985–86, not exceeding 2% since 1995–96. A 2000 initiative (Proposition 20) required that annual increases or decreases in education's share of the lottery revenue be split evenly, with one half going to unrestricted revenues and one half to be used only for instructional materials.

K-12 EDUCATION'S SHARE OF LOTTERY FUNDS PER ADA*

Year	Unrestricted Revenue	Instructional Materials	Total Income
2004-05	\$120	\$22	\$142
2003-04	115	17	132
2002-03	113	12	125
2001-02	120	15	135
2000-01	126	18	144

*ADA stands for average daily attendance.

Data: CDE

School Services of California, Inc.

Finance Background



TOPIC	CARD
Budget Calendar.....	9
Proposition 13 and Gann Limit	10
Proposition 98	11
Revenue Limits for School Districts.....	12
Revenues for School Districts (Other Sources).....	13
School Finance Chronology.....	14

For more information, see the following EdSource publications, which can be ordered by calling 650/917-9481 or by going online at: www.edsource.org

Rethinking How California Funds Its Schools (5/04)

Understanding School District Budgets (1/05)

Understanding School Finance (1/00)

School Finance 2005–06 (10/05)

* *School Finance Highlights 2005–06* (10/05)

A Glossary of School Finance Terms (8/04)

* *Building Political Will To Overhaul California’s School Finance System* (4/04)

* *Q&A: The Basics of California’s School Finance System* (8/03) (also in Spanish)

* *Q&A: The School District Budget Process* (8/03) (also in Spanish)

General Background

TOPIC	CARD
Charter Schools	15
Class Size Reduction	16
Data Collection and Reporting	17
Governance of Public Schools	18
Instructional Materials	19
Special Education	20

Issues and Actions in California Education Policy: Setting the Stage for 2006 (1/06)

How Are California’s Charter Schools Performing? (5/05)

Charter Schools in California: An Experiment Coming of Age (6/04)

* *Q&A: Charter Schools in California* (5/05) (also in Spanish)

* *Show Me the Data: EdSource Forum focuses on using and improving data, and on NCLB* (5/03)

* *California’s School Data System: In Need of Improvement* (5/02)

* *Aligning California’s Education Reforms* (1/01)

* Can be downloaded for free from the EdSource website.

School District Dates

- January** District projects enrollments and staffing, begins developing budget for next year.
- March 15** Initial notice to lay off nonsupervisory certificated staff, such as teachers, librarians, and counselors, if necessary.
- May 15** Final notice to lay off teachers, if necessary.
- * July 1** Deadline for district to hold public hearing, adopt budget, and file with county superintendent.
- * Within 45 days** of State Budget Act signing, district makes public any revisions to budget.
- August 15** County superintendent approves, gives conditional approval, or rejects district budget.

If Budget Disapproved:

- * September 8** District files revised budget with county superintendent.
- October 8** Budget Review Committee at the county office of education forms to make its recommendations.
- November 30** County superintendent develops and adopts fiscal plan/budget for district, using Budget Review Committee input.

* Districts may use a schedule with two sets of public hearings and budget adoptions. These budgets are also reviewed by the county superintendent.

Classified employees must have a 30-day notice of intent not to rehire; for superintendents, assistant superintendents, and other senior management, the time is 45 days before expiration of contract.

State Dates

- December 1** In even-numbered years, the first year of a two-year legislative session begins.
- January 2** The second year of a two-year legislative session begins.
- January 10** Governor submits proposed budget.
- February** Legislative Analyst releases *Analysis of the Budget Bill and Perspectives and Issues*.
- May** Governor issues “May Revision” to his/her proposed budget to reflect updated revenue and expenditure estimate.
- June 15** Legislature faces deadline to pass Budget Bill. The governor must respond to the Budget Bill within 12 working days after legislative approval or it becomes law.
- September** Legislative session typically ends.
- October** Governor faces deadline to sign or veto bills, some of which may have a budgetary impact (30 days after Legislature adjourns).

The fiscal year for public agencies, including school districts and county offices of education, is July 1 to June 30.

See: *School District and State Budget Cycle Calendar*, EdSource (1/05)

Gann Limit on Spending Tax Revenues (1980)

Proposition 13: Definition

This initiative, passed by voters in June 1978, amended the California Constitution so that property taxes can be no more than 1% of assessed value. Annual increases in assessed value are capped at 2% or the percentage growth in the state's Consumer Price Index (CPI), whichever is less. (It has been less than the 2% only a few times since 1977.) However, if owners sell or remodel their individual properties, the assessed value is typically raised.

Thus property owners who keep their property as is for many years pay much less property tax than their neighbors who have just bought or remodeled their properties.

Impact

Until 1978, property taxes furnished about two-thirds of education's revenues, with state funds providing much of the rest. Proposition 13 drastically reduced property taxes, which prompted the Legislature to backfill with state funds. The net result was a near reversal in the ratio of state to local funds. The governor and Legislature also took over the allocation of local property taxes to schools, cities, counties, and special districts.

Annual increases in property tax revenues do not change the total amount of funding for most school districts because their state aid is reduced to keep income within their revenue limits. (See Card 12.) In less than 10% of districts, however, property taxes exceed their revenue limits; these districts are allowed to keep this additional revenue.

Local voters can levy a uniform dollar tax per parcel of land (called a parcel tax), but they cannot increase property taxes based on value. The one exception is that school districts can levy taxes for general

obligation (G.O.) bonds for school construction or renovation. Parcel taxes need a two-thirds majority to pass. But with the passage of Proposition 39 in 2000, G.O. bonds can require only a 55% majority. (See Card 4.)

Gann Limit: Definition

This constitutional amendment, passed by voters in 1979, is named after its sponsor, the late Paul Gann. It limits the amount of tax revenues that state and local governments, including school districts, can spend. The amount is adjusted annually for changes in per capita (or per resident) personal income and population, including enrollment in kindergarten-through-12th grade (K–12) schools and community colleges. The amount can also be adjusted for transfers of responsibility between governmental units, and local voters can increase Gann limits. Certain expenditures—such as debt service, meeting federal or court mandates, qualified capital outlay, and addressing emergencies such as natural disasters—are exempted.

Impact

Senate Bill 1342, the implementing legislation, defined school district Gann limits in a way that has thus far minimized their impact.

Only once, in 1986–87, did the state exceed its Gann Limit and refund \$1.1 billion to taxpayers. As subsequently amended by Proposition 98 (see Card 11), if state tax revenues exceed the Gann spending limit for two consecutive years, half of the excess must be returned to taxpayers and the other half goes to K–12 schools.

Provisions

This constitutional amendment, approved by voters in November 1988, took effect in the 1988–89 school year. As amended by Proposition 111 in 1990, it has four general provisions:

- Minimum funding guarantee for K–12 schools and community colleges based on three tests (see right);
- Payment to K–14 education of 50% of the excess when state tax revenues exceed the Gann spending limit (see Card 10), with the remaining 50% rebated to taxpayers;
- Annual School Accountability Report Cards (SARCs) listing at least 13 specific items for each school; and
- “Prudent” state budget reserve.

Proposition 98 may be suspended for a year by a two-thirds vote of the Legislature and signature of the governor.

Impact

The calculation of the guaranteed amount is largely based on the condition of the state’s economy:

- In years of “normal” state revenue growth, K–14 education receives at least the same amount as the previous year, adjusted for changes in enrollment and per capita personal income.
- When revenue growth from one year to the next is particularly low, K–14 education participates in the state’s losses according to specified “fair share” formulas.
- Following a “fair share” reduction that causes the Proposition 98 funding guarantee to lag normal growth, the state is obligated to eventually restore K–14 funding to what it would have been if no reduction had occurred.

In practice, Proposition 98 has meant that education is entitled to the same amount allocated the previous year, plus enrollment growth and an inflation adjustment equal to the change in per capita personal income in the state. This is generally referred to as Test 2 (see right). In difficult economic years, the state can provide a

lesser amount as specified in Test 3. The shortfall must be restored in a future year when state tax revenues grow faster than personal income by a specified amount.

In 2004–05 Proposition 98 was suspended. A suspension allows the state to fund education at a lower level in the current year, and that level becomes the new Proposition 98 base that gets adjusted going forward. When state tax (General Fund) revenues grow faster than personal income by a specified amount, the state must begin restoring funding to what it would have been had no suspension occurred. (The difference between actual funding and that obligatory amount is called the “maintenance factor.”) But the state does not have to pay back the savings it realized from the suspension in the intervening years.

The Tests

- Test 1**— At least 34.6% of state General Fund revenues. (This test has never been used because the percentage of the General Fund is well over that minimum.)
- Test 2**— Same amount as previous year, plus enrollment growth and inflation adjustment based on growth in per capita personal income. (This test has been used most often.)
- Test 3**— Used in difficult economic years. Same as Test 2 except the inflation adjustment used is the annual change (increase or decrease) in per capita General Fund revenues plus one-half percent.

See: *Proposition 98 guarantees a minimum level of funding for public schools (4/04)*
at: www.edsource.org/pub_update_prop98.cfm

Formula

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{General Purpose (Per-pupil Revenue Limit} \times \text{ADA)} \\ & + \text{Special Purpose (Categorical Aid)} \\ & + \text{Miscellaneous Local \& Other} \\ & + \text{Lottery} \\ & \hline & = \text{Total District Income} \end{aligned}$$

ADA (Average Daily Attendance)

ADA is the average number of students present each day of the school year. Since 1998–99 students with excused absences have not been included in ADA. Only students attending school are counted.

Revenue Limit Definition

The basic general purpose money for each student—the revenue limit—is calculated separately for each district. The concept of revenue limits was established by law in 1972. The per-pupil amount varies by type of district (elementary, unified, high school). Extra funding is given to districts defined as “small,” creating a total of six revenue limit categories.

Revenue limit income is a combination of local property taxes and state money. Any increase in property taxes is offset by a reduction of state funds. Revenue limits were adjusted in 1998–99 to account for the new definition of ADA (see above). In 2005–06 statewide average per-pupil revenue limits by type of district are estimated to be \$4,978 (elementary), \$5,194 (unified), and \$5,985 (high school).*

* Estimate by School Services of California, Inc., 9/05

Property Taxes and Basic Aid

In some districts, the amount of their property taxes exceeds their revenue limit. In the past, they kept all of it and still received state “basic aid” of \$120 per student (based on average daily attendance or ADA)—or a minimum \$2,400 per district—according to the California Constitution. Because of budget constraints beginning in 2002–03, lawmakers eliminated the \$120, saying that the state met its constitutional obligation to these districts with other state funding from categorical programs. Generally less than 10% of districts are “basic aid” (or “excess revenue”) districts.

