

YPI CHARTER SCHOOLS *EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT*

October 24, 2016

The mission of 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.*
- *Enable students to become life-long learners.*

Students at YPICS 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:

AB 1198 (Dababneh) Vetoed by Governor Brown

Governor Jerry Brown vetoed AB 1198 by Assemblymember Matt Dababneh. AB 1198 was CCSA's sponsored legislation to save charter schools thousands of dollars on facilities through the provision of more affordable financing rates. Citing fiscal concerns, the Governor vetoed AB 1198 and three other education bills. You can read the Governor's full veto message [here](#).

While the veto action is very disappointing, we remain committed to ensuring charter schools have equitable access to facilities in the next legislative session. We want to thank the more than 400 charter school supporters who advocated on behalf of charter students by writing to the Governor in support of AB 1198.

SB 739 (Pavley) Vetoed by Governor

Governor Brown vetoed SB 739 by Senator Fran Pavley. CCSA Opposed SB 739, which limited charter schools operating outside of district boundaries. In his veto message, the Governor wrote, "This bill attempts to address an issue, currently being reviewed by the State Auditor, whereby school districts authorize multiple charter schools outside of district boundaries to collect oversight fees. Let's review the audit when it's released next spring to better determine the scope of the issue and what, if any, policy changes are necessary." You can read the Governor's full veto message [here](#).

California Awarded \$49 Million Charter School Program Grant

The federal Department of Education (DOE) announced that the California Department of Education (CDE) was awarded \$49 million for the Public Charter School Grant Program (PCSGP) over the next three years. The PCSGP program provides start-up grants to charter developers to support the creation of high-quality charter schools and improve educational outcomes for students from high-need communities.

This is wonderful news for California's charter school sector as California was not selected as a grant recipient last year. Many thanks to the charter staff at the CDE and State Board of Education who worked to put together a highly competitive application this year. California is one of eight states to receive funding this year. In addition to the state grant, three California charter management organizations, Amethod, Equitas and KIPP, received direct start up awards from the DOE. CDE will release details on the application for these new funds in the coming months.

The funds will help to meet parent demand for high-quality charter schools across the state. Now is a great time to develop new and innovative charter school programs in communities across California!

National:

From the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools -

Community Voices Concerned about NAACP Resolution Against Charter Schools Spur Action, Launch *ChartersWork* to Promote Equity and Choice for Black Students

Parents with children in charter public schools, as well as those on waiting lists to get in, are speaking up for parental choice and the positive impact charter schools are having on Black student achievement across the nation. Led by the Black Alliance for Educational Options and the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, the new *ChartersWork* campaign tells a clear and compelling story of why more than 700,000 Black families have chosen charter schools. The campaign formed in response to a growing number of voices from San Antonio to Washington, DC calling on the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) to reconsider the position it took in July to put a moratorium on charter schools.

The campaign is launching with a letter from more than 160 Black education and community leaders who are calling on the NAACP to reconsider and learn more about how charter schools are helping Black families.

Signees include Cheryl Brown Henderson, daughter of Oliver Brown, plaintiff in *Brown v. Board of Education*, and founding president and CEO of the Brown Foundation for Educational Equity, Excellence and Research; Geoffrey Canada, president of the Harlem Children's Zone; Mariama Carson, founder of Global Preparatory Academy Charter School and wife of Rep. Andre Carson (D-IN); Dr. Howard Fuller, founder and chair emeritus of Black Alliance for Educational Options; Dr. Michael Lomax, president of the United Negro College Fund; Bishop Reginald Jackson of the African Methodist Episcopal Church; Dr. Rod Paige, former US Secretary of Education; George Parker, former president of the Washington Teacher's Union; Dr. Steve Perry, founder and principal of Capital Preparatory Schools; and more.

Citing a shared understanding that Black students are getting a raw deal in America's schools, and are frequently underserved by the traditional public education system, the *ChartersWork* campaign is calling on the NAACP's national board to reconsider the organization's call for a moratorium and learn more.

"Over 60 years ago my father joined with numerous parents to stand with the NAACP and fight for all African American students stuck in a separate, broken education system. *Brown v. Board of Education* created better public education options for African American students, and made it the law of the land that neither skin color, socioeconomic status, nor geography should determine the quality of education a child receives," said **Cheryl Brown Henderson**, daughter of Oliver Brown, plaintiff in *Brown v. Board of Education* and founding president and CEO, Brown Foundation for Educational Equity, Excellence and Research. "I am eternally grateful to the NAACP for their leadership on this case and for giving

African American families the opportunity to send their children to the best schools that would help them to succeed. But I am troubled that in 2016, the NAACP would oppose placing better educational choices in the hands of families across the country. Charter public schools present African American families, especially those in low-income communities, with the choice to choose a public option that is best for their child. We must protect this choice."

Brown Henderson and other advocates are speaking out because charter schools are working for Black students. According to Stanford University's CREDO 2015 Urban Charter Schools Report on students in 41 urban regions across the country, low-income Black students attending charter schools gained 33 percent more learning in math and 24 percent more learning in reading each year as compared to their traditional public school peers.

"For generations, the NAACP has been at the forefront of the fight for political, educational, social and economic equality for Black Americans. This is why their resolution calling for a nationwide moratorium on charter schools, many of which serve the same Black families the NAACP is fighting to protect, is inexplicable," said **Jacqueline Cooper**, president of Black Alliance for Educational Options. "The truth is, banning new charter schools will only widen the achievement gap for low-income and working-class Black children by reducing the number of high-quality educational options available and increasing the number of names on existing waiting lists. As a result, there will yet again, be another generation of Black children who will not be prepared to go to, through and beyond college to become economically independent adults."

More than 20 years after the formation of the first charter school, there are now more than 6,800 charter schools across 43 states and the District of Columbia, educating nearly three million children. Black students account for 27 percent of charter school enrollment nationally, versus just 15 percent of traditional district school enrollment. And the number is growing. One in 10 Black students who attend a public school in this country attends a charter school. And many of the one million names on waiting lists to get into charter schools are Black children.

"The reality is that for too long, many traditional schools have been leaving Black students behind," said **Shirline Wilson**, a parent in Washington state whose third child to go through public schools has chosen a charter school. "Charter schools are meeting the needs of so many families like mine and providing real opportunities for kids who deserve equal access to a great education."

ChartersWork will run through the end of 2016 and focus on elevating Black voices and stakeholders from the civil rights and charter communities, dispelling myths and putting the focus of this conversation back on what works for children.

