

Assembly Appropriations Committee
Education

8/10/16 3:08 PM

BILL	AUTHOR	SUBJECT/FISCAL EFFECT	RECOMMENDATION
SB 322	Leno	<p>Subject: Charter school admission policies and due process regarding suspension and expulsion.</p> <p>Modifies charter school policies regarding preferences for admission and establishes requirements for suspension and expulsion procedures.</p> <p>Fiscal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Proposition 98/GF state mandated costs to charter authorizers (school districts and county offices of education), likely in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, to review and approve material revisions to charter petitions and to provide ongoing oversight to ensure compliance with admissions, suspension and expulsion requirements. These costs may be offset by existing oversight fees charged to charter schools. Authorizers are allowed to charge fees for oversight based on actual costs not to exceed 1% or 3% of revenues, depending on facilities arrangements. As of 2014-15, there were 1,179 charter schools enrolling approximately 544,900 of the state's 6.2 million students. 2) Unknown costs to charter schools that may need to modify existing admissions requirements and suspension and expulsion procedures, consistent with the requirements of this bill. Any additional costs would be absorbed locally since charters are ineligible to claim reimbursement of costs resulting from state mandates. Costs associated with suspension and expulsion procedures may be offset by funding provided through the K-12 Mandate Block Grant. 	

SB 412	Glazer	<p>Subject: California Promise Program at CSU.</p> <p>Guarantee eligible students a baccalaureate degree within four years of enrolling at CSU or within two years after transferring to the CSU from a community college.</p> <p>Fiscal:</p> <p>CSU indicates that four campuses (Fresno, Fullerton, Cal Poly Pomona, and San Bernardino) have four-year pledge programs similar to what is proposed in this bill for incoming freshman. Administrative costs to replicate this model at six additional campuses would be in the range of \$450,000 to \$600,000 annually. [General Fund]</p> <p>CSU also indicates that one of four campuses in the system that has over 1,000 Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) students (see Comment #3, Prior Legislation) already has a two-year pledge program serving these students. Costs for the two-year pledge program at these four campuses will total \$300,000 to \$400,000 and for 16 additional campuses, with smaller numbers of ADT students, will be between \$300,000 and \$800,000, for total costs of \$600,000 to \$1.2 million for the two-year pledge programs. [General Fund]</p> <p>Costs for the legislative reports will be about \$100,000. [General Fund]</p>	
--------	--------	---	--

SB 527	Liu	<p>Subject: Learning Communities for School Success Program.</p> <p>Establishes the Learning Communities for School Success Program, contingent upon funds appropriated in the Budget Act, for the purpose of implementing the K–12 education portion of the Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Fund (Proposition 47). Grants are to support evidence-based, nonpunitive programs and practices to keep the state’s most vulnerable students in school, consistent with LEA goals for the pupil engagement and school climate, as required by their LCAP.</p> <p>Fiscal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The grant program established by this bill is contingent upon funding provided in the budget act. The 2016-17 budget, pending signature by the Governor, provides a total of \$27.9 for the purposes of this bill. Specifically, the budget includes \$9.9 million in Proposition 47 savings and an additional \$18 million in one-time Proposition 98 funds to implement the K-12 grant program required under Proposition 47, pursuant to legislation. 2) Administrative costs to the CDE in the range of \$400,000 to \$800,000 to administer grants, provide technical assistance, and collect and analyze data. This bill, consistent with the Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Act, allows the CDE to use no more than 5% of the funding the department receives from the Act for administrative costs. 	
--------	-----	--	--