Serrano v. Priest

This 1976 California Supreme Court decision called for property tax rates and general purpose revenues for schools (revenue limits) to be equalized within certain parameters. One of them was the definition of revenue limits by type of school district. By 1983 revenue limits were close enough to equal to satisfy the court order that called for the vast majority of students to attend school in districts with revenue limits within \$100 of each other. Subsequently, an inflation factor for the band was added, bringing the allowable difference in revenue limits up to about \$350 by 2000.

Cost-of-living Adjustment (COLA)

The state usually grants a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) to school districts for revenue limits and categorical programs. For revenue limits, the law ties the COLA to the current inflation rate. The amount actually paid depends upon the legislative appropriation. In 2005–06 the state set aside \$1.3 billion to cover a 4.23% COLA, which applies to districts’ general purpose funds (revenue limits) and most state categorical programs.

Along with receiving a set amount of local property taxes and funds from the state and federal governments, school districts have a limited ability to raise additional revenues. Some of these revenues can be used as operating funds, while others must be spent on capital projects.

Operating Funds

Sources for operating funds include parcel taxes, community contributions, food service sales, and interest on investments.

Parcel Taxes

Although Proposition 13 prevents districts from asking voters to increase tax rates on property, it does allow the collection of special taxes not related to property value (*non-ad valorem*) if two-thirds of the electorate in the district approves. From 1983 through 2005, districts have held 403 parcel tax elections, usually for specific programs. Of these, 208 won the necessary vote, while another 137 achieved a majority vote but did not pass. (See Card 6.)

School Foundations and Private Contributions

Some districts receive significant income from contributions or grants from individuals and local businesses. Based on reports to the California Consortium of Education Foundations (CCEF), more than 500 foundations have formed to support local schools in California. The amount of money raised in 2004 was estimated in excess of \$70 million.

Surplus Property

Unused school buildings or school sites can be leased or sold. However, in some cases the law restricts the expenditure of revenues gained through such a lease or sale.

Capital Funds

Capital funds can come from general obligation bonds, school facility improvement districts, and developer fees. They must be used to build or improve facilities.

Bonds

As a result of the approval of Proposition 39 in November 2000 and related legislation, either 55% or two-thirds of local voters may authorize general obligation (G.O.) bonds. If districts choose to seek 55% voter approval, they face added requirements involving financial and performance accountability as well as limits on the amount of property tax increase they can request to repay the bonds. Prior to 2001, the approval threshold for all G.O. bonds was two-thirds. (See Card 5.)

School Facility Improvement Districts

School districts are also able to tax just a portion of their districts—often new housing developments—by establishing a Mello-Roos Community Facility District or a School Facility Improvement District (SFID). Under Mello-Roos, which requires two-thirds voter approval, property owners pay a special tax based on a formula. An SFID also taxes just a portion of the school district but is a general obligation bond based on the value of the property. A law passed in July 2001 allowed the voter-approval threshold for SFIDs to be either two-thirds or 55% (with added accountability provisions). Prior to July 2001, a two-thirds vote was required. (See Card 4.)

Developer Fees

Developer fees authorized by the school district governing board may be levied on new construction within a district.

- 1972 Senate Bill (SB) 90** Established revenue limits—a ceiling on the amount of general purpose money each school district can receive per pupil.
- 1976 Serrano v. Priest** California Supreme Court ruling on a 1968 lawsuit alleging that the system of school finance was inequitable. (See Card 12.) The state Legislature responded with Assembly Bill (AB) 65 in 1977 and made other changes with AB 8 in 1979.
- 1978 Proposition 13** Constitutional amendment limiting property tax rates and increases. (See Card 10.)
- 1979 Assembly Bill (AB) 8** Funding structure for schools after Proposition 13, with a revised formula for dividing property taxes. Created the “Serrano squeeze” by granting larger inflation increases to low-revenue districts. (See Card 12.)
- 1979 Gann Limit** Constitutional limit on spending at every level of government, including school districts. (See Card 10.)
- 1981 AB 777** Revisions to school finance formulas, procedures for requesting waivers from portions of the Education Code, and consolidation of some categorical programs at the local level.
- 1983 SB 813** Major reform law to improve California schools through such programs as mentor teachers, longer school day/year, higher beginning teachers’ salaries, more rigorous graduation requirements, and statewide curriculum standards.
- 1984 Lottery** Constitutional amendment creating the California State Lottery, with a percentage of winnings for public education. (See Card 8.)
- 1988 Proposition 98** Constitutional amendment guaranteeing a minimum funding level for schools. (See Card 11.)
- 1991 AB 1200** Put county offices of education in charge of reviewing districts’ financial statements and certifying their financial viability. (See Card 9.) It also created the state Fiscal Crisis & Management Assistance Team (FCMAT). AB 2756 (2004) required the state to update oversight standards and strengthen the district budget review process.
- 1996 SB 1777** Instituted incentive payments to reduce class size in primary grades. (See Card 16.)
- 2000 Proposition 39** Reduced approval threshold for local school district general obligation bonds to 55% “yes” vote, with some additional regulations. (See Card 13.)
- 2001 SB 982** Response to a court ruling that California should pay for extra Special Education mandates. (See Card 20.)
- 2004 Williams v. California** Lawsuit, originally filed in 2000, charging that the state has failed to give thousands of children the basic tools necessary for their education. The 2004 settlement included accountability measures, extra financial support, and other help for low-performing schools. It also required all schools to report the condition of their facilities, teacher misassignments and vacancies, and textbook availability.

Funding for education is usually part of the Budget Act and follow-up legislation.

Definition

Charter schools do not have to comply with certain sections of the state Education Code, which means they are less regulated and have more independence in making decisions than traditional public schools. Instead, they are governed according to the provisions of their charters, which may be granted for a five-year period by a chartering authority (a school district, a county office of education, or the State Board of Education).

However, charter schools have academic performance requirements. They must participate in the state testing system and comply with the provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). (See cards 24 and 25.) Also, these schools must perform at a specified level to qualify for renewal of their charters.

A charter school may be newly established or converted from an existing public school. Usually a charter is created by a group of interested parents, teachers, or community members. It may be focused around a theme (such as performing arts) or an audience (such as at-risk students).

Funding

Charter schools may receive funding through their chartering agency or directly from the state. Either way, these schools receive general purpose and categorical revenues. The amount of general purpose funding a charter school receives depends upon the grade level of the students. For 2005–06 the per-pupil amounts ranged from an estimated \$4,964 for grades K–3 to \$6,019 for grades 9–12.

Charter schools' categorical funding comes in three forms:

- 1) a discretionary block grant that consolidates funding from about 45 programs;
- 2) discretionary funds for educationally disadvantaged students (English learners and low-income students, with double funding for students who fit both categories); and
- 3) individual programs not included in either of the above block grants, with the same requirements that districts face.

In addition, loans from the state, as well as federal grants, are available for start-up costs.

Charter schools can also secure support for facilities in a number of ways. Proposition 39, passed in November 2000, requires districts to provide charter schools of a certain minimum size with "sufficient" facilities that are "furnished and equipped" and reasonably close to where the charter school wishes to locate. State bond funds are also available for construction of charter schools.

Furthermore, the state provides charters serving large percentages of poor students up to \$750 per student for rent or lease costs.

Laws

The Charter Schools Act of 1992 (SB 1448, Hart) initiated charter schools in California, limiting the number to 100. In 1998 Assembly Bill (AB) 544 (Lempert) permitted the addition of 250 charter schools in 1998–99 and 100 each year thereafter.

In response to alleged financial misconduct by a few charter schools, lawmakers in 2002 passed AB 1994 (Reyes), which tightens the charter approval process, curtails the freedom of charter schools to serve any grade, restricts their ability to operate multiple sites, and tries to force them to locate their operations completely within the boundaries of their chartering authority. It also authorizes the county superintendent of schools to monitor local charter schools. In 2003 lawmakers passed AB 1137 (Reyes), which increased the accountability of charter schools by creating new performance requirements and requiring more oversight by chartering authorities. It also added four programs to the categorical block grant. In 2005 legislators enacted AB 740 (Huff), which made that grant amount more predictable and more generous, raising it from about \$287 per pupil in 2005–06 to a planned \$400 in 2006–07 and \$500 in 2007–08.

CALIFORNIA CHARTER SCHOOLS

Year	No. of Schools	Enrollment
2004-05	511	181,818*
2002-03	418	158,942
2000-01	305	113,956
1998-99	159	68,685
1996-97	110	39,624
1994-95	60	23,170

* Represents 2.9% of statewide public school enrollment. Also note that the enrollment figures are underestimated because each year a few of the schools that are counted in this chart did not report their enrollment to the state, often because they opened after the reporting date.

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)

Class Size Reduction for K–3

Class Size Reduction (CSR), an incentive program to reduce class size in early grades, began in 1996. Participating schools must have one teacher per group of 20 students or fewer. Districts must collect information for evaluating the program. CSR classes must be conducted in separate classrooms to ensure funding. Schools may elect either to provide a full school day with small classes or a half day (with partial funding).

In the past, if a classroom exceeded an enrollment of 20.44 students—based on the average number of students between the start of the school year and April 15—the district would lose its entire CSR apportionment for that classroom. Senate Bill 311, which became law in 2004, reduces the penalty if a school modestly exceeds the annual cap. A 21.95 student average is the new maximum that triggers the full penalty, with interim deductions of 20%, 40%, and 80% for each one-half student above the 20.44 class average.

K–3 Funding and Participation

In 2005–06 districts offering a full school day with smaller classes received \$967 per participating student, while schools offering the half-day program received \$484 per pupil. The state earmarked a total of \$1.68 billion for K–3 CSR.

Of the state’s 891 eligible districts in 2004–05, only 10 opted out. Altogether 881 districts plus 184 charter schools offered CSR

classes, most with a full-day program. The number of CSR classes has grown steadily from the initial 51,612 in 1996–97 until 2002–03. In both 2003–04 and 2004–05, there has been a slight dip.

K–3 CSR Evaluation

In 1996 the state commissioned an evaluation of K–3 CSR by the CSR Research Consortium (which included EdSource). Among other findings, the June 2002 study’s authors reported:

- Implementation of CSR occurred rapidly, though it lagged in schools serving minority and low-income students;
- The relationship of CSR to student achievement was unclear;
- CSR created a demand for teachers that resulted in schools’ hiring more teachers who were not fully credentialed, with most of them in schools serving the most disadvantaged students;
- Classroom space and dollars were taken from other programs to support CSR.

