

HOW EDUCATION IS FUNDED IN CALIFORNIA

Prior to the 1970s, California's schools were financed largely with property tax revenues imposed for the benefit of local school districts. This led to dramatic differences in school district funding. A school district with very high property values could raise more revenue per pupil with a low property tax rate, while a district with low property values could raise less with a much higher property tax rate. The state attempted to reduce these differences by providing more state aid to low-property wealth districts. Despite this effort, per pupil revenues varied considerably between districts. In fiscal year 1968-69, for example, per pupil expenditures ranged from \$577 in Baldwin Park to \$1,232 in Beverly Hills.¹ This disparity led to the important Serrano v. Priest (1976) equal protection litigation, which was resolved through statutory enactments that called for a general equalization of state apportionment revenue to school districts.

In 1978, voters approved Proposition 13. The new law limited property tax rates to 1 percent of a property's assessed value at the time of acquisition. Proposition 13 reduced property tax revenues available for local governments and school districts. To cushion the impact to school districts, the state Legislature shifted state dollars to schools.

With the adoption of Proposition 98 (1988) and Proposition 111 (1990), a minimum funding level from State and local property taxes was provided to K-14 public schools. California schools today receive the large majority of their funding from the State, primarily from income and sales tax revenues. To a much lesser extent, districts also receive some local property revenues that are collected at the local level but distributed by the State. Income and sales taxes are more volatile revenue sources than property taxes. When the economy sours, unemployment rises, leading to fewer purchases. This correspondingly leads to less income and goods to be taxed. As a result, fewer dollars become available for schools.

California school districts therefore face dramatic cyclical funding variations as the economy rises and falls. Further, California's Governor and State Legislature, whose vote on the State Budget Act determines how State funds may be spent, have enormous control over the ability of local school districts to utilize funding to meet the specific needs of their students. Approximately 60% of all school district funds in California are general purpose in nature; the remaining 40% are restricted to specific purposes, such as the needs of special education students, low income students, limited English-proficient students, and specific grade levels. This greatly constrains local boards of education in their spending decisions. They are further constrained in their ability to raise taxes independently of the State. Bond issues, usually limited to building programs, require a 55% vote for passage. Parcel tax measures require a 2/3 vote.

In 2013, the Governor proposed revising the state's allocation formula for school districts to increase flexibility at the local level. This proposal is known as the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF). Under LCFF, the state provides a base grant for all students and additional grants for high-need students such as English Learners and socio-economically disadvantaged pupils.

¹ California Budget Project, *School Finance in California and the Proposition 98 Guarantee* (April 2006).

The following provides information on legislation and court rulings that have significantly affected California's funding for education.²

Senate Bill 90 (1972) – In 1972, the Legislature established revenue limits for California public schools. The legislation placed ceilings on the amount of tax money each district could receive per pupil. This was in order to help reduce the wide differences in school funding between high and low property-wealth districts. The 1972-73 general purpose spending level became the base amount in determining each district's annual revenue limit.

Serrano v. Priest (1976) – This 1976 California Supreme Court decision declared the existing system of financing schools unconstitutional because it violated the equal protection clause of the State Constitution. The Court ruled that property tax rates and per pupil expenditures should be equalized and that, by 1980, the difference in revenue limits per pupil should be less than \$100 (the "Serrano band"). This allowable difference in revenue limits has subsequently been adjusted for inflation. In equalizing funding, districts are divided into three types: elementary, high school, and unified. They are then further divided into small and large districts to ensure that appropriate funding comparisons are made. Special purpose or "categorical" funds are excluded from this calculation.

Assembly Bill 65 (1977) – In response to the *Serrano* decision, the California State Legislature passed AB 65, creating an annual inflation adjustment based on a sliding scale in order to equalize revenue limits among districts over time. Higher inflation increases were provided to districts with low revenue limits, with lower (occasionally no) inflation adjustments for high revenue districts.