SB 911	Hertzberg	<p>Subject: California American Indian education centers.</p> <p>Deletes the January 1, 2017 repeal of the California American Indian Education Center (AIEC) program thereby extending the operation of the program indefinitely. Requires the California Department of Education (CDE) to continue to report on the evaluation of the program every five years, starting in January 2021, and to make this information available to the appropriate fiscal and policy committees of the Legislature.</p> <p>Fiscal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Although this bill extends the AIEC program indefinitely, funding for the program is still subject to an appropriation in the annual Budget Act. The 2016-17 Budget Act provides \$4.1 million (Proposition 98) for the program. This level of support is likely to be ongoing. 2) Ongoing costs of at least \$70,000 (General Fund) to maintain the existing .6 FTE position at the CDE to administer the AIEC program. 	
SB 916	Allen	<p>Subject: Teaching credential for dance and theater.</p> <p>Authorizes the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) to issue a single subject teaching credential in dance and theater. This bill also includes a grandfather provision to allow a person issued a credential in English prior to the establishment of a credential in theater, to teach theater and a person issued a credential in physical education before the establishment of a teaching credential in dance, to teach dance.</p> <p>Fiscal:</p> <p>One-time administrative costs to the CCTC in the range of \$400,000 to \$500,000 [Test Development and Administration Account (TDAA)] to develop credential standards and develop both the dance and theater exams for certification. The TDAA currently has a reserve of \$2.9 million.</p>	

SB 933	Allen	<p data-bbox="474 102 968 134">Subject: Teacher residency programs.</p> <p data-bbox="474 175 1566 318">Establishes the California Teacher Corps program to provide \$60 million in one-time Proposition 98 funding for matching grants to local school districts to create or expand teacher residency programs. Grant funding can be used for master teacher stipends, stipends and tuition for residents, and costs of mentoring and induction.</p> <p data-bbox="474 354 569 386">Fiscal:</p> <ol data-bbox="474 422 1566 670" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="474 422 1289 454">1) One-time appropriation of \$60 million (Proposition 98/GF).<li data-bbox="474 490 1566 670">2) General Fund administrative costs to the California Department of Education (CDE) of \$275,000 for each year of the three year grant program (\$825,000 total) to develop the competitive application process and provide ongoing technical assistance. The CDE also estimates General Fund costs of approximately \$300,000 to complete the program evaluation.	
--------	-------	---	--

SB 959	Lara	<p>Subject: UC service contracts.</p> <p>Effective, January 1, 2018, requires bidders on University of California (UC) contracts for specified types of personal services to certify that their employees' total compensation does not significantly undercut the total compensation of UC employees doing comparable work.</p> <p>Fiscal:</p> <p>UC estimates that its total annual spending on service contracts of the types that would be subject to the provisions of this bill is \$345 million, with just over one half of this amount representing contracts at UC's 10 campuses and the remainder representing contracts at UC's five medical centers. Of this total, an estimated 60% (\$207 million) constitutes labor costs. Assuming a 30% increase in costs related to providing parity in benefits and a 12.5% increase in costs related to wage parity, total annual costs would be \$88 million. These costs will come from a variety of UC fund sources, including the State General Fund, federal funds, auxiliary funds, and enterprise funds, such as from the medical centers.</p> <p>In addition to increased contract costs, UC will incur administrative costs of several hundred thousand dollars to calculate average per-employee compensation for every type of contract and to factor in all known cost escalators to project future per-employee costs. There will be additional administrative costs, likely in the millions of dollars over time, associated with revising contract bid specifications, maintaining information provided by prospective and successful bidders for potential Public Records Act requests, and performing additional bidding due to the bill's restrictions on contract renewals or extensions.</p>	
--------	------	---	--

