



YPI CHARTER SCHOOLS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

June 17, 2019

The mission of the YPI Charter Schools (YPICS) is to prepare students for academic success in high school, as well as post--secondary education; prepare students to be responsible and active participants in their community; and enable students to become life-long learners. Students at YPI Charter Schools will become active citizens who characterize the ideals of a diverse and democratic society. Students will provide service to their community, take responsibility for their own learning, and develop the habits of mind and body that will empower them to be successful in high school and beyond.

CCSA:

May 30, 2019

SACRAMENTO, CA – In an updated response, CCSA President and CEO Myrna Castrejón issued the following statement after both Assembly Bill (AB) 1506 and Senate Bill (SB) 756 were defeated and moved to the inactive file:

"Charter public school families' voices were heard loud and clear by Sacramento politicians: We cannot and will not accept legislation that limits access to great public schools. Today, the collective power of charter school leaders, teachers, families and students defeated this extreme legislation and with their voices, we'll continue to do all we can to defend great public schools throughout California."

Charter public school families were outraged by a package of legislation that threatened to rip opportunities and public schools from families throughout California. [Authored by Assemblymember Kevin McCarty \(D-Sacramento\), AB 1506](#) would have imposed a district-level cap on the opening of new charter public schools, while [SB 756 by Senator Maria Elena Durazo \(D-Los Angeles\)](#) would have imposed a two-year moratorium on the opening of new charter public schools.

AB 1506 moved to the inactive file earlier this morning, while SB 756 moved to the inactive file yesterday afternoon.

State:

From School Services of California –

**“The Charter School Policy Task Force’s Recommendations For
Charter School Reform”**

With Since coming into office, Governor Gavin Newsom has signaled his willingness to consider additional accountability measures for charter schools. In Addition to signing Senate Bill 126 (Chapter 3/2019), which increased transparency for charter schools by explicitly making them subject to the same transparency laws that apply to all public agencies, in early 2019, he tasked State Superintendent of Public Instruction Tony Thurmond with convening a Charter School Policy Task Force (Task Force) to examine the financial impact of charter school growth on school district budgets and thin inconsistencies in how charter schools are authorized throughout California.

On June 6, 2019, Superintendent Thurmond submitted a report of the Task Force’s recommendations to the Governor. With its report, the Task Force was seeking to “put forward recommendations that address the issues of fiscal impact and authorization, and to do so in a way that is in the beset interest of California students.” The Task Force ultimately reached consensus on four recommendations, with an additional nine proposal discussed. The four agreed upon recommendations are as follows:

1. **Extend the timeline for approval or denial of a new charter school petition.**
Current law requires school districts to either approve or deny a charter school petition within 60 days of receipt (or 90 days for a county board of education), with an additional 30 days if both parties agree. The Task Force agrees with authorizers across the state that 60 days is an insufficient amount of time to conduct a thorough review of a charter school petition. Therefore, the Task Force recommends that the review of a new charter school petition be extended by an additional 30 days.
2. **Create a statewide entity to:**
 - a. **develop standards, used by authorizers, for providing oversight to charter schools.** Between school districts, county offices of education, and the State Board of Education (SBE), there are over 1,000 entities with the ability to authorize charter schools in California. While the Education Code outlines the responsibilities of authorizing agencies, it does not establish any standards by which these entities should provide oversight As a result, practices vary wildly from authorizer to authorizer. Therefore, the Task Force recommends that statewide oversight standards be developed.
 - b. **provide training for authorizers.** In order for authorizers to provide consistent oversight as noted in a. above, authorizers need themselves to understand the review and oversight process. Therefore, the Task Force recommends that authorizers be provided training and additional resources

to support their practices.

3. **Provide a one-year hold harmless for school districts when students transfer from a school district to a charter school.** Currently, when a student transfer to a charter school, the school district must recognize the loss of the student when calculating its average daily attendance (ADA) for the respective fiscal year. For other ADA losses, a school district is provided with a on-year hold harmless (i.e., they have the ability to utilize either current-year or prior-year ADA, whichever is higher). Therefore, the Task Force recommends that the existing hold harmless provision be extended to include the students transferring to charter schools. While not addressing all fiscal impacts experienced by school districts, this change would provide some additional funding to school districts and help mitigate the los of ADA experience by the establishment of charter schools.

