



California Association for Bilingual Education



Martha Zaragoza-Díaz,
CABE Legislative Lobbyist



CA Capitol News

CABE Continues Its Advocacy Work

CABE, along with co-sponsor **Californians Together**, is sponsoring two proposed bills this year.

AB 2516, authored by **Assembly Member Reyes**, is a two-part bill. The bill seeks to establish the **Licensed Child Development Teacher Professional Development Program** for child development permitholders to acquire and improve their knowledge, skills and abilities to support dual language learners enrolled in child development programs. Existing law establishes the **Bilingual Teacher Professional Development Program** which will discontinue June 30, 2020. The bill proposes to continue the Bilingual Teacher Professional Development Program for another three years. Both programs would be administered by the **California Department of Education**. The bill addresses the shortage of bilingual education teachers and would ensure child development programs have appropriately trained staff instructing dual language learners in their programs. The bill is also co-sponsored with **Early Edge, Children NOW, Advancement Project and Moms Rising**.

💡 The second bill, authored by **Assembly Member Jones-Sawyer**, is also a two-part bill. The bill proposes to establish an advisory committee with representation from the various segments of higher education, educators, industry representatives, whose purpose includes, providing recommendations to the **State Superintendent of Public Instruction Thurmond** on the establishment and implementation of various pathways for the establishment of a post-secondary **Biliteracy Badge**. CABE and **Californians Together** believe this must be done in order to maintain and continue with the focus of biliteracy in education.

📎 The second part of the bill is to amend the statute that establishes the **State Seal of Biliteracy** allowing local educational agencies to use locally developed language proficiency assessments. District or County superintendents would certify that these assessments meet the level of proficiency of an **Advanced Placement** or **International Baccalaureate** examination.

Stay tuned for the bill number!

March 3, 2020 Ballot

A very important proposition will be on the March 3, 2020 ballot; **PROPOSITION 13 - AB 48 (CHAPTER 530, STATUTES OF 2019), O DONNELL. EDUCATION FINANCE: SCHOOL FACILITIES: PUBLIC PRESCHOOL, K-12, AND COLLEGE HEALTH AND SAFETY BOND ACT OF 2020.**

 Please do not be confused! This bond measure is **NOT** the famous 1978 Proposition 13, which restricted property tax increases. This **Proposition 13** authorizes \$15 billion in state general obligation bonds for construction and modernization of public education facilities.

 The bond measure will provide \$9 billion for pre-kindergarten through 12th grade public schools capital improvements; renovation or repair. Charter and technical schools would get \$100 million. And \$6 billion would go to the community college and four-year university systems. The bond also would assign \$500 million for modernizing training facilities for career and vocational training programs in public schools.

 According to the **“California Guide to Propositions”** from the **Office of the Secretary of State**, a YES vote on this measure means the state could sell \$15 billion in general obligation bonds to fund school, community college, and university facility projects. In addition, school districts and community college districts would be authorized to issue more local bonds, and school districts would have new limits on their ability to levy developer fees.

 A NO vote on this measure means the state could not sell \$15 billion in general obligation bonds to fund education facility projects. The state also would not make changes to school districts' and community college districts' existing local borrowing limits or the existing rules for school districts to levy developer fees.

According to the **Center for Cities and Schools at UC Berkeley’s Institute of Urban and Regional Development**, nearly “80 percent of students attend districts failing to meet minimum industry standard benchmarks for facilities maintenance and operations spending, capital renewal spending, or both.”

Additionally, according to **Ed-Data**, a partnership of the **California Department of Education, EdSource and Fiscal Crisis & Management Assistance Team**, “more than two-thirds of California’s public school buildings are 25 years old” compounded by the fact that many districts have not had funds for proper maintenance or needed repair.

 Proponents in favor of **Proposition 13** argue that it would fund essential repairs to make California public schools safer and healthier by removal of toxic mold and asbestos from aging classrooms, providing cleaner drinking water and performing fire and earthquake safety upgrades.

Opponents against **Proposition 13** argue this bond would cost taxpayers \$27 billion including interest, to build and repair schools. It is also argued that borrowing is nearly twice as expensive as paying for school construction from the regular state budget, which has a huge \$21 billion surplus.

The top three contributors to **Proposition 13** are the **California Teachers Association**, the **Coalition for Adequate School Housing Issues Committee** and the **United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America**. No contributions had been reported to the “No on 13 campaign” in the election cycle when it appeared on the ballot.

For more information on **Proposition 13** please go to the Secretary of State website:
<http://quickguidetoprops.sos.ca.gov/propositions/2020-03-03>.