SB 1014	Liu	<p>Subject: Pregnant and parenting pupil leave policy and funding.</p> <p>Authorizes a school district to grant parental leave to a student, and provides that such absences generate average daily attendance (ADA) funding, if the school district files an expectant and parenting student policy with the California Department of Education (CDE). Modifies the definition of temporary disability to include pregnancy and requires districts to provide a plan for make-up work.</p> <p>Fiscal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Unknown increase in the Proposition 98 minimum guarantee to the extent the bill results in increased ADA. Increased costs to the General Fund are unknown but could be in the tens of millions of dollars. Actual costs will depend upon whether districts file an expectant and parenting student policy, the number of students that choose to take leave, the total leave taken, and hours of instruction provided to the student on parental leave. 2) Unknown state mandated costs, likely in the low hundreds of thousands of dollars, for school districts to expand the existing annual parent notification mandate and disseminate information. 3) One-time General Fund administrative costs to the California Department of Education of approximately \$85,000 to make revisions to the Principal Apportionment and Data Collection System to account for absences attributed to parental leave. Ongoing costs of approximately \$50,000 GF to provide technical assistance to districts to implement the new policy. 	
---------	-----	---	--

SB 1072	Mendoza	<p>Subject: Schoolbus child safety alert systems.</p> <p>Requires local education agencies (LEAs) to ensure various bus safety requirements are met, including the installation of child safety alarms, as specified, to ensure that a student is not left unattended on a bus. Requires school pupil activity buses (SPABs) to be equipped with child alert systems, except when the SPAB is not used exclusively to transport students and when various safety precautions are in place, including specific chaperone and bus driver requirements.</p> <p>Fiscal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Proposition 98/GF cost pressures, likely in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, for LEAs to modify transportation plans, report information to the DMV, maintain specified documents for two years and install child alarm systems. These costs are not reimbursable since state law does not require school districts to provide transportation on school buses. 2) Minor GF costs to the California Department of Education (CDE) to modify bus driver training programs to include instruction on inspection procedures that ensure a student is not left unattended. 3) Minor/absorbable costs for the California Highway Patrol (CHP) to adopt regulations regarding child safety alarm systems, and to incorporate requirements into school bus inspections. 4) Minor/absorbable costs for the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to account for an additional circumstance that would result in the refusal to issue or renew a bus driver certificate, or the revocation or suspension of that certificate. 	
---------	---------	---	--

SB 1113	Beall	<p>Subject: Early mental health partnerships.</p> <p>Authorizes competitive grants, contingent upon an appropriation, for county mental health providers and local educational agencies (LEAs) to establish partnerships for the purpose of providing mental health services to students. Requires the Department of Health Care Services to collect academic performance data for students that receive Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) funds as part of their IEP.</p> <p>Fiscal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Proposition 98/GF cost pressure, in the millions of dollars, to implement a competitive grant program to fund county and LEA partnerships. The author's office estimates approximately \$1.8 million would be needed per LEA. The bill intends for at least three LEAs to be funded. Actual costs could be higher or lower depending upon available funding. <p>This bill establishes a Partnership Fund to provide competitive grants to partnerships, available upon appropriation by the Legislature. The 2016-17 Budget Act does not provide funding for this purpose. The bill does not specify a fund source for the Partnership Fund and does not expressly prohibit the use of Proposition 98/GF, thereby creating cost pressure on state funds.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) Annual administrative costs to the California Department of Education (CDE) of approximately \$236,000 to administer the competitive grant process and work with DHCS to provide data as specified. 3) General Fund administrative costs to DHCS of approximately \$700,000 in the first year, and approximately \$500,000 ongoing, to report children who receive EPSDT mental health services as part of their IEP. 	
---------	-------	---	--

