



# ANALYSIS OF CALIFORNIA'S PROPOSITION 88: A EDUCATION FUNDING, REAL PROPERTY PARCEL TAX, INITIATIVE CON- STITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE

By Lisa Snell





## Reason Foundation

Reason Foundation's mission is to advance a free society by developing, applying, and promoting libertarian principles, including individual liberty, free markets, and the rule of law. We use journalism and public policy research to influence the frameworks and actions of policymakers, journalists, and opinion leaders.

Reason Foundation's nonpartisan public policy research promotes choice, competition, and a dynamic market economy as the foundation for human dignity and progress. Reason produces rigorous, peer-reviewed research and directly engages the policy process, seeking strategies that emphasize cooperation, flexibility, local knowledge, and results. Through practical and innovative approaches to complex problems, Reason seeks to change the way people think about issues, and promote policies that allow and encourage individuals and voluntary institutions to flourish.

Reason Foundation is a tax-exempt research and education organization as defined under IRS code 501(c)(3). Reason Foundation is supported by voluntary contributions from individuals, foundations, and corporations. The views are those of the author, not necessarily those of Reason Foundation or its trustees.

Copyright © 2006 Reason Foundation. Photos used in this publication are copyright © 1996 Photodisc, Inc. All rights reserved.

# Analysis of California's Proposition 88: Education Funding, Real Property Parcel Tax, Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute

By Lisa Snell

## Executive Summary

Proposition 88 is a Constitutional Amendment and Statute initiative that according to the California Secretary Of State's Office:<sup>1</sup>

*Provides additional public school funding for kindergarten through grade 12 by imposing a \$50 tax on each real property parcel; exempts certain elderly and disabled homeowners. Funds must be used for class size reduction, textbooks, school safety, Academic Success facility grants, and a data system to evaluate educational program effectiveness. Provides for reimbursement to government entities to offset anticipated decrease in other tax revenue. Prohibits fund use for school administrative overhead. Requires school district audits and penalties for fund misuse. Excludes funds from Proposition 98 calculations. Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local governments: Annual revenue of up to \$500 million from a new, statewide parcel tax with the revenue dedicated to specific K-12 education programs (such as class size reduction, instructional materials, school safety, and facility grants).*

Proposition 88 gives special interests a loophole to avoid the two-thirds voting requirement of Proposition 13. Since Proposition 13 only applies the two-thirds voting requirement for parcel taxes to *local* initiatives, and *statewide* property initiatives for parcel taxes only need a simple majority to pass, this initiative works around the protections of Proposition 13 to create easy access to property taxes. Once one statewide parcel tax is approved by a simply majority vote, increases in the tax in the future are likely. For example, the continuing efforts to raise new cigarette taxes and new taxes on the wealthy demonstrate how once a specific tax is successful other special interests will try to raise new revenue through additional taxes on the same sources.

Governor Schwarzenegger has increased education spending in California by more than 17 percent over the last two years. Local school districts have also received large increases in discretionary funding. If local school districts feel the need to increase funding for the education programs identified in Proposition 88, they can direct the increased funding from the new state budget.

Proposition 88 takes what traditionally has been a local tax—the parcel tax—and starts using it for state purposes. Decisions about property tax spending for education are best made at the local level. If the new discretionary funds are not enough, local school districts are free to take their case to local voters through the initiative process to pass a local parcel tax for specific education needs with a two-thirds approval by local voters. The state already has enough sources of tax revenue including income, capital gains and most of sales taxes. More than 40 percent of state general revenue already funds education.

Furthermore, education spending in California is at an all-time high. Proposition 88 would offer schools a tiny increase in revenue in exchange for a large bureaucratic administrative hassle. The initiative has strict accountability measures that require districts to invest in audits and tracking mechanisms for a tiny amount of money. While accountability is a good thing, this initiative applies the most severe penalties for the misuse of funds to the smallest revenue stream and creates another burdensome administrative requirement for local school districts. The initiative also specifically excludes all of Proposition 88 funding from being used for administrative purposes. Therefore, school districts may have to use revenue from other funding streams to actually pay for the monitoring costs of Proposition 88. These funds would be restricted to very narrow education purposes. Furthermore, this initiative funds programs that are duplicative and unproven and that have already received large increases in funding for the 2006-2007 school year.