A Model Law for Supporting the Growth of High-Quality Charter Schools

A New Model Law for Supporting High-Quality Charter Public Schools: Second Edition calls on state policymakers to strengthen the laws governing charter schools. In this revised version of the National Alliance's model charter school law, the policies outlined would increase the focus of state-level charter school laws on creating high-quality charter schools while holding underperforming schools and authorizers accountable.

This report draws on best practices in state policy that have led to the growth of high-quality charter schools, while also addressing weaknesses that, in some cases, have allowed underperforming charter schools and ineffective authorizers to avoid accountability. For example, the model law follows and builds on a report from earlier this year where the National Alliance called for reform of full-time virtual charter schools, too many of which significantly underperform.

The revised model law encourages states to provide more equitable support to charter school students, allow for more flexibility to charter schools, and strengthen accountability for charter schools and their authorizers. Specific revisions to the model law include policy updates on full-time virtual schools, funding, authorizers, facilities, flexibility, and discipline.

State:

From School Services of California –

Bill Signing Update

Governor Jerry Brown is gradually working through the nearly 800 bills that made it to his desk this year. So far he has had significant bill signings in the area of farmer worker overtime, climate change, construction oversight, and EpiPens. He also made the news cycle by vetoing tax changes for tampons and diapers.

But few education-related bills have been acted upon:

- Assembly Bill (AB) 2016 (Chapter 327/2016) requires the Instructional Quality Commission to develop, and the State Board of Education to adopt, modify, or revise a model curriculum in ethnic studies, and encourages each school district and charter school that maintains any of grades 9 to 12, inclusive, that does not otherwise offer a standards-based ethnic studies curriculum to offer a course of study in ethnic studies based on the model curriculum
- Senate Bill (SB) 1029 (Chapter 307/2016) imposes new reporting requirements to the California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission (CDIAC) by local educational agencies (LEAs) relating to state and local debt issuances, requiring LEAs to submit an annual report to CDIAC covering the period from July 1 to June 30 that includes debt authorized and outstanding during the reporting period, as specified, and the use of proceeds from the issuance of debt during the reporting period
- SB 1353 (Chapter 350/2016) addresses a drafting error in the California State Teachers' Retirement System full funding plan (AB 1469, Chapter 47/2014) that would have reduced the state's additional contribution
- SB 1455 (Chapter 312/2016) provides that a student meets residency requirements for school attendance if the student's parent is transferred or is pending transfer to a military installation that is within the boundaries of the school district

Many significant bills still remain on Governor Brown's desk, which include providing unemployment benefits to classified staff during the summer (AB 2197), providing 12 weeks of parental leave for classified staff (AB 2393), and changing the lease-leaseback process (AB 2316).

Second Bill Signing Update

Governor Jerry Brown and his staff were busy this weekend, acting on 161 bills since Friday afternoon. Of those 161 bills, 133 were signed and 28 were vetoed.

Below are some of the top education issues approved by Governor Brown in the past 72 hours:

- Assembly Bill (AB) 575 (Signed by the Governor) reestablishes a fee-supported process for the follow-up adoption of instructional materials until 2024.

- AB 1719 (Signed by the Governor) mandates that commencing in the 2018-19 school year, school districts and charter schools that require a health course for graduation include instruction in compression-only cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR).
- AB 1748 (Signed by the Governor) authorizes school nurses and other trained personnel to use naloxone hydrochloride or another opioid antagonist to provide emergency medical aid to persons suffering, or reasonably believed to be suffering, from an opioid overdose.
- AB 2246 (Signed by the Governor) mandates the governing board of a local educational agency that serves pupils in grades 7 to 12 to, before the beginning of the 2017-18 school year, adopt, at a regularly scheduled meeting, a policy on pupil suicide prevention in grades 7 to 12, and requires the policy to address training to be provided to teachers regarding suicide awareness and prevention.
- AB 2316 (Signed by the Governor) eliminates the authority for school districts to issue a lease-leaseback contract without advertising for bid, establishes a competitive selections process for awarding lease-leaseback contracts, and allows a contractor to be paid reasonable costs furnished by the contractor if a lease-leaseback contract entered into prior to July 1, 2015, is found to be invalid by a court.
- Senate Bill (SB) 527 (Signed by the Governor) establishes the Learning Communities for School Success Program to implement the K-12 education portion of the Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Act (Proposition 47). This is a companion bill to AB 1014 (Chapter 397/2016), which also sets forth the criteria for the grant program.
- SB 1375 (Signed by the Governor) mandates, on or before July 1, 2017, all public schools, private schools that receive federal funds and are subject to the requirements of Title IX, school districts, county offices of education, and charter schools to post in a prominent and conspicuous location on their Internet websites specified information relating to Title IX.

While few bills are accompanied by signing messages, every veto is conveyed with a message to the Legislature explaining the Governor's rationale for not signing the bill. The most significant, though not unexpected, veto of an education bill this weekend was AB 2548 (Weber, D-San Diego). AB 2548 would have required the State Board of Education (Board) to adopt a statewide accountability system aligned to state and federal accountability requirements. In his veto message, the Governor stated:

The Board has spent more than two years listening to parents, students, teachers, school leaders, and the public in order to create a thoughtful and integrated federal, state, and local accountability system based on the Local Control Funding Formula. On September 8, 2016, the Board adopted the Local Control Funding Formula indicators which serve as the foundation of the new accountability system. The Board is committed to continuously improving the system and has an annual review process in place for just that reason. It is unnecessary and premature to impose additional requirements at this time.

As of September 23, 2016, 353 bills remain on the Governor's desk and must be acted on before midnight on Friday, September 30. Any bills not vetoed or signed by September 30 automatically become law.

Many significant bills still remain on Governor Brown's desk, which include requiring schools in areas of higher seismic activity to conduct an inspection of the contents of their buildings for earthquake safety (AB 1783), providing unemployment benefits to classified staff during the summer (AB 2197), and providing 12 weeks of parental leave for classified staff (AB 2393). Stay tuned.

Third Bill Signing Update

After nearly nine months of watching hundreds of bills make their way through the legislative process, today at 11:59 p.m., marks the final day for Governor Jerry Brown to take action on the remaining stack of bills on his desk.

This year, more than 750 bills were passed by the Legislature and sent to Governor Brown. As of this posting, he had less than fifty left to consider whether to sign, veto, or allow to become law without taking any action. In the past two days, he has acted on over a dozen bills affecting K-12 education. As of this posting, we are still waiting word of his action on Assembly Bill (AB) 2393 (Campos, D-San Jose), which would provide 12 weeks of parental leave for K-12 and community college classified employees and clarify differential pay provisions for certificated school employees.

