

# AGENDA

## ASSEMBLY BUDGET SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2 ON EDUCATION FINANCE

Assembly Member Julia Brownley, Chair

TUESDAY, APRIL 22, 2008  
STATE CAPITOL, ROOM 444  
9:00 AM

---

---

### ITEMS TO BE HEARD

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
<b>1760</b>	<b>DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES</b>	<b>2</b>
ISSUE 1	SCHOOL FACILITIES PROGRAM – FISCAL SERVICES STAFFING	2
ISSUE 2	WILLIAMS SETTLEMENT-PROGRAM SERVICES STAFFING FOR THE EMERGENCY REPAIR PROGRAM (ERP)	5
ISSUE 3	LAO RECOMMENDATIONS: SCHOOL FACILITIES PROGRAM (SFP)	7
<b>6110</b>	<b>DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION</b>	<b>10</b>
ISSUE 1	APRIL DOF REVISIONS TO THE JANUARY 10 BUDGET – STATE OPERATIONS AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE ITEMS	10

## ITEMS TO BE HEARD

### 1760 DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

#### ISSUE 1: SCHOOL FACILITIES PROGRAM – FISCAL SERVICES STAFFING

The issue for the Subcommittee to consider is the request from the Department of General Services (DGS) for 7.0 positions (6 permanent and 1 limited term) and \$740,000 (School Facilities Fund) for the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) to conduct audits under the School Facilities Program (SFP) and to establish an integrated audit information system.

*Note: The Subcommittee will hear this item and make a recommendation to Assembly Subcommittee 4. Subcommittee 4 will take action on this issue when they consider the DGS budget.*

#### PANELISTS

- Office of Public School Construction
- Department of Finance
- Legislative Analyst's Office

#### BACKGROUND

Under the direction of the State Allocation Board (SAB), OPSC administers the functions of various school facilities and building acts (most recently, the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998) through which school districts establish eligibility for funding from statewide bond measures for school facility construction. The SAB approves and apportions funds for projects of eligible schools districts which are certified by the OPSC as compliant with applicable statutory prerequisites.

Over the past ten years, the voters have passed four statewide bonds that provided funding for school facilities. The following table displays funds authorized for each bond along with the amounts awarded and disbursed as of January 31, 2008:

Bond	Authorized Funds*	Awarded to Date*	Disbursed to Date*
Prop 1D (2006)	\$7,350,000	\$903,813	\$475,997
Prop 55 (2004)	\$10,015,500	\$9,342,087	\$6,653,444
Prop 47 (2002)	\$11,400,000	\$11,284,811	\$9,675,482
Prop 1A (1998)	\$6,700,000	\$6,648,081	\$6,647,663
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$35,465,500</b>	<b>\$28,178,792</b>	<b>\$23,452,586</b>

(\*dollars in thousands)

**SFP Construction Process.** The current process for construction under the SFP can take more than nine years to go from application to apportionment, from funding to expenditure, and finally from the beginning to the end of the audit process (project closeout). The following table shows where the OPSC estimates each of the school facilities bonds in terms of the progression from fund apportionment to final closeout.

	<b>Prop 1A (1998)</b>	<b>Prop 47 (2002)</b>	<b>Prop 55 (2004)</b>	<b>Prop 1D (2006)</b>
Duration of Bond Fund Apportionments	11/1998 to 10/2002	11/2002 to 12/2006	03/2004 to 05/2008*	12/2006 to 08/2011*
# of Projects Not Yet Apportioned* (\$ Amount)	0	8 (\$0.1 billion)	67 (\$0.7 billion)	2,215 (\$6.4 billion)
# of Projects Apportioned, But Not Closed (\$ Amount)	331 (\$2.5 billion)	2,117 (\$8.4 billion)	2,407 (\$9.1 billion)	615 (\$0.9 billion)
# of Projects Closed (\$ Amount)	2,126 (\$4.2 billion)	1,496 (\$2.9 billion)	111 (\$0.2 billion)	0
Closeout Period*	4/2000 to 3/2011	5/2003 to 5/2015	10/2005 to 10/2016	5/2008 to 1/2020

