

## **PRESENTED: GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE – JUNE 2, 2020**

[AB 1835 \(Weber\)](#) – D – San Diego - Education finance: local control funding formula: supplemental and concentration grants – Legislation to implement the Bureau of State Auditor’s Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) audit recommendations to ensure that supplemental and concentration grant funding is properly spent on unduplicated pupils. CCSA is supporting this legislation as we believe it is consistent with the intent of LCFF to support our highest-need students

### **SUMMARY:**

This bill prohibits a local education agency (LEA), including a charter school, from rolling over from one year to the next certain unspent state education dollars intended to increase and improve services for low-income students and using those dollars towards other purposes.

Specifically, with regard to unspent funds intended to increase and improve services for low-income students, this bill requires each LEA, including a charter school, to (a) identify unspent grant funds by annually reconciling and reporting to the California Department of Education (CDE) estimated and actual spending; (b) report in its local planning document the amount of unspent funds annually; and (c) continue to expend any unspent funds towards the originally intended purpose.

### **FISCAL EFFECT:**

1) Unknown, though likely minor, ongoing Proposition 98 General Fund cost to an LEA to add this data to existing financial reports to CDE and report this information in its local plans. The state has over 1,000 LEAs and over 1,200 charter schools. If the cost to report this information to the CDE averaged even \$100 in additional administrative costs per LEA or charter school, costs would exceed \$200,000.

If the Commission on State Mandates determines the activities above to be a reimbursable state-mandated program, cost pressures to the K-12 Mandates Block Grant.

2) Unknown, though likely minor, ongoing General Fund administrative costs to CDE to receive financial data from LEAs

### **Motion: Recommend AIMS Board Support**

**VOTE: Thompson, Abuyen, Cook, Woods-Cadiz – Yes**

[AB 1982 \(Cunningham\)](#) – R – San Louis Obispo - Introduced by Assembly Member Cunningham (Coauthors: Assembly Members Fong – R – Bakersfield and Wicks - D) - Teacher credentialing: basic skills proficiency test: exemption – Legislation that would provide flexibility in teacher credentialing by exempting teacher candidates from the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) if they have a B or better in qualifying higher education coursework. CCSA is supporting this legislation as we support further credentialing flexibility for our schools.

## **SUMMARY:**

This bill creates a temporary alternative to the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST). Specifically, until December 31, 2023, the bill authorizes a teacher credential applicant, in lieu of taking the CBEST, to demonstrate basic reading, writing and mathematics skills by (a) earning at least a letter grade of "B" in qualifying coursework as determined by a teacher credential preparation program or by the state Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), or (b) through a combination of qualifying coursework and exams.

## **FISCAL EFFECT:**

- 1) Minor and absorbable special fund costs to the CTC to determine qualifying coursework.
- 2) Minor and absorbable costs, potentially General Fund costs, to determine qualifying coursework, if an applicable credential preparation program is operated by a state university.
- 3) Lost teacher applicant fee revenue of an unknown amount, potentially in the hundreds of thousands of dollars annually, to CTC should teacher applicants opt to demonstrate basic skill proficiency through coursework rather than through the CBEST. (On average, CTC takes in about \$840,300 from CBEST fees. Assuming 75% of teacher candidates opt not to take the CBEST, the CTC would lose about \$630,000 in fee revenue annually.) However, the CTC indicates it holds reserves large enough to absorb these costs over the three-year period of this bill.

## **Motion Recommend AIMS Board Support**

**VOTE: Abuyen, Thompson, Cook, Woods-Cadiz - Yes**

[AB 2485 \(Kalra\)](#) – D – San Jose - Teacher credentialing: subject matter competence – Similar to AB 1982, legislation that would provide flexibility in teacher credentialing by allowing teacher candidates to demonstrate subject matter competence by completing higher education coursework in the subject matters related to the content area of the credential. Similar to AB 1982, CCSA is supporting this legislation as we support further credentialing flexibility for our schools.

## **SUMMARY:**

This bill creates a temporary alternative pathway to fulfilling the requirements of the Subject Matter Competency Requirement (SMR). Specifically, until January 1, 2023, this bill creates another pathway for a teacher credential candidate to meet requirements related to the Subject Matter Competency Requirement (SMR) beyond taking California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) approved college coursework sequences, passing California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSETs) or mixing the two to demonstrate competency in a given subject matter. Specifically, this bill allows a teacher candidate to meet subject matter requirement by using coursework they completed as part of their college major or by mixing and matching with other existing pathways, such as CSETs.

**FISCAL EFFECT:**

- 1) Minor and absorbable special fund costs to the CTC to determine qualifying coursework.
  
- 2) Lost teacher applicant fee revenue of an unknown amount, potentially in the hundreds of thousands of dollars annually, to CTC should teacher applicants opt to meet requirements of the SMR through coursework or mixing and matching coursework with other pathways, such as testing. (Assuming half of all teacher candidates use the coursework option in place of one or two CSET subtests, lost test revenue to CTC over the three years during which the bill's requirements are in effect would range between \$502,000 to \$757,000.) However, the CTC indicates it holds reserves large enough to absorb these costs over the three-year period

**Motion – Recommend AIMS Board Support**

**VOTE: Woods-Cadiz, Abuyen, Thompson, Cook - Yes**