Below are his most recent actions. Unless the bill indicates it contains an “urgency clause,” it will become effective January 1, 2017.

Signed Bills

AB 1639 (Maienschein, R-San Diego) requires the California Department of Education (CDE) to develop guidelines regarding sudden cardiac arrest symptoms and warning signs for students and requires athletic coaches to complete a sudden cardiac arrest training course every two years. The bill becomes effective July 1, 2017. Beginning July 1, 2019, a coach that violates the training requirement is subject to suspension from coaching any athletic activity until it is completed.

AB 2329 (Bonilla, D-Concord) requires the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI) to convene, on or before September 1, 2017, a computer science strategic implementation advisory panel for the purpose of making recommendations for a computer science strategic implementation state plan.

SB 884 (Beall, D-San Jose) requires an audit procedure to be included in the annual K-12 audit guide to review whether state funding provided for educationally related mental health services was used by local educational agencies (LEA) for its “intended purpose” in the 2016-17 fiscal year.

SB 1072 (Mendoza, D-Artesia) requires by the 2018-19 school year, school buses and child care motor vehicles to be equipped with a “child safety alert system,” which is a device located at the interior rear of a bus requiring the driver to either manually contact or scan the device before exiting to assess whether any children are still on the bus. The bill provides exemptions for activity buses when certain conditions are met.

SB 1413 (Leno, D-San Francisco) allows school districts to dedicate school district-owned land to the development of affordable rental housing and restrict occupancy to teachers and school district employees.

Vetoed Bills

AB 491 (Gonzalez, D-San Diego) would have required LEAs to annually notify parents if their children are long term English learners (LTELs) or at risk of becoming LTELs, and required the CDE to develop a sample notification letter informing parents of their right to dispute the school districts' determinations of primary language.

AB 709 (Gipson, D-Carson) would have expressly stated that a charter school is subject to the Ralph M. Brown Act or Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, whichever is applicable; the California Public Records Act; and various other existing Conflict of Interest statutes.

AB 1783 (Dodd, D-Napa) would have required school districts, county offices of education (COEs), and charter schools with school buildings located in an area susceptible to seismic activity to inspect and secure building contents when those buildings are accessible to or occupied by students.

AB 2182 (Mullin, D-South San Francisco) would have established a school athletic neurocognitive testing pilot program to collect and maintain data on traumatic brain injuries and concussions sustained during sports activities.

AB 2197 (Garcia, D-Coachella) would have deleted the prohibition on the payment of unemployment benefits to classified education employees of a public school, other than teachers, researchers, and administrators, between two academic years. The bill would have phased in, starting in 2017, up to eight weeks of benefits available to those specified employees over a four-year time frame.

AB 2353 (McCarty, D-Sacramento) would have required CDE to identify professional development programs in culturally responsive instruction and to provide links to those programs on its website.

AB 2621 (Gomez, D-Los Angeles) would have required an LEA that maintains an employee code of conduct to provide a written copy of that document to the parent or guardian of each enrolled student at the beginning of each school year and to also post it on its website.

SB 123 (Liu, D-La Canada Flintridge) would have established a revised process for school-based and non-school-based administrative claiming, beginning January 1, 2018. The bill would have authorized the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) to administer or oversee a single statewide quarterly random moment time survey and required the DHCS and CDE to enter into an interagency agreement or memorandum of understanding by July 1, 2018. The bill would have established a workgroup to provide advice on issues related to the delivery of school-based Medi-Cal services to students. The veto message can be found [here](#).

SB 739 (Pavley, D-Agoura Hills) would have prohibited school districts from authorizing new charter schools outside of their boundaries if the school district was assigned a negative certification. The veto message can be found [here](#).

SB 1113 (Beall, D-San Jose) would have authorized a county, or a qualified provider operating as part of the county mental health plan network, and an LEA to enter into a partnership for the provision of Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment (EPSDT) mental health services.

Final Bill Signing

Meeting his September 30, 2016, deadline, Governor Jerry Brown completed action on more than 1,300 bills for the 2016 legislative year, signing 1,161 and vetoing 159, or nearly 14% of those that made it to his desk.

We have sorted the bills we have been following this year into those that were signed by Governor Brown and those that were vetoed. All bills vetoed by Governor Brown include a veto message, providing his rationale behind returning the bill to the Legislature without his signature. They are often an interesting read—and provide direction on how a bill can be more successful in a future legislative attempt.

This issue of Top Legislative Issues will be the last for the year and will return to production in January 2017.

Signed by the Governor

Assembly Bill (AB) 575 (Chapter 550/2016)—Instructional Materials: Followup Adoptions. This bill reestablishes a fee-supported process for the follow-up adoption of instructional materials until 2024.

AB 1014 (Chapter 397/2016)—Education Finance: Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Fund: Learning Communities for School Success Program. This bill establishes the Learning Communities for School Success Program, which requires the California Department of Education (CDE) to administer grants from Proposition 47 funds to improve outcomes for students by reducing truancy and supporting students who are at risk of dropping out of school or are victims of crime. Local educational agencies (LEAs) would apply for grants to provide assistance in identifying and implementing evidence-based, non-punitive programs and practices that are aligned with the student goals contained in the LEA’s Local Control and Accountability Plan. The CDE would develop the grant application and the bill prioritizes funding to LEAs that have a high rate of chronic absenteeism or located in a high crime rate area, and/or has a high population of foster youth.

The grant application would be for three years of funding, but grantees would need to meet requirements at the end of the first and second years in order to receive funding for the remaining grant period. LEAs that receive grant funding will be required to evaluate and report the results of the activities it undertakes with the grant funds.

SSC Comment: The 2016-17 State Budget includes \$10 million to fund these grants.

AB 1557 (Chapter 764/2016)—School Facilities: Use By Nonprofit Youth Organizations: Recreational Youth Sports Leagues. This bill will specifically authorize a governing board of a school district to authorize the use of school facilities or grounds by a nonprofit organization, or by a club or an association organized to promote youth and school activities, that is a recreational youth sports league that charges participants an average of no more than \$60 per month.

AB 1676 (Chapter 856/2016)—Employers: Wage Discrimination. This bill specifies that prior salary cannot, by itself, justify any disparity in compensation between men and women.

AB 1719 (Chapter 556/2016)—Pupil Instruction: Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation. This bill mandates that commencing in the 2018-19 school year, school districts and charter schools that require a health course for graduation include instruction in compression-only cardiopulmonary resuscitation.