Ninth Grade CSR

In 1997–98 the state authorized funding to also reduce class sizes in two grade 9 courses: English and one other core academic subject—mathematics, science, or history/social science. Average class size must be no larger than 20, with no single class larger than 22.

Ninth Grade Funding and Participation

In 2005–06 the state apportioned \$110 million for 9th grade CSR, and school districts received \$192 per 9th grade pupil taught under the program.

In 2004–05 the equivalent of 257,332 9th graders—46.8% of 9th grade enrollment—took part for a full year in CSR English classes. In the other core subject areas, the equivalent of 140,289 participated in mathematics, 5,602 in social studies, and 1,477 in science. A total of 746 schools in 249 districts were in the high school program.

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)

See: *What We Have Learned About Class Size Reduction in California*, CSR Research Consortium (9/02)

(An executive summary with the same title can be downloaded for free from: www.edsource.org)

K–3 CSR PARTICIPATION

Year	Classes Participating	Students Participating	Percent of K-3 Enrollment
2004–05	94,044	1,762,845	93.3%
2003–04	94,767	1,785,293	93.5%
2002–03	98,110	1,847,201	95.9%

Data: CDE



Public agencies and private groups collect data from schools and districts for a variety of purposes, including to monitor for regulatory compliance, to ensure local and state accountability for improving student achievement, and to study the impact programs and practices have on student performance. Much of the data is available online.

California Data Sources

California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS) A data collection from California public schools that includes information on student demographics, enrollment, graduates and dropouts, and staff. The California Department of Education (CDE) collects this data annually in October.
www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd

DataQuest A CDE database that allows users to create customized reports of CBEDS data by school, district, county, and the state.
<http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest>

Education Data Partnership (Ed-Data) A state-funded interactive database with financial, demographic, and accountability data for schools, districts, counties, and the state. The database also has powerful comparison functions.
www.ed-data.k12.ca.us

Standards and Assessment Division The CDE division responsible for administering, collecting, and reporting data on all of California's statewide standardized tests.
www.cde.ca.gov/re/di/or

Policy and Evaluation Division The CDE division that calculates and reports the accountability data. Data are available at the school, district, county, and state levels.
www.cde.ca.gov/re/di/or

School Fiscal Services The division of the CDE that provides district financial and accounting data and information.
www.cde.ca.gov/re/di/or

Department of Finance (State of California) A state agency that provides data files on population projections, revenue estimates, and budget analyses.
www.dof.ca.gov

National Data Sources

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) The primary federal entity that collects and analyzes education data from the United States and other nations on demographics, finance, staffing, school characteristics, and student performance—including the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).
<http://nces.ed.gov>

National Education Association (NEA) National organization of teachers and other education professionals that collects and reports enrollment, expenditures, class size, teacher salary, and other data for states and the nation as a whole. It also ranks states based on the data.
www.nea.org

School Matters A collaborative effort of the Council of Chief State School Officers, Standard & Poor's School Evaluation Services, and CELT (Center for Expansion of Language and Thinking), a nonprofit educational corporation. School Matters is a national clearinghouse for education information and analysis, with information on individual states and the nation as a whole.
www.schoolmatters.com

State Data Services in Development

California School Information Services (CSIS) A state-funded effort to enhance the ability of districts and county offices to collect, share, and report data about individual students. Participation in CSIS is voluntary.
www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd

California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) A database that focuses on accurate individual student performance data over time. It is being developed by the state to meet new federal reporting requirements under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). To see updates on the progress being made toward developing this database, go to:
www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sp/cl

Federal

The federal government influences the governance of public schools primarily through requirements that the state must meet in order to receive funding for special purposes. The most notable of these are the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) and Special Education. (See cards 20, 24, and 25.) Some federal laws—such as accessibility requirements for disabled students and anti-discrimination statutes—also affect schools.

State

The state government in California largely controls education funding. Beyond the budget, the governor and Legislature can make laws that influence every facet of school operations. California's secretary of education is appointed by the governor to advise the governor on education matters.

The State Board of Education (SBE), appointed by the governor with the approval of the state Senate, is the governing body for the California Department of Education (CDE). The SBE is responsible for approving curriculum frameworks, textbooks, statewide assessments, and standards for student performance. It acts as a court of appeals for various local decisions (such as school district reorganization) and approves regulations drafted by the superintendent of public instruction (SPI) to implement new laws.

Voters elect the SPI, who administers the day-to-day operation of the CDE under the policies of the SBE and advocates for the public K–12 school system. The CDE's work includes administering and enforcing state education laws; advising school districts on legal, financial, and program matters; and collecting, analyzing, and disseminating financial, demographic, and other data about public education.

Local

Every school district has a publicly elected governing board, which is responsible for governing and managing local schools within the limits of state and federal law. Together with the school district administration, the school board is responsible for many fiscal, personnel, instructional, and student-related policies, such as adopting the budget, negotiating with employee unions, and hiring or firing the superintendent.

The role of schools and their school site councils or other parent/staff groups depends on how much autonomy the district gives to its schools. Principals are responsible for helping teachers improve student academic achievement, developing a positive school culture, and managing personnel and operations effectively.

County

All 58 county offices of education (COEs) in California are operated by a superintendent and board, but the methods for selecting the

members of the governance team vary. In general, county offices provide:

- Business, administrative, and curriculum services to school districts.
- Financial oversight of districts.
- Oversight to ensure that facilities, teachers, and instructional materials in low-performing schools meet state-determined standards.
- Educational programs for certain students, such as classes for homeless students and pregnant minors. By law, some statewide programs—such as Juvenile Hall and the Homes and Camp Program—are offered only by county offices. In other cases, both county offices and school districts provide similar services, such as vocational education and Special Education for students with disabilities.

COE services are affected by the type of districts within the county, the geographical location and size of the county, and the special needs of students that are not met by districts within the county. Generally, county offices provide more services to smaller districts.

Employee Unions

The California Government Code gives teachers and most other school employees the right to be represented by a union and to engage in collective bargaining. (See Card 32.)

Definition

Instructional materials include textbooks, technology-based materials (e.g., software), workbooks, science kits, and tests.

Adoption of Instructional Materials K–8

The State Board of Education (SBE) adopts instructional materials in each subject with advice from an 18-member Curriculum Commission. The commission evaluates and recommends materials based on criteria described in curriculum frameworks that the SBE adopts every six to eight years. The materials adoption process is as follows:

- Publishers submit instructional materials for consideration to the SBE.
- The Curriculum Commission oversees an evaluation process with three concurrent steps:
 - Materials undergo “social content review” to ensure that they accurately portray the cultural and racial diversity of American society and do not contain inappropriate company logos or references to commercial products.
 - Doctorate-level experts, educators, parents, and others review materials for usability, accuracy, and alignment to SBE-adopted academic content standards, which specify what students in each grade should know and be able to do.
 - The public comments on submitted materials.
- The SBE holds a “primary” materials adoption.
- In two to four years, the SBE holds a “follow up” adoption to broaden the selection of materials and allow publishers to modify unaccepted materials so they meet the evaluation criteria.

Since 1998 the SBE has adopted standards-based instructional materials for English language arts, mathematics, science, history/social science, and visual and performing arts. It has also adopted

materials for health and foreign languages—neither of which currently have state content standards. For a list of these materials, go to: www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf

Grades 9–12

The SBE does not adopt instructional materials for grades 9 to 12. Instead, districts select them, using SBE-adopted curriculum frameworks and “standards maps” for guidance. (Standards maps, provided by textbook publishers, demonstrate how materials align with the state’s standards.)

Funding for Instructional Materials

In 2002–03 the state created the Instructional Materials Funding Realignment Program (IMFRP), which received \$361 million in 2005–06. The IMFRP requires districts to provide standards-based materials for pupils by the start of the school year that begins within two years of the adoption of materials by the state for K–8 and by the district for 9–12. Under certain circumstances, the SBE can grant a waiver of that deadline.

Districts may use some IMFRP funding on related costs but only after they take specific actions. Such costs could include supplemental materials, professional development, and assessment materials.

As part of the settlement of the *Williams* class action lawsuit (see Card 14), the state also set aside an additional \$138 million for extra instructional materials for schools that score in the bottom 20% on the Academic Performance Index (API) rankings. In addition, at the start of each school year, county superintendents must inspect schools that are in the *bottom* 30% of the API rankings and are *not* in an intervention program in order to make sure those schools have sufficient instructional materials.

The state lottery also provides funding earmarked for instructional materials. (See Card 8.)

Public Law 94-142 (1975), The Education for All Handicapped Children Act

This federal law required states to provide special services to children with exceptional needs and established procedural rights for parents and children. Congressional reauthorization and some changes to the renamed federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) were last enacted in 2004.

Senate Bill 1870 (1980), California's Master Plan for Special Education

- Each district must provide free, appropriate education to all qualifying individuals, ages infancy through 21, who live within its boundaries.
- An assessment (with parental permission) and a program plan (IEP or Individualized Education Program) are required for each special-needs child.
- The goal is to place students in the “least restrictive environment” in regular classrooms as much as possible (called “mainstreaming” or, more recently, “inclusion” if for a full day).

Funding in California

As of 1998–99, Special Education funding is based on the total number of students in K–12 public schools rather than on the number of Special Education students and the services they receive. Money is allocated by regional SELPAs (Special Education Local Plan Areas) to districts and programs serving qualified students.

In 2005–06 about \$2.9 billion of state funds and more than \$1.1 billion of federal funds were allocated for Special Education in California. In addition, school districts spent local funds to meet IDEA requirements. In order to settle a lawsuit brought by the Riverside County Office of Education in 1980, state funds increased dramatically in 2001–02. That year the state approved a \$100 million permanent increase in Proposition 98 base funding,

a one-time General Fund allocation of \$270 million to reimburse past costs, and an additional \$25 million payment to be allocated annually from 2001–02 through 2010–11. Facing budget deficits since 2002–03, the state has used increased funds from the federal government to help offset these new funding requirements.

In 2005–06 the state provided districts a minimum basic Special Education allocation of \$538.50 for every K–12 student based on average daily attendance (ADA). Districts use those funds to help pay for the extra services they must provide to Special Education students.

Effective in 2004–05, the state changed its approach to funding for students needing Special Education who are placed into public or private group homes, licensed children’s institutions, or other residential facilities. The state established a set amount based on the level of care required and expanded eligibility for these funds to public agencies.

Almost 11% of students in California receive Special Education services each year. In 2004–05 schools served 681,969 special-needs students. Of those students, 328,381 had a specific learning disability, making up almost half (48.2%) of those enrolled in Special Education. More than a quarter (25.8% or 176,265) of Special Education students had a speech or language impairment, and 44,263 (6.5%) had mental retardation. Altogether there are 13 categories of disabilities, including visual, orthopedic, or other health impairment; emotional disturbance; autism; hard of hearing, deaf, or deaf-blind; traumatic brain injury; and multiple disability.