SB 1146	Lara	<p>Subject: Religious postsecondary educational institutions.</p> <p>Requires a college or university that claims a religious exemption from Title IX laws and regulations to make specified disclosures to students, faculty, and staff, and specifies that religious colleges and universities are subject to state anti-discrimination laws.</p> <p>Fiscal:</p> <p>Given the potential consequences to the institutions that could be impacted by this bill and the legal issues raised by this bill (see the Assembly Judiciary Committee analysis), the probability of litigation against the state appears fairly high. The state could therefore incur significant legal costs, at least in the low hundreds of thousands of dollars.</p> <p>It appears that religious postsecondary educational institutions that participate in the Cal Grant program and have policies that do not comply with the antidiscrimination provisions of the bill could (a) choose not to continue their Cal Grant participation and thereby no longer enroll Cal Grant awardees or (b) continue Cal Grant participation and be subject to possible litigation through an action brought by an aggrieved student or employee.</p> <p>To the extent some institutions would no longer participate in the Cal Grant program, their students that would otherwise be awarded Cal Grants could discontinue their education, remain at the institution and lose their award eligibility, or transfer and maintain their awards at another Cal Grant participating institution—either public or private. Under these first two scenarios, the state would realize unknown, but potentially significant Cal Grant savings. (The maximum Cal Grant award at such institutions will be about \$8,000 starting in 2017-18.)</p> <p>To the extent some of the Cal Grant-eligible students described above would instead attend a California Community College or the California State University (CSU), the state would bear the costs of those students attendance, which could be significant. For every 100 additional CCC or CSU students, state costs would be \$475,000 (GF-Prop 98) at the CCC or \$750,000 (General Fund) at the CSU. These costs would be offset to some extent by savings from lower Cal Grant awards amounts at the CCC and CSU.</p>	
---------	------	---	--

SB 1156	Huff	<p>Subject: Open Enrollment Act.</p> <p>Makes changes to the Open Enrollment Act (Act), starting July 1, 2018, and sunsets the program on January 1, 2023. Specifically, the bill changes the criteria used to identify low achieving schools that students are authorized to transfer from. The bill also increases reporting requirements at the local and state level.</p> <p>Fiscal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Administrative costs to the California Department of Education (CDE) of approximately \$230,000, starting July 1, 2018, to maintain a list of open enrollment schools, develop a template to assist districts with the collection and maintenance of data on transfers, and to comply with reporting requirements to the Legislature, Governor and Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO). 2) Unknown, potentially reimbursable, state mandated costs for school districts of enrollment to track and report data on transfer requests and report information to their school board, county office of education and the SPI. The author estimates approximately 355 schools would be required to allow students to transfer under the Act but it is not clear: 1) how many students would choose to transfer and 2) where these students would choose to enroll. 3) Unknown costs to the LAO, likely in the tens of thousands, for existing staff to produce an evaluation and recommendation of the Open Enrollment program. 	
---------	------	---	--

SB 1180	Jackson	<p>Subject: Paid leave for military veterans working in schools.</p> <p>Provides school employees, hired on or after January 1, 2017 and who are military veterans with service-connected disabilities, additional paid leave for the purpose of undergoing medical treatment for those disabilities during their first year of employment.</p> <p>Fiscal:</p> <p>Unknown one-time Proposition 98/GF cost pressure, likely in the low hundreds of thousands of dollars, to support local education agency (LEA) costs to provide extended leave benefits to classified and certificated employees who are veterans with a military service-connected disability rated at 30% or more by the VA.</p> <p>According to CalHR, there were 147 disabled veterans hired by the state in 2014. For illustration, assuming a daily substitute rate of \$120 or \$15 an hour rate for classified employees, costs per employee could range from \$1,200 to \$1,400. If 150 school employees qualified for additional paid leave, costs would range from \$180,000 to \$210,000.</p>	
---------	---------	--	--