AB 2016 (Chapter 327/2016)—Pupil Instruction: Ethnic Studies. This bill requires the Instructional Quality Commission to develop, and the State Board of Education (SBE) to adopt, modify, or revise a model curriculum in ethnic studies, and encourages each school district and charter school that maintains any of grades 9 to 12, inclusive, that does not otherwise offer a standards-based ethnic studies curriculum to offer a course of study in ethnic studies based on the model curriculum.

AB 2116 (Chapter 129/2016)—School Bonds: Projections of Assessed Property Valuations. AB 2116 requires that before school and community college districts order a local bond election they shall obtain “reasonable and informed projections of assessed property valuation” that include projections made by a county assessor.

AB 2316 (Chapter 521/2106)—School Facilities: Leasing Property. This bill eliminates the authority for school districts to issue a lease-leaseback contract without advertising for bid, establishes a competitive selections process for awarding lease-leaseback contracts, and allows a contractor to be paid

YPICS Agenda – October 24, 2016

reasonable costs furnished by the contractor if a lease-leaseback contract entered into prior to July 1, 2015, is found to be invalid by a court.

AB 2393 (Chapter 882/2016)—School Employees: Sick Leave: Parental Leave. Existing state law establishes California Family Rights Act, which requires employers to grant employees up to 12 weeks of unpaid protected leave, in any 12-month period, to care for a seriously ill spouse, child or parent, or for their own serious medical condition, which includes the birth of a child or parental bonding.

This bill requires K-14 classified school employees on maternity or paternity leave to receive differential pay for up to 12 workweeks of unpaid and protected family and medical leave.

AB 2537 (Chapter 106/2016) Pupils: School Attendance: Residency Requirements. AB 2537 eliminates the existing July 1, 2017, sunset of the provisions of the Education Code authorizing a pupil to enroll in a school district where at least one of the parents or legal guardians of the pupil is physically employed within the boundaries of that school district for a minimum of ten hours during the school week. During the period of enrollment the parent or legal guardian of the pupil must continue to be physically employed by an employer situated within the attendance boundaries of the school district.

AB 2615 (Chapter 470/2016)—After School Programs. This bill authorizes a school program participating in the 21st Century High School After School Safety and Enrichment for Teens program to charge family fees; authorizes the CDE to withhold or terminate grant allocations that do not comply with specified CDE required reporting requirements; and, allows participating school programs to transfer program services to another school site within the same local educational agency under specified circumstances.

Existing law establishes the After School Education and Safety Program (ASES) to serve pupils in kindergarten and grades 1 to 9, inclusive, at participating public elementary, middle, junior high, and charter schools. This bill would, among other things, specify that grades to be served by participating school programs may be determined by local needs; require participating school programs that charge family fees to waive or reduce the cost of these fees for pupils who are eligible for free or reduced-price meals; and, state the intent of the Legislature that participating middle school or junior high school pupils participate in the full day of the program every day during which pupils participate.

Existing law states the intent of the Legislature that the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) program contained within a specified federal act complement ASES. Existing law requires at least 40% of the total amount appropriated pursuant to the 21st CCLC program, except as specified, to be allocated to programs serving elementary and middle school pupils and at least 50% of the total amount appropriated, except as specified, to be allocated on a priority basis for after school grants to community learning centers serving high school pupils. This bill would require the CDE to allocate those funds to each geographic region of the state, as specified.

AB 2656 (Chapter 697/2016)—Pupils: Diploma Alternatives: Fee Waiver: Foster Youth. This bill extends to foster youth the fee waivers for the California High School Proficiency Exam and the high school equivalency exam that are currently provided to students who are homeless.

AB 2738 (Chapter 472/2016)—School Bonds: Local School Bonds: Investment. AB 2738 prohibits school or community college districts from withdrawing proceeds issued by the county for purposes of making investments outside the county treasury.

AB 2815 (Chapter 829/2016)—Pupil Attendance: Supervisors of Attendance. The bill deletes the requirement that a county board of education approve a contract between a school district and the county superintendent of schools for the supervision of attendance of pupils in the school district.

Senate Bill (SB) 884 (Chapter 835/2016)—Special Education: Mental Health Services. This bill requires an audit procedure to be included in the annual K-12 audit guide to review whether state funding provided for educationally related mental health services was used by LEA for its “intended purpose” in the 2016-17 fiscal year.

SB 1029 (Chapter 307/2016)—California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission: Accountability Reports. This bill imposes new reporting requirements to the California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission (CDIAC) by LEAs relating to state and local debt issuances, requiring LEAs to submit an annual report to CDIAC covering the period from July 1 to June 30 that includes debt authorized and outstanding during the reporting period, as specified, and the use of proceeds from the issuance of debt during the reporting period.

SB 1072 (Chapter 721/2016)—School bus Safety: Child Safety Alert System. This bill requires by the 2018-19 school year, school buses and child care motor vehicles to be equipped with a “child safety alert system,” which is a device located at the interior rear of a bus requiring the driver to either manually contact or scan the device before exiting to assess whether any children are still on the bus. The bill provides exemptions for activity buses when certain conditions are met.

SB 1413 (Chapter 732/2016)—School Districts: Employee Housing. This bill establishes the Teacher Housing Act of 2016 and provides that a school district may establish and implement programs that address the housing needs of teachers and school district employees who face challenges in securing affordable housing.

The bill creates a state policy supporting housing for teachers and school district employees, pursuant to the IRS code, and permits school districts and developers in receipt of local or state funds designated for affordable rental housing to restrict occupancy to teachers and school district employees on land owned by school districts, so long as that housing does not violate any other applicable laws.

SB 1455 (Chapter 312/2016)—Pupil Enrollment: Military Dependents. This bill allows school districts to dedicate school district-owned land to the development of affordable rental housing and restrict occupancy to teachers and school district employees.

Vetoed by the Governor

AB 491 (Gonzalez, D-San Diego)—English Learners: Identification Notice. This bill would have required LEAs to annually notify parents if their children are long-term English learners (LTELs) or at risk of becoming LTELs, and required the CDE to develop a sample notification letter informing parents of their right to dispute the school districts’ determinations of primary language.

The Governor’s veto message states in part:

“This bill would, among other things, require school districts to provide parents, at the time of enrolling their student, information explaining how their responses to a home language survey may lead to their student being designated as an English learner. Given that English learners constitute approximately one-fourth of students enrolled in California public schools, I agree that we need to do a better job explaining to parents how their student may be designated as an English learner and what happens once

they receive this designation. The specific statements included in this bill, however, are not clear and will cause more confusion for parents, not less. This is an important matter that we have to get right.”