(\*estimated)

**OPSC Projected Audit Workload.** According to OPSC, state regulations (Title 2 California Code of Regulations Section 1859.106) require OPSC to audit project expenditures of school districts within two years of receipt of the final expenditure report from the district. According to the regulations, the audit is conducted to ensure that districts are meeting statutory requirements with regard to their projects as well as assure that the district complied with all site acquisition guidelines.

According to OPSC, the bulk of the audit and closeout workload will hit in the next ten years. For example, OPSC indicates that its current audit workload of 1,400 projects worth \$7 billion is anticipated to grow in FY 2008-09 to 2,000 audits—a 43 percent increase. In the long-term, over the next eight years, OPSC projects that the audit workload will increase to approximately 8,000 projects, more than doubling the total of 3,400 from the previous eight years. In anticipation of this increase workload, OPSC is requesting 7.0 additional auditor positions to augment the existing 35.0 positions in the Auditing Services Section of the OPSC.

**Audit Standards.** According to OPSC, since 2000, OPSC Fiscal Services staff has recovered nearly half a billion dollars from school districts that have not complied with the various laws and regulations that govern the SFP. However, concerns have been raised by the field with regard to the consistency of the standards by which these audits are conducted since OPSC does not have published or adopted audit standards. With clear audit guidelines and audit training for staff, the SFP audit program would better ensure that bond awards are being spent appropriately.

The Subcommittee may wish to ask OPSC to clarify their audit process and specify which laws and regulations were not complied with and how many districts have been found to be in non-compliance.

**Governor's Executive Order Regarding the Establishment of an Automated and Integrated Audit Information System.** According to OPSC, under the Governor's *Executive Order S-02-07* the OPSC is required to establish an automated and integrated audit information system to provide better accountability and web accessibility to project information for all SFP projects. *Executive Order S-02-07* sets forth the Administration's plan to audit all 2006 General Obligation Bond expenditures and make the audit findings available to the public via the internet.

The Subcommittee may wish to ask OPSC to comment on their plans to meet this Executive Order and how they plan to automate and integrate their existing audit information system. There may be opportunities for OPSC to develop its system to allow better tracking of how bond dollars are actually spent and the tangible results they produce at school sites. This information might better inform policy makers in deciding when to initiate and how to size the next education bond.

## ISSUE 2: WILLIAMS SETTLEMENT-PROGRAM SERVICES STAFFING FOR THE EMERGENCY REPAIR PROGRAM (ERP)

The issue for the Subcommittee to consider is the request from the Department of General Services for 2.0 positions and \$217,000 (General Fund) to process, review, and approve emergency repair requests from school districts seeking funding under the Williams Settlement.

*Note: The Subcommittee will hear this item and make a recommendation to Assembly Subcommittee 4. Subcommittee 4 will take action on this issue when they consider the DGS budget.*

### PANELISTS

- Office of Public School Construction
- Department of Finance
- Legislative Analyst's Office

### BACKGROUND

**Williams Settlement and the Emergency Repair Program (ERP).** In August 2004, the state settled the *Williams v. California* lawsuit which aimed to ensure that students in low-performing schools have access to adequate teachers, instructional materials, and facilities. SB 6 (Alpert), Chapter 899, Statutes of 2004, as part of the legislative package implementing the Williams Settlement, created the ERP and established a procedure whereby districts could apply to the state for supplemental funding to address emergency facility needs (for schools in deciles one through 3). The settlement requires that the greater of \$100 million or half of all funds from the Proposition 98 Reversion Account go toward the ERP until the state has appropriated a total of \$800 million for the program.