The bottom line is that Proposition 88 creates a whole new kind of statewide tax. Currently all property taxes are local and used for local services from roads to schools. Proposition 88 would encourage other advocacy groups to pass more and bigger statewide property tax proposals. This proposition is in conflict with the clear intent of Proposition 13 to protect citizens from excessive property taxes and to give local residents control over the spending of property taxes raised in their communities.

# Table of Contents

---

Introduction.....	1
Proposition 88 Overview.....	3
Problems with Proposition 88 .....	5
A. Undermines the Protections of Proposition 13 .....	5
B. Continues the Trend of Ballot Box Budgeting .....	6
C. Continues the Trend of Inflexible Education Funding Micromanaged by Sacramento .....	6
D. Funds Duplicative Programs that Already Have Sufficient Resources .....	7
E. No Performance Requirements.....	9
Conclusion.....	11
About the Author .....	12
Endnotes.....	13

## Part I

# Introduction

In California in 2006-2007 schools will receive the largest education funding increase in the history of the state. The California state budget for 2006-2007 provides Proposition 98 education funding of \$55.1 billion for K-12 schools and community colleges. This is an increase of \$5.1 billion above the 2005-2006 Budget Act and represents the single largest year-to-year increase in education funding in California's history. Proposition 98 raises per pupil funding to \$8,288 for 2006-07—an increase of \$886 or 12 percent. Total funding for California's K-12 education system rises to \$67.1 billion, for total per pupil funding from all sources of \$11,264.<sup>2</sup>

Despite this massive increase in education funding in California, proponents of Proposition 88 want to increase K-12 education funding by another \$500 million a year. The money would be raised through an unprecedented use of a \$50 state parcel tax on the 10 million properties in the state of California. Every parcel in the state, no matter what size, would pay \$50 to fund very specific education programs including class size reduction, school safety, and school facility grants. This initiative sets up yet another form of state-level taxation in a state whose residents already pay the highest state-level taxes in the nation. For example, the top income tax rate is the highest in the nation at 10.3 percent. In addition, the sales tax of 7.25 percent also is the highest of any state.

Proposition 88 represents a serious threat to California's property tax protections through Proposition 13. Proposition 88 would create a statewide parcel tax—the first such statewide tax in California since 1910. This initiative circumvents the requirements of Proposition 13 that local parcel taxes can only be approved with a two-thirds majority vote. Proposition 13 blocks easy access to taxpayers' property taxes, but this initiative would bypass the block, making an inroad to raising taxes by a simple majority vote. Since Proposition 13 only applies to *local* parcel taxes (requiring a two-thirds majority vote), this initiative taxes property at the *state level*, requiring a simple majority vote. This initiative sets up a bad precedent and will encourage other special interests to run ballot initiatives to raise funds through state-level parcel taxes by requiring a simple majority vote. Clearly such legislation violates the intent of Proposition 13 to protect taxpayers from onerous property taxes.

For this, Proposition 88 would raise less than half of the revenue generated by the California State Lottery and would increase school funding by less than 1 percent. Although it is unclear how the

money will be distributed, the initiative calls for the legislature to adopt a funding formula that offers more resources to the neediest students including English Language Learners and students in low-performing schools. Therefore, while this money will be collected in every jurisdiction, it is likely that some districts will receive more resources than others. Consequently, this legislation takes money that is usually a local funding stream and diverts it to the state to redistribute to districts that may not have raised the money locally. This means that taxpayers would likely be funding schools from which they derive no benefit.