4. **Provide additional discretion to authorizers when considering a new charter school petition and amend the California Department of Education’s (CDE) role in the oversight process.** The first part of this recommendation pertains to providing authorizers with broader discretion to consider community impacts when determining whether to approve or deny a petition for the establishment of a new charter school. The task Force agreed that authorizers should be allowed to consider the following three factors:
 - a. Saturation, including both numbers of schools and overall enrollment in those schools

 - b. Academic outcomes and offering-offered by both traditional schools and charter schools

 - c. A statement of need—based on academic outcomes and offerings

The second part of this recommendation pertains to the CDE role as the entity providing oversight for SBE-authorized charter schools. The Task Force also agreed that the CDE should no longer be responsible for oversight of these charter schools, but did not elaborate with regards to who should take on this role.

The Task Force discussed nine other proposals, but was unable to reach consensus. Several of the proposals were supported by the majority, while two others were either opposed by the majority or did not move to a vote. Many of these proposals are similar to the proposals included in the various pieces of legislation that have been working their way through the California state Senate and Assembly.

1. One-year moratorium on the establishment of new virtual charter schools
2. Remove the SBE from the appeals process
3. Limit authorization of new charter schools to local school districts with limited appeals to county boards of education
4. Prohibit school districts from authorizing charter schools located outside the authorizing district’s boundaries
5. Allow authorizers to consider fiscal impact as part of the authorization process

6. Establish clear guidelines for new charter petitions
7. Update the Education Code to reflect current state accountability requirements (e.g., remove references to the Academic Performance Index)
8. Implement a plan for managing charter school growth
9. Allow, rather than require, the approval of charter school petitions and renewals

The recommendations and additional proposals have been provided to Governor Newsom by the Task Force. The Governor, and several legislators, have expressed a desire to receive these recommendation prior to moving forward with the various bills currently making their way through the legislature. We will keep you posted as those debates continue.

From California Association of School Business Officials (CASBO)-

**Assembly Subcommittee on Education Finance Adopts
Proposition 98 Package**

By Sara C Bachez and Elizabeth Esquivel, Governmental Relations

Yesterday, May 22, 2019, the Assembly Budget and Fiscal Review Subcommittee No. 2 on Education Finance adopted their education package. This report compares the Governor’s Budget Proposals with each legislative house’s proposals on education policy.

Proposition 98

The Senate Budget plan aligns with the Governor’s May Revision of Proposition 98 funding levels for the 2017-2018 through 2019-20 fiscal years. The assembly’s budget generates a slightly higher Proposition 98 in the budget year as they do not adopt the Governor’s proposed tax conformity proposals that generates \$1.7 billion of new revenues in 2019-20.

According to the Assembly, their plan maintains the similar Proposition 98 levels, which results in the less available General Fund revenues, which would not require a deposit into the Public School Systems Stability Account (PSSSA). Governor Newsom’s May Revision would make a \$389.3 million deposit into the PSSSA and the Senate plan would reduce that allocation to \$241.9 million due to their proposed Special Education Early Intervention Grant program, which adds Transitional Kindergarten to the Average daily attendance (ADA).

Proposition 98 General Fund

(Dollars in Millions)

	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Governor’s Budget Proposal	\$75,576	\$78,146	\$81,069

Local Control Funding Formula

For the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), the Senate aligns with the Governor’s

\$1.9 billion adjustment to the formula for a 3.26 percent cost of living adjustment (COLA) and average daily attendance (ADA) changes. However, the Senate plan would use less on-time funds to cover LCFF costs.

The Assembly plan would include \$2.3 billion in ongoing Proposition 98 funds for a 3.88 percent COLA an increase of \$372 million above the Governor's May Revision Proposal. The Assembly plan would approve the Governor's proposed funding level for the LCFF for county offices of education. They would also adopt legislative intent language to set aspirational LCFF base grant targets to meet the national average pre-pupil funding level, adopting AB39 (Muratsuchi) in the budget process as follows:

- \$12,194 for kindergarten and grades 1-3
- \$12,377 for grades 4-6
- \$12,745 for grades 7-8
- \$14,768 for grades 9-12

Proposition 98 Certification

In January, the Governor had proposed three changes to the Proposition 98 Certification Process, which was established in the 2018 Budget Act, as follows:

- Eliminate the cost allocation schedule.
- Prohibit the state from adjusting Proposition 98 funding levels for a prior fiscal year.
- Create a cap on the increases to LCFF related to the continuous appropriation of LCFF COLA

The Assembly plan would reject the Governor's proposal to eliminate the cost allocation schedule and prohibit the state from making any downward adjustments to the Proposition 98 funding level once a fiscal year is over. The Assembly justifies their position as maintaining legislative discretion over these decisions in the annual budget process.