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)
Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO)

Performance

TOPIC	CARD
Accountability: State	21
High School Exit Exam	22
High School Graduation	23
No Child Left Behind (NCLB)	24
Program Improvement/Interventions	25
Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program ...	26
STAR Data	27

For more information, see the following EdSource publications, which can be ordered by calling 650/917-9481 or by going online at: www.edsource.org

* *Similar Students, Different Results: Why Do Some Schools Do Better?* (Initial report of findings 10/05; final report to be released in spring 2006)

School Accountability Under NCLB: Ambitious Goals and Competing Systems (8/05)

The California High School Exit Exam Gets Real (2/06)

Spotlight on High School Performance (6/05)

How Are California's Charter Schools Performing? (5/05)

* *The Movement To Transform High School* (5/05)

* *The State's Official Measures of School Performance* (6/05) (also in Spanish)

No Child Left Behind in California? (1/04)

California's Lowest Performing Schools (2/03)

Available at EdSource Online only (also in Spanish):

Frequently Asked Questions About the No Child Left Behind Act or NCLB



Students

TOPIC	CARD
English Learners	28
Enrollments	29
Student Demographics	30

Narrowing the Achievement Gap (1/03)

California's Middle Grade Students (3/04)

* *Middle Grades: The Challenge of Meeting High Expectations* (3/04)

* *Who Are California's Students?* (6/02)

* Can be downloaded for free from the EdSource website.

California schools and districts are held accountable for student performance under two systems: 1) the federal system of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) (see Card 24), and 2) the state system, which uses the Academic Performance Index (API). Both rely on scores from the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program and the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) to measure school performance. (See cards 22, 26, and 27.)

API (Academic Performance Index)

The API is a single-number indicator of the performance of a school's students on state tests administered each spring. Based on their API scores, elementary, middle, and high schools are divided into 10 performance levels (deciles) and ranked from 1 (lowest) to 10 (highest). Each year schools receive a "Base API" between 200 and 1000 and a growth target. (See the sample API cycle calendar to the right.) APIs have been calculated for the entire school and for "numerically significant subgroups" of students based on ethnicity and economic status. Beginning with the Base API score due to be released in March 2006, English learners and Special Education students will also be official subgroups. Schools with API scores below the state's performance target of 800 are expected to progress each year by 5% of the difference between their Base API score and 800. Subgroups' improvement goals are 80% of their school's growth target.

Sample API Cycle Calendar

API scores are in two-year cycles with Base API scores coming out in the first school year and Growth API scores in the second year. Below is a sample timeline showing when the tests were taken and when API scores were released in the most recent API cycle.

Spring 2004	Students take STAR tests and the CAHSEE.*
March 2005	2004 Base API scores, based on spring 2004 tests, come out.
Spring 2005	Students take STAR tests and the CAHSEE.*
October 2005	2005 Growth API scores, based on spring 2005 tests, come out.

* The CAHSEE is administered several times a year. Test results from other administrations are also included in a high school's API score.

Components of the API

Scores from several tests are used to compute schools' and subgroups' API scores. Different tests have different weights, and these weights have been altered as new tests have been included in the index over recent years. The weights are always the same for the Base and Growth scores within one API cycle, however. Until the 2004–2005 cycle, each subject had a uniform weight for schools at each level (elementary, middle, and high). Now the weights can vary somewhat from school to school within the same level and API cycle, depending on which tests are taken and the percentage of students taking each test. The table to the right shows the weight of each component for typical elementary, middle, and high schools.

API COMPONENT WEIGHTS IN "TYPICAL" SCHOOLS FOR 2005–2006 API CYCLE

	K-5	6-8	9-12
California Standards Tests (CSTs)			
English Language Arts	53%	51%	30%
Math	36%	34%	20%
Social Science	N/A	N/A	15%
Science	6%	7%	15%
Norm-referenced Test (CAT/6) (Grades 3 & 7 only)			
English Language Arts	3%	4%	N/A
Math	2%	3%	N/A
California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE)			
English Language Arts	N/A	N/A	10%
Math	N/A	N/A	10%

API RESULTS Median Base API

	Elementary	Middle	High
2004	730	696	668
2003	728	685	658
2002	699	667	643
2001	689	668	635

Percent of Schools that Met Growth Targets*

	Elementary	Middle	High	Overall
2005	68%	66%	69%	68%
2004	46%	55%	50%	48%
2003	82%	69%	67%	78%
2002	60%	38%	29%	52%

* Based on Growth API scores, including subgroup targets.

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)

District API

In 2003–04 the state began compiling API scores for school districts. To make AYP under the federal accountability system, districts are supposed to reach a minimum API score of 590 for districtwide API performance or raise their API score by one point.

Beginning with the class of 2006, public high school students must pass the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) in order to receive a high school diploma.

The test is based on California’s academic content standards. The English language arts (ELA) section tests state standards for grades 9 and 10 and includes one writing exercise. The math section covers standards for grades 6 and 7 and Algebra I.

Students first take the exit exam in the spring of their sophomore year. The 10th-grade results are used to help determine whether high schools have made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) under the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). (See Card 24.) Students have multiple chances to pass the test before graduation. A student who passes one section of the test does not take that section again.

For both the classes of 2006 and 2007, more 10th graders passed the English section of the exam (73% for 2006 and 75% for 2007) than the math section (72% for 2006 and 2007). When these

numbers are broken down based on sex, ethnicity, or enrollment in special programs, the differences are sometimes more pronounced. For example, more African American (by nine percentage points) and more female (by seven percentage points) 10th graders in the class of 2007 passed English than math. On the other hand, more Asians and English learners (each by six percentage points) passed math than English. The differences between subject areas are less dramatic for males, Latinos, whites, economically disadvantaged students, and students enrolled in Special Education.

Students with Disabilities

Students with disabilities must be allowed to take the exit exam with any accommodations (such as large-sized print) or modifications (such as the use of a calculator) specified for testing in their individualized education programs (IEPs) or Section 504 plans. For the class of 2006 only, Special Education students who meet certain requirements are exempt from having to pass the exit exam.

California High School Exit Exam Passing Rates

	All Students	Female	Male	African American	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic/Latino	Native American	Pacific Islander	White	Economically Disadvantaged	English Learner+	Reclassified Fluent English+	Special Education
Class of 2006: 10th grade	64%	67%	62%	45%	82%	81%	49%	60%	60%	81%	48%	30%	76%	19%
Class of 2007: 10th grade	65%	68%	63%	46%	83%	81%	51%	60%	63%	81%	50%	31%	79%	20%
Class of 2006: 10th plus 11th grade*	78%	81%	76%	63%	89%	N/A	68%	N/A	N/A	90%	66%	51%	N/A	35%

* Because California does not track individual student performance, the passing rates are estimates. Accurate 11th grade data are particularly difficult to obtain because 11th graders have multiple opportunities to take the exam and students move from one district to another, sometimes registering under slightly different names.

+ See Card 28 for an explanation of these terms.

Data: *Independent Evaluation of the CAHSEE: 2005 Evaluation Report* by Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO)

Graduation Course Requirements

California requires that students pass a minimum number of courses to graduate. School districts, however, can require more than the minimum. State-required courses include:

- Three years of English;
- Two years of math (including Algebra I);
- Three years of social studies (including U.S. history and geography; world history, culture, and geography; a semester in American government and civics; and a semester in economics);
- Two years of science (including biological and physical science);
- One year of visual or performing arts or foreign language (which can be American Sign Language);
- Two years of physical education unless exempted.

California High School Exit Exam

Starting with the class of 2006, students must pass the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) to receive their diploma. (See Card 22.)

Advanced Placement Courses

High school students who study college-level material and score a 3 (of 5) or higher on Advanced Placement (AP) exams in various subjects may receive college credit. Statewide, 19.8% of 11th and 12th graders took at least one AP exam in 2003–04. (A smaller

number of high schools offer International Baccalaureate or IB courses with exams that can also qualify for college credit.) Students who earn a “C” or above in AP or IB courses receive additional points in their grade-point averages.

Graduation and Dropout Rates

High school completion is reported using several different measures for different purposes.

The one-year dropout rate tracks how many students in a given year have left school, based on enrollment data submitted by schools. Dropouts are defined as grade 7–11 students from the previous year who are not attending school on Information Day (the day in October when the statewide enrollment count is taken) unless they have a legitimate, verifiable reason, such as being ill or suspended.

The statewide dropout rate was 3.3% in 2003–04, with higher rates for African Americans (6.3%), Pacific Islanders (4.3%), Latinos (4.2%), and Native Americans (3.7%) compared to whites (1.9%), Filipinos (1.8%), and Asians (1.5%).

The graduation rate attempts to measure how many of a group of 9th graders reach graduation. Under the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), the graduation rate is determined by dividing the number of graduates by the number of dropouts plus graduates from the previous four years. In 2003–04 the state graduation rate using this method was 85.3%. However, this method may undercount dropouts because schools do not always know what happens to students when they leave. High schools must have a graduation rate of 82.8% or improve based on one of two formulas to meet NCLB requirements. (See Card 24.)

California traditionally has calculated graduation rates by dividing the number of graduates by the 9th grade enrollment four years prior. This measure does not count how many students in a cohort left over four years, but rather how many stayed. The graduation rate based on this approach is significantly lower (70.7% in 2003–04). Any method that does not track individual students over time can produce statistics that are at best estimates.

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)

GRADUATION RATES BY ETHNICITY FOR NCLB, 2003–04

African American	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic/Latino	Native American/Alaskan	Pacific Islander	White	Multiple/No Response	Overall
73.4%	93.7%	92.3%	79.4%	81.8%	79.5%	91.6%	81.2%	85.3%

Data: CDE



AYP RESULTS BASED ON SCHOOL TYPE

Percent of Schools that Made AMOs

	Elementary	Middle	High	All
2004–05	68%	45%	86%	69%
2003–04	77%	46%	93%	76%

Percent of Schools that Made AYP

2004–05	60%	39%	56%	56%
2003–04	75%	44%	53%	65%

Note: Includes alternative schools, direct-funded charter schools, and small schools.

2004–05 AYP RESULTS BASED ON SUBGROUPS

Groups	% Proficient in English	% Proficient in Math
Statewide	41.9	44.9
African American	28.8	27.4
Asian	64.5	73.5
Filipino	58.5	61.3
Hispanic/Latino	26.8	32.6
Native American/Alaskan	36.8	37.7
Pacific Islander	39.0	42.4
White	60.8	59.5
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	26.6	32.9
English Learners	21.6	31.6
Students with Disabilities	17.0	19.8

Note: Students who because of their disability are unable to take the CSTs or CAHSEE take an alternative examination called the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA).