In addition, the initiative has strict accountability measures that require districts to invest in audits and tracking mechanisms for a tiny amount of money. While accountability is a good thing, this initiative applies the most severe penalties for the misuse of funds to the smallest revenue stream and creates another burdensome administrative requirement for local school districts. These funds would be restricted to very narrow education purposes. Additionally, the programs funded by this initiative are duplicative and unproven and that have already received large increases in funding for the 2006-2007 school year. To make matters worse, in appropriating funds through the state constitution, this initiative takes discretion away from legislators to decide the priorities of education spending in California by enshrining very specific appropriations into the state constitution. It also takes discretion for education spending away from local schools, who best know where their greatest needs lie.

Spending on K-12 education is up 17 percent in the last two years, yet there is no correlation between increased spending and better performance. In the midst of the largest education funding increase in California's history, it is fiscally irresponsible for California to pass another constitutional amendment that mandates more categorical education spending.

## Part 2

## Proposition 88 Overview

Proposition 88 is a Constitutional Amendment and Statute initiative that according to the California Secretary Of State's Office:<sup>3</sup>

*Provides additional public school funding for kindergarten through grade 12 by imposing a \$50 tax on each real property parcel; exempts certain elderly and disabled homeowners. Funds must be used for class size reduction, textbooks, school safety, Academic Success facility grants, and a data system to evaluate educational program effectiveness. Provides for reimbursement to government entities to offset anticipated decrease in other tax revenue. Prohibits fund use for school administrative overhead. Requires school district audits and penalties for fund misuse. Excludes funds from Proposition 98 calculations. Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local governments: Annual revenue of up to \$500 million from a new, statewide parcel tax with the revenue dedicated to specific K-12 education programs (such as class size reduction, instructional materials, school safety, and facility grants).*

This initiative adds a new section to the Constitution establishing an annual \$50 tax on each real property parcel. This dollar amount would not change over time, although the number of parcels could rise (for example, as the result of new subdivisions of property). For purposes of the measure, a "parcel" is defined as any unit of real property in the state that receives a separate local property tax bill; accordingly, most individuals and businesses currently paying property taxes would become subject to the new parcel tax. However, the measure exempts from the new tax any parcel owner who: (1) resides on the parcel; (2) is eligible for the state's existing homeowner's exemption; and (3) is 65 years of age or older or is severely and permanently disabled.

A relatively small portion of the revenue generated by the proposed statewide parcel tax would be allocated to: (1) the state general fund to offset the decrease in income tax revenues resulting from the increased deductions related to the parcel tax; and (2) counties to offset added administrative costs.

The remaining revenues would be transferred to a new, constitutionally established Classroom Learning and Accountability Fund, out of which will be annually allocated:

- \$175 million for class size reduction in K-12 education



- \$100 million for instructional materials
- \$100 million for school safety programs
- \$85 million for facility grants for certain academically successful school districts and charter schools that have not received funding from a state general obligation bond for construction or modernization
- \$10 million for an integrated longitudinal teacher and student achievement data system.

To the extent that revenues in the fund are more or less than the amounts allocated by the measure, the amounts provided for each activity would be adjusted proportionately.

It is estimated that the proposed statewide parcel tax would initially raise approximately \$450 million annually. Given that the dollar amount of the tax would not increase, total parcel tax revenues would only grow slowly over time as new parcels of land were created. Approximately \$30-40 million of the tax would be transferred to the state General Fund to compensate for a projected loss of state income tax revenues, and approximately 0.2 percent (or about \$1 million) would be allocated for county administrative expenses. The remainder of new tax revenue would be allocated to schools for the specified education programs. At least initially, these revenues likely would be somewhat less than that needed to meet the measure's designated funding levels; if so, the program allocations would be adjusted downward proportionally.

## Part 3

# Problems with Proposition 88

### A. Undermines the Protections of Proposition 13

Currently in California property taxes represent a local resource for local services. Local governments in California impose a property tax based on the assessed value of property, so that the amount assessed increases as the value of the property increases. Proposition 13, officially titled the “People’s Initiative to Limit Property Taxation” limits how local entities may assess and collect these taxes. Some local governments also impose a type of property tax known as a parcel tax, where the amount owed is typically the same for each parcel of property.