The Senate plan would approve the Governor's proposal.

Special Education

Governor Newsom's special education proposal would appropriate \$696.2 million in ongoing Proposition 98 funds to local educational agencies that have an unduplicated pupil count higher than 55 percent and special education enrollment as a percentage of total district enrollment above the statewide average of 10.9 percent. For eligible LEAs, the funding will be based on the three-year average number of students with disabilities above the statewide average.

The Assembly plan would reject the Governor's proposal and provides a total of \$593 million in ongoing Proposition 98 funding. Of this total, \$333 million will be provided to equalize special education rates to the 90th percentile and \$260 million will be provided to add an estimate of preschool ADA to the AB 602 funding formula.

The Senate plan would reject the Governor’s special education funding distribution proposal and instead allocate \$533 million in ongoing funds for special education services in the following manner:

- \$33 million to equalize the AB502 funding rates to the 90th
- \$200million to provide a Special Education Early Intervention Grant of \$4000 per student to schools of residence for each child receiving Individualized Education Program (IEP) services that is also enrolled in a mainstream early education settings pursuant to their IEP. The grant is intended to cover costs associated with providing IEP services within the district.
- Expand Transitional Kindergarten eligibility to include 4-year old children with IEPs who turn 5 years old after December 2 but within the same school year.

Both Senate and Assembly plans would approve the Governor’s proposal of \$500,000 in one-time non-Proposition 98 General Fund to convene the Department of Education, Department of Health Care Services, and Department of Development Services, and local education agencies to improve the transition of 3-year olds with disabilities from regional centers to school districts. The plan would expand the focus to also include non-special education services relating to accessing federal funds and the use of Medi-Cal Billing Option Program and the School-based Medi-Cal Administrative Activities Program.

Pensions

The Governor’s May Revision would provide an additional \$150 million, for a total of \$850 million, in one-time non-Propositions 98 General Fund to reduce the school employer’s rate contributions in the 2019-20 from 18.13% to 16.7 % and in 2020-21 from 19.1% to 18.1%. In January, the Governor had also included \$2.3 billion to reduce the employer’s share of the unfunded liability and reduce employer contribution rates long term by an estimated 0.5 percent.

The Assembly plan would approve the Governor’s May Revision CalSTRS proposal and provide \$1.5 billion in one-time Proposition 98 General Fund for CalPERS to prefund school employers’ payments. Of this amount, \$350 million would reduce school employers’ contribution payment in 2019-20 and 2020-21 (\$175 million per year) and \$1.15 billion would reduce the employers’ long-term unfunded liability.

The Senate plan would provide an additional \$1 billion above the Governor’s May Revision to both CalPERS and CalSTRS cost over a 2-year period. The Senate generates these available resources by forgoing the Governor’s proposal to repay portion of state debt. The Senate plan would reduce school employers’ rate contribution for both CalPERS and CalSTRS as follows:

2019-20 Fiscal Year	2020-21 Fiscal Year
---------------------	---------------------

	Current Law	Governor	Senate			Current Law	Governor	Senate
CalSTRS	18.13%	16.70%	16.33%		CalSTRS	19.10%	18.10%	17.30%
CalPERS	20.73%	20.73%	18.93%		CalPERS	23.60%	23.60%	21.80%

Career Technical Education

The Governor’s budget would maintain the %150 million for Career Technical Incentive Grant Program and %150 million for the Strong Work force Program.

The Assembly plan would shift eh %150 million in ongoing Proposition 98 funding from the K-12 component of the Strong Workforce Program that is administered by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office to the Career Technical Education Incentive Grant Program, for a total of \$300 million for CTE purposes. This proposal would eliminate the k-12 Technical Assistance Providers within the Strong Workforce Program and authorize the Department of Education to use up to 2 percent of the grant funding to contract with county offices of education (COE) to provide technical assistance to grantees.

The Senate plan did not make any changes to the CTE Incentive Grant Program.