SB 1192	Hill	<p>Subject: Private postsecondary education.</p> <p>Makes numerous changes to the California Private Postsecondary Education Act of 2009.</p> <p>Fiscal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Enforcement Monitor. Annual cost of around \$200,000 for two years to contract for the enforcement monitor. [BPPE Administration Fund] 2) Out-of-State Registration and Enforcement. The BPPE estimates approximately 500 out-of-state institutions will register with the Bureau to provide online education to California students. Ongoing cost will be around \$170,000 for two positions to register these institutions and to work with students and the out-of-state institution's home regulatory body or accrediting agency to ensure compliance with the Act. [BPPE Administration Fund] 3) OSAR. In addition to the one-time STRF appropriation of \$1.3 million for grants to community-based organizations, ongoing costs will be \$600,000 for six positions to fulfill the new office's responsibilities. [BPPE Administration Fund] 4) Corinthian Students. The Bureau estimates it would receive 720 STRF claims, of which 39 percent (281 cases) would be approved, for a total STRF payout of almost \$1.1 million [STRF]. The number of applications and approvals could be larger, however, with the assistance provided to nonprofits under contract to OSAR. The Bureau will also require \$190,000 for two years for two positions to administer this assistance. [BPPE Administration Fund] 5) Office Space. The BPPE indicates that the additional positions described above will require larger office space, resulting in \$1 million in one-time moving costs and \$250,000 annually in increased rental charges. [BPPE Administration Fund] 6) Increased Revenue. Increasing, from \$50,000 to \$100,000, the fine that may be issued to a person for operating an institution without proper approval to operate will increase revenues by about \$300,000 per year to the BPPE Administrative Fund. 	
---------	------	--	--

SB 1225	Mendoza	<p>Subject: Teacher Bill of Rights Act.</p> <p>Creates the Teachers Bill of Rights Act and requires the principal of each school to ensure a conspicuous notice of specified teacher rights is posted in a common area of administrative offices. Requires specific wording, and placement of wording, for the notice, for example 10 bulleted categories that address the following: health and safety requirements, overall teaching environment, the principal as the master teacher, access to basic supplies, input on curriculum, adequate class sizes, collective bargaining rights, competitive salary and benefits, access to quality professional development, fair evaluations, and due process rights.</p> <p>Fiscal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Unknown one-time state-mandated costs, likely in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, for each school to produce and post the notice in administrative areas. There are approximately 12,000 schools statewide that would need to produce and post the notice. Assuming a cost of \$50 per site, statewide costs would be \$600,000. Additional costs could be incurred in the out-years to the extent the notice needs to be updated. 2) Unknown, potentially significant, state cost pressure to the extent the rights provided in the notice are not declaratory of existing law and require districts to provide additional services and benefits. 	
---------	---------	---	--

SB 1309	Leyva	<p>Subject: Student expulsion hearings in county schools.</p> <p>Establishes a process for the expulsion of a student enrolled in a school operated by a county office of education.</p> <p>Fiscal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Unknown costs to the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) to conduct expulsion hearings, to the extent a county board of education chooses to contract with OAH. According to OAH, estimated costs for a one-day hearing are approximately \$4,500. <p>There is no statewide data on the number of hearings that were conducted to determine whether a student attending a county school should be suspended or expelled. Although only six students were expelled from county schools last year, over 7,000 students were suspended from these schools. It is possible that some of the suspension cases began as expulsion cases. For illustration, if OAH was required to conduct 50 hearings, OAH would incur costs in the range of \$225,000 (special funds).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) Unknown Proposition 98/GF state mandated costs, likely in the tens of thousands, for county boards of education to amend their education plan to include a plan for students expelled from a county school and to process expulsion appeals. Actual costs will depend upon the number of appeals. 	
---------	-------	---	--

SB 1314	Block	<p>Subject: Cal Grant and Middle Class Scholarship eligibility for community college baccalaureate degree program students.</p> <p>Provides that California Community College (CCC) students participating in a baccalaureate degree pilot program, who meet all other eligibility criteria, are eligible to receive a Cal Grant award covering upper division coursework fees or a Middle Class Scholarship for two years of full-time upper division coursework.</p> <p>Fiscal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Estimated General Fund costs of \$1.2 million in 2016-17, \$2.4 million in 2017-18, and \$2.8 million in 2018-19 for Cal Grants and Middle Class Scholarship awards, based on an estimated 320, 619, and 720 total recipients, respectively. Costs will continue until the pilot program sunsets in 2022-23. Cost will continue if the program is extended and will increase if the program is expanded to additional districts. 2) CSAC will have annual administrative costs (General Fund) of about \$90,000 for one position. 	
SB 1359	Block	<p>Subject: Higher education course materials.</p> <p>Requires each campus of the California Community Colleges (CCC), CSU, and requests each UC campus to clearly highlight in the online campus course schedule those courses that exclusively used digital course materials, as specified, that are free of charge and that may have a low-cost option for printed versions of those materials.</p> <p>Fiscal:</p> <p>CCC. Annual General Fund (Prop 98) costs of up to \$100,000 for campuses to identify and disclose in course schedules those classes using free digital materials.</p> <p>CSU. Annual General Fund cost of around \$100,000.</p> <p>UC. Minor and absorbable costs.</p>	