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)

Under the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)—signed into law in January 2002—all students are expected to be proficient in reading and math by 2013–14. “Proficient” in California means: 1) elementary and middle school students scoring “proficient” or “advanced” on California Standards Tests (CSTs) in English language arts and math; 2) for high schools, 10th graders scoring the equivalent of 77% in English and 69% in math on the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE), which is more than what is required to pass.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

The state has set annual benchmarks (called annual measurable objectives, or AMOs) for the percentage of students who should be proficient in English and math in order for schools, districts, and the state to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) toward the 100% proficiency goal. All “significant subgroups” of students based on ethnicity, poverty, disabilities, and status as English learners must achieve these targets. For the 2004–05 through 2006–07 school years, to have made AYP schools must also have: 1) tested 95% of students in each significant subgroup; 2) had an API score of at least 590 or increased it by one point; 3) for high schools, achieved a graduation rate of at least 82.9% or shown improvement under one of two formulas.

For 2004–05 California as a state did not make AYP, though it met 43 of its 46 AYP criteria, which included having 23.0% of students overall and in each subgroup score proficient in English and 23.7% in math. Students with disabilities did not meet the

criteria in either English or math, and English learners did not meet the English criteria.

The targets (AMOs) for 2004–05 through 2006–07 include:

- Elementary/middle schools and elementary districts: 24.4% proficient in English, 26.5% in math.
- High schools (9–12) and their districts: 22.3% in English, 20.9% in math.
- Unified (K–12) districts, county offices of education, and high school districts that include students from lower grades: 23.0% in English, 23.7% in math.

District AYP

To make AYP districts must: 1) Meet their targets (AMOs) for the district and all of their significant subgroups; 2) Reach a districtwide minimum Academic Performance Index (API) score, which is 590 for 2004–05 through 2006–07; 3) Have a 95% test participation rate districtwide and for all of their significant subgroups; and 4) If they have high schools as part of their district, meet the graduation rate criterion districtwide.

(For information about the API, see Card 21.)

AYP RESULTS BASED ON DISTRICT TYPE

Percent of Districts that Made AYP

	Elementary	High (9–12)	Unified*	All Districts
2004–05	71%	72%	42%	60%
2003–04	69%	56%	45%	59%

* Also includes high school districts with lower grades and county offices of education.

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)

Under the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), there is a new emphasis on an intervention called “Program Improvement.”

Program Improvement Under NCLB

Only schools that receive federal Title I funds under NCLB are placed in the program. Schools enter Year 1 of Program Improvement (PI) if they do not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for *two years in a row on the same indicator*. (See Card 24.) Consequences become more severe with each year that a school does not make AYP:

- **Year 1:** The district must inform parents of the school’s status and must: strengthen core academic subjects; offer teachers professional development; promote parental involvement; and allow students to transfer to a school not in PI and provide free transportation.
- **Year 2:** The district must also provide supplemental services, such as tutoring outside the normal school day.
- **Year 3:** Corrective action begins. The district must inform parents of the school’s status and do one or more of the following: replace staff; implement new curriculum; decrease the authority of the principal; appoint an outside expert; extend the school day or year; or restructure the school.
- **Year 4:** The district and school must develop a plan for alternative school governance, and allow parents and teachers to comment on it.
- **Year 5:** The district must implement the new governance plan.

If a school in PI makes AYP, it stays in whatever part of PI it was in—years 1, 2, 3, or 4. If it makes AYP for two years in a row, it is released from PI. In 2005, 9,395 schools received AYP reports, 63% of which were Title I schools. In 2005–06, 19% of *all* California schools were in PI, which includes 9% that were facing corrective action (in years 3–5).

2005–06	Elementary	Middle	High	Total
Number of Title I Schools	4,072	835	994	5,901
Title I Schools in Program Improvement				
Year 1	227	55	115	397
Year 2	385	116	39	540
Year 3	250	138	19	407
Year 4	80	48	28	156
Year 5	110	106	32	248
Total	1,052	463	233	1,748

Note: California has 5,766 elementary, 1,392 middle, and 2,237 high schools under AYP reporting. In 2005–06, 71% of all elementary, 60% of all middle, and 44% of all high schools received Title I funding.

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)

Program Improvement for Districts

School districts and county offices of education (COEs) enter PI in much the same way as schools. If for two consecutive years a district does not make AYP on the same indicator (see Card 24), it enters PI. However, districts and COEs are exempt from PI if they can show that students in any of three specific grade spans (3–5, 6–8, or 10) have in either year met the AYP indicator that the district as a whole failed.

California introduced PI for districts in 2004. By August 2005, the state had identified 152 districts and COEs for PI.

During the first year of PI, districts are expected to do a self-assessment and get support from a county office of education or some other external entity. If funds are available, districts in PI will initially receive \$50,000 per district and \$10,000 for each school in PI to implement the recommendation of the external entity.

If a district does not improve after two years in PI, it faces serious sanctions in the third year, such as being required to implement a new curriculum, replace staff, set up public supervision of some schools, replace the superintendent and school board with a trustee, or restructure or abolish the district.

In order to exit PI, a district must make AYP for two consecutive years.

High Priority Schools Grant Program

In 2001–02 California lawmakers created this intervention program, which focuses on schools in the lowest 10% of the Academic Performance Index (API) rankings, providing extra resources to implement an improvement plan. (See Card 21.) In 2005–06 the state allocated \$239 million to this program.

SAIT

Schools that do not make significant progress under state intervention programs may be required to work with a School Assistance and Intervention Team (SAIT), which is a group of educators with demonstrated experience helping schools with serious challenges. The California Department of Education must approve SAITs.



Statewide Testing Program

California students in grades 2–11 participate in the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program each spring. Parents and schools receive individual student scores. Results for schools, districts, counties, and the state are made public and posted on the Internet each summer. Based on their student test results, schools are given an Academic Performance Index (API) score and ranked. The test results are also used to determine whether schools have made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) under the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB).* (See cards 21, 24, and 25.) The STAR program consists of:

- **California Standards Tests (CSTs)**, based on the state’s academic content standards—what students are supposed to learn.
- **California Achievement Tests, Sixth Edition Survey (CAT/6)**, a norm-referenced test of basic skills. A student’s scores are national percentile rankings, which indicate the performance of each student relative to a national sample. Beginning in 2005, only 3rd and 7th graders take the CAT/6.
- **Spanish Assessment of Basic Education, Second Edition (SABE/2)**, a norm-referenced test for native Spanish speakers in grades 2–11 during their first year in public school. Under NCLB, states are required, to the extent practicable, to develop standards-based tests in students’ native languages. California has not yet done so.

* For high schools, API scores reflect STAR and California High School Exit Exam scores. AYP results are based primarily on exit exam scores.

Special Education Students

Most participate in STAR according to requirements in their individualized education programs (IEPs). The IEP may call for certain accommodations, such as a large-print version of an exam, which do not alter the test. Or it may require modifications, such as allowing the use of a calculator, which do alter the test.

Students who are unable to participate in the STAR program because of severe disabilities are tested with the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA). Teachers observe and record student performance on tasks that are the building blocks of California’s academic content standards.

California Standards Tests (CSTs)

The state has set performance levels for student results on the California Standards Tests. Test scores are described as: far below basic, below basic, basic, proficient, and advanced. (For test results, see Card 27.)

English language arts: Reading, vocabulary, and language arts for grades 2–11. Fourth and 7th graders also take writing tests that last about an hour.

Mathematics: Grades 2–11. In grades 2–7 students take tests based on their grade level. Beginning in 8th grade, the CST becomes course-specific, such as Algebra I. Students who have previously completed Algebra II or Integrated Math III take the High School Summative Math CST.

History/Social Science: Students in grades 8, 10, and 11. The 8th grade test covers standards for grades 6–8.

Science: A comprehensive test for grade 5. In high school, students take tests only for specific subjects, such as biology. To meet NCLB requirements, California will begin administering tests to grades 8 and 10 in spring 2006.

Early Assessment Program (EAP)

Beginning in 2004, high school juniors whose schools participate in EAP can choose to take expanded versions of CSTs in English language arts (including an essay) and math (Algebra II or Summative High School Mathematics) to determine college readiness. The results are used by the California State University (CSU) system to exempt students from college placement tests or let students know that they need additional preparation during their senior year.

EAP Test Results*	11th Grade Students Taking the Test	Students Who Need To Improve Skills During 12th Grade	Students Who Demonstrated College-level Proficiency
English 2005	185,695	76%	24%
Mathematics 2005	119,338	44%	56%

* In 2005 about 46% of 11th grade students volunteered to take the EAP, according to the California Department of Education (CDE).

Data: The California State University Early Assessment Program (EAP)



Each spring California students in grades 2–11 participate in the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program. The major component of STAR is the California Standards Tests (CSTs) aligned to the state’s academic content standards. In addition, 3rd and 7th graders take the norm-referenced test, which compares California with a national sample. (See Card 26.)

California Standards Test Performance Levels in 2005

The state’s goal is for all students to score at a “proficient” or “advanced” level.

Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced

Grades	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
English Language Arts										
English Language Arts	42	31	47	43	38	43	39	43	36	36
(percent taking test)	(99)	(99)	(99)	(99)	(99)	(98)	(98)	(97)	(96)	(95)
History/Social Science <i>Grade 8 is a cumulative test; grade 10 is World History; and grade 11 is U.S. History.</i>										
History/Social Science							31		31	37
(percent taking test)							(98)		(94)	(93)
Science* <i>Grade 5 is a cumulative test. High school students take science CSTs based on their courses. State standards do not delineate a specific course order.</i>										
Science				28						
(percent taking test)				(98)						
Biology								42	27	30
(percent taking test)								(27)	(46)	(20)
Chemistry								32	33	22
(percent taking test)								(<1)	(17)	(26)
Earth Science								26	16	21
(percent taking test)								(22)	(6)	(7)
Physics								14	26	40
(percent taking test)								(3)	(2)	(8)

* Some students take Integrated Math and Integrated Science. To find those results and more detailed information on STAR, go to: <http://star.cde.ca.gov>

Grades	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Mathematics* <i>Once students reach 8th grade, their CSTs are based on the courses they take. The shaded boxes indicate the grade level at which, based on state standards, students are expected to take the relevant course.</i>										
Mathematics	56	54	50	44	40	37				
(percent taking test)	(99)	(99)	(99)	(99)	(99)	(98)				
General Math							26	14		
(percent taking test)							(48)	(25)		
Algebra I							34	16	7	4
(percent taking test)							(45)	(46)	(28)	(17)
Geometry							79	47	17	7
(percent taking test)							(3)	(19)	(29)	(18)
Algebra II							69	63	36	12
(percent taking test)							(<1)	(3)	(18)	(22)
High School Summative								67	62	43
(percent taking test)								(<1)	(3)	(18)

Norm-referenced Test 2005 (CAT/6)

For the statewide results, scores on the California Achievement Tests, Sixth Edition Survey (CAT/6) are averaged and compared to a national sample of students. A score of 50 means that California students are, on average, performing the same as the national sample. A score below 50 means they are performing below average. Starting in 2005, the state only tested 3rd and 7th graders.