Proposition 88 represents a serious threat to the taxpayer protections established in Proposition 13. Proposition 13 was a ballot initiative to amend the constitution of the state of California. Proposition 13 limited property taxes to 1 percent of the purchase price, with a maximum increase of 2 percent per year for inflation. Property taxes would go up when the property was sold. In addition to lowering property taxes, the initiative also contained less-well-publicized language requiring a two-thirds majority in both legislative houses for future increases in all state tax rates or amounts of revenue collected, including income tax rates. The initiative also required a two-thirds approval for local voters to raise the parcel tax. The initiative was enacted by the voters of California on June 6, 1978.

Proposition 88 gives special interests a loophole to avoid the two-thirds voting requirement. Since Proposition 13 only applies the two-thirds voting requirement for parcel taxes to *local* initiatives, and a *statewide* property initiative for parcel taxes only needs a simple majority to pass, Proposition 88 effectively bypasses Proposition 13’s obstacles to easy access to taxpayer dollars. Once one statewide parcel tax is approved by a simple majority vote, increases in the tax in the future are likely. For example, the continuing efforts to raise new cigarette taxes and new taxes on the wealthy demonstrate how once a specific tax is successful other special interests will try to raise new revenue through additional taxes on the same sources.

Currently, the state does not impose property taxes in California. Proposition 88 takes what traditionally has been a local tax—the parcel tax—and starts taxing it at the state level and using it for state purposes. Decisions about property tax spending for education are best made at the local

level where taxpayers can see the money they pay go to the schools they use and where schools can assess their own needs and fund them accordingly. The state already has enough sources of tax revenue including income, capital-gains and most of sales taxes. More than 40 percent of state general revenue already funds education.

Local parcel tax revenue may be used for virtually any designated purpose. For example, in recent years parcel taxes have been approved by voters in several school districts and the resulting revenues used to fund class size reduction, school libraries, education technology, and other education programs. In such school districts, the parcel tax revenue can be a significant source of funding for kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) education programs.

Citizens can already levy a local parcel tax—or raise general property taxes overall—on their own for their school districts through a local initiative process. Proposition 88 does nothing to assure that funds raised in one community will be spent on that community's schools.

## **B. Continues the Trend of Ballot Box Budgeting**

California has an ever-increasing trend of special interests using the ballot box to raise specific taxes on classes of citizens such as the wealthy or on products such as cigarettes in order to circumvent the normal legislative budget process. This has been seen in previous elections with the mental health tax on the wealthy, the stem cell research bond, or the cigarette tax to fund First Five early education programs. All of these special interest programs take potential revenue out of the general fund and take the pressure to prioritize spending off of legislators at the state level. These initiatives mandate restrictive spending categories that are protected through the state constitution, making a small sector of the population pay for programs that don't benefit them. Spending decisions should be made through the normal legislative process to ensure checks and balances between interest groups and to avoid penalizing one group of taxpayers for the pet projects of a specific interest group.

## **C. Continues the Trend of Inflexible Education Funding Micromanaged by Sacramento**

Local schools need maximum flexibility over their school resources. Proposition 88 would require districts to use funds for very restrictive education purposes only. This Proposition continues the trend of categorical funding in California, which earmarks funding for specific education programs, and already amounts to more than one-third of total K-12 spending. There is little performance-based evidence to demonstrate the value of most categorical programs. The state has more than 100 different categories of money for specific programs. Each has a different history, a different funding pattern, and different people in charge. Categorical programs distribute money without connecting the funds to the needs of individual schools. Some local school districts may need to distribute resources to school safety or instructional materials while others may have

different specific needs. Proposition 88 mandates what programs school districts should spend money on.