SB 1375	Jackson	<p>Subject: Title IX notifications in schools.</p> <p>Requires by July 1, 2017, public and private schools that receive federal funds and are subject to the requirements of federal Title IX, as well as local educational agencies, to post in a prominent and conspicuous location on their websites specific information regarding Title IX. Requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI), on or before April 1, 2017, and annually thereafter, to send a letter through electronic means to all LEAs, as specified, to inform them of the requirements of the bill and of their responsibilities under Title IX.</p> <p>Fiscal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Proposition 98/GF state mandated costs, potentially in excess of \$500,000, for public schools, school districts and county offices of education to develop the notice required by the bill and post online. There are over 11,000 LEAs that could be impacted by the requirements of this bill. Actual costs will depend on size and types of claims LEAs submit to the Commission on State Mandates (CSM) to implement this measure. Charter schools and private schools would also incur costs to implement the requirements of this bill; however, these schools are not eligible to seek reimbursement from the CSM for mandated activities. 2) Minor/absorbable costs to the California Department of Education to monitor compliance and to develop and send the letter to LEAs annually. 	
---------	---------	--	--

SB 1412	Block	<p>Subject: Expand CSU special fund investment options.</p> <p>Expands the California State University's (CSU's) investment authority for certain university funds to include mutual funds and real estate investment trusts, with the earnings to fund deferred maintenance and capital outlay.</p> <p>Fiscal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Unknown revenue gains or losses related to expanded investment authority. The authority provided to the CSU to utilize alternative investment tools could potentially lead to a significant increase in returns. Current law restricts CSU to investing in securities characterized as low-risk, fixed-income securities with fairly low rates of return (according to the CSU, less than one percent annually). To the extent higher returns materialize, the CSU would be restricted to using these funds to address one-time maintenance and capital outlay projects, which theoretically would relieve pressure on the CSU's operating budget, including the General Fund. However, given CSU's huge backlog on deferred maintenance and its capital needs (see below), the additional investment gains would instead help to reduce these funding shortfalls. 2) CSU would incur annual administrative costs in the low hundreds of thousands of dollars for at least one staff position and to support the investment advisory committee. 	
---------	-------	---	--

SB1432	Huff	<p>Subject: Districts of Choice program.</p> <p>Revises and recasts provisions of the District of Choice (DOC) program and extends the program through January 1, 2023. Changes include requirements to register the DOC with the Superintendent of Public Instruction and post student transfer and application information online. The bill also replaces the 10% hard cap on transfers with an 8% rolling cap and provides for an appeal process through the county board of education for students that are denied a transfer. Also requires DOCs to provide transportation to transferring students, upon request.</p> <p>Fiscal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Ongoing administrative costs to the California Department of Education of approximately \$154,000 for one consultant to maintain the list of DOCs; collect and report data; post information online; respond to inquiries and provide technical assistance to districts. The CDE indicates some of these activities require more than one consultant but CDE can absorb some of this workload. 2) Unknown, potentially reimbursable state mandated costs, for county boards of education to process appeals made by parents regarding a denied transfer and to process complaints made by school districts of choice and school districts of residence purporting a violation of law. 3) This bill will also result in cost pressures on DOCs to comply with additional program requirements; however, since the DOC program is optional, these requirements would not be eligible for reimbursement under state mandate law. 	
--------	------	---	--