

KAREN GETMAN, State Bar No. 136285
MARGARET R. PRINZING, State Bar No. 209482
REMCHO, JOHANSEN & PURCELL, LLP
201 Dolores Avenue
San Leandro, CA 94577
Phone: (510) 346-6200
Fax: (510) 346-6201
Email: kgetman@rjp.com

EMMA LEHENY, State Bar 196167
PRISCILLA S. WINSLOW, State Bar 78609
LAURA P. JURAN, State Bar 199978
CALIFORNIA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION
1705 Murchison Drive
Burlingame, CA 94010
Phone: (650) 552-5413
Fax: (650) 552-5019
Email: ljuran@cta.org

Attorneys for Plaintiff/Intervenor
California Teachers Association

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

MAYA ROBLES-WONG, a minor, by Michael Robles-Wong, guardian ad litem;) No.: RG10515768
MILENA ROBLES-WONG, a minor by Michael Robles-Wong, guardian ad litem;) Action Filed: May 20, 2010
REINA BONTA, a minor, by Robert Bonta, guardian ad litem;) **[PROPOSED] COMPLAINT
IN INTERVENTION**
ILIANA BONTA, a minor, by Robert Bonta, guardian ad litem;)
HARRISON BRAND, a minor, by Susan Davis, guardian ad litem;) The Honorable Steven A. Brick
PHOEIBE BRAND, a minor by Susan Davis, guardian ad litem;) Dept: 17
RUBY MEYER SILTANEN, a minor, by Robert Siltanen, guardian ad litem;)
ELI MEYER SILTANEN, a minor, by Robert Siltanen, guardian ad litem;)
CHRISTOPHER BARKLEY, a minor, by Mary Barkley, guardian ad litem;)
BRADLEY BARKLEY, a minor, by Mary Barkley, guardian ad litem;)
EASTON SCAGGS, a minor, by Nanette Scaggs, guardian ad litem;)
HAYDEN SCAGGS, a minor, by Nanette Scaggs, guardian ad litem;)
ALEX SCAGGS, a minor, by Nanette Scaggs, guardian ad litem;)
ANGELINA VUE, a minor, by Khou Vue, guardian ad litem,)

1 JIN VUE, a minor, by Khou Vue, guardian ad litem;)
2 EMILY HILL, a minor, by Paula Hill, guardian ad litem;)
3 SARAH HILL, a minor, by Paula Hill, guardian ad litem;)
4 GENEVIEVE HILL, a minor, by Paula Hill, guardian ad litem;)
5 LENA GRACE HILL, a minor, by Paula Hill, guardian ad litem;)
6 NIGEL ROBINSON, a minor by Rodney Robinson, guardian ad litem;)
7 NATALIE ROBINSON, a minor, by Rodney Robinson, guardian ad litem;)
8 NYAH ROBINSON, a minor, by Rodney Robinson, guardian ad litem;)
9 SAMUEL RUBY, a minor, by Laura Ruby, guardian ad litem;)
10 JORDAN THOMPSON, a minor, by Donna Thompson, guardian ad litem;)
11 ZACHARY NAYLOR, a minor, by Wendy Naylor, guardian ad litem;)
12 JILLIAN NAYLOR, a minor, by Wendy Naylor, guardian ad litem;)
13 SAMUEL NAYLOR, a minor, by Wendy Naylor, guardian ad litem;)
14 BOBBIE RIVERS, a minor, by Tammy Rivers, guardian ad litem;)
15 KRISTA RIVERS, a minor, by Tammy Rivers, guardian ad litem;)
16 OLIVIA NASH, a minor, John Nash, guardian ad litem;)
17 ABIGAIL NASH, a minor, by John Nash, guardian ad litem;)
18 ISAAC NASH, a minor, by John Nash, guardian ad litem;)
19 ELIZABETH BAILEY, a minor, by Judy Bailey, guardian ad litem;)
20 JULIA BAILEY, a minor, by Judy Bailey, guardian ad litem;)
21 BEAU BETTEN, a minor, by Amy Betten, guardian ad litem;)
22 CODY BETTEN, a minor, by Amy Betten, guardian ad litem;)
23 GRACE BETTEN, a minor, by Amy Betten, guardian ad litem;)
24 SAMUEL MEDURE, a minor, by Angela Medure, guardian ad litem;)
25 BENJAMIN MEDURE, a minor, by Angela Medure, guardian ad litem;)
26 LUKE MEDURE, a minor, by Angela Medure, guardian ad litem;)
27 RYAN RAMIREZ, a minor, by Sandra Ramirez, guardian ad litem;)
28)

1 EASTAN RAMIREZ, a minor, by Sandra)
2 Ramirez, guardian ad litem;)
2 JORDAN RAMIREZ, a minor, by Sandra)
3 Ramirez, guardian ad litem;)
3 MADISON RAMIREZ, a minor, by Sandra)
4 Ramirez, guardian ad litem;)
4 PEYTON RAMIREZ, a minor, by Sandra)
5 Ramirez, guardian ad litem;)
5 LUMUMBA DIOP, a minor, by Carl Barnes,)
guardian ad litem;)
6 KIBWE DIOP, a minor, by Carl Barnes, guardian)
ad litem;)
7 LUIS MORAN, a minor, by Jacquie Chavez,)
guardian ad litem;)
8 CONSUELO CHAVEZ, a minor, by Jacquie)
Chavez, guardian ad litem;)
9 ALEXANDER PARKER, a minor, by Michelle)
Parker, guardian ad litem;)
10 ZACHARY PARKER, a minor, by Michelle)
Parker, guardian ad litem;)
11 ABIGAIL PARKER, a minor, by Michelle Parker,)
guardian ad litem;)
12 NATHANIEL ELIOT HAYS, a minor, by Sally)
Payson Hays, guardian ad litem;)
13 JACK ZANTE HAYS, a minor, by Sally Payson)
Hays, guardian ad litem;)
14 MARC ANTHONY AGUIRRE, a minor, by)
Regina Aguirre, guardian ad litem;)
15 CRISTINA MARIE AGUIERRE, a minor, by)
Regina Aguirre, guardian ad litem;)
16 LISA GRANADOS, a minor, by Melissa Sanchez,)
guardian ad litem;)
17 JENNIFER ZAMORA, a minor, by Melissa)
Sanchez, guardian ad litem;)
18 ESTEVAN ZAMORA, a minor, by Melissa)
Sanchez, guardian ad litem;)
19 ALEXIS ZARAGOZA, a minor, by Victoria)
Zaragoza, guardian ad litem;)
20 ARACELI ZARAGOZA, a minor, by Victoria)
Zaragoza, guardian ad litem;)
21 CHRISTIAN ZARAGOZA, a minor, by Victoria)
Zaragoza, guardian ad litem;)
22 ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT;)
ALPINE UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT;)
23 DEL NORTE COUNTY UNIFIED SCHOOL)
DISTRICT;)
24 FOLSOM CORDOVA UNIFIED SCHOOL)
DISTRICT;)
25 HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT;)
PORTERVILLE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT;)
26 RIVERSIDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT;)
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL)
DISTRICT;)
28 _____)