The Little Hoover Commission explains the administrative costs of categorical programs:

*Categorical programs have their own paperwork, justifying district eligibility and documenting expenditures. Teams of district personnel to fill out the paperwork are matched by teams of state workers to check it. In addition, most school districts of any size spend money on consultants for advice on how to maximize funding and pass audits.<sup>4</sup>*

Proposition 88 would create large administrative costs including audit costs for several very specific programs that would offer individual districts small amounts of money for each restrictive category. The initiative requires school districts to conduct an annual independent audit showing how they spent their Classroom Learning and Accountability Fund monies. These audits are to be reviewed by the applicable county superintendent as well as the state superintendent and posted on all the applicable district, county, and state Web sites. Since the initiative prohibits schools from using Proposition 88 funds to pay these administrative costs, this legislation would actually cost schools money that would have to be pulled from other sources to administer the funds as required. The compliance cost of this program would hardly be worth the funding.

The initiative also calls for the creation of an “integrated longitudinal teacher and student data system” requiring teachers and local school districts to collect and report data for the system. While a better data system may be a pressing educational need for the state, it should be funded through Proposition 98 funds as an operating cost of every school. It should be designed through the legislative process and not as an afterthought to an ill-conceived property-tax increase.

#### **D. Funds Duplicative Programs that Already Have Sufficient Resources**

This initiative would fund specific education programs that duplicate state-level programs and already are well funded through Proposition 98.<sup>5</sup>

**Class Size reduction**—The state already provides \$1.8 billion for class-size reduction for kindergarten through grade 3 (K-3), funding school districts to reduce the size of their K-3 classrooms to no more than 20 students. In addition, the governor just completed a deal to direct another \$2.9 billion to reduce class sizes in additional grades at California's 500 lowest-performing schools. There is no evidence that reduction in class size improves student achievement, and in California class size has been reduced at great expense over the past few years with nothing to show for it on national education achievement tests. Therefore, there seems to be little need for an additional \$175 million for class-size reduction from Proposition 88.

**Instructional materials**—The state provides over \$400 million annually for instructional material purchases, or about \$66 per K-12 student. This is sufficient to purchase one new core textbook for most students in most grades each school year. The 2006-2007 budget also includes an additional

\$100 million block grant to purchase additional materials and a \$105 million block grant to purchase materials related to the arts and music. Therefore, there is little need for an additional \$100 million provided by Proposition 88 to purchase materials and textbooks.

**School Safety**—The state provides \$548 million (or about \$90 per student) for after school programs, \$97 million for general school safety programs, and \$17 million (or about \$3 per student) for competitive school safety grants. There is little need to spend an additional \$100 million in Proposition 88 funds for more school violence prevention, gang-risk intervention, or after school programs.

**School Facilities**—The state provides funds for school facilities primarily using general obligation bonds. In the last ten years voters have passed more than \$95 billion in state and local bonds for school construction. On the November 2006 ballot is another bond initiative, Proposition 1D, to raise \$10 billion to build more schools and modernize classrooms. In addition, the state has provided \$9 million annually for the last several years to help public charter schools in low-income areas cover some of their facility lease costs. The \$85 million provided by this initiative would be for school districts and charter schools that have not yet received any state general obligation bond monies for school facilities. In addition, charter schools are only eligible if they are governed by or operated by a nonprofit public benefit corporation. If those conditions are met, then school districts and charter schools would receive funding for each student enrolled in a school ranking in the top 50 percent based on the state's standardized test scores. It is estimated that only 1 percent of traditional public schools would be eligible for facility grants. There is little need to create a whole new program for school facility grants that 99 percent of traditional schools would be ineligible for.

Since the majority of these programs are already well funded, school districts can spend their own discretionary resources to increase the budget of these programs if it is a local need. There is mounting evidence that schools with the most autonomy and control over their school level budget achieve the greatest student performance gains.

According to the Office of the Secretary of Education school districts will receive large increases in discretionary funding in 2006-2007.<sup>6</sup> The budget contains a total of \$2.3 billion in new general purpose funding above the levels in 2005-2006 budget. The budget also contains a \$534 million discretionary block grant for school districts. In addition, the budget contains several other funding augmentations with few strings attached including \$957 million in mandate reimbursements and \$350 million in economic impact aid. Taken together, these funds offer school districts billions in new discretionary funds for 2006-2007 that could be used at the local level to supplement the specific programs identified in Proposition 88 including class-size reduction, more instructional materials, or school safety programs.