Proposition 13 (1978) – This constitutional amendment (the "Jarvis Amendment") approved by California voters in 1978 limits property taxes to 1% of a property's assessed value, and caps increases in assessed value at 2% annually or the percentage growth in the Consumer Price Index, whichever is less. It also mandated a 2/3 vote for approval of new taxes, such as parcel taxes.

Assembly Bill 8 (1978) – In response to Proposition 13, the Legislature established a formula for dividing property taxes among cities, counties, and school districts. This shielded schools from some of the measure's effects. In the process, the State replaced the lost property taxes and effectively took control of school district funding.

Gann Limit (Proposition 4, 1979) – Proposition 4 created a constitutional limit on government spending at every level in the State, including school districts. No agency's expenditures can exceed its Gann Limit, which is adjusted annually for inflation and population increase.

Senate Bill 813 (1983) – SB 813 provided additional money to school districts through equalization of revenue limits and new categorical programs, longer school day/year, and higher beginning teachers' salaries. It also established statewide model curriculum standards.

Lottery Initiative (1984) – In November 1984, voters approved Proposition 37, a constitutional amendment establishing the California State Lottery. Provisions guarantee that a minimum of 34% of total

² Many of these rulings have been amended by subsequent legislations.

lottery receipts be distributed to public schools, colleges, and universities. Funds are to supplement, not replace, State support for education. Lottery funds cannot be used for purchase or construction of facilities, for land, or research. Under Proposition 20, passed in March 2000, 50% of lottery funding above the 1997-98 funding level must be used for purchase of instructional materials.

Proposition 98 (1988) – This constitutional amendment guarantees a minimum funding level from State and property taxes for K-14 public schools in a complex formula based on State tax revenues. It also requires each school to prepare and publicize an annual School Accountability Report Card (SARC) that covers at least 13 required topics. A 2/3 vote of the Legislature and the Governor's signature are required to suspend Proposition 98 for a year.

Proposition 111 (1990) – This constitutional amendment changed the inflation index for the Gann Limit calculation, effectively raising the limit. Additionally, the minimum Proposition 98 funding guarantee was changed to reflect the growth of California's overall economy. It did so by shifting the adjustment from the growth of per capita personal income (which historically has tended to be a lower amount) to the growth in State per capita General Fund revenues plus one-half percent.

Assembly Bill 1200 (1991) – AB 1200 established a system for school district accounting practices that specifies how districts must report their revenues and expenditures. It requires that districts project their fiscal solvency two years out, and provide the State with Board-approved financial interim reports twice annually. County offices of education are responsible for monitoring and providing technical assistance to their districts. AB 2756 (2004) adds to the responsibilities and control of county offices of education over the budget and expenditure reporting of local districts.

Class Size Reduction, K-3 (SB 1777, 1996) – This legislation provided incentives for school districts to reduce K-3 classes to a pupil-teacher ratio of no more than 20 to 1, and provided additional funding to districts that met these ratios. A one-time allocation of \$25,000 per added classroom was also made available.

Senate Bill 1468 (1997) – This legislation changed the way average daily attendance (ADA) is counted, largely eliminating the concept of "excused absences" and basing ADA on students who are actually at school. To ensure that districts did not lose a large proportion of their revenue, the per-pupil revenue limit rate was adjusted by the average attendance rates of each individual school district.

Assembly Bill 602 (1997) – This legislation revised the state's allocation formula for special education funding for school districts. The formula distributes a large share of special education funds based on total student population of each school district, rather than the number of special education students at each district or the specific needs of those students.

Assembly Bill 1115 (1999) – Under the terms of this bill, an independent charter school is deemed a school of the chartering school district for the purposes of establishing its special education local plan ("SELPA") status unless it designates otherwise in its charter petition. As such, independent charter schools which are members of a school district's SELPA are entitled to an equitable share of special education services and funding.

Assembly Bill 1600 (1999) – This bill gave charter schools the option to receive funding directly from the State, rather than from their local district, in the form of a block grant.