1 SANTA ANA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT;)
2 CALIFORNIA CONGRESS OF PARENTS)
3 TEACHERS & STUDENTS, a California non-)
4 profit corporation;)
5 ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL)
6 ADMINISTRATORS, a California non-profit)
7 corporation; and)
8 CALIFORNIA SCHOOL BOARDS)
9 ASSOCIATION, a California non-profit)
10 corporation, by its Education Legal Alliance,)
11 Plaintiffs,)

12 vs.)

13 STATE OF CALIFORNIA; and ARNOLD)
14 SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor of the State of)
15 California,)

16 Defendants.)
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 By leave of Court, the California Teachers Association hereby intervenes in this action
2 and joins with plaintiffs in claiming the relief sought as follows:

3 **I.**

4 **INTRODUCTION**

5 The California Constitution grants each California child the fundamental right to a free
6 education in a “system of common schools” that provides the “general diffusion of knowledge and
7 intelligence” that is “essential to the preservation of the rights and liberties of the people.” (Cal.
8 Const., art. IX, §§ 1, 5.) The Constitution also requires that this “system of common schools” be open
9 to all school children on an equal basis and that it afford those children equal educational
10 opportunities. (Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(a) & (b); art. IV, § 16(a).) The State has failed to carry out these
11 duties because it has enacted a system of education funding that bears no rational relationship to, and
12 fails to provide, the means necessary to ensure all California public school children are provided the
13 full educational opportunity guaranteed them by the Constitution. As a consequence, public school
14 children throughout California are suffering the increasingly dire consequences that flow from that
15 failure. This lawsuit seeks a declaration stating that the State’s current education finance system is
16 unconstitutional, and an injunction requiring the State to design an education finance system that
17 provides California’s school children with the education guaranteed them by the California
18 Constitution.

19 **II.**

20 **PARTIES**

21 1. Plaintiff MAYA ROBLES-WONG, a minor, and Plaintiff MILENA ROBLES-
22 WONG, a minor, by Michael and Martha Robles-Wong, as their guardians. Maya is an eleventh grade
23 student at Alameda High School in the Alameda Unified School District. Milena is a sixth grade
24 student at the Nea Charter School in the Alameda Unified School District.

25 2. Plaintiff REINA BONTA, a minor, and Plaintiff ILIANA BONTA, a minor, by
26 Mialisa and Robert Bonta, as their guardians. Reina is a fifth grade student at Frank Otis Elementary
27 School in the Alameda Unified School District. Iliana will enter kindergarten in September 2010 at
28 Frank Otis Elementary School in the Alameda Unified School District.

1 3. Plaintiff HARRISON BRAND, a minor, and Plaintiff PHOEBE BRAND, a
2 minor, by Peter Brand and Susan Davis as their guardians. Harrison is a third grade student at Frank
3 Otis Elementary School in the Alameda Unified School District. Phoebe is a sixth grade student at
4 Lincoln Middle School in the Alameda Unified School District.

5 4. Plaintiff RUBY MEYER SILTANEN, a minor, and Plaintiff ELI MEYER
6 SILTANEN, a minor, by Gwen Meyer and Robert Siltanen, as their guardians. Ruby is a fifth grade
7 student at William G. Paden Elementary School in the Alameda Unified School District. Eli is a first
8 grade student at William G. Paden Elementary School in the Alameda Unified School District.

9 5. Plaintiff CHRISTOPHER BARKLEY, a minor, and Plaintiff BRADLEY
10 BARKLEY, a minor, by Mary and Paul Barkley, as their guardians. Christopher is an eighth grade
11 student at Joan MacQueen Middle School in the Alpine Union School District. Bradley is a third grade
12 student at Shadow Hills Elementary School in the Alpine Union School District.

13 6. Plaintiff EASTON SCAGGS, a minor, Plaintiff HAYDEN SCAGGS, a minor,
14 and Plaintiff ALEX SCAGGS, a minor, by David and Nanette Scaggs, as their guardians. Easton is an
15 eighth grade student at Smith River Elementary School in the Del Norte County Unified School
16 District. Hayden is a fourth grade student at Smith River Elementary School in the Del Norte County
17 Unified School District. Alex is a kindergarten student at Smith River Elementary School in the Del
18 Norte County Unified School District.

19 7. Plaintiff ANGELINA VUE, a minor, and Plaintiff JIN VUE, a minor, by Khou
20 Vue and Pang Xiong, as their guardians. Angelina is a third grade student at Mary Peacock
21 Elementary School in the Del Norte County Unified School District. Jin is a kindergarten student at
22 Mary Peacock Elementary School in the Del Norte County Unified School District.

23 8. Plaintiff EMILY HILL, a minor, Plaintiff SARAH HILL, a minor, Plaintiff
24 GENEVIEVE HILL, a minor, and Plaintiff LENA GRACE HILL, a minor, by Vincent and Paula Hill,
25 as their guardians. Emily is an eleventh grade student at Folsom High School in the Folsom Cordova
26 Unified School District. Sarah is a ninth grade student at Folsom High School in the Folsom Cordova
27 Unified School District. Genevieve is an eighth grade student at Sutter Middle School in the Folsom
28 Unified School District.

1 Cordova Unified School District. Lena Grace is a fourth grade student at Natoma Station Elementary,
2 School in the Folsom Cordova Unified School District.

3 9. Plaintiff NIGEL ROBINSON, a minor, Plaintiff NATALIE ROBINSON, a
4 minor, and Plaintiff NYAH ROBINSON, a minor, by Marsha and Rodney Robinson, as their
5 guardians. Nigel is an eighth grade student at W.E. Mitchell Middle School in the Folsom Cordova
6 Unified School District. Natalie is a fourth grade student at Cordova Lane Elementary School in the
7 Folsom Cordova Unified School District. Nyah will enter kindergarten in September 2010 at Cordova
8 Springs Elementary School in the Folsom Cordova Unified School District.