AB 1783 (Dodd, D-Napa)—School Facilities: Nonstructural Earthquake Hazards: Inspection. This bill would have required school districts, county offices of education, and charter schools with school buildings located in an area susceptible to seismic activity to inspect and secure building contents when those buildings are accessible to or occupied by students.

The Governor’s veto message states in part:

“I am returning the following four bills without my signature: Assembly Bill 1198 Assembly Bill 1783 Assembly Bill 2182 Senate Bill 1113. Each of these bills creates unfunded new programs. Despite significant funding increases for local educational agencies over the past few years, the Local Control Funding Formula remains only 96 percent funded. Given the precarious balance of the state budget, establishing new programs with the expectation of funding in the future is counterproductive to the Administration’s efforts to sustain a balanced budget and to fully fund the Local Control Funding Formula. Additional spending to support new programs must be considered in the annual budget process.”

AB 1878 (Jones-Sawyer, D-Los Angeles)—Public Employees’ Retirement System: State or School Members: Postretirement Death Benefit. Existing law requires that, upon the death of any state or school member after retirement and while receiving a retirement allowance, the sum of \$2,000 be paid to the member’s designated beneficiary. This bill would have authorized the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees’ Retirement System to annually adjust the lump-sum death benefit for state and school members, based on changes in the All Urban California Consumer Price Index.

The Governor’s veto message states in part:

“This bill authorizes the California Public Employees’ Retirement System Board to increase the lump-sum post-retirement death benefit for state and school members based on inflation. Given the state’s huge unfunded pension liabilities, I don’t believe it is prudent to add the additional costs that this bill would require.”

AB 2197 (Garcia, Cristina, D-Bell Gardens)—Unemployment Insurance: Classified Employees. This bill would have deleted the prohibition on the payment of unemployment benefits to classified education employees of a public school, other than teachers, researchers, and administrators, between two academic years. The bill would have phased in, starting in 2017, up to eight weeks of benefits available to those specified employees over a four-year time frame.

The Governor’s veto message states in part:

“This bill allows classified school employees to collect unemployment insurance benefits between school years. This bill creates several conformity issues with the federal Unemployment Insurance laws, which could result in sanctions from the federal government, including the loss of significant tax credits for California’s employers.”

AB 2548 (Weber, D-San Diego)—School Accountability: Statewide Accountability System. This bill would have required the SBE to do the following in an effort to design and build a coherent and aligned local, state, and federal accountability system, including:

- Establishing clear and ambitious statewide performance standards and expectations for improvement among a set of indicators that shall be differentiated by pupil subgroup
- Establishing a mechanism to meaningfully differentiate school-level performance annually
- Establishing multiple levels of performance for purposes of continuous improvement and the provision of support, including the identification of the lowest 5% of Title 1 schools and schools where any pupil subgroup consistently under-performs or where any one pupil subgroup would on its own cause the school to be among the lowest 5% of lowest performing schools

The bill would have required the inclusion of a pupil achievement measure in English language arts, mathematics, and science (an academic measure for the K-8 grade span and graduation rates for the high school grade span), rates of English proficiency, chronic absenteeism, and school climate.

The Governor’s veto message states in part:

“This bill would impose new requirements for the public school accountability system that the State Board of Education has already developed. The Board has spent more than two years listening to parents, students, teachers, school leaders and the public in order to create a thoughtful and integrated federal, state and local accountability system based on the Local Control Funding Formula. On September 8, 2016, the Board adopted the Local Control Funding Formula indicators which serve as the foundation of the new accountability system. The Board is committed to continuously improving the system and has an annual review process in place for just that reason. It is unnecessary and premature to impose additional requirements at this time.”

AB 2826 (Weber)—Teachers: Evaluation and Assessment. Existing law, known as the Stull Act, requires school districts to evaluate teacher performance on a periodic basis as it relates to the following:

- 1) The progress of pupils toward the standards established pursuant to subdivision (a) and, if applicable, the state adopted academic content standards as measured by state adopted criterion referenced assessments.
- 2) The instructional techniques and strategies used by the employee.
- 3) The employee’s adherence to curricular objectives.
- 4) The establishment and maintenance of a suitable learning environment, within the scope of the employee’s responsibilities.

This bill would have specified measures of pupil progress, instructional techniques and strategies, and adherence to curricular objectives that school districts may use for purposes of teacher evaluation.

Legislative Analyst’s Office Examines Impacts of Proposition 13

The Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO), the Legislature’s nonpartisan fiscal advisor, has issued a report that examines the long-term impacts of Proposition 13, the landmark measure which sparked a nationwide taxpayer revolt.

Passed by state voters in 1978, Proposition 13 limited California’s local property tax rate to 1% and limited the growth in assessed valuation to 2% annually. As a result, property tax owners saw an immediate reduction in their property tax payments, but at the same time, local governments experienced a 60% drop in property tax revenues from about \$42 billion before 1978 to about \$18 billion in 1979. *YPICS Agenda – October 24, 2016*

billion following implementation of Proposition 13. The LAO report concludes that property taxes remain a foundation of public finance in California, raising about \$55 billion annually, second only to the personal income tax.

Below are some of the key questions about Proposition 13 asked and answered by the LAO:

- *What Happened to Local Government Revenues After Proposition 98?* Tax revenue per person for cities and counties has declined since Proposition 13, falling from \$790 per person in 1977-78 to \$640 per person in 2014-15, adjusted for inflation. However, this reduction has been offset by increases in fees and assessments.
- *Do Proposition 13's Benefits for Property Owners Vary with Income?* Tax relief from Proposition 13 is generally proportionate to the market value of homes; therefore, higher-income homeowners, who own more homes and homes of higher value, receive a larger share of tax relief.
- *Does Proposition 13 Reduce Property Turnover?* Yes. Property turnover has slowed since 1978, with many factors driving this trend, including the state's aging population, rising real estate prices, and Proposition 13.
- *Did Proposition 13 Cause Residential Properties to Pay a Larger Share of Property Taxes?* No. While homeowners do pay a slightly larger share of property taxes today than prior to the passage of Proposition 13, the measure does not appear to have caused this increase. Instead, faster growth in the number of residential properties, up 60% since 1978, compared to commercial and industrial properties, up 30%, explains this shift in the property tax payments toward residential properties.
- *Did Proposition 13 Increase Fees on Developers?* Yes. Local governments appear to be increasingly using fees—parcel taxes, impact fees, and Mello-Roos assessments—to pay for the costs associated with new development. Over half of the states in the nation impose impact fees, with California having fees that are almost three times as high as the national average of the states surveyed.
- *Did Assessments Associated with Development Rise After Proposition 13?* Yes. Local governments increasingly use Mello-Roos assessments to pay for infrastructure—including schools—associated with new development. Since 1990—five years after Mello-Roos assessments were enacted—the amount per residential building permit has increased over 130%.