Proposition 39 (2000) – This constitutional amendment established a 55% vote threshold for the issuance of school facilities construction bonds. In order to issue bonds under Proposition 39, the District must, among other things, use Proposition 39 bond funds only for those projects specifically listed in the ballot measure and strategic execution plans; create and maintain a citizens' bond oversight committee; and annually ensure that performance and financial audits are conducted for Proposition 39 facilities projects. Proposition 39 also requires the District to offer reasonably equivalent District school facility space to independent charter schools.

Proposition 49 (2002) – This voter initiative, otherwise known as the "The After School Education and Safety Program Act of 2002," increased state funding for before and after school programs at elementary and middle schools. Funding is provided to the District through a competitive grant process with priority given to school sites that have at least 50 percent of its students receiving free and reduced priced lunch. A portion of state funding under Proposition 49 satisfies the revenue limit guarantee under Proposition 98.

Assembly Bill 825 (2009) – Under the terms of this bill, the District receives funding for its Integration Program and for other instructional program needs as part of a Targeted Instructional Improvement Block Grant.

Senate Bill 1133 (Quality Education Investment Act of 2006) – Adopted in 2006 as a settlement of the CTA v. Schwarzenegger et al. lawsuit, the QEIA program provides targeted funding for eligible schools in API deciles 1, 2, and 3. The funding is to be used primarily for class-size reduction purposes and overall academic achievement goals. QEIA ended in fiscal year 2016-17.

Education Trailer Bill - Senate Bill 4 of the 2009-10 Third Extraordinary Session (SBX3 4, 2009) – For fiscal years 2008-09 through 2012-13, this bill established: (1) Categorical Program Flexibility, which grouped categorical programs into Tiers I, II, and III, and identified Tier III programs as unrestricted; (2) the public hearing requirement as a condition for receipt of Tier III funds; (3) the use of 2008-09 as the base year in calculating for most of the Tier III categorical programs and use of 2007-08 as the base year for calculating the revenue limit-related Tier III categorical programs; and (4) the use of June 30, 2008 ending balances as unrestricted funds with a few program exceptions. See the glossary for additional details on Tiers I, II, and III programs. In addition, SBX3 4 relaxed K-3 Class Size Reduction penalties for fiscal years 2008-09 through 2011-12 only.

Proposition 30 (2012) – The initiative passed on November 2012 provides for a [personal income tax](#) increase over seven years for California residents with an annual income over \$250,000, through the end of 2018. This also provides for an increase in [sales tax](#) by 0.25 percent over four years (from January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2016). This initiative funds K-12 public education among other purposes.

Local Control Funding Formula (2013) – This legislation simplified the state's funding allocation formula for school districts. The new funding formula intends to increase transparency for state funding to schools and increase decision-making as to expenditure of funds at the local education agency level. Under LCFF,

the state provides a base grant for all students and additional grants for high-need students such as English learners, low income, and foster youth.

Proposition 39 (2013) – The California Clean Energy Jobs Act changed the corporate income tax code and allocates projected revenue to the state General Fund and the Clean Energy Job Creation Fund for five fiscal years beginning 2013-14. Under the initiative, available funds are to be used for eligible projects to improve energy efficiency and expand clean energy generation in schools. School Districts can request funding by submitting an application to the California Energy Commission.

Proposition 55 (2016) - Extends by twelve years the temporary personal income tax increases enacted in 2012 (Proposition 30) on earnings over \$250,000, with revenues allocated to K-12 schools, California Community Colleges, and, in certain years, healthcare. Proposition 55 will raise tax revenue by between \$4 billion and \$9 billion a year. Half of funds will go to schools and community colleges, up to \$2 billion a year would go to Medi-Cal, and up to \$1.5 billion will be saved and applied to debt.

Source: This section of the budget relies heavily on information found in the *State Funding of K-12 Education* section of the State Funding of Education website, from *EdSource*.