Charter Schools

The Governor’s May Revision included four policy proposals on improving accountability and transparency for school districts and charter schools, as follows:

- Prohibits charter schools from discouraging students from enrolling in a charter school or encouraging student to disenroll from a charter school on the basis of academic performance or student characteristic, such as special education status.
- Prohibits charter schools from requesting a pupil’s academic records or requiring that a pupil’s records be submitted to the charter school prior to enrollment.
- Creates a process for families of prospective and current charter school students to report concerns to the relevant authorizer.
- Requires the Department of Education to examine the feasibility of using data from the California Longitudinal Pupil Assessment Data System to identify charter school enrollment disparities that ay warrant inquiry and intervention by corresponding authorizers.

The Assembly plan would defer the Governor’s proposals to the policy process and instead prohibit charter schools from discouraging students from enrolling in a charter school or encouraging students to disenroll from a charter school on the basis of academic performance or characteristic, or from obtaining specified student information prior to enrollment. The Assembly would require the Department of Education to conduct a study

on the feasibility of using student enrollment data from the California Longitudinal Pupil Assessment Data System to identify potential instances where charter schools have discouraged students from enrolling in their schools.

The Senate plan would adopt the Governor's charter school LCAP transparency and enrollment practices proposals.

Educator Workforce Investment Grant

The Governor's May Revision provided \$89.8 million in one-time General Fund for 4,500 loan repayments of up to \$20,000 for newly credentialed teachers working in high-need schools for at least 4-years. The proposal would also direct \$44.8 million in on-time General Fund to provide training and resources for educators and \$13.9 million in one-time federal funds for professional development for school administrators.

The Assembly plan would approve the Governor's May Revision proposal to provide \$34.8 million in one-time General Fund for the Educator Workforce Investment Grant. The Assembly makes an amendment to include training for ethnic studies courses. The Assembly would also exempt a school district with ADA of more than 400,000 from administrator to teacher ratio penalties for the 2019-20 through 2011-2022 fiscal years. However, the Assembly plan would reject the loan repayment program and instead fund the Golden State Teacher Grant Program with the 89.9 million.

The Senate plan would approve the Governor's proposal of \$34.8 million in on-Proposition 98 funds for teacher training services, but requires the focus of professional development to support English learners and incorporate the principles and policies described in the California English Learner Roadmap State Board of Education Policy; Educational Programs and Services for English Learners as passed by the State Board of Education in July 2017; and various other inclusive practices to support English Learners and student with disabilities. The Senate plan also redirects \$4.2 million in on-time Proposition 98 funds to be used over a 3-year period to support the Health curriculum framework.

The Senate plan would modify the loan repayment program to 1) require applicants to have student loan debt 2) require awardees to teach at specified priority schools, 3) require reporting to appropriate policy and fiscal committees of the Legislature regarding outcome of the program.

Facilities

The Assembly and Senate plan would approve the Governor's proposal to release \$1.5 billion in Proposition 51 bond funds in 2019-20 and the funding for 10 positions for the Office of Public School Construction.

After School Education & Safety

The Assembly plan would reject the Governor's proposal to use \$80.5 million in

Proposition 64 funding for alternative payment childcare vouchers. Instead, the Assembly would dedicate these funds to increase rates for the After School Education and Safety (ASES) program.

The Senate plan would provide \$100 million in additional ongoing Proposition 98 funding to increase the daily per pupil rate for the ASES program. In 2002, voters approved Proposition 49 to establish a \$550 million dedicated funding level to support these programs but funds have not adjust to recognize the cost of living change, and rising minimum wage increases and cost of operations.

Early Education

Listed below are the key actions from Senate and Assembly on early education proposals.

Preschool Expansion. The Senate and Assembly plan would approve the Governor's proposed 10,000 full-day State Preschool slots for non-local educational agencies, beginning in April 1, 200. However, the Senate would add a reporting requirement on utilization of slots and prioritization of series to working families.

Kindergarten Facilities Grant. The Assembly plan would approve the Governor's Full-Day Kindergarten Facilities Grant Proposal with major modifications, as follows:

- \$200 million in on-time General Fund (instead of \$600 million)
- Expand eligibility to include facilities for LEAs to expand full-day State Preschool programs
- Reject the Governor's proposal to increase the state share of the facility grant from 50 percent to 75 percent
- Clarify that this program does not impact a district's eligibility for School Facility Program.