The state has appropriated \$292 million towards this obligation, including a recent payment of \$100 million made during the 2008 special session. Expenditures from the ERP total \$167.8 million as of the March 26, 2008 SAB meeting, leaving a total of \$124.3 million for expenditure. According to the LAO, there are approximately \$380 million worth of applications pending approval and the LAO estimates that the ERP will run out of funds by October 2008.

<b>Expenditures from ERF</b>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Amount</b>
2005-05	\$3.5 Million
2006-07	\$36.6 Million
2007-08	\$127.7 Million
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$167.8</b>
<b>Remaining Balance</b>	<b>\$124.3</b>

**Staffing Need.** The ERP was originally implemented as a reimbursement program in which eligible school districts were required to complete and make payment for the repair or replacements costs prior to submitting a request for funding. However, AB 607 (Goldberg), Chapter 704, Statutes of 2006 changed the ERP to a grant program. Whereas the original reimbursement program design made ERP funds difficult for many districts to access, the switch to a grant model has increased demand for the funds significantly.

According to OPSC, each of the 2,230 schools that were eligible for the ERP as of July 1, 2007, will file 2.5 ERP applications over the course of the next three years, resulting in 5,125 ERP applications over that time period, or 1,708 applications annually. OPSC estimates that there are currently approximately 1,400 ERP applications on its workload list and that the average processing time per application is approximately 160 days (this is above the OPSC's goal of 90 to 120 days).

OPSC further states that this projected workload would ordinarily justify 8.0 positions however OPSC is conservatively requesting 2.0 positions to address increased ERP applications.

**ISSUE 3: LAO RECOMMENDATIONS: SCHOOL FACILITIES PROGRAM (SFP)  
(INFORMATION ONLY)****PANELISTS**

- Legislative Analyst's Office
- Department of Finance
- Office of Public School Construction

**BACKGROUND**

In their analysis of the 2008-09 Budget Act, the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) raised a number of policy issues related to school facilities.

**Need for a School Facilities Data System.** According to the LAO, the SFP program has over \$8 billion in available funds that have not been set aside for any school district. Over \$4 billion of these funds are in the programs the Governor proposes to fund in the 2008 bond—almost \$3 billion remains available for new construction, \$500 million for career technical education facilities, and \$634 million for charter school facilities. An additional \$3.9 billion in funds have been approved for specific school district projects but remain unspent because the district has not entered into a construction contract.

According to the LAO, the state has insufficient data to determine the amount of funding that is needed to meet the facility needs of K–12 schools. Currently, school districts are required to provide enrollment and capacity data when they apply for new construction funding, but they are not required to update this information in years when they do not apply for new construction grants. Thus, the state has an inadequate measure of overall district capacity. Similarly, districts are required to provide information on the age of their facilities when applying for modernization funding. However, they are not required to provide this information for all facilities, and information is not updated in future years.

The LAO contends that the state lacks sufficient data on the cost of constructing K–12 facilities. OPSC does conduct close–out audits for all school projects that receive state funding. However, the purpose of these audits is to ensure that schools have complied with the rules and regulations of the SFP. Since the audit process can be very time–consuming, districts often provide only enough information to show that they have complied with program requirements.

For the reasons stated above, the LAO recommends that if the state is going to maintain its current facilities program, the Legislature should authorize the creation of a statewide database that includes information on the capacity, age, and cost of facilities for school districts.

**Need to re-evaluate Financial Hardship Program.** Approximately 15 percent of funds provided by the SFP for new construction and modernization projects are through the state's financial hardship program, which provides funding for school districts that are

determined unable to provide their matching share of project costs. Since the inception of the SFP (1998), the state has provided on average almost \$300 million a year for the financial hardship program. A recent study (conducted by the Macias Consulting Group for the SAB) found that many school districts that applied for financial hardship for new construction and modernization projects were taking on short-term debt and temporarily transferring funds out of their capital outlay accounts to appear financially needy. Such action allowed them to qualify for additional state funding and reduce or eliminate their local share. Any funding provided to school districts for financial hardship cannot be provided for additional facility projects. The Governor, however, does not propose any changes to address these issues.