The LAO's 51-page report addresses other questions about the effects of Proposition 13, including land use decisions, homeownership rates, new business creation, and other important public policy issues.

Fourth and Final Bill Actions: Parental Leave for Classified Employees Signed by Governor

In his final legislative update issued on September 30, 2016, Governor Jerry Brown announced his signature on Assembly Bill (AB) 2393 (Campos, D-San Jose), which will provide 12 weeks of parental leave for K-12 and community college classified employees as well as community college certificated employees.

This is a follow-up to the passage of AB 375 (Chapter 400/2015) last year, which granted K-12 certificated employees this benefit. Specifically, current law requires K-12 employers to grant certificated employees up to 12 weeks of leave for the birth of a child of the employee or the placement of a child with an employee in connection with the adoption or foster care of the child by the employee. The 12-week period is reduced by sick leave taken for parental leave and provides for the use of substitute differential pay for up to the balance of the 12 weeks. The employee is not required to have 1,250 hours of service with the employer during the previous 12-month period in order to take parental leave.

AB 2393 not only extends this benefit to the rest of the K-14 classified and certificated employees, but clarifies current law by specifying that for either differential pay system that the school or community college district is using—substitute differential pay or 50% differential pay—an employee on parental leave who has exhausted all available sick leave, including all accumulated sick leave, and continues to be absent shall be compensated according to the differential pay system in use for the remaining portion of the 12-week period.

Additionally, in his final actions, the Governor signed:

Senate Bill (SB) 1406 (Chapter 892/2016), which requires an attorney who provides a prelitigation letter or sends or serves a complaint alleging a construction-related accessibility claim against an education entity to send a copy of the prelitigation letter or complaint to the California Commission on Disability Access (CCDA) within five business days. The bill requires the attorney to submit certain information about the complaint and to submit the notification of judgment, settlement, or dismissal to the CCDA. This bill subjects an attorney who fails to comply with these requirements to discipline.

Finally, the Governor vetoed:

AB 2826 (Weber, D-San Diego), which would have made various changes to the Stull Act, by adding new measures of pupil progress, instructional techniques and strategies, and adherence to curricular objectives that school districts could use for purposes of teacher evaluation. The Governor's veto message was short, stating, "This bill sets forth 20 separate measures that school districts may voluntarily use for teacher evaluation. I don't believe that this list of particular measures will materially change current teacher evaluations in California."

Poll Finds Concern for Tax Extension and Facilities Bond Approval

On Thursday, September 22, 2016, with fewer than seven weeks to go until the 2016 November election, the Public Policy Institute of California released its latest *Californians and Their Government Survey*. The survey shows that 54% of likely voters support Proposition 55, the effort to extend the income tax portion of Proposition 30. More than three out of four Democrats support the tax extension as well as one-third of Republicans and half of Independent voters.

In May (see "[Latest Poll Shows Support for Extending Proposition 30](#)" in the June 3, 2016, *Fiscal Report*), 58% of likely voters supported the Proposition 30 extension. This latest poll shows a drop in support for the proposition despite the lack of an active opposition campaign.

Back in 2012, when Proposition 30 was on the ballot, poll after poll showed support for the measure sliding lower and lower (see "[Downward Slide for Proposition 30 Continues](#)" in the October 26, 2012, *Fiscal Report*). As Election Day approached, however, Governor Jerry Brown began actively campaigning for his temporary tax measure, and Proposition 30 passed with 55.4% of the vote.

It is unclear whether Governor Brown will be involved in Proposition 55's campaign. He has not endorsed the proposal and is more actively engaged in getting his juvenile justice initiative passed (Proposition 57) and in defeating Proposition 53, which would require voter approval of revenue bonds and could jeopardize building the high-speed rail and the twin tunnels project for water conveyance.

Proposition 51 appears to be in worse shape than Proposition 55 with fewer than half of likely voters supporting the \$9 billion education facilities bond (47% in support versus 43% opposed). With opposition from Governor Brown and no support from the statewide teachers' groups, the campaign for

school facilities funding is having a rough time keeping voters supporting the bond. In April, 63% of likely voters supported Proposition 51.

The last statewide school bond, Proposition 1D from 2006, was approved with 56.9% of the vote and that was with support from teachers' groups as well as the two candidates for Governor that year, Arnold Schwarzenegger and Phil Angelides.

Proposition 55

All of us at School Services of California, Inc., strive for precision in our descriptions of various legislative and budget outcomes, but sometimes the details get in the way of the main message. Such is the case with explanations of the benefits of Proposition 55, an initiative that would extend the current temporary income taxes through 2030 instead of allowing them to expire at the end of 2018.

We know that over that long period an additional \$4 billion to \$9 billion per year in state revenues will benefit Proposition 98 and will serve to elevate revenues for schools above where they would be without extension of the taxes. Proposition 55 is a good thing for public education over the long haul.

We continue to get questions about things no one can know at this point, like, "How much more will my district get in 2019 if the taxes are extended?" Or, "Will the extension guarantee that in every year, under a wide variety of economic circumstances, Proposition 98 will increase?" The answers to these questions are a bit elusive given the vagaries of the economy and the fact that Local Control Funding Formula funding is determined by the Legislature each year based upon facts that are specific to that year. However, just as we cannot be precise about how many years will be added to your life if you stop smoking, the benefits of Proposition 55, while not precisely specified year by year, are real and have the potential to dramatically improve funding for schools for years to come.

Our main message here is that Proposition 55 is a good thing for schools, we urge readers not to allow the leaves to block the view of the forest; the green in those trees is from the dollars education will receive if Proposition 55 passes.

From California Association of School Business Officials (CASBO) –

Statewide Propositions for November Election

By Sara C. Bachez and Elizabeth Munguia, Governmental Relations

The initiative process empowers voters in California to determine whether to enact changes to the state Constitution or other laws, with a simple majority of the vote to pass. Since 2000, California voters have considered a total of 140 propositions, with just over half of those being approved. For the 2016 November elections, voters will have to decide on 17 statewide ballot propositions.

Proposition 51: School Bonds. Funding for K-12 School and Community College Facilities. (Initiative Statutory Amendment)

This initiative authorizes \$9 billion in general obligation bonds for new construction and modernization of K–12 public school facilities; charter schools and vocational education facilities; and California Community Colleges facilities.