9 10. Plaintiff SAMUEL RUBY, a minor, by Laura Ruby, as his guardian. Samuel is
10 a ninth grade student at Vista del Lago High School in the Folsom Cordova Unified School District.

11 11. Plaintiff JORDAN THOMPSON, a minor, by Donna and Steve Thompson, as
12 her guardians. Jordan is a seventh grade student at Sutter Middle School in the Folsom Cordova
13 Unified School District.

14 12. Plaintiff ZACHARY NAYLOR, a minor, Plaintiff JILLIAN NAYLOR, a minor,
15 and Plaintiff SAMUEL NAYLOR, a minor, by Paul and Wendy Naylor, as their guardians. Zachary is
16 a fourth grade student at Cawston Elementary School in the Hemet Unified School District. Jillian is a
17 first grade student at Cawston Elementary School in the Hemet Unified School District. Samuel will
18 enter kindergarten in September 2010 at Cawston Elementary School in the Hemet Unified School
19 District.

20 13. Plaintiff BOBBIE RIVERS, a minor, and Plaintiff KRISTA RIVERS, a minor,
21 by Robert and Tammy Rivers, as their guardians. Bobbie is a fourth grade student at Ramona
22 Elementary School in the Hemet Unified School District. Krista will enter a Head Start program in
23 September 2010 in Hemet, California.

24 14. Plaintiff OLIVIA NASH, a minor, Plaintiff ABIGAIL NASH, a minor, and
25 Plaintiff ISAAC NASH, a minor, by John and Rulaine Nash, as their guardians. Olivia is a tenth grade
26 student at Porterville High School in the Porterville Unified School District. Abigail is a seventh grade
27 student at Pioneer Middle School in the Porterville Unified School District. Isaac is a fourth grade
28 student at Vandalia Elementary School in the Porterville Unified School District.

1 15. Plaintiff ELIZABETH BAILEY, a minor, and Plaintiff JULIA BAILEY, a
2 minor, by Judy Bailey, as their guardian. Elizabeth is a second grade student at Alcott Elementary
3 School in the Riverside Unified School District. Julia will enter kindergarten in September 2012 at
4 Alcott Elementary School in the Riverside Unified School District.

5 16. Plaintiff BEAU BETTEN, a minor, Plaintiff CODY BETTEN, a minor, and
6 Plaintiff GRACE BETTEN, a minor, by Amy Betten, as their guardian. Beau is a second grade
7 student at Castleview Elementary School in the Riverside Unified School District. Cody is a
8 kindergarten student at Castleview Elementary School in the Riverside Unified School District. Grace
9 will enter kindergarten in September 2012 at Castleview Elementary School in the Riverside Unified
10 School District.

11 17. Plaintiff SAMUEL MEDURE, a minor, Plaintiff BENJAMIN MEDURE, a
12 minor, and Plaintiff LUKE MEDURE, a minor, by Angela Medure, as their guardian. Samuel is a first
13 grade student at Washington Elementary School in the Riverside Unified School District. Benjamin is
14 a kindergarten student at Washington Elementary School in the Riverside Unified School District.
15 Luke is a pre-kindergarten student at Washington Elementary School in the Riverside Unified School
16 District.

17 18. Plaintiff RYAN RAMIREZ, a minor, Plaintiff EASTAN RAMIREZ, a minor,
18 Plaintiff JORDAN RAMIREZ, a minor, Plaintiff MADISON RAMIREZ, a minor, and Plaintiff
19 PEYTON RAMIREZ, a minor, by Rudy and Sandra Ramirez, as their guardians. Ryan is a twelfth
20 grade student at North High School in the Riverside Unified School District. Eastan is a ninth grade
21 student at North High School in the Riverside Unified School District. Jordan is a sixth student at
22 Emerson Elementary School in the Riverside Unified School District. Madison is a fourth grade
23 student at Emerson Elementary School in the Riverside Unified School District. Peyton is a third
24 grade student at Emerson Elementary School in the Riverside Unified School District.

25 19. Plaintiff LUMUMBA DIOP, a minor, and Plaintiff KIBWE DIOP, a minor, by
26 Carl Barnes, as their guardian. Lumumba is a sixth grade student at A.P. Giannini Middle School in
27 the San Francisco Unified School District. Kibwe is a fourth grade student at Sheridan Elementary
28 School in the San Francisco Unified School District.

1 20. Plaintiff LUIS MORAN, a minor, and Plaintiff CONSUELO CHAVEZ, a
2 minor, by Jacquie Chavez, as their guardian. Luis is a tenth grade student at Balboa High School in the
3 San Francisco Unified School District. Consuelo is a first grade student at Longfellow Elementary
4 School in the San Francisco Unified School District.

5 21. Plaintiff ALEXANDER PARKER, a minor, Plaintiff ZACHARY PARKER, a
6 minor, and Plaintiff ABIGAIL PARKER, a minor, by David and Michelle Parker, as their guardians.
7 Alexander is a fourth grade student at Sherman Elementary School in the San Francisco Unified
8 School District. Zachary is a second grade student at Sherman Elementary School in the San Francisco
9 Unified School District. Abigail is a kindergarten student at Sherman Elementary School in the
10 San Francisco Unified School District.

11 22. Plaintiff NATHANIEL ELIOT HAYS, a minor, and Plaintiff JACK ZANTE
12 HAYS, a minor, by John Hays and Sally Payson Hays, as their guardians. Nathaniel is a sixth grade
13 student at James Lick Middle School in the San Francisco Unified School District. Jack is a third
14 grade student at Monroe Elementary School in the San Francisco Unified School District.

15 23. Plaintiff MARC ANTHONY AGUIRRE, a minor, and Plaintiff CRISTINA
16 MARIE AGUIRRE, a minor, by Regina and Salvador Aguirre, as their guardians. Marc is an eighth
17 grade student at Carr Intermediate School in the Santa Ana Unified School District. Cristina is a fifth
18 grade student at Sepulveda Elementary School in the Santa Ana Unified School District.

19 24. Plaintiff LISA GRANADOS, a minor, Plaintiff JENNIFER ZAMORA, a minor,
20 and Plaintiff ESTEVAN ZAMORA, a minor, by Melissa Sanchez, as their guardian. Lisa is a tenth
21 grade student at Century High School in the Santa Ana Unified School District. Jennifer is a fifth
22 grade student at Benjamin Franklin Elementary School in the Santa Ana Unified School District.
23 Estevan is a fourth grade student at Benjamin Franklin Elementary School in the Santa Ana Unified
24 School District.