Given these problems, the LAO recommends the Legislature set reasonable expectations of what a district should contribute, without looking at specific account balances. This approach would look at two indicators of district resources—the assessed value of property within the district and the amount of revenues from developer fees—to determine an expected district contribution. The state would provide hardship funding if the costs of construction projects exceeded the expected district contribution.

**Charter School Facilities.** The LAO identifies a number of obstacles charter schools face when seeking school facilities. As part of his 2008 bond proposal, the Governor proposes several changes to existing law regarding the Charter School Facility Program (CSFP) and the SB 740 grant program which the LAO agrees will likely make charter schools more successful in completing construction projects and will provide more flexibility through incentive grants provided through the SB 740 program.

The Governor's proposal would: 1) allow another local government entity besides a school district—such as a city, county, or county board of education—to own title of a charter school facility; 2) Give preference for funds under the CSFP to charter schools in low-performing school districts; and 3) Allow, under the SB 740 grant program, in addition to using funds for lease costs, allow charters to use the funds for debt service or mortgage payments related to construction of new facilities.

According to the LAO, while the Governor's proposals would make significant improvements to the system, additional changes could be made to further improve facilities programs for charter schools. In addition to approving many of the Governor's proposals, the LAO would recommend that the Legislature explore three other options: (1) providing more resources to per-pupil grant programs rather than increasing bond funds; (2) expanding eligibility for the SB 740 program; and (3) as a condition of participating in the state facility program, requiring local school districts to provide charter schools with proceeds from local bonds.

**COMMENTS:**

The Coalition for Adequate School Housing (CASH) has offered the following comments for the Subcommittee to consider:

**Needs Assessment.** To address the issue of unsatisfactory data for needs assessment, C.A.S.H. makes two recommendations.

- 1) Require the California Department of Education to conduct a study, in consultation with the Office of Public School Construction, comprised of a sampling of school districts based upon CDE's list of complete schools provided to the State Allocation Board in 2006. A study of this nature is feasible, minimizes costs, and is effective in identifying facilities needs.
- 2) Require, except for small school districts, if a district's eligibility with the State Allocation Board for the School Facility Program exceeds 18 months without being applied to a new construction application, the eligibility would be removed from state records and the district would need to re-establish eligibility with a future new construction application. The re-establishment of eligibility ensures that the state has the most current data on future facilities needs.

**Financial Hardship Program.** The LAO analysis states that there are problems with the current Financial Hardship Program and makes recommendations to evaluate a school district's fiscal health for purposes of determining financial hardship eligibility whereby the state pays for up to 100 percent of the costs of new school construction. The State Allocation Board (SAB) has initiated a review of the Financial Hardship Program.

C.A.S.H. recommends, and in fact believes, that changes to the Financial Hardship Program require regulatory and/or statutory change depending on the changes proposed from the SAB review.

**Charter School Facilities.** The LAO analysis makes several recommendations relative to funding for charter school facilities, including the adoption of several of the Governor's proposals, as well as requiring school districts to provide charter schools with local bond proceeds as a contingency of participating in the School Facility Program.

C.A.S.H. believes that the funding policy issues for charter schools should be vetted fully through the legislative policy and appropriations committees rather than through budget action.

## 6110 DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### ISSUE 1: April DOF revisions to the January 10 budget – State Operations and Local Assistance items

The issues for the Subcommittee to consider are various technical amendments proposed by DOF to the January 10 budget. The revisions are related to federal funds, and reflect updated information on the amount of federal funds that are available for expenditure.

#### BACKGROUND:

The following is a list of technical revisions that DOF proposes to the January 10 budget. The revisions are contained in an April 1 letter to the Legislature ("April DOF Letter"), and are part of the annual process whereby the Administration makes changes to its proposed January 10 budget. All of the changes below pertain to federal funds, and reflect updated estimates of both a) how much money California will receive from various federal programs and b) unused funds (carryover) from prior years that are available for re-appropriation.