Fiscal Impact: The estimated state cost of the facilities bond initiative is about \$17.6 billion to pay off both the principal (\$9 billion) and interest (\$8.6 billion) on the bond.

Polling: 62% of likely voters would vote to “support” Proposition 51, while 35% of likely voters would “oppose” and 2% of likely voters were undecided. (*Source:* Public Policy Institute of California, April 2016).

CASBO Position: Support

If passed, Proposition 51 will:

- Fund projects on the true unfunded
- Fund eligible modernization projects on the acknowledged list.
- Fund eligible new construction projects on the acknowledged list.
- Fund approved Community College projects.
- Fund eligible career technical education facilities and eligible charter school facilities.

Proposition 52: State Fees on Hospitals. Federal Medi-Cal Matching Funds. (Initiative Statutory and Constitutional Amendment)

This initiative extends indefinitely an existing statute that imposes fees on hospitals to fund Medi-Cal health care services, care for uninsured patients, and children’s health coverage.

Fiscal Impact: Uncertain fiscal effect, ranging from relatively little impact to annual state General Fund savings of around \$1 billion and increased funding for public hospitals in the low hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

Polling: No polling data available at time of publication.

Proposition 53: Revenue Bonds. (Initiative Constitutional Amendment)

This initiative requires statewide voter approval before any revenue bonds can be issued or sold by the state for certain projects if the bond amount exceeds \$2 billion.

Fiscal Impact: State and local fiscal effects are unknown and would depend on which projects are affected by the measure and what actions government agencies and voters take in response to the measure’s voting requirement.

Polling: 70% of respondents would “support” Proposition 53, while 22% would “oppose” and 8% were undecided. (*Source:* Public Policy Institute of California, January 2016)

Proposition 54: Legislature. Legislation and Proceedings. (Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute)

This initiative prohibits Legislature from passing any bill unless published on Internet for 72 hours before vote. Requires Legislature to record its proceedings and post on Internet. Authorizes use of recordings.

Fiscal Impact: One-time cost of \$1 million to \$2 million and ongoing cost of about \$1 million annually to record legislative meetings and make videos of those meetings available on the Internet.

Polling: No polling data available at time of publication.

Proposition 55: Tax Extension to Fund Education and Healthcare. (Initiative Constitutional Amendment)

This initiative extends the temporary personal income tax increases enacted in 2012 on earnings over \$250,000 for single filers and over \$500,000 for joint filers, for an additional twelve years. The state revenues will continue to support K-12 public schools and community colleges, and allocates up to \$2 billion per year for healthcare programs dedicated to low-income families and senior citizens. The initiative bars use of education revenue for administrative costs, but provides local school governing boards discretion to decide how revenues are to be spent in open meetings that are subject to annual audit.

Fiscal Impact: Increased state revenues—\$8 billion to \$11 billion annually from 2019–2030—depending on the economy and stock market. The increased funding is dedicated for schools, community colleges, health care for low-income people, budget reserves, and debt payments.

Polling: 57% of respondents would be in “support” of Proposition 55, while 35% are “opposed” and 8% have no answer. The support dropped from 62% based on the Public Policy Institute of California survey conducted in April. (*Source:* USC Dornsife/*Los Angeles Times*, September, 2016)

CASBO Position: Support

If passed Proposition 55 will:

- Generate an estimated \$8-11 billion per year on average.
- Prevent nearly \$4 billion in funding cuts for public education.
- Put new revenue into the Education Protection Account, to make sure the money goes to local schools and community colleges.
- Give control to local school boards to determine student needs.

Proposition 56: Cigarette Tax to Fund Healthcare, Tobacco Use Prevention, Research, and Law Enforcement. (Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute)

This initiative increases cigarette tax by \$2.00 per pack, with equivalent increase on other tobacco products and electronic cigarettes containing nicotine. Excludes these revenues from Proposition 98 funding requirements. If tax causes decreased tobacco consumption, transfers tax revenues to offset decreases to existing tobacco-funded programs and sales tax revenues. Requires biennial audit.

Fiscal Impact: Additional net state revenue of \$1 billion to \$1.4 billion in 2017–18, with potentially lower revenues in future years. Revenues would be used primarily to augment spending on health care for low-income Californians.

Polling: 60% of respondents would “support” Proposition 56, while 33% would vote “no” and 7% were undecided. (*Source:* SurveyUSA, September 2016)

Proposition 57: Criminal Sentences. Juvenile Criminal Proceedings and Sentencing. (Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute)

This initiative allows parole consideration for persons convicted of nonviolent felonies upon completion of full prison term for primary offense, as defined. Authorizes sentence credits for rehabilitation, good behavior, or educational achievements. Provides juvenile court judge decides whether juvenile will be prosecuted as adult.

Fiscal Impact: Net state savings likely in the tens of millions of dollars annually, depending on implementation. Net county costs of likely a few million dollars annually.

Polling: 66% of respondents would vote “yes” on Proposition 57, while 26% would vote “no” and 8% did not provide an answer. (*Source:* USC Dornsife/*Los Angeles Times*, September 2016)

Proposition 58 (SB 1174, Lara): English Proficiency. Multilingual Education. (Initiative Statute)

This initiative preserves requirement that public schools ensure students obtain English language proficiency, but allows schools to use multiple programs, including bilingual education to meet student needs. The initiative requires school districts to solicit parent/community input in developing language acquisition programs and authorizes school districts to establish dual-language immersion programs for both native and non-native English speakers.

Fiscal Impact: No notable fiscal effect on school districts or state government.

Polling: No polling data available at time of publication.

Proposition 59 (SB 254, Allen): Corporations. Political Spending. Federal Constitutional Protections. (Legislative Advisory Question)

This initiative asks whether California’s elected officials should use their authority to propose and ratify an amendment to the federal Constitution overturning the United States Supreme Court decision in *Citizens United vs. Federal Election Commission*. *Citizens United* ruled that laws placing certain limits on political spending by corporations and unions are unconstitutional.

Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect on state or local governments.

Polling: No polling data available at time of publication.

Proposition 60: Adult Films. Condoms. Health Requirements. (Initiative Statute)

This initiative requires performers in adult films to use condoms during filming of sexual intercourse. Requires producers of adult films to pay for performer vaccinations, testing, and medical examinations related to sexually transmitted infections. Requires producers to obtain state health license at beginning of filming and to post condom requirement at film sites.

Fiscal Impact: Likely reduction of state and local tax revenues of several million dollars annually. Increased state spending that could exceed \$1 million annually on regulation, may offset by new fees.