## E. No Performance Requirements

The new parcel tax proposed by Proposition 88 would be permanent, whether or not it results in improvements to our education programs. Class-size reduction is the case in point.

Nationwide class-size reduction has had little effect on student performance. Between 1960 and 1995, average student-teacher ratios in U.S. schools fell by one-third. Yet student achievement trends on both the SAT and the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) showed a general decline in test scores and achievement even as class-size fell during that period.

More specifically, California has received little improvement for its multi-billion dollar investment in class-size reduction. Mike Antonucci of the Education Intelligence Agency argues that California's class-size reduction program has had little impact on California's students' performance on the National Assessment of Education Progress, the federal government's national benchmark for student achievement.

*In 1998, before 4<sup>th</sup>-graders had the benefit of smaller classes, California's 4<sup>th</sup>-graders ranked ahead of only those in Hawaii and Louisiana in reading (NAEP test). The benchmark for math is 1996, where California's 4<sup>th</sup>-graders finished ahead of those in Mississippi and tied with those in Louisiana.*

*In 2005, California's 4<sup>th</sup>-graders beat out Mississippi in reading. Hawaii and Louisiana passed us. The brightest picture is 4<sup>th</sup>-grade math. California finished ahead of Alabama, Mississippi and New Mexico, and tied with Louisiana and Nevada.*

*What's worse is that we have had class size reduction for so long, we can now compare the NAEP scores of 8<sup>th</sup>-graders under the old class sizes with 8<sup>th</sup>-graders who experienced four years of 20-student classes. They are virtually indistinguishable.<sup>7</sup>*

A 2004 RAND study confirms that California's large-scale class-size reduction program has had little effect on student achievement.<sup>8</sup>

In 1996, California enacted SB 1777, which provided a substantial incentive for school districts to reduce their class sizes from an average of roughly 30 students per class to 20 or fewer. As a result of SB 1777, nearly \$1 billion in education funds was provided to districts in 1996-97 to reduce class size in grades K-3. The program currently provides more than \$1.7 billion a year to schools for class-size reduction.

RAND researchers examined the standardized test scores over five years for pupils in 2,892 schools across the state. Some children had spent only their second- and third-grade years in smaller classes. Others had been in small classes for the first, second, and third grades. All other factors being equal, the researchers found getting the extra year of small classes in first grade did not result in significant test-score gains.

Nevertheless, California's class-size reduction program did have consequences—unintended ones. Qualified teachers in urban areas fled to higher-performing schools in the suburbs, where class-size reduction meant new teaching positions opened up. Urban schools were faced with huge shortages of classroom space and qualified teachers. As a result, many less-experienced teachers were hired. Since student achievement tends to be more strongly correlated with teacher quality than with small class size, many urban students were actually worse off after the class-size reduction program took effect.

This initiative directs the most resources to an unproven and well-funded categorical program, class-size reduction, without any regard for the program's impact on student achievement.

Similarly, California's investment in school safety has shown little evidence of improving school violence. While most schools in California have always been safe, the few truly dangerous schools have been marked by years of violence despite investments in school safety programs. For example, schools like Los Angeles' Locke High School have years of violence. Between 2000 and 2002 Locke had: 14 sex offenses, 53 robberies, and 22 assaults, yet was not labeled "persistently dangerous." In fact, although school safety advocates argue for more funding based on the dangers present in California schools, the state of California has not identified even one school as dangerous.<sup>9</sup> In other words, the multi-million dollar investment in school safety has not been performance-based. These programs do not offer parents even minimal information to evaluate the safety of individual schools and there has been no evidence that any of these safety programs has actually reduced the amount of crime in schools. School safety is yet another category of restrictive funding with no performance measurement to ensure that it actually meets the goals of making schools safer.

## Part 6

# Conclusion

Governor Schwarzenegger has increased education spending in California by more than 17 percent over the last two years. Local school districts have also received large increases in discretionary funding. If local school districts feel the need to increase funding for the education programs identified in Proposition 88, they can direct the increased funding from the new state budget.