	<b>Federal Funds Adjustments</b>
<b>1</b>	<p><b>Items 6110-001-0001 and 6110-001-0890, State Operations, Translation of Parental Notification Documents (Issue 406).</b> It is requested that this item be increased by \$385,000 federal Title III carryover funds. The carryover is a result of a delay in establishing a prioritized list of documents to translate. The State Department of Education (department) will use these funds to complete the initial translations authorized with one-time funds in fiscal year 2007-08. Local educational agencies (LEAs) will have access to the documents through an online clearinghouse.</p> <p>It is further requested that provisional language be added as follows to conform to this action:</p> <p>X. Of the funds appropriated in this item, \$385,000 is available to the State Department of Education on a one-time basis for the cost of translating into languages other than English state prototype documents. The department shall contract with appropriate translators or translator services to translate these documents. The department shall post all documents translated as a result of the appropriation referenced in this provision on its existing Internet-based electronic clearinghouse system of state and locally-translated parental notification documents.</p>
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Items 6110-001-0001 and 6110-001-0890, State Operations, Education Technology Administration (Issue 407).</b> It is requested that language in this item be amended to conform with a reduction of \$404,000 Federal Trust Fund for administration of the Education Technology Program. The Governor's Budget reduced federal funds for state operations by \$11.0 million because base appropriation level exceeded the amount of federal funds available to the state. Included within the reduction was \$404,000 that should have been earmarked for</p>

	<p>administration. Therefore, only a language change is necessary.</p> <p>It is requested that Provision 7 of Item 6110-001-0890 be amended as follows to conform to this action:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">7. Of the funds appropriated in this item, <del>\$1,470,000</del> <u>\$1,066,000</u> shall be used for administration of the Enhancing Education Through Technology Grant Program. Of this amount:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(a) \$150,000 is available only for contracted technical support and evaluation services.”</p>
<p>3</p>	<p><b>Item 6110-102-0890, Local Assistance, Learn and Serve America Program (Issue 164).</b> It is requested that this item be <del>decreased by \$10,000</del> <u>increased by \$11,000</u> Federal Trust Fund to align the appropriation for the Learn and Serve America Program with available federal funds. The program provides grant funding to K-12 schools, community-based organizations, and higher education institutions to facilitate service-learning projects. These funds support school-community partnerships, training and technical assistance resources, as well as the collection and dissemination of research, effective practices, curricula, and service learning program models.</p>
<p>4</p>	<p><b>Item 6110-103-0890, Local Assistance, Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship Program (Issues 646 and 647).</b> It is requested that this item be decreased by \$161,000 Federal Trust Fund, which includes a decrease of \$174,000 to align the appropriation with available federal funds and an increase of \$13,000 to reflect the availability of one-time carryover funds. These funds will be used to promote student excellence and achievement by awarding higher education scholarships on the basis of academic merit to students who show promise of continued academic excellence.</p> <p>It is further requested that provisional language be added as follows to conform to this action:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">X. Of the funds appropriated in this item, \$13,000 is provided in one-time carryover funds to support the existing program.</p>
<p>5</p>	<p><b>Item 6110-103-0001, Local Assistance, Apprenticeship Programs (Issue 161)</b></p> <p>It is requested that this item be increased by \$587,000 Proposition 98 General Fund to reflect the transfer of an identical amount from Schedule (2) of Item 6870-101-0001. This request is necessitated by local decisions made pursuant to Education Code Section 8156, which authorizes the transfer of operations of two apprenticeship programs from community colleges to K-12 institutions, as well as the operations of one program from a K-12 institution to a community college. This transfer will ensure that funding is appropriately redirected to the respective education segments that are now serving the apprenticeship program sponsors.</p>
<p>6</p>	<p><b>Item 6110-119-0890, Local Assistance, Neglected and Delinquent Children Program (Issue 416).</b> It is requested that this item be decreased by \$322,000 federal Title I Neglected and Delinquent Children funds to align the appropriation with available federal funds. LEAs will use these funds for services to educate neglected and delinquent or incarcerated youth.</p>
<p>7</p>	<p><b>Item 6110-136-0890, Local Assistance, Title I Basic Program, McKinney-Vento Homeless Children Education Program, and Title I Even Start Program (Issues 412, 413, and 414).</b></p>