25 25. Plaintiff ALEXIS ZARAGOZA, a minor, Plaintiff ARACELI ZARAGOZA, a
26 minor, and Plaintiff CHRISTIAN ZARAGOZA, a minor, by Victoria Zaragoza, as their guardian.
27 Alexis is a sixth grade student at Kennedy Elementary School in the Santa Ana Unified School
28 District. Araceli is a sixth grade student at Kennedy Elementary School in the Santa Ana Unified

1 School District. Christian is a fifth grade student at Kennedy Elementary School in the Santa Ana
2 Unified School District.

3 26. Plaintiff ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (“Alameda”) is a unified
4 school district duly formed and validly existing under the laws of the State of California. Alameda is a
5 suburban district located in Alameda County and its boundaries are co-terminus with the city of
6 Alameda, California. Alameda operates ten elementary schools, three middle schools, four high
7 schools (including one continuation school and one Early College High School located on the campus
8 of the College of Alameda), one early childhood development center, and one adult school. Alameda
9 enrolls approximately 10,000 students, including 12.1% African Americans, 32.7% Asian/Asian
10 Americans, 9.1% Filipino/Filipino Americans, and 11.8% Hispanic. Approximately 22.8% of its
11 students are English Learners and 31.5% qualify for free/reduced lunch.

12 27. Plaintiff ALPINE UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT (“Alpine”) is an elementary
13 school district duly formed and validly existing under the laws of the State of California. Alpine is a
14 predominantly rural district encompassing all of Alpine, California, in San Diego County. Alpine
15 operates three elementary schools, one middle school, one early childhood education center, a home
16 school and a community day school. Alpine enrolls approximately 2,000 students, including 4.7%
17 American Indians, and 15.4% Hispanic. Approximately 4.1% of its students are English Learners and
18 20.0% qualify for free/reduced lunch.

19 28. Plaintiff DEL NORTE COUNTY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (“Del
20 Norte”) is a unified school district duly formed and validly existing under the laws of the State of
21 California. Del Norte is a predominantly rural district encompassing all of Del Norte County. The
22 only incorporated city in Del Norte is Crescent City. Del Norte, which also serves as the County
23 Office of Education, operates eight elementary schools, one middle school, one high school, and one
24 continuation school. (The County Office of Education runs a separate system of schools.) Del Norte
25 enrolls approximately 3,900 students, including 13.8% American Indians, 7.6% Asian/Asian
26 Americans, and 15.7% Hispanic. Approximately 11% of its students are English Learners and 60.4%
27 qualify for free/reduced lunch.

28

1 29. Plaintiff FOLSOM CORDOVA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT ("Folsom
2 Cordova") is a unified school district duly formed and validly existing under the laws of the State of
3 California. Folsom Cordova is a suburban district located in Sacramento County, and serves the cities
4 of Folsom, Rancho Cordova, and most of Mather. Folsom Cordova operates 23 elementary schools
5 (one of which is a charter school), four middle schools, three high schools, and four adult/alternative
6 schools. Folsom Cordova enrolls approximately 19,000 students, including 7.9% African Americans,
7 10.4% Asian/Asian Americans, 2.4% Filipino/Filipino Americans, and 16.3% Hispanic.
8 Approximately 11.9% of its students are English Learners and 31.6% qualify for free/reduced lunch.

9 30. Plaintiff HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT ("Hemet") is a unified school
10 district duly formed and validly existing under the laws of the State of California. Hemet is a suburban
11 district located in the San Jacinto Valley and Valle Vista in Riverside County and serves the towns of
12 Hemet, Anza, Aguanga, Idyllwild, and Winchester. Hemet operates one preschool, 15 elementary
13 schools, four middle schools (one of which is under construction), five high schools, and three
14 alternative schools. Hemet enrolls approximately 23,000 students, including 7.6% African Americans,
15 1.6% American Indians, 1.4% Asian/Asian Americans, 1.3% Filipino/Filipino Americans, and 44.4%
16 Hispanic. Approximately 15.8% of its students are English Learners and 71.5% qualify for
17 free/reduced lunch.

18 31. Plaintiff PORTERVILLE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT ("Porterville") is a
19 unified school district duly formed and validly existing under the laws of the State of California.
20 Porterville is a rural district located in Tulare County and serves the town of Porterville and its
21 surrounding communities. Porterville operates ten elementary schools, three middle schools, six high
22 schools, one alternative school, one continuation school, and one community day school. Porterville
23 enrolls approximately 13,000 students, including 1.9% American Indians, 1.8% Asian/Asian
24 Americans, 1.1% Filipino/Filipino Americans, and 68% Hispanic. Approximately 22.6% of its
25 students are English Learners and 72.9% qualify for free/reduced lunch.

26 32. Plaintiff RIVERSIDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT ("Riverside") is a unified
27 school district duly formed and validly existing under the laws of the State of California. Riverside is
28 an urban district which serves a large portion of the City of Riverside and both the Highgrove and

1 Woodcrest areas outside Riverside. Riverside operates 47 schools including one special education
2 preschool, 30 elementary schools, seven middle schools, five high schools, two continuation high
3 schools, two alternative schools, and the Riverside Virtual School. Riverside enrolls approximately
4 43,000 students, including 9.1% African Americans, 3.3% Asian/Asian Americans, 1.3%
5 Filipino/Filipino Americans, and 54.4% Hispanic. Approximately 19.8% of its students are English
6 Learners and 59.4% qualify for free/reduced lunch.

7 33. Plaintiff SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT ("San Francisco")
8 is a unified school district duly formed and validly existing under the laws of the State of California.
9 San Francisco is an urban district encompassing all of the City and County of San Francisco.
10 San Francisco, which also serves as the County Office of Education, operates 72 elementary schools,
11 15 middle schools, 21 high schools, two alternative schools, and two continuation schools. (The
12 County Office of Education runs a separate system of schools.) San Francisco enrolls approximately
13 55,000 students, including 12.3% African Americans, 41.3% Asian/Asian Americans, 5.8%
14 Filipino/Filipino Americans, 23.1% Hispanic, and 1.3% Pacific Islanders. Approximately 30.5% of its
15 students are English Learners and 55.5% qualify for free/reduced lunch.