The Senate would reduce the funding appropriation to \$150 million in on-time General Fund to fund this program over a 2-year period (instead of 3-years) and limit grants exclusively to schools serving low-income students to convert from part-day to full-day kindergarten programs. It retains the proposal to increase the state share of the facility grant from 50 percent to 75 percent for school converting from part-day to full-day kindergarten programs. The Senate plan would redirect the funds to the Mental Health Student Services Act.

The Assembly and Senate would reduce the Governor's proposed \$10 million to \$5 million to establish an early learning and care master plan.

Both Assembly and Senate adopted significant policy proposals on early education to expand services and address reimbursement rates, which will be in conference committee for reconciliation.

Settle-Up Funds (The distribution comparison chart details the use of settle-up funds.)

	Governor Newsom's May Revision Proposal	Senate Budget Plan	Assembly Budget Plan
Cover some 2019-20 LCFF costs with on-time funds	\$98.5 million	\$58 million	\$98.5 million
Cover some 2018-19 LCFF costs with on-time funds	\$368.4 million	\$368.4 million	\$368.4million
CCC Deferred maintenance	\$34.7 million	\$37.5 million	\$34.7 million
Classified Employee Assistance Plan	\$36 million	\$36 million	\$36million
Backfill San Francisco Unified for previous misallocation of property tax	\$149 million	\$149 million	\$149 million
Senate Mendocino College Construction CTE Start Up Cost		\$1 million	
Senate CCC HBCU Transfer Program		\$81,000	
Senate CCC Hunger and Basic Needs		\$15 million	
Senate CCC Re-entry programs		\$5 million	
Senate Community College Teacher Credentialing Partnership Pilot Program		\$1.5 million	
Senate: Veterans Resource Centers		\$15 million	
Total	\$686.6 million	\$686.6 million	\$686.6 million

What to Expect Next

Yesterday, May 22, 2019, the Senate Budget & Fiscal Review adopted their full budget package. Once the full Assembly Budget Committee adopts its state budget plan, the Legislature will reconcile their budgetary difference in the Budget Conference Committee process prior to a final budget deal that is sent to Governor Newsom, by June 15, 2019. WE will continue to share information on the development of the state budget as events and further analysis warrant.

From School Services of California

“Top Legislative Issues for 2019-May 31, 2019

The deadline for bills with fiscal implication to be acted upon by the Appropriations Committee was May 17, 2019. Numerous bills fell victim to the process and, barring any rule waivers, will progress no further in 2019. However, since we are in the first year of the two-year legislative session, those bills that have stalled in 2019 can potentially be revived next year. For many of those bills that did make it out the Appropriations Committee, there were amendments to address concerns, and add coauthors, or reduce cost.

Those amendments occurred as the bills moved to the net step in the process: floor votes. By the end of Friday, May 31, 2019, bills must be approved and voted out of their house of origin and on to the second house. For legislators who don't sit on a specific policy committee or the Appropriations Committee, this will be their first opportunity to weigh in on a bill. With hundreds of bills to make it through this step in a matter of days, both houses have held marathon-length sessions in hopes to meet the deadline ahead of schedule and go back to their districts without a Friday floor session.

Accountability and Assessments

Assembly Bill (AB) 751 (O'Donnell, D-Long Beach)—Pupil Assessments: Pathways to College Act. The Pathways to college Act would require the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) to approve a nationally recognized high school assessment that local educational agencies (LEAs) and charter schools could administer, commencing with the 2021-22 school year, in lieu of the consortium summative assessment in English Language arts and mathematics for grade 11.

SSC Comment: AB 751 passed out of the Assembly on Tuesday, Mays 28, with a 75-0 vote and will now go to the Senate where it will be referred to the Senate Education Committee. As a reminder this bill is a reintroduction of last year's AB 1951 , which passed out of the Legislature without a single no vote, but was vetoed by Governor Jerry Brown.

Charter Schools

AB 1505 (O'Donnell) Charter Schools: Petitions. AB 1505 makes significant changes to the charter school authorization, renewal, and revocation process. The bill survived a tough vote on the Assembly Floor only after Assembly Member O'Donnell committed to continue to work on additional amendments to further refine the appeal process establish by AB 1505 after concerns were raised by various Assembly Members. The current version of the bill allows for petitioner to appeal only to the county boar of education and only for procedural violations. Appeals would no longer be considered by the State Board of Education (SBE). AB 1505 is now in the Senate for consideration.