	<p>It is also requested that this item be increased by \$34,459,000 federal Title I Basic Program funds, which includes an increase of \$15,207,000 to align the appropriation with available federal funds and an increase of \$19,252,000 to reflect the availability of one-time carryover funds. LEAs will use these funds for services to assist economically-disadvantaged students. (Issue 412)</p> <p>It is also requested that this item be increased by \$1,215,000 Title I McKinney-Vento Homeless Children Education funds, which includes a decrease of \$118,000 to align the appropriation with available federal funds and an increase of \$1,333,000 to reflect the availability of one-time carryover funds. LEAs will use these funds to provide services to homeless students. (Issue 413)</p> <p>It is also requested that this item be decreased by \$3,007,000 Title I Even Start funds, which includes a decrease of \$4,507,000 to align the appropriation with available federal funds and an increase of \$1.5 million to reflect the availability of one-time carryover funds. LEAs will use these funds for services to improve the educational opportunities of low-income families and for a unified literacy program that integrates early childhood education and parenting education. (Issue 414)</p> <p>It is also requested that provisional language be added to require the department to allocate all carryover funds in this item on a per-pupil basis by October 1, 2008. The purpose is to allocate funding in a timely manner so that LEAs can use the funds effectively and promptly to improve student performance for these vulnerable populations.</p> <p>It is further requested that provisional language be added as follows to conform to this action:</p> <p>X. Of the funds appropriated in Schedule (1), \$19,252,000 is provided in one-time carryover funds to support the existing program.</p> <p>X. Of the funds appropriated in Schedule (2), \$1,333,000 is provided in one-time carryover funds to support the existing program.</p> <p>X. Of the funds appropriated in Schedule (4), \$1,500,000 is provided in one-time carryover funds to support the existing program.</p> <p><del>X. The State Department of Education shall allocate all carryover funds in this item on a per pupil basis by October 1, 2008, to all eligible service providers. Local educational agencies shall use these funds to supplement, but not supplant, one-time base services authorized by law.</del></p>
<p>8</p>	<p><b>Item 6110-137-0890, Local Assistance, Rural/Low-Income School Program (Issue 415).</b> It is requested that this item be increased by \$152,000 federal Title VI Rural/Low-Income School funds, which includes an increase of \$85,000 to align the appropriation with available federal funds and an increase of \$67,000 to reflect the availability of one-time carryover funds. LEAs will use these funds for services to improve instruction and achievement for children in rural and low-income schools by supporting activities such as teacher recruitment and retention, professional development, educational technology projects, and parental involvement activities.</p> <p>It is further requested that provisional language be added as follows to conform to this action:</p> <p>X. Of the funds appropriated in this item, \$67,000 is provided in one-time</p>