NORM-REFERENCED TEST 2005 (CAT/6)				
Grade	Reading	Math	Language	Spelling
3	40	57	42	53
7	46	48	48	53

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)

CALIFORNIA'S ENGLISH LEARNERS (ELS)

Primary Language	2004–05	% of Total*
Spanish	1,357,778	85.3%
Vietnamese	34,333	2.2%
Hmong	22,776	1.4%
Cantonese	22,475	1.4%
Filipino (Pilipino or Tagalog)	20,939	1.3%
Korean	16,463	1.0%
Others (more than 50 languages)	116,761	7.3%
Total	1,591,525	

In 2004–05, 25.2% of California's students were learning English, while an additional 16.8% had mastered English though it was not their first language.

* The percentages do not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)

Chronology

- 1974** U.S. Supreme Court *Lau v. Nichols* decision ruled that districts are required to address linguistic deficiencies of language minorities.
- 1976** Assembly Bill 1329, Bilingual/Bicultural Education Act, required schools with 10 or more children in the same grade with the same foreign language to offer bilingual instruction. Subsequently amended and revised.
- 1987** Bilingual education laws were allowed to expire, but districts must comply with the intent of the federal *Lau* decision.
- 1998** Proposition 227, approved by California voters, limited non-English instruction. However, parents may petition a school for instruction in a student's native language.

Funding

Programs for English learners are funded by both federal and state sources, principally Title III of the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) and state Economic Impact Aid, augmented with local district funds. The total amount spent to teach English learners is difficult

to determine because of the flexibility schools have in the use of some funding sources.

English Language Development

Assessment: English learners (ELs) are students whose primary language—as reported by their parents—is not English and whose performance on the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) indicates that they do not yet possess the English language skills necessary to succeed in a school's regular instructional program. Students take the CELDT upon initial enrollment and annually thereafter until it is determined that they have mastered English. At that point, they are reclassified fluent English proficient (FEP). The CELDT evaluates listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills. In 2004–05, 1,342,954 students took the CELDT Annual Assessment. Another 393,977 took the Initial Assessment.* In addition, ELs take part in the STAR testing program. (See Card 26.)

NCLB requirements: California must set benchmarks—called annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs)—for ELs in three areas. The first two pertain to progress toward, and attainment of, English proficiency. Beginning in 2006–07, districts are expected to have 52.5% of their ELs meet their individual annual growth target and slightly more than 32.1% attain English proficiency as measured by their CELDT results. By 2013–14, 64% of each district's ELs should make their annual target and 46% should attain proficiency. The third area is the annual measurable objective (AMO) used to determine Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). (See Card 24.) NCLB is also requiring states to develop standards-based tests in students' native languages to the extent practicable.

Standards: In 1999 the state adopted English language development (ELD) standards, which define what students must know and be able to do in each domain—listening, speaking, reading, and writing—as they progress toward full fluency.

Instructional materials: In order for their K–8 reading/language arts textbooks to be considered for state adoption, textbook publishers must include a daily instructional component designed for ELs.

* Includes students who tested proficient and were reclassified fluent English proficient (FEP).

K-12 ENROLLMENT

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
Public Schools	6,147,375	6,244,642	6,298,774	6,322,189
Grades K-8	4,374,958	4,413,739	4,421,847	4,385,204
Grades 9-12	1,772,417	1,830,903	1,876,927	1,936,985
Private Schools*	635,719	611,350	599,605	591,056
Total	6,783,094	6,855,992	6,898,379	6,913,245

* Includes schools with six or more students.

Data: California Department of Education (CDE) (DataQuest, Private Schools Office)

TYPES OF DISTRICTS, 2004-05

	Number
Elementary Districts (K-8)	562
High School Districts (9-12)	88
Unified Districts (K-12)	329
Total	979

Data: Education Data Partnership (Ed-Data)

SIZE OF DISTRICTS, 2004-05

	% of Districts*	% of Students
Less than 500 Students	32%	1%
500 to 999	12%	1%
1,000 to 14,999	47%	37%
15,000 to 49,999	9%	37%
50,000 and more	1%	24%

* Includes county offices of education and state special school districts.

Data: CDE

Enrollment is the number of students registered in each school and district on a given day in October. The number of pupils enrolled in the school district is usually larger than the average daily attendance (ADA), which is the average number of students who attended school over the course of the year. Enrollment and ADA are both used for funding purposes, depending on the program.

The number and percentage of students in private schools has declined slightly over the past few years, with about 8.5% attending private schools in 2004-05.

California has three types of school districts: elementary (typically kindergarten through grade 8), high school (typically grades 9 to 12), and unified (kindergarten through grade 12). The number of districts usually changes annually because of consolidations or mergers.

In 176 districts, a total of 1,483 schools enrolling 1.32 million students (21% of the total enrollment) were on a year-round calendar in 2004-05. Most schools—80%—that have year-round programs are elementary schools.

CALIFORNIA STUDENTS RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION

	2001-02		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05	
African American	512,996	8.3%	515,805	8.3%	510,613	8.1%	505,354	8.0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	535,714	8.7%	544,122	8.7%	544,281	8.6%	550,084	8.7%
Filipino	150,360	2.4%	156,549	2.5%	160,400	2.5%	163,157	2.6%
Hispanic/Latino	2,717,602	44.2%	2,819,504	45.2%	2,898,115	46.0%	2,961,097	46.8%
Native American/Alaskan Native	53,314	0.9%	53,898	0.9%	52,706	0.8%	51,823	0.8%
White	2,138,085	34.8%	2,106,042	33.7%	2,046,422	32.5%	1,981,460	31.3%
Multiple/No Response	39,304	0.6%	48,483	0.8%	86,237	1.4%	109,214	1.7%
Total Enrollment	6,147,375		6,244,403		6,298,774		6,322,189	

SPECIAL PROGRAMS

English Learners (EL)	1,559,248	25.3%	1,599,542	25.6%	1,598,535	25.4%	1,591,525	25.2%
Special Education (Age 0-22)	663,220	10.8%	675,332	10.8%	681,980	10.8%	638,517	10.1%
Gifted & Talented (GATE)	433,018	7.0%	461,619	7.4%	471,976	7.5%	481,958	7.6%
Free/Reduced-priced Meals	2,911,604	47.4%	3,006,877	48.2%	3,078,483	48.9%	3,106,818	49.7%

Data: California Department of Education (CDE) (DataQuest)

Special Programs

For information on English learners and Special Education, see cards 28 and 20, respectively.

Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) programs provide a challenging curriculum to students deemed by districts to be intellectually gifted or especially talented in leadership or visual and performing

arts. In 2005-06 GATE programs operated in 796 districts statewide. State funding is limited.

Almost half of the student population in 2004-05 qualified for the **National School Lunch Program**, a federal program that provides free and reduced-priced meals based on parent or guardian income.

Staffing

TOPIC	CARD
Administrators in California	31
Collective Bargaining	32
Teacher Credential Requirements	33
Teacher Demographics	34
Teacher Quality.....	35

For more information, see the following EdSource publications, which can be ordered by calling 650/917-9481 or by going online at: www.edsource.org

- * *Teacher Pay in California: Is It Fair? Is It Competitive? Is It Enough?* (4/02)
Help Wanted: Administrators To Lead California's Schools (3/01)
- * *Update on California's Teacher Workforce Issues* (3/01)
Strengthening Teacher Quality in California (4/99)
- * *Collective Bargaining* (3/99)



Higher Education

TOPIC	CARD
College Eligibility.....	36
College Enrollments	37
Community Colleges	38

- Quality. Access. Low Cost. Can California's Community Colleges Do It All?* (3/05)
- * *Executive Summary: Quality. Access. Low Cost. Can California's Community Colleges Do It All?* (3/05)

The following publications are available in English and Spanish:

- * *A Guide to California's Community Colleges* (4/05)
- * *Community College: A first step to a bachelor's degree* (4/05)
- * *A Guide to UC Admissions Policies* (4/05)
- * *A Guide to CSU Admissions Policies* (4/05)

* Can be downloaded for free from the EdSource website.

TOTAL ADMINISTRATORS 2004–05

58.1% Female; 41.7% Male*	26,513
Average Years of Education Service	20.1
Average Years in District	14.0

RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION 2004–05

African American	7.9%
Asian/Pacific Islander	3.4%
Filipino	0.8%
Hispanic/Latino	15.4%
Native American/Alaskan Native	0.6%
White	70.0%
Multiple/No Response	1.9%

*0.2% None reported.

Data: California Department of Education (CDE) (DataQuest)

Administrator Preparation

Currently California has two credentials for certificated administrators—the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential and the Professional Clear Administrative Services Credential. In 2002 lawmakers passed legislation (Senate Bill 1655) that streamlined the credentialing process.

Preliminary Credential Requirements

To obtain a preliminary credential, candidates must pass the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST); possess a valid California teacher, specialist, or services credential; and have completed at least three successful, full-time years in teaching or pupil services in a public school or a private school of equivalent status. In addition, they must do one of the following:

- 1) Complete a college- or university-based administrator credential program accredited by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC).

- 2) Complete a CTC-accredited internship program through a college, university, or local education agency.
- 3) Pass the School Leaders' Licensure Assessment.
- 4) Complete an alternative program approved by the CTC.

When candidates complete the preliminary credential program, they receive a certificate of eligibility. Once they find employment as an administrator, they exchange the certificate for the preliminary credential, which is valid for five years.

Fully Credentialed Administrator

An administrator who has a preliminary credential and has completed two years as a successful full-time administrator must do one of the following to earn a professional clear credential:

- 1) Complete a CTC-accredited college- or university-based program.
- 2) Complete the Administrator Training Act Program.
- 3) Meet the Mastery of Fieldwork Performance Standards through a CTC-accredited program. Candidates may forego all or part of the course-work component of the program if they can demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and abilities through the assessment component.
- 4) Complete an alternative program approved by the CTC.