16 34. Plaintiff SANTA ANA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT ("Santa Ana") is a
17 unified school district duly formed and validly existing under the laws of the State of California. Santa
18 Ana is an urban district in Orange County which serves residents of Santa Ana, Tustin, Irvine, Costa
19 Mesa, and Newport Beach. Santa Ana operates 37 elementary schools, nine middle schools, and nine
20 high schools. It also operates a community day intermediate and high school, a child development
21 center, and a school for pregnant or parenting students. Santa Ana enrolls approximately 54,000
22 students, including 3.3% Asian/Asian Americans and 94.4% Hispanic. Approximately 58.0% of its
23 students are English Learners and 83.1% qualify for free/reduced lunch.

24 35. Plaintiff CALIFORNIA CONGRESS OF PARENTS TEACHERS &
25 STUDENTS ("California State PTA") is a California nonprofit corporation duly formed and validly
26 existing under the laws of the State of California. California State PTA is a membership-based
27 association composed of state, district, council, and local PTA groups, which together have
28 approximately one million member parents, teachers, and students from school districts throughout the

1 State of California. The purposes of California State PTA are, among other things, to promote the
2 welfare of children in school and work with educators and the general public to secure the highest
3 advantages in education for children. California State PTA focuses on issues that have statewide
4 consequences for public education. California State PTA brings this action on its own behalf and on
5 behalf of its members. California State PTA members would otherwise be entitled to bring this suit in
6 their own right, the interests that California State PTA seeks to protect in this litigation are germane to
7 its purpose, and neither the claims asserted nor the relief sought herein are unique to the specific
8 groups or members and therefore do not require the participation of each and every member of
9 California State PTA.

10 36. Plaintiff ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
11 (“ACSA”) is a California nonprofit corporation and a membership based association composed of the
12 Superintendents and other administrators at all levels of kindergarten through adult education programs
13 with over 16,000 members in K-12 school districts throughout the State of California. The purpose of
14 ACSA is, among other things, to ensure that all students attending K- 12 schools in California have the
15 skills, knowledge, and environment they need to learn and that appropriate funding for state programs
16 is provided to school districts for those purposes. ACSA focuses on issues that have statewide
17 consequences for public education. ACSA brings this action on its own behalf and on behalf of its
18 members. ACSA members would otherwise be entitled to bring this suit in their own right, the
19 interests that ACSA seeks to protect in this litigation are germane to its purpose, and neither the claims
20 asserted nor the relief sought herein are unique to specific districts and therefore do not require the
21 participation of each and every member of ACSA.

22 37. Plaintiff CALIFORNIA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCATION (“CSBA”) is, and
23 was at all relevant times, a California nonprofit corporation duly formed and validly existing under the
24 law of the State of California. CSBA is a membership-based association composed of the governing
25 boards of nearly 1,000 K-12 school districts and county boards of education throughout California.
26 CSBA brings this action through its EDUCATION LEGAL ALLIANCE (“ELA”), which is composed
27 of approximately 800 CSBA members dedicated to addressing legal issues of statewide concern to
28 school districts. All references herein to “CSBA” include the Alliance. CSBA supports sufficient

1 funding to meet the educational needs of K-12 students in public schools and opposes efforts to
2 circumvent, bypass or manipulate constitutional funding guarantees. CSBA's purposes are, among
3 other things, to ensure that local school boards retain the authority and financial capacity to fully
4 exercise the responsibilities vested in them by law, to advance appropriate educational policies on
5 behalf of school districts, and to ensure that the State of California, its officers, agents and employees
6 properly execute those responsibilities for public education vested in them by state law. CSBA focuses
7 on issues that have statewide consequences for public education. CSBA brings this proceeding on its
8 own behalf and on behalf of its member school districts that are charged with providing the enacted
9 programmatic element of the public school system. CSBA members would otherwise be entitled to
10 bring this suit in their own right, the interests that CSBA seeks to protect in this litigation are germane
11 to its purpose, and neither the claims asserted nor the relief sought herein are unique to specific
12 districts and therefore do not require the participation of each and every member of CSBA.

13 38. Plaintiff/Intervenor CALIFORNIA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION ("CTA") is a
14 voluntary membership organization of over 300,000 California public school teachers, counselors,
15 librarians, nurses and other school personnel who work in approximately 1,000 school districts across
16 California. CTA is a non-profit organization that exists to protect and promote the well-being of its
17 members; to improve the conditions of teaching and learning; to advance the cause of free, universal,
18 and quality public education; to ensure that the human dignity and civil rights of all children and youth
19 are protected; and to secure a more just, equitable, and democratic society. To fulfill this mission,
20 CTA has worked throughout its history on issues relating to the education finance system in California.
21 For example, CTA worked successfully to secure a law providing free public schools to California
22 children in 1866, it won the right for all students in grades 1-8 to have free textbooks in 1911; and, in
23 1988, it sponsored Proposition 98, a school funding initiative passed by the voters of California to
24 amend article XVI, section 8 of the California Constitution to provide funding stability for school
25 districts and community college districts. Since that time, CTA has fought to enforce Proposition 98
26 through the budget process and, when necessary, through court actions challenging the State's
27 interpretation and implementation of Proposition 98. (See *CTA v. Hayes* (1992) 5 Cal.App.4th 1513;
28 *CTA v. Gould* (1994) Sacramento Superior Ct., No. 373415; *CTA v. Schwarzenegger* (2006)

1 Sacramento Superior Ct., No. 05CS01165.) The public school teachers and other school personnel
2 who are members of CTA are directly harmed by the State's failure to fulfill its constitutional
3 obligation to support its public schools in a way that ensures all students are provided an equal
4 opportunity to meet the State's academic goals, acquire the knowledge and skills necessary for success
5 in our competitive economy, and become informed citizens and productive members of society. The
6 State's failure to fulfill its constitutional obligation directly impacts CTA's members and the students
7 they teach and serve. Accordingly, CTA and its members are interested in enforcing the State's duty
8 to fund public education in a way that complies with the California Constitution. Finally, CTA and its
9 members have been liable to pay, and within one year before the commencement of this action have
10 paid, taxes within the State of California. Consequently, CTA claims an interest in this matter that
11 justifies intervention under Code of Civil Procedure section 387(a).

12 39. Defendant STATE OF CALIFORNIA is the legal and political entity required
13 by the California Constitution to maintain and oversee the system of public education in California. In
14 particular, sections 1, 5 and 6 of article IX guarantee all students the right to an education and impose a
15 specific duty on the Legislature of the State of California to provide and support a system of common
16 schools that will provide that education. Section 8 of article XVI also requires the State to first set
17 apart monies for the support of the public school system. References in this Complaint to the "State"
18 are to Defendant STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

19 40. Defendant ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER is the Governor of the State of
20 California and, as the chief executive officer of the State, is responsible for executing the Constitution
21 and laws of the State of California. He is also responsible for presenting to the Legislature a budget for
22 each fiscal year containing recommended state expenditures and estimated state revenues, and for
23 signing into law or vetoing each bill passed by the Legislature.