AB 1506 (McCary, D-Sacramento) __ Charter Schools: Statewide Total: Authorization Restrictions. AB 1506 would establish caps on the number of charter schools in line with the number of charter schools in existence on January 1, 2020. AB 1506 was not taken up on the Assembly Floor in time for this week's house of orgin deadline, and as a result, the bill will need rule waivers to proceed this year.

AB 1507 (Smith, D-Santa Clarita)—Charter Schools: Location Resource Center. AB 1507 Prohibits a school district from approving a petition for a charter school that will operate outside the district's boundaries. AB 1507 is now in the Senate for consideration.

Facilities

AB 48 (O'Donnell)—Kindergarten-Community Colleges Public Education Facilities Bond Acts of 2020 and 2022. As amended on May 17, 2019, AB48 would place a \$13 billion statewide school bond on the March 2020 ballot and an unspecified amount for the November 2022 ballot that includes funding for traditional school facilities projects such as New Construction, Modernization, Career Technical Education, and Charter Schools. Additionally, the 2020 bond would provide state resources to mitigate lead in water, disaster and small school district assistance, a replacement program for school buildings that are 75 years old or older, and for the first time, preschool facilities for LEAs operating preschool programs.

AB 48 requires a two-thirds vote and passed out of the Assembly with 69 “aye” votes and on “no” vote.

Senate Bill (SB) 14 (Glazer, D-Orinda) –Education Finance: Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of 2020. As amended on April 22, 2019, SB 14 would place an \$8 billion statewide bond on the March 2020 ballot to provide funds for higher education facilities. Historically, bonds for their education facilities have been included in statewide bond initiatives for k-2 and community college facilities; however the 2006 bond (Proposition 1d) was the last statewide bond that contained a higher education facilities provision.

SB 14 requires a two-thirds voted and passed out of the Senate with 34 “aye” votes and four “no” votes.

Governance and District Operations

SB 328 (Portantino, D-La Cañada Flintridge) –Pupil Attendance: School Start Time. This bill would require the school-day for middle schools and high schools, including those operated as charter schools, to begin no earlier than 8:00 a.m. and 8:30 a.m., respectively, by July 1, 2020-22, or the date in which a district’s collective bargaining agreement that is operative on January 1, 2020, expires whichever is later. The measure further specifies that “school-day” has the same meaning as defined by the school district or charter school for purposes of calculating average daily attendance in order to compute any apportionments of state funding. This start time restriction would not apply to rural school districts, which are not defined in the bill.

SSC Comment: This bill as originally reintroduces was the same as last year’s SB 328, which was vetoed by Governor Brown who state that these types of decision should be decide at the local level.

Instruction

AB 28 (Oberholte, R-Big Bear Lake)—High School Diplomas: State Seal of Stem. This bill would establish as State Seal of STEM to recognize high school graduates who have attained a high level of proficiency in science technology, engineering, and mathematics fields. The bill would require the SPI to provide to participating school districts an insignia

to be affixed to pupil diplomas or transcripts and would require participating school districts to affix the insignia to diplomas or transcripts of recipient pupils. The bill would become operative only if both of the following occur: (1) data from the state-wide administration of specified state science assessments are available, and (2) the SBE, in a public meeting makes specified declarations.

AB 331 (Medina, D-Riverside)—Pupil instruction: High school Graduation Requirements: Ethnic Studies. This bill would add the completion of a one-semester course in ethnic studies to the high school graduation requirements commencing with the 2024-2025 school year. The added course would be based on the model curriculum in ethnic studies developed by the Instructional Quality Commission. The bill would further authorize LEAs to require a full-year course in ethnic studies at their discretion, as specified. Finally, this bill would explicitly subject students enrolled in charter schools to the same high school graduation requirements as they pertain to non-charter school students.

Miscellaneous

SB 2 (Glazer)---Statewide Longitudinal Student Database. This bill would require the Office of Higher Education Coordination, Accountability, and Performance (Office), as proposed to be established by SB 3 (Allen, D-Santa Monica), to assume the responsibilities previously assigned to the now defunct California Postsecondary Education Commission and to convene a review committee to advise the Office regarding the creation of a statewide longitudinal student database. The bill would require that every education segment (early childhood education, California department of education (CDE), California Community Colleges, California State University, and University of California) include a representative on the review committee.