Valid for five years, the professional clear credential can be renewed upon completion of additional professional growth and service requirements.

Administrators from Outside California

Administrators who have completed an out-of-state administrator program and have met the basic credential and service requirements referenced above qualify for a preliminary credential. If, in addition, they have been an administrator for three or more years, they qualify for a professional clear credential.

Training Program for Chief Business Officers

In 2005–06 lawmakers provided \$1.1 million in one-time funds to develop a pilot training program in school finance, school operations, and leadership for chief business officers.

Collective bargaining is a procedure, regulated by law, for negotiating an employment contract between a school district and employee representatives. California school districts bargain with their unions in a process that can range from adversarial to cooperative.

Success with collective bargaining in the private sector led to passage of the 1965 Winton Act, which required districts and teachers to “meet and confer” on subjects of mutual interest. Ultimate authority, however, rested with the local school board.

Senate Bill 160 (Rodda)

This law established collective bargaining for K–16 (kindergarten through university) employees in 1975, replacing the Winton Act. The law gave employees the right to unionize, and it required school districts to recognize the duly elected unions as the sole bargaining agents and to negotiate only with them.

Employees in a bargaining unit (usually a school district) select one organization as exclusive representative. The largest unions are California Teachers Association (CTA), California Federation of Teachers (CFT), and United Teachers of Los Angeles (UTLA) for certificated employees. For classified employees, the largest are California School Employees Association (CSEA), American Federation of School, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), and Service Employees International Union (SEIU).

Negotiations in private between representatives of the union and the governing board result in a binding contract (for a maximum of three years). Some districts use alternatives to the traditional collective bargaining process, such as trust agreements.

Scope

The topics for negotiations (“scope of bargaining”) include “matters relating to wages, hours of employment, and other terms and conditions of employment,” such as benefits, leave and transfer policies, safety conditions, class size, evaluation procedures, and grievance procedures. Additional items have been added through

court cases, PERB (Public Employment Relations Board) decisions, and the law (e.g., longer school day/year).

The “sunshine clause” of Senate Bill 160 requires that initial proposals be presented for public comment before negotiations begin and that financial consequences be made public before the school board signs a contract.

Effective Jan. 1, 2001, all employees must join the selected union or pay a service fee. Previously, this so-called “organizational security” was subject to negotiation.

In addition, a government code section added in 2004 requires that the superintendent and chief business official of a school district certify in writing that the costs incurred by the district under the proposed collective bargaining agreement can be met during the term of the agreement. This certification, which is submitted to the county superintendent, must also itemize any budget revisions necessary to meet the costs of the agreement.

PERB (Public Employment Relations Board)

Established by Senate Bill 160, this board consists of five members appointed by the governor. They decide matters in dispute, especially about the scope of collective bargaining. PERB also establishes rules regarding various types of disputes, including:

- Unfair labor practices;
- Impasse, mediation, and fact-finding processes if negotiations break down; and
- “Work to rule” and strike actions by employee groups.

Court Ruling on Strikes

In May 1985 the California Supreme Court ruled that strikes by public employees are legal unless the public safety is threatened (*County Sanitation District No. 2 v. Los Angeles County Employees Association*).

Types of Teaching Credentials

- Multiple-Subject Teaching Credential used for elementary or middle school.
- Single-Subject Teaching Credential used for middle or high school.
- Specialist credentials used for reading, Special Education, or instruction of English learners.

Fully Credentialed Teacher

To be a fully credentialed teacher in California, a person must:

- Earn at least a bachelor's degree.
- Pass the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST).
- Complete an approved teacher-preparation program, including successful student teaching.
- Pass the appropriate subject-matter examination *or* complete course work in core academic subject areas, as approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC).
- Complete a comprehensive reading instruction course and course work on the use of computers in educational settings.
- Complete a course on the U.S. Constitution *or* instead pass an examination.
- For those seeking a multiple-subject credential who did not complete a traditional teacher-preparation program, pass the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA).

Having met these requirements, a teacher receives a Preliminary Credential, valid for five years. To obtain a Professional Clear Credential, the teacher is expected to complete additional requirements—including participating in a formal induction program or equivalent. The Professional Clear Credential is valid for five years and is renewable upon completion of additional professional growth and service requirements.

Short-term Staff Permit and Provisional Internship Permit

If a district is unable to recruit suitable credentialed staff, emergency permits may be issued to teachers who are not yet fully credentialed. However, to comply with the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), the state will stop issuing or renewing these permits after June 30, 2006. It has replaced the emergency permit with two other permits:

- The Short-term Staff Permit (STSP) will help schools meet immediate teacher vacancies. It requires the holder to have earned a bachelor's degree, passed the CBEST, and acquired a specified level of subject-matter knowledge (generally a number of college course units). The permit is good for up to one year; an individual can be issued only one STSP in a lifetime.
- The Provisional Internship Permit (PIP) aims to get permit holders into an internship program, which allows them to teach while working toward a full credential. Prerequisites for a PIP are the same as for an STSP, but the employer's requirements are more rigorous. Employers must verify that they conducted a diligent search for a credentialed teacher or an intern and help the permit holder take the steps necessary to earn a credential. The PIP may be renewed—but only once and only if the person has taken all appropriate subject-matter exams and not passed.

Alternative Pathways to the Teaching Credential

To encourage more individuals to consider a teaching career, the state provides several alternative pathways to a credential. Internship, pre-internship, and CalStateTeach programs allow individuals to hold paid teaching positions while completing their preparation. The CTC is also authorized to waive certain requirements for individuals with previous teaching experience in private schools or in other states.

The CTC's website provides additional details on California teacher credentials: www.ctc.ca.gov

A Shortage of Qualified Teachers

In California, an estimated 22,073 teachers were hired for 2005–06 because of enrollment growth plus teacher retirement and attrition. Over the next decade, California will need to replace about 100,000 teachers to keep up with the projected retirements. (Enrollment is still growing in the middle and high school grades, but the number of students is decreasing at the elementary level.) The demand is especially high in certain urban and rural areas and in subjects such as physical science and Special Education.

In 2004–05, 286,149—or 93.3%—of teachers were fully certified. Another 10,847 teachers (3.5%) were in classrooms under emergency permits. In addition, 15,995 teachers (5.2%) were pre-interns or interns in university or district-sponsored programs. The state also issued 1,360 waivers (0.4% of teachers) to districts for a variety of reasons, allowing them to staff specific classrooms with less than fully credentialed teachers or those teaching “out of field.” (Because some teachers hold more than one type of credential, these numbers add up to more than the total number of teachers.)

Under the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), by June 2006 all teachers in core academic areas—English, math, science, social sciences, arts, and foreign languages—should meet NCLB’s minimum definition of “highly qualified.” (See cards 33 and 35.)

Data: California Department of Education (CDE) (CBEDS)

California’s Teaching Force 2004: Key Issues and Trends, Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning

TOTAL TEACHERS 2004–05

71.9% Female; 28.1% Male	306,548
Average Years of Teaching	12.8
Average Years in District	10.5

RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION 2004–05

	Teachers	
African American	13,851	4.5%
Asian/Pacific Islander	14,814	4.8%
Filipino	3,677	1.2%
Hispanic/Latino	44,388	14.5%
Native American/Alaskan Native	1,865	0.6%
White	221,051	72.1%
Multiple or Not Reported	6,902	2.3%

TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS 2004–05

	FTE* Teachers		Average Class Size
Self-contained (usually elementary)	137,506	47.8%	22.3
Middle & High School Courses	103,794	36.1%	28.9
Vocational	5,207	1.8%	25.7
Special Education	26,945	9.4%	11.4
Advanced Placement	2,738	1.0%	26.6
International Baccalaureate	242	<0.1%	26.7
Other Instruction-related	11,261	3.9%	19.1

* Full-time equivalent. FTE does not necessarily equal the total number of teachers because more than one teacher’s time may be counted toward the hours equivalent to full time. For example, two half-time teachers equal one FTE.

Data: CDE (DataQuest)

Highly Qualified Teachers: Meeting NCLB Guidelines

Under the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), all teachers in core academic areas—English, math, science, social sciences, arts, and foreign languages—must be “highly qualified.” All teachers must hold a bachelor’s degree and either have a credential in the subject that they teach or be enrolled in an internship program for less than three years. The deadline to meet this requirement was originally the end of the 2005–06 school year, but the federal government is offering flexibility to states that can show that they have made a good faith effort to comply.

For Teachers Hired Before July 1, 2002

Under NCLB, experienced teachers must prove they are highly qualified by doing *one* of the following for each subject they teach:

- Pass the California Subject Examinations for Teachers or a similar approved subject-matter test; or
- Complete relevant college coursework (middle/high school only); or
- Participate in the new High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) process. Based on a state-adopted rubric, the teacher’s supervisor looks at a number of issues, including teaching experience (which can count for only half of the total points needed). Middle/high school teachers may skip the HOUSSE process by becoming certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

If a teacher is not approved, then the administrator must observe the teacher or review a curriculum portfolio based on certain criteria. If teachers receive an unfavorable assessment, they can be deemed “highly qualified” after completing individualized professional development plans.

The NCLB certification follows teachers to new districts.

For Teachers Hired After July 1, 2002

These teachers can prove they are highly qualified in much the same way as teachers hired before July 1, 2002, except they cannot use the HOUSSE process or National Board Certification.

NCLB Requirements for Instructional Aides

Both veteran and new paraprofessionals supported by federal Title I funds must have either two years of college or pass a district test by the end of 2005–06. NCLB exempts paraprofessionals from the requirement if they act primarily as translators.

Strengthening Teacher Quality

A variety of state programs provide resources districts can use to support the professional development of their new and experienced teachers.

Mentoring and Support

Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) provides a formal induction program for teachers during their first two years in

the profession—helping improve teaching practice and increasing the odds that teachers will remain in the profession.

Professional Development Programs

State and federal support for professional development comes through various programs, including:

- A *block grant* providing general funding for professional development programs.
- *Mathematics and Reading Professional Development Program*, which funds district-run professional development programs.
- *Reading First*, which helps districts improve reading in grades K–3.

National Board Certification

California’s National Board–certified teachers can use their certification to obtain a Professional Clear Credential. If they teach at least 50% of the time in a low-performing school, they can receive \$20,000 over four years. Fifty percent of the \$2,300 National Board application fee for California first-time candidates can be paid with federal funds. In 2004–05, 74 California districts offered financial or other incentives to encourage teachers to become certified, according to the California Department of Education (CDE).

Postsecondary Public Education in California

California operates three separate public systems for postsecondary education: two-year community colleges (see Card 38), the four-year California State University (CSU) system, and the more selective four-year University of California (UC) system.

