

Most school leaders are principals and vice principals at neighborhood schools. Others manage the essential programs and services that support students and

School district administrators account for only 0.5 percent of personnel employed in California's schools, compared with teachers at 52.9 percent; student and instructional coordinators at

legislative action day april 16, 2018 | #ACSAadvocates

The Local Control Funding Formula Works

BACKGROUND: The total dollar amount allocated in the California state budget for education is too low to provide the comprehensive and constitutionally required education that all California students deserve. As we near the 30 year anniversary of the passage of Proposition 98, the state is still far from prioritizing California public education funding.

The overarching goal of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) is to improve academic outcomes by directing additional funding to school districts that serve highneed students. The intent of the LCFF was for individual school districts to have more authority over their spending decisions, while also holding each district accountable for their student results. The LCFF established a new way to split Proposition 98 funding however, this new funding distribution method did nothing to increase the total amount of funding.

In a study released in February 2018 by the Learning Policy Institute, Money and Freedom: The Impact of California's School Finance Reform, researchers found that LCFF revenue increases have a significant impact on the average high school graduation rates for a plurality of student demographics in districts statewide.

ACSA'S POSITION: ACSA urges the Legislature and the governor to establish new LCFF targets in this legislative cycle. At a minimum, we believe the new total LCFF target should be a base grant that is the national average for every California school district, plus the supplemental and concentration grants as additional resources for eligible local educational agencies. ACSA is co-sponsoring AB 2808 (Muratsuchi) which establishes a higher LCFF base grant funded by growth within Proposition 98. The funding goal set within the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) should be adjusted to reflect current and future funding needs, and Muratsuchi's AB 2808 provides an avenue to achieve those objectives.

ASK: ACSA requests the following:

- Increase LCFF funding levels through the base grant, while maintaining the supplemental and concentration grant funding levels
- Create a new long-term education funding plan
- Support Muratsuchi's AB 2808

Extend the Probationary Period

BACKGROUND: It is often stated that a teacher is the most important individual for a student's academic success. If that is the case, then public policy must ensure that teachers receive the best opportunity to succeed. Currently, California is facing a severe teacher shortage due primarily to a high number of retirements and high turnover. The supply of quality candidates is shrinking while the number of inexperienced teachers is increasing. One method to maintain the quality of teacher candidates is to extend the probationary period for new teachers in order to provide them the tools for long-term success. A third year of coaching, mentoring, or professional development for new teachers will help the employee improve, keep them in the teaching career, and strengthen the academic achievement for our students.

ACSA POSITION: ACSA supports an extension of the teacher probationary period to three years. In the third year of probation, a teaching candidate shall be observed, coached and/or mentored, and provided feedback. At the end of the third year, the school district maintains the ability to non-reelect the probationary employee.

ASK: Enact a legislative change that extends the teacher probationary period to three years.

■ Support Weber's AB 1220