SSC Comment: This bill passed out of the Senate on Tuesday, May 28, with a 37-0 vote and will now go to the Assembly where it will likely be double referred to the Assembly Education and Assembly Higher Education committees. This bill is contingent upon the passage of SB 3, which also passed out of the Senate meaning that if SB 3 stalls, then this bill would also stall.

Both Governor Newsom and the Legislature have proposed \$10 million (one-time, non-Proposition 98) to establish a statewide longitudinal data system that connects the education segments, but have different views on the establishment of the workgroup and implementation of the system, meaning the provisions of this bill could be a part of final budget negotiations.

School Safety and student Discipline

SB 390 (Umberg, D-Santa Ana)—School Districts and Community College Districts: School Security Officers and Security Guards. Under existing law, every school security officer employed by a school district, and every security guard working on the property of a school district pursuant to a contract with a private licensed security agency,

who works more than 20 hours a week as a school security officer or security guard, is required to complete a course of training developed by the Bureau of Security and Investigative Services of the Department of Consumer Affairs in consultation with the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training.

This bill would require those school security officers, commencing July 1, 2021, and security guards to complete that training course regardless of the number of hours worked per week. The bill would also require school district to provide the training required for their school security officer employees during regular work hours.

Special Education

AB 428 (Medina)—Special Education Funding. This bill would implement several recommendations from the California Special Education Task Force and provide support to California’s students with special needs by:

- Establishing support for Special Education preschool programs by adding funding for preschoolers to the AB 602 formula
- Addressing long-standing inequities by equalizing Special Education funding rates to the 95th percentile.
- Providing a supplemental grant to support students with greater needs, including students on the autism spectrum, and students who are blind, visually impaired, and intellectually disabled.
- Amending the current AB 602 calculation to allow the greater of the current or prior school year average daily attendance (ADA) for each district in a multiple district Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) to be used in determining total SELPA ADA

SSC Comment: The Assembly version of additional funding for Special Education in the 2019-2020 State Budget is based on AB 428, but provides equalization to the 90th percentile instead of the 95th and resources for four-year-old preschoolers with disabilities instead of three- and four-year-olds as proposed in AB 428. The bill itself would cost more than \$1.3 billion, so these changes make the proposal fit within the resources being discussed for Special Education in 2019-20.

State Budget, Education Finance, LCFF

AB 39 (Muratsuchi, D-Torrance)—Education Finance: Local Control Funding Formula: Aspirational Funding Level: Reports. This bill would express the Legislature’s intent, as of the 2020-21 fiscal year, to set new, aspirational Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) per-student base grants at k-12 schools. Specifically, the new aspirational grade span adjusted base grants would be equal to the following amounts to meet the national average per-pupil funding level:

- Kindergarten and grades 1 to 3: \$12,188
- Grades 4 to 6: \$12,377
- Grades 7 to 8: 12,194

- Grades 9 to 12: 14,768

In addition, the bill would require, beginning July 1, 2020, that the SPI publish, in addition to information about supplemental and concentration grants at each LEA and charter school, information about each LEA and charter school's base grant and counts of low-income, English learner and foster youth students.

SSC Comment: AB 39 passed out of the Assembly on Wednesday, May 22, with a 74-0 vote and has been referred to the Senate Education Committee. The Assembly adopted almost identical intent language its version of the State Budget and that language will be a part of the Budget Conference Committee negotiations, which may result in the intent language being included in the final version of the 2019-20 State Budget.

AB 1233 (Smith)—Advance Placement Examinations: Fees. This bill would, subject to a one-time appropriation, create a five-year grant program beginning with the 2021-22 school year for the CDE to award grants to school districts, charter schools, and county offices of education to cover the costs of Advance Placement (AP) exam fees for low-income and foster youth students. The bill specifies that the grant awards would not be allowed to supplant existing funds dedicated to lowering the costs of AP exams for low-income students.

SSC Comment: This bill passed out of the Assembly on Wednesday, May 29, with a 78-0 vote and has been sent to the Senate where it will be referred to the Senate Education Committee. The original version of this bill would have lowered the AP exams for low-income and foster youth student to \$5, but the Assembly Appropriations Committee amended the bill so that the total cost of the test would be covered.