Eligibility for Admissions

CSU and UC

Eligibility to enter either system is based on the successful completion of 15 one-year college prep (referred to as “a–g”) courses, high school grades, performance on college admissions exams, advanced course work, and personal attributes.

Periodically both CSU and UC change their eligibility requirements and their admissions review process and criteria. For example, UC has said it plans to raise its minimum grade point average (GPA) from 2.8 to 3.0 beginning with the class entering in fall 2007. The GPA is based on all “a–g” courses taken in 10th and 11th grades.

Required College Prep Courses (“a–g”):

- Two history/social science (world and U.S.);
- Four English language arts;
- Three math (through Algebra II or Integrated Math III);
- Two laboratory science (two different disciplines);
- Two foreign language (same language);
- One visual/performing arts;
- One elective from the above subjects.

Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC)

Under ELC, the top 4% of each California high school’s graduating senior class—based on their grades in and successful completion of college preparatory classes—are granted admission to UC. The program, which began in fall 2001, is designed to attract students from schools that historically have sent few graduates to UC. Altogether 22% of 2002 public high school graduates who enrolled in UC in fall 2002 entered through this program.

Early Assessment Program (EAP)

This CSU program helps determine college readiness for high school juniors. (See Card 26.)

College Admissions Tests

CSU and UC require admissions tests that measure reasoning ability and abstract thinking. UC also requires achievement tests in specific academic subjects, such as chemistry.

Beginning with the class entering in fall 2006, the testing requirements for UC and CSU are as follows:

- the ACT Assessment (and, for UC, the new ACT Writing Test), or
- the new SAT I (critical reading, mathematics, and writing).

In addition, UC requires two SAT II Subject Tests in different subject areas. To determine eligibility, UC will weight equally each of the three components of the SAT I and the two SAT II Subject Tests. UC also has a method to equate the new SAT I with the ACT tests.

In 2005, 50% of California’s graduating seniors took the SAT as compared to the U.S. average rate of 49%, according to the College Board. The mean (or average) score for the verbal section (critical reading) was 504 and for math 522. The U.S. mean scores were 508 and 520, respectively.

CSU/UC ELIGIBILITY RATES BY ETHNIC GROUP

(based on successful completion of “a–g” courses)

	2002–03	2003–04
African American	24.3%	25.1%
Asian	56.0%	56.2%
Filipino	43.7%	44.8%
Hispanic/Latino	21.5%	21.7%
Native American/Alaskan Native	23.0%	22.3%
Pacific Islander	25.4%	27.2%
White	39.0%	39.5%
Multiple/No Response	24.1%	26.9%
Total Eligible	33.5%	33.7%

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)

CALIFORNIA'S PUBLIC COLLEGE SYSTEMS

	Number of Campuses, 2005-06	Undergraduate Enrollment	
		Fall 1999	Fall 2004
Community Colleges	109	1,548,036	1,605,282
California State Univ.	23	317,674	344,880
Univ. of California	10	137,115*	158,431*

*These totals include health sciences majors, which are often excluded in UC enrollment figures. In 2004, 133 students were health sciences majors at UC compared to 333 students in 1999.

Data: California Community Colleges, CSU, UC

In fall 2004 about 48% of California's public high school graduates went to UC, CSU, or a public state community college, up from 45% in fall 2003. The California Master Plan for Higher Education specifies that UC accept the top eighth and CSU accept the top third (including those who are also UC-eligible) of state high school graduates who apply on time. A little more than half of those accepted actually enroll.

FALL 2004 COLLEGE-GOING RATES

(of the California Public High School Graduating Class of 2004)

University of California (UC)	California State University (CSU)	California Community Colleges
6.7%	9.8%	31.4%

Data: California Postsecondary Education Commission

Admission and Enrollment Rates

Admission rates, shown on the right, are the number of *all* first-time freshmen admitted divided by the number who applied. The UC numbers mask the differences among the 10 universities. For example, in fall 2004 UCLA accepted less than a quarter of its applicants, while UC-Riverside accepted almost three-quarters. UC's

overall admission rate of 78% (see below) is due to the fact that most UC applicants apply to more than one campus. CSUs also have a wide range, with the Channel Islands campus accepting only 11% of applicants while Chico accepted 73% in fall 2004.

FALL 2004 ADMISSIONS AND ENROLLMENT

California Residents* Who Applied, Were Admitted, and Enrolled as First-Time Freshmen

	Applied	Admitted	Admission Rates	Enrolled
UC	63,489	49,479	78%	27,972
CSU	115,067	80,975	70%	41,138

Note: The data in the table above include high school seniors from public and private schools.

* CSU does not have separate data for California residents, except for enrollment statistics. The CSU enrollment number includes 1,463 out-of-state and international students.

Data: UC Office of the President
CSU, Statistical Reports

In November 1996 voters passed Proposition 209, which forbade state agencies and educational institutions from granting preferential treatment to anyone on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin. It was implemented in August 1997, first affecting the fall 1998 freshman class.

When comparing 2004 with 1997 admissions data, UC admission rates of all students dropped. For some underrepresented students based on ethnicity, the drop was more severe. It was less of a drop for Asian/East Indian (-1.6%), white (-2.4%), and Filipino (-3.6%) students, but more for Native American (-17.7%), African American (-14.9%), and Chicano/Latino (-11.0%) students.

UC has attempted to address the issue of underrepresented students with a program called Eligibility in the Local Context. (See Card 36.)

Community colleges aim to provide college access to all California students who are able to attend. They serve almost three-quarters of California's public higher education students through:

- Courses leading to an associate degree in academic and technical fields; many then transfer to four-year colleges.
- Training or certificate programs in health, high-technology, or other occupational fields.
- Remedial courses for students who need additional assistance before starting college courses.
- Continuing education for the general community.

Eligibility

Students must be at least 18 years old for regular enrollment, but a high school diploma is not required. However, high school students can enroll to take college-level courses.

While the vast majority of students are California residents, each district has its own policy on whether out-of-state residents can attend.

Configuration

The 109 community colleges statewide are organized in 72 districts. District sizes vary—from 10 colleges and 123,672 full-time equivalent students in Los Angeles in spring 2005 to one college with 2,009 full-time equivalent students in Feather River in Plumas County.

Local community colleges have autonomy to make decisions about administration, curriculum, and site issues. The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and the Board of Governors in Sacramento govern the system, manage disbursement of funds, ensure that state mandates are met, and serve as a liaison among campuses.

Enrollment/Demographics

In spring 2005, about 38% of the student body was white, 28% Hispanic/Latino, 12% Asian/Pacific Islander, 7% African American, 4% Filipino, and 1% Native American/Alaskan Native. The rest were other ethnicities or unknown. According to a 2003 Campaign for College Opportunity report, more than 70% of California's Hispanic and African American students start their college experience at a community college. Income levels vary widely, but almost 80% of community college students work while attending school. Less than half of enrolled students come directly from high school.

STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

	Spring 2004	Spring 2005
Student Enrollment	1.62 million	1.60 million
24 Years and Younger	49%	50%

Data: California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO)

TOTAL REVENUES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

A state formula determines how much funding community college districts receive. Student fees contribute less than 5% of the total budget. Thus if state funding decreases, enrollment is likely to be affected.

	2004-05		2005-06 (Estimated)	
	(Millions)		(Millions)	
State	\$3,300	48%	\$3,700	46%
Local*	2,900	42%	3,500	44%
Federal	251	4%	276	3%
Student Fees+	333	5%	355	4%
Lottery	143	2%	140	2%

Total **\$6,360** **\$7,971**

* Local includes local property taxes, the local portion of Proposition 98 Reversion Account, and other local funds.

+ \$26 per unit in 2005-06 for California residents.

Note: Due to rounding, the total may not add up to 100%.

Data: California Department of Finance (DOF)
Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO)

Index

Card	Card
Accountability Data.....	21, 24, 25, 27
Accountability: State	21, 25
ADA (Average Daily Attendance).....	12
Administrators in California	31
API (Academic Performance Index)	21
AYP (Adequate Yearly Progress).....	24, 25
Basic Aid	12
Bonds.....	4, 5, 13
Budget Calendar	9
California English Language Development Test (CELDT)	28
California Standards Tests (CSTs)	26, 27
Categorical Aid, Funding.....	1, 2, 3
Charter Schools	15
Class Size Reduction.....	16
COLA (Cost-of-living Adjustment).....	12
Collective Bargaining.....	32
College Eligibility.....	36
College Enrollments	37
Community Colleges	38
Data Collection and Reporting	17
Demographics, Student.....	30
Demographics, Teacher	34
Developer Fees	4, 13
Dropout Rates.....	23
English Language Development.....	28
English Learners (ELs).....	28, 30
Enrollments, College.....	37
Enrollments, K-12.....	29
Equity (Funding)	12
Facilities	4, 13
Foundations and Contributions	13
Funding	1-8, 12, 13
Gann Limit.....	10
General Obligation Bonds	4, 5, 13
Governance of Public Schools.....	18
High Priority Schools Grant (HPSG) Program.....	25
High School Exit Exam.....	22
High School Graduation	23
Highly Qualified Teachers.....	35
Instructional Materials.....	19
Interventions (State)	25
Local Elections: General Obligation Bonds.....	5, 13
Local Elections: Parcel Taxes	6, 13
Local Sources of Revenue	13
Lottery	8
National Board Certification (Teacher).....	35
National Data Sources	17
No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)	3, 24, 25, 28, 34, 35
Parcel Taxes	6, 13
PERB (Public Employment Relations Board).....	32
Program Improvement (NCLB)	25
Property Taxes	8, 12, 38
Proposition 13 & Gann Limit.....	10
Proposition 98.....	8, 11
Pupil-Teacher Ratio	7
Race/Ethnicity of Students	30
Racial and Ethnic Distribution of Teachers	34
Rankings for California	7
Revenue Limits.....	12
Revenues	8, 12, 13
SAT (College Admissions Test)	36
School District Income	12, 13
School Districts, General Information	29
School Finance Chronology.....	14
<i>Serrano v. Priest</i>	12, 14
Special Education.....	20, 22, 26, 30
Special Student Populations	20, 22, 26, 28, 30
Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program.....	21, 26, 27
STAR Data.....	27
Student Demographics	30
Teacher Credential Requirements	33
Teacher Demographics.....	34
Teacher Quality	35
Teaching Assignments	34
Tests and Scores.....	21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28
UC/CSU Eligibility	36
<i>Williams v. California</i>	14, 19





520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217
Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482 E-mail: edsource@edsource.org

Website: www.edsource.org