Polling: 55% of respondents would “support” Proposition 60, while 32% would “oppose” and 13% were undecided. (*Source:* USC Dornsife/*Los Angeles Times*, September 2016)

Proposition 61: State Prescription Drug Purchases. Pricing Standards. (Initiative Statute)

This initiative prohibits state from buying any prescription drug from a drug manufacturer at price over lowest price paid for the drug by United States Department of Veterans Affairs. Exempts managed care programs through Medi-Cal.

Fiscal Impact: Potential for state savings of an unknown amount depending on (1) how the measure’s implementation challenges are addressed and (2) the responses of drug manufacturers regarding the provision and pricing of their drugs.

Polling: 66% of respondents would vote “yes” on Proposition 61 while 23% of respondents would vote “no” and 12% stated they were undecided. (*Source:* USC Dornsife/Los Angeles Times, September 2016)

Proposition 62: Death Penalty. (Initiative Statute)

This initiative repeals death penalty as maximum punishment for persons found guilty of murder and replaces it with life imprisonment without possibility of parole. Applies retroactively to persons already sentenced to death. States that persons found guilty of murder and sentenced to life without possibility of parole must work while in prison as prescribed by the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. Increases to 60% the portion of wages earned by persons sentenced to life without the possibility of parole that may be applied to any victim restitution fines or orders against them.

Fiscal Impact: Net ongoing reduction in state and county criminal justice costs of around \$150 million annually within a few years, although the impact could vary by tens of millions of dollars depending on various factors.

Polling: 36% of likely voters would “support” Proposition 62, while 52% of likely voters would vote “no” and 12% were undecided. (*Source:* SurveyUSA, September 2016)

Proposition 63: Firearms. Ammunition Sales. (Initiative Statute)

This initiative requires background check and Department of Justice authorization to purchase ammunition. Prohibits possession of large capacity magazines.

Fiscal Impact: Increased state and local court and law enforcement costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars annually, related to a new court process for removing firearms from prohibited persons after they are convicted.

Polling: 64% of likely voters would vote “yes” on Proposition 63, while 28% said they would vote “no” and 8% had no answer. (*Source:* USC Dornsife/Los Angeles Times, September 2016)

Proposition 64: Marijuana Legalization. (Initiative Statute)

This initiative legalizes marijuana and hemp under state law. Designates state agencies to license and regulate marijuana industry. Imposes state excise tax on retail sales of marijuana equal to 15% of sales price, and state cultivation taxes on marijuana of \$9.25 per ounce of flowers and \$2.75 per ounce of leaves. Exempts medical marijuana from some taxation. Establishes packaging, labeling, advertising, and marketing standards and restrictions for marijuana products. Allows local regulation and taxation of marijuana. Prohibits marketing and advertising marijuana to minors. Authorizes resentencing and destruction of records for prior marijuana convictions.

Fiscal Impact: The fiscal statement prepared jointly by the Legislative Analyst and the Director of the Department of Finance stated the following: the size of the measure’s fiscal effects could vary significantly depending on:

- (1) how state and local governments choose to regulate and tax marijuana,
 - (2) whether the federal government enforces federal laws prohibiting marijuana, and
 - (3) how marijuana prices and consumption change under the measure
- Net additional state and local tax revenues that could eventually range from the high hundreds of millions of dollars to over \$1 billion annually. Most of these funds would be required to be spent for specific purposes such as youth programs, environmental protection, and law enforcement.
 - Net reduced costs potentially in the tens of millions of dollars annually to state and local governments primarily related to a decline in the number of marijuana offenders held in state prisons and county jails.

Polling: About 4 different surveys have been conducted on Proposition 64 with voter support ranging from 52%-71%, respondent opposition ranging from 26%-40% and between 3%-8% were undecided. (*Source:* Survey USA, September 2016; USC Dornsife/*Los Angeles Times*, September 2016; California Counts, August 2016; Probolsky Research, August 2016)

Proposition 65: Carryout Bags. Charges. (Initiative Statute)

This initiative redirects money collected by grocery and certain other retail stores through mandated sale of carryout bags. Requires stores to deposit bag sale proceeds into a special fund to support specified environmental projects.

Fiscal Impact: Potential state revenue of several tens of millions of dollars annually under certain circumstances, with the monies used to support certain environmental programs.

Polling: No polling data available at time of publication.

Proposition 66: Death Penalty. Procedures. (Initiative Statute)

This initiative keeps death penalty in place and changes death penalty procedures to speed up the appeals process by putting trial courts in charge of initial petitions challenging death penalty convictions, establishing a time frame for death penalty review, and requiring appointed attorneys to work on death penalty cases.

Fiscal Impact: Unknown ongoing impact on state court costs for processing legal challenges to death sentences. Potential prison savings in the tens of millions of dollars annually.

Polling: 75.7% of respondents would be in “favor” of Proposition 66, while 24.3% would “oppose”. (*Source:* UC Berkeley Institute of Governmental Studies, June/July 2016)

Proposition 67: Ban On Single-Use Plastic Bags. (Referendum)

This initiative prohibits grocery and other stores from providing customers single-use plastic or paper carryout bags but permits sale of recycled paper bags and reusable bags.

Fiscal Impact: Relatively small fiscal effects on state and local governments, including a minor increase in state administrative costs and possible minor local government savings from reduced litter and waste management costs.

Polling: 59% of respondents would “support” Proposition 67, while 34% would “oppose” and 7% were undecided. (*Source:* USC Dornsife/*Los Angeles Times*, October 2014)

For additional information on the statewide propositions that qualified for the November 2016 ballot, visit the Secretary of State website.

YPICS:

MORCS Renewal

On Tuesday, September 20, 2016, Monseñor Oscar Romero Charter School was renewed for another 5 years by the LAUSD Board of Education. All of this happened on consent (no board member contested the approval recommended by the Charter Schools Division). The strategy employed throughout the renewal process for MORCS was recommended by CCSA and ensured that we moved forward with other strong charter schools: Fenton Avenue Charter School, Fenton Primary Center, Santa Monica Boulevard Community Charter School (under the leadership of our Board Treasurer Joe Lucente), Equitas, and Synergy. This strategy of moving forward with charter school friends who reflect the same level of integrity and strong reputation as MORCSW was the key to such an inconsequential renewal. We thank the CCSA staff for their efforts to accomplish the approvals for all new and renewing schools, and we will employ this same strategy when it is time to renew Bert Corona in two years.

Parent Conferences

All three YPICS are holding parent conferences this week. Parent attendance is has exceeded the 88% for the high school and over 95% for the middle schools. At the time of this writing conferences are still underway, therefore, we will provide you with final data for all three schools next month's report.