District:

From School Services of California-June 4, 2019

“Los Angeles Parcel Tax”

The efforts to implement the first parcel tax (Measure EE) in LAUSD's history was easily defeated last night. Parcel taxes require a supermajority (two-thirds) vote from constituents, and Measure EE received less than 46% of the vote (45.68%).

The measure would have levied a \$0.16 per square foot parcel tax, which would have raised approximately \$500 million annually for LAUSD to fund educational improvements, instruction, and programs.

The agreement reached by LAUSD and the United Teachers Los Angeles (UTLA) earlier this year, which ended a seven-day strike for the state's largest district, included a 6% raise for teachers. In a letter addressed to the LAUSD Board President, the Los Angeles County Office of Education expressed concerns that LAUSD would not be able to afford the commitments made in the contract.

However, both LAUSD and UTLA were confident that Measure EE would provide the necessary funds for the commitments made in the contract. They were hopeful that the measure would pass after results from a LAUSD-commissioned survey showed that more than two-thirds of respondents said they would support a parcel tax. However, the survey was taken before the strong opposition campaign of the business and real estate community, including the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce.

Despite the defeat, there is a chance that LAUSD will come back with another parcel tax plan for the 2020 election, which would yield greater turnout due to the presidential campaign.

YPICS:

The schools have experienced higher challenges this year than in years past. Students are in greater need of social-emotional supports today than previously. The lack of models of civility and bullying in leadership, communicated in the daily news that our families regularly source has created a highly stressed everyday living environment. Survival is the core to the thinking of our students. “Ms. King-Berg, We don’t always want to be, or act tough or be bad, but we have to be that in order to get from school to home without getting beat up. You have to be tough to survive our streets. If not, weak people don’t survive. We don’t want to be this way. We come to school everyday and we try to start over but bad habits are hard to break.”-A YPICS student.

Teachers reported through several mini surveys provided throughout the school year during YPICS-wide PDs that they felt that needed more support with PBIS strategies in the classroom. The increases in adverse behavior incidents made it challenging to remain focused and intentional to instruction periodically. They also reported that they need more consistent and regular feedback on teaching throughout the year. And they want to engage in additional instructional rounds during the 2019-2020 school year.

As a result of reviewing all available data formative, summative, and surveys to date, YPICS is awaiting the Youth Truth Survey results and analysis, YPICS will focus on the following areas for the 2019-2020 school year:

- Consistent Classroom Management Strategies in all classrooms to create emotionally safe spaces for ALL students (Relay GSE Instructional Leadership PD)
- Support rigorous, thinking-rich classes (Relay GSE Instructional Leadership PD)
- Weekly observation and feedback to teachers (Relay GSE Instructional Leadership PD)
- Focus on Data, Data, Data
- Joy

Goals:

- Decrease Chronic Absenteeism to below 5% (students out of school don't grow academically)
- Decrease suspensions and expulsions below 3 %
- Become the fastest growing middle and high schools in increasing student academic achievement in ELA and Math (including ELs and students with IEPs) by 5%+.

System Changes to support the above:

- Changed bell schedules to ensure in-school intervention with teachers for both Math and ELA
- Adopted new YPICS (grades 5th-12th) Benchmark Assessment-iReady, which will replace NWEA Maps to better support teachers with the data analysis and guidance on what the students are ready to learn next.
- Middle School Math Adoption of Ready Math with Curriculum Associates
- Clarified and redefined the composition (members), scope of work, and direct data outcomes for the YPICS' Instructional Teams, School Climate and Culture Teams, and Parent & Community Teams.
- Ensure a viable rigorous curriculum is available for all subject areas (middle schools subjects other than math-Achievement First, and the high school will continue to use UC doorways approved UCI curriculum aligned to the CTE pathways). Middle Schools Math Adoption is Ready Math.

We will continue to provide social-emotional support to our students through the following counseling services:

- Luminarias Counseling Services
- Part-Time Social Worker
- PUC MFT Counseling Services

The above 2019-2020 YPICS Plan includes both first and second order changes. 8 Members (Executive Director, Executive Administrators, Directors of Instruction, Special Education Director) of the YPICS Instructional will be attending the first Relay Instructional Leadership PD in Los Angeles July 14-19, 2019.

We will submit the Bert Corona Charter High School Renewal Petition in July as planned and are on track to do so. We will provide you with updates throughout the summer.

We are eagerly looking forward to the year ahead!