III.

JURISDICTION

26 41. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to section 1060 of the Code
27 of Civil Procedure, which authorizes declaratory relief, and sections 525, 526, and 526a, which
28 authorize injunctive relief.

IV.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

42. This action was commenced on May 20, 2010 against defendants the State of California and Arnold Schwarzenegger by a coalition of plaintiffs including the California School Boards Association, the Association of California School Administrators, the California State PTA, and a coalition of school districts and students. Defendants have not yet appeared in this action.

The Constitution Requires a System of Common Schools That Prepares Students To Become Informed Citizens and Productive Members of Society

The Constitutional Duty to Provide and Support a System of Public Education

43. The California Constitution guarantees its citizens certain rights and liberties, including “pursuing and obtaining safety, happiness, and privacy,” “acquiring, possessing, and protecting property,” the right to “freely speak, write and publish his or her sentiments on all subjects,” the right to “instruct their representatives, petition government for redress of grievances, and assemble freely to consult for the common good,” the right to vote, and the right to a jury trial. (Cal. Const., art. 1.)

44. The California Constitution establishes the State's responsibility for educating its citizens as "essential to the preservation of [those] rights and liberties":

A general diffusion of knowledge and intelligence being essential to the preservation of the rights and liberties of the people, the Legislature shall encourage by all suitable means the promotion of intellectual, scientific, moral and agricultural improvement.

(Cal. Const., art. IX, § 1.)

45. Education is a fundamental right of each child in California. (*Serrano v. Priest* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 584.) Because public education is “uniquely a fundamental concern of the State,” the State must ensure that all students have equal access to the State’s educational program and cannot delegate that responsibility. (*Butt v. State of Cal.* (1992) 4 Cal.4th 668, 685.) This educational program must be provided on an equal basis to all students, permitting all students the opportunity to develop the skills and capacities necessary to achieve economic and social success in our competitive

society, participate meaningfully in political and community life, and to become informed citizens and productive members of society. (*Serrano*, 5 Cal.3d at 605.)

46. In order to ensure that all students are afforded their right to an education, the Constitution requires that “[t]he Legislature shall provide for a system of common schools by which a free school shall be kept up and supported in each district at least six months in every year. . . .” (Cal. Const., art. IX, §§ 5, 6.)

47. As part of this system, the Constitution requires the establishment of a "State School Fund" to be maintained by the Legislature to provide for the public schools. (Cal. Const., art. IX, § 6.)

48. The California Constitution accords priority to education funding over other State expenditures by requiring that from each year's State revenues there shall "*first be set apart* the moneys to be applied by the State for support of the public school system." (Cal. Const., art. XVI, § 8(a), emphasis added.)

49. The California courts have interpreted the constitutionally-required system of common schools to require an organizational structure in which each of the various constituent parts operates harmoniously with each other and with a unity of purpose. (*Kennedy v. Miller* (1893) 97 Cal. 429, 432.)

The State's Comprehensive Public Education Program

50. To implement its constitutional duties, the State has developed an educational program that includes not only direct instructional services (including specialized instructional services for English Learners and students with disabilities), but also course content standards and instructional materials; mandatory testing and accountability programs; teacher credentialing, certification and professional development; school health and safety programs; physical education, nutrition and meal programs; compulsory attendance and truancy programs; facilities maintenance and safety requirements; transportation; procedural rights and grievance procedures for students and parents; social service programs; and employee rights, including health and retirement benefits, collective bargaining and due process rights.

51. In 1995, exercising its constitutional authority over the public education system, the State established a comprehensive, standards-based education program that defines the specific academic knowledge, skills, and abilities that all public schools are expected to teach and all students are expected to learn. The Legislature specifically directed that the academic content standards at the core of this comprehensive education program "shall be based on the knowledge and skills that pupils will need in order to succeed in the information-based, global economy of the 21st century." (Ed. Code, § 60602.)

52. The Legislature directed the development of statewide academic content standards. These content standards are defined as “the specific academic knowledge, skills, and abilities that all public schools in this state are expected to teach and all pupils expected to learn in each of the core curriculum areas, at each grade level tested.” (Ed. Code, §§ 60602, 60603.) Curriculum frameworks, instructional materials, and teacher training and development are now all statutorily required to be aligned with the content standards.

53. At the same time, the Legislature also created a statewide assessment program, with the content standards serving as the basis for assessing the achievement of individual pupils and of schools, school districts, and the California educational system. (Ed. Code, § 60605.) The California Standards Tests and the California High School Exit Exam (“CAHSEE”) are the primary components of the State’s accountability system. Based on student performance on these tests, each school and school district receives an “Academic Performance Index,” or API ranking, and an API “growth target” for the next school year. Interventions for “persistently lowest achieving schools” can include school closure, conversion to a charter school or other substantial changes to school management. (Ed. Code, § 53200 et seq.)

54. In 2002, the federal government enacted the No Child Left Behind Act (“NCLB”). (20 U.S.C. § 6301 et seq. (2010).) NCLB makes receipt of federal funds for education contingent upon each state’s adoption of content standards, student achievement standards, assessments aligned to standards, and an accountability system. California relies on its existing standards and assessment system to comply with NCLB.

1 55. Schools and school districts that fail to meet the targets required by NCLB are
2 identified for “program improvement” which can lead to increasingly serious levels of “corrective
3 action,” including removal of school or district personnel, state takeover of the school or district, or
4 other major governance changes.

5 56. In summary, California has designed and imposed an educational program that
6 includes not only content standards that dictate what all schools will teach and all students will learn,
7 but that also requires numerous services and programs deemed necessary for students to succeed,
8 including safe facilities, highly-qualified teachers and instructional materials aligned with the
9 challenging standards. The State’s assessment and accountability systems are designed to identify
10 students that are not reaching proficiency in meeting the State’s standards, and are supposed to trigger
11 assistance and interventions to ensure that all students are given the opportunity to master these
12 standards.

13 California’s Education Reality: State Funding Denies Students the Education Necessary to
14 Become Informed Citizens and Competitive Participants in the Global Economy

15 57. Abundant evidence shows that the State’s school finance system is
16 fundamentally flawed and directly impedes the ability of school districts to provide students with the
17 programs and services they need.