	carryover funds to support the existing program.
9	<p><b>Item 6110-156-0890, Local Assistance, Adult Education Program (Issue 165).</b> It is requested that this item be <del>decreased by \$420,000</del> <u>increased by \$300,000</u> Federal Trust Fund to align the appropriation with available federal funds. The Adult Education and Family Literacy Act provides federal funds to supplement adult basic skill programs, high school completion programs, and programs that enable adults to become more employable, productive, and responsible citizens. Local programs provide specific instruction to adults in the areas of adult literacy, English as a second language, citizenship, vocational literacy, family literacy, elementary basic skills, high school basic skills, literacy for homeless adults, and literacy for incarcerated adults.</p>
10	<p><b>Item 6110-180-0890, Local Assistance, Education Technology Program (Issue 408)</b></p> <p>It is requested that this item be decreased by \$527,000 federal Title II Education Technology funds, which includes a decrease of \$2,314,000 to align the appropriation with available federal funds and an increase of \$1,787,000 to reflect the availability of one-time carryover funds. This program assists LEAs in utilizing technology to enhance teaching and to promote learning. The reduction will be applied proportionally to the formula grants, competitive grants, the California Technology Assistance Project, and support. Carryover will be used for its original purposes (<del>\$601,000 for technical assistance, \$814,000 for competitive formula grants, and \$372,000 for formula-competitive grants</del>).</p> <p>It is further requested that provisional language be amended as follows to conform to this action:</p> <p>“1. Of the funds appropriated in this item, <del>\$15,569,000</del> <u><del>\$14,880,000</del> \$15,322,000</u> is for allocation to school districts that are awarded formula grants pursuant to the federal Enhancing Education Through Technology Grant Program. <u>This allocation includes <del>\$372,000</del> \$814,000 in one-time carryover funds.</u></p> <p>2. Of the funds appropriated in this item, <del>\$15,569,000</del> <u><del>\$15,322,000</del> \$14,880,000</u> is available for competitive grants pursuant to Chapter 8.9 (commencing with Section 52295.10 of Part 28 of the Education Code and the requirements of the federal Enhancing Education Through Technology Grant Program including the eligibility criteria established in federal law to target local educational agencies with high numbers or percentages of children from families with incomes below the poverty line and one or more schools either qualifying for federal school improvement or demonstrating substantial technology needs. <u>This allocation includes <del>\$814,000</del> \$372,000 in one-time carryover funds.</u></p> <p>3. Of the funds appropriated in this item, <del>\$654,000</del> <u>\$1,062,000</u> is available for the California Technology Assistance Project (CTAP) to provide federally required technical assistance and to help districts apply for and take full advantage of the federal Enhancing Education Through Technology grants. <u>This allocation includes \$601,000 in one-time carryover funds.”</u></p>
11	<p><b>Item 6110-183-0890, Local Assistance, Safe and Drug Free Schools Program (Issues 648 and 649).</b> It is requested that this item be decreased by \$4,196,000 Federal Trust Fund, which includes a decrease of \$5,796,000 to align the appropriation with available federal funds and an increase of \$1.6 million to reflect the availability of one-time carryover funds. These funds will be used to support programs that prevent violence in and around schools and prevent the illegal use of alcohol, tobacco, and drugs.</p>

	<p>It is further requested that provisional language be added as follows to conform to this action:</p> <p>X. Of the funds appropriated in this item, \$1,600,000 is provided in one-time carryover funds to support the existing program.</p>
12	<p><b>Item 6110-193-0890, Local Assistance, Mathematics and Science Partnership Program (Issues 084 and 085).</b> It is requested that this item be decreased by \$591,000 Federal Trust Fund, which includes a decrease of \$2,091,000 to align the appropriation with available federal funds and an increase of \$1.5 million to reflect the availability of one-time carryover funds. This program provides competitive grant awards to partnerships of low-performing schools and institutes of higher education to provide staff development and curriculum support for mathematics and science teachers.</p> <p>It is further requested that provisional language be added as follows to conform to this action:</p> <p>X. Of the funds appropriated in this item, \$1,500,000 is provided in one-time carryover funds to support the California Mathematics and Science Partnership Program.</p>
13	<p><b>Item 6110-240-0890, Local Assistance, Advanced Placement Test Fee Waiver Program (Issue 650).</b> It is requested that this item be increased by \$561,000 Federal Trust Fund to align the appropriation with available federal funds. These funds will be used by LEAs to reduce Advanced Placement test fees for low-income students.</p>