If the new discretionary funds are not enough, local school districts are free to take their case to local voters through the initiative process to pass a local parcel tax for specific education needs with a two-thirds approval by local voters.

Proposition 88 is such an ill-conceived plan that a large bipartisan group of organizations oppose it. The California School Boards Association, California State Parent Teachers Association, California Association of School Business Officials, California Labor Federation (AFL-CIO), National Federation of Independent Businesses, California Small Business Association, Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, Small Business Action Committee, and the California Business Properties Association are all opposed to Proposition 88.

The bottom line is that Proposition 88 creates a whole new kind of statewide tax. Currently all property taxes are local and used for local services from roads to schools. Proposition 88 would encourage other advocacy groups to pass more and bigger statewide property tax proposals. This proposition is in conflict with the clear intent of Proposition 13 to protect citizens from excessive property taxes and to give local residents control over the spending of property taxes raised in their communities.



## About the Author

**L**isa Snell directs the Education Program at Reason Foundation, where she oversees research on education issues.

Ms. Snell, who has testified before the California State Legislature and numerous government agencies, has recently authored policy studies on universal preschool, school violence, charter schools, and child advocacy centers.

Ms. Snell is a frequent contributor to *Reason* magazine. She is a regular contributor to *School Reform News* and *Privatization Watch*. Her commentary has also appeared in *The Wall Street Journal*, *USA Today*, *San Francisco Chronicle*, the *Orange County Register*, *Los Angeles Daily News*, and numerous other publications.

Ms. Snell is also the President of the Board of the California Virtual Academy, which is a K12 virtual charter school.

Before joining Reason Foundation, Ms. Snell taught public speaking and argumentation courses at California State University, Fullerton.

# Endnotes

- 
- <sup>1</sup> The following description of Proposition 88 is taken from the Official California Voter Information Guide put out by the California Secretary of State at:  
[http://www.ss.ca.gov/elections/vig\\_06/general\\_06/pdf/proposition\\_88/entire\\_prop88.pdf](http://www.ss.ca.gov/elections/vig_06/general_06/pdf/proposition_88/entire_prop88.pdf)
  - <sup>2</sup> California State Budget, 2006-2007  
<http://govbud.dof.ca.gov/Enacted/StateAgencyBudgets/6010/agency.html>
  - <sup>3</sup> The following description of Proposition 88 is taken from the Official California Voter Information Guide put out by the California Secretary of State at:  
[http://www.ss.ca.gov/elections/vig\\_06/general\\_06/pdf/proposition\\_88/entire\\_prop88.pdf](http://www.ss.ca.gov/elections/vig_06/general_06/pdf/proposition_88/entire_prop88.pdf)
  - <sup>4</sup> *Dollars and Sense: A Simple Approach to School Finance* (Sacramento: Little Hoover Commission, July 1997).
  - <sup>5</sup> Program amounts are taken from California State Budget 2006-2007  
<http://govbud.dof.ca.gov/Enacted/StateAgencyBudgets/6010/agency.html>
  - <sup>6</sup> Office of the Secretary of Education, 2006-07 Budget: K-12 Education,  
<http://www.ose.ca.gov/budg06-07.pdf>.
  - <sup>7</sup> Mike Antonucci, *California Redoubles Its Efforts*, Education Intelligence Agency, Communiqué September 5, 2006.
  - <sup>8</sup> Brian M. Stecher, Daniel F. McCaffey, and Debra Bugliari, *The Relationship Between Exposure to Class Size Reduction and Student Achievement in California* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, November, 2003).
  - <sup>9</sup> For more on school violence see: Lisa Snell, *School Violence and the No Child Left Behind Act: Best Practices to Keep Kids Safe* (Los Angeles: Reason Foundation, January 2005).



# CALIFORNIA GENERAL ELECTION



*Reason*

Reason Foundation  
3415 S. Sepulveda Blvd., Suite 400  
Los Angeles, CA 90034  
310/391-2245  
310/391-4395 (fax)  
[www.reason.org](http://www.reason.org)