18 58. In 2005, Governor Schwarzenegger commissioned a Committee on Education
19 Excellence (“Governor’s Committee”) and instructed it to analyze current impediments to excellence,
20 to explore ideas and best practices relevant to California, and to recommend changes and reforms to
21 the governor and Secretary of Education. In its November 2007 report, the Committee concluded that
22 education funding “is based on anachronistic formulas, neither tied to the needs of individual students
23 nor to intended academic outcomes” and that the current system “[d]oes not ensure that sufficient
24 resources reach students according to their needs.” The Committee Report further concluded that:

25 California’s K - 12 education system is fundamentally flawed. It is not
26 close to helping each student become proficient in mastering the state’s
27 clear curricular standards, and wide disparities persist between rich and
28 poor, between students of color and others, and between native English
learners and native English speakers. Our current system is simply not
preparing every student to be successful in college or work; it is not

1 producing the results that taxpayers and citizens are counting on and that
2 our children deserve.

3 59. The Governor's Committee found the situation to be even worse for California's
4 most disadvantaged students. "Students from low-income families, many of them children of color
5 and/or English learners, are losing the most. California has created a pattern of disparities – an
6 achievement gap – in public schools that not only limits the opportunities for these students, but
7 reinforces and enlarges the existing social inequalities confronting them – exactly opposite of the
8 intended function of public education in a democracy."

9 60. As a result of its low spending levels, California ranks at or near the bottom in
10 the nation in staffing ratios. For example, in 2007-08, the year the Governor's Committee released its
11 report, California ranked 49th among the 50 states in student teacher ratios with 20.8 students per
12 teacher compared to 15.5 nationally (34 percent more students per teacher than the national average).

- 13 • 48th in total school staff with 10.9 students per staff member compared to
14 7.9 students nationally (37 percent more students per staff member);
- 15 • 47th in principals and assistant principals (38 percent more students per
16 principal);
- 17 • 46th in district officials and administrators (148 percent more students per
18 administrator);
- 19 • 45th in instructional aides (39 percent more students per aide);
- 20 • 49th in guidance counselors (73 percent more students per counselor);
- 21 • 50th in librarians (456 percent more students per librarian); and
- 22 • 49th in access to computers (63 percent more students per computer
23 workstation).

24 California educates over 1.7 million students more than Texas but does so with 16,700 less teachers.
25 Just to reach the national average for staffing ratios, California needs to add an additional
26 104,000 teachers, 26,569 instructional aides, 5,740 guidance counselors, 5,740 librarians,
27 5,630 principals or assistant principals, and 63,000 more computer workstations,

1 61. The situation has deteriorated since the issuance of the Governor's Committee
2 Report. In 2008-09, California spent \$2,131 less per pupil than the national average, ranking the state
3 44th in the country. California spent less per pupil than each of the largest 10 states in the nation -
4 almost \$6,000 less per pupil than New York. Rhode Island and Vermont each spent double what
5 California spent per pupil. When adjusted for the regional cost differences of providing education
6 services (using a national wage index), California spends \$2,856 less per pupil than the national
7 average, or 47th in the country.

8 62. As of the 2009-10 school year, nearly a third of the State's school districts and
9 close to half of all schools were in program improvement because their students were not meeting the
10 proficiency levels prescribed by the State.

11 63. California ranks among the lowest in the nation on the National Assessment of
12 Educational Progress (NAEP), the national report card for education. On the most recent assessment,
13 California tied for 47th on fourth grade reading and tied for 46th in eighth grade math.

14 64. Academic performance, compared with students in other states, is low for all
15 subgroups of students, but especially for the economically disadvantaged.

16 65. More than half (52%) of California's students qualify as "economically
17 disadvantaged," meaning that they qualify for free or reduced lunches under federal law. California's
18 economically disadvantaged students rank 49th in fourth grade reading and 48th in eighth grade math
19 when compared to economically disadvantaged students in other states.

20 66. California also has the largest proportion of English-learner students in the
21 nation by a wide margin, with English Learners comprising 24% of the student population.
22 Economically disadvantaged students and English Learners often need a higher level of service and
23 more student support to obtain a given level of performance. As a result, the cost to properly educate
24 these students is often more. Chronic under-funding leaves many schools and districts without the
25 educational resources necessary to ensure that students, especially those struggling with poverty or
26 learning the English language, have an opportunity to master the standards set by the State.

27 67. Only half of all California students are proficient in English-Language Arts as
28 measured by the California Standards Tests; this percentage drops to 37% for African-American

1 students, 37% for Hispanic students, 36% for economically disadvantaged students, and 20% for
2 English Learners. Approximately 46% are proficient in Mathematics; this percentage drops to 30% for
3 African-American students, 36% for Hispanic students, 37% for economically disadvantaged students,
4 and 32% for English Learners.

5 68. Approximately seventy percent of California students graduate from high
6 school. The graduation rates are even lower for African-American and Hispanic students, whose rates
7 are both equal to or less than sixty percent. Less than half of all African-American males graduate
8 from high school. While almost 40% of white students who graduate high school are UC/CSU
9 eligible, less than 25% of African-American and Hispanic students are similarly eligible. For all
10 entering CSU freshman, 37% are not proficient in Math and 47% not proficient in English. 64% and
11 66% of African-American students, respectively, are not proficient in Math and English and 52% and
12 63% of Latino students, respectively, are not proficient in Math and English.

13 Education Funding Is Not Aligned With the Cost of Providing
14 the Required Program and Services or with the Cost of Ensuring that All Students'
 Educational Needs are Met

15 69. The State's school finance system does not reflect either the actual cost of
16 providing the programs and services required by the State or the cost of providing that program to
17 students with varying educational needs.

18 Early Funding for Public Education

19 70. The State School Fund was created at the beginning of statehood and was
20 originally supported by designated revenues which were to be "inviolably appropriated to the support
21 of Common schools." (Cal. Const., art. IX, § 2 (1849).) In 1910, the Constitution was amended to
22 impose the requirement that, from each year's state revenues, "there shall *first be set apart* the moneys
23 to be applied by the state for support of the public school system." (Cal. Const., art. XVI, § 8(a),
24 emphasis added.)

25 71. In 1920, voters amended the Constitution to provide for minimum state funding
26 per average daily attendance unit ("ADA") and local property taxes to provide additional support for
27 schools.

72. In 1946, the state constitution was again amended to provide state funding based on a “foundation program” whereby each school district was entitled to receive a constitutionally mandated minimum amount of funding – “the foundation program minimum.”

73. Under the foundation program, every school district – regardless of wealth – was entitled to receive from the State a certain level of “basic aid” funding per unit of average daily attendance (“ADA”). School districts were authorized to bridge the gap between the State’s basic aid payments and foundation program minimum by levying local property taxes at a statutory rate. If the total of local district tax revenues plus state basic aid was less than the foundation program minimum, the State provided the difference in the form of “equalization aid.” If local district tax revenues plus state basic aid equaled or exceeded the foundation program minimum, the district was allowed to retain the additional revenues.

74. In 1971, the California Supreme Court held that the State's heavy reliance on local property tax wealth to fund public schools resulted in substantial disparities among districts in the quality and extent of educational opportunities afforded students which, if proven, would violate students' constitutional right to equal opportunity within the public education system. (*Serrano v. Priest* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 584.)

Revenue Limit Funding

75. The State responded to the inter-district funding disparities and *Serrano* by enacting a system of “revenue limit” controls that limited the maximum amount of general purpose state aid and local property tax revenue that a district could receive. Each district’s revenue limit was based on the State’s foundation program minimum funding and each district’s local property tax revenues as of 1972-73 (adjusted periodically for inflation). Revenue limits were completely unrelated to the actual cost of the educational program in that district.

76. The revenue limit system attempted to equalize per-pupil spending by allowing low revenue districts larger increases for inflation than were allowed for high revenue districts, thus allowing low revenue districts to be “leveled up” to the statewide average over time, and forcing the base revenue limits of high revenue districts to be “leveled down” to the statewide average over time.

1 77. Although revenue limits were primarily designed to equalize inter-district per
2 pupil spending, they also had the effect of locking in district spending at the 1972-73 base revenues,
3 based on the minimum foundation funding requirements in effect that year, adjusted only for inflation
4 or as otherwise deemed appropriate by the State.

5 78. Revenue limit funding (also termed "unrestricted" or "general purpose" funding)
6 continues to constitute the majority of education funding to school districts. Although some
7 equalization of revenue limits has occurred, generally this funding continues to be based on historical
8 data unrelated to the actual costs of providing the educational program and services required by the
9 State. Although the financial resources necessary for each district to deliver the educational program
10 required by the State vary based on the demographics of the student population and geographic cost
11 differences, revenue limit funding does not take either of these variables into account.

12 79. Categorical programs are those in which funding is tied to the provision of a
13 specific program or service, and use of that funding is restricted to those purposes. Categorical funds
14 cannot be used for general support of the public school system. Unless total education funding is
15 increased, an increase in categorical program funding results in a comparable decrease in unrestricted
16 revenue limit dollars available to districts for the general education program.

17 80. In 1980, state and federal categorical programs constituted about 13% of state
18 education funding. Since that time, categorical funding has grown to approximately a third of state
19 funding.

20 Proposition 13 and the Increased State Role in Education Funding

21 81. Proposition 13, a constitutional amendment adopted by the voters in June 1978,
22 severely restricted the taxing authority of all local governments, including school districts. (Cal.
23 Const., art. XIII A.) Proposition 13 rolled property assessments back to 1975-76 levels, limited the
24 total allowable property tax rate to 1 percent, and gave the State the authority to allocate the reduced
25 property tax revenues among school districts, local governments and other special districts. As a
26 result, even those tax revenues nominally defined as "local" became subject to control and allocation
27 by the State, which has the option of allocating none, some or all of those revenues to school districts.

82. The immediate effect of Proposition 13 was a near 60% reduction in local property tax revenues. The State allocated most of those revenues directly to counties, cities and special districts. The share of property tax revenues allocated to schools decreased from 53% to 35%. The State used General Fund revenues to bridge the gap, but only enough to bring each district's total revenues up to the pre-Proposition 13 revenue limits. These revenue limits effectively became a permanent ceiling: for every dollar provided to a district from local property tax revenues, the State reduces its funding to the district by the same amount. Following this transition, school districts became much more dependent on state funding.

83. The year after the adoption of Proposition 13, the voters adopted Proposition 4, which amended the California Constitution to impose new spending limits on State and local governments, including school districts. (Cal. Const., art. XIII B.) The new spending restrictions were also based on historical spending patterns as opposed to actual needs and costs. Each school district's revenue limit, itself the product of the minimum foundation funding developed in the 1950s and the property tax scheme in effect in the 1960s, became the district's spending limit.

Proposition 98

84. In the decade following Proposition 13, education was forced to compete with other programs for General Fund revenues. During this time, California's spending per-pupil fell behind the national average. In November 1988, voters passed Proposition 98 to amend the State Constitution to set a minimum funding level for the support of K-14 education. (Cal. Const., art XVI, § 8.)

85. Proposition 98 amended article XVI of the California Constitution to require schools be provided each year a stable base of funding. Specifically, Proposition 98 sought to “guarantee[] schools as much money as they received in the last year adjusted to pay for new children and inflation.” (Ballot Pamp., Gen. Elec. (Nov. 8, 1988) Prop. 98, Rebuttal to Argument Against Prop. 98, p. 81.) In so doing, it “[e]stablish[ed] a minimum level of funding for public schools and community colleges.” (*Id.*, Analysis by the Legislative Analyst, p. 78.) The State remained free to provide more money to schools; but they could not provide less “except in fiscal emergencies.” (*Id.*,

1 Argument in Favor of Prop. 98.) Nowhere does Proposition 98 refer to article IX of the California
2 Constitution.

3 86. As amended in 1990, the Proposition 98 minimum funding for a given year is
4 based on one of three “tests” keyed to changes in state economic conditions. The minimum funding
5 requirement can be suspended during a period of economic crisis by a two-thirds vote of the
6 Legislature, but only on a temporary basis, and it is temporarily lowered in certain years when the
7 economy is faltering.

8 87. The Proposition 98 funding formulas are based on the 1986-87 education budget
9 – which had in turn been based on antiquated caps set in the 1970s – adjusted for cost-of-living and
10 changes in the size of the student population. They are not keyed to the costs of providing the
11 education required by article IX and they do not require adjustments based on changes to the contents
12 of the educational program.

13 88. With very few exceptions, the Proposition 98 “minimum” has become a
14 maximum funding calculation. At the time Proposition 98 was adopted, California ranked 30th among
15 the states in per pupil spending. In 2008-09 – before the latest round of budget cuts – California
16 ranked 44th.

17 89. In addition, the State has used various accounting devices to manipulate the
18 Proposition 98 minimum funding calculations and further reduce and destabilize funding for the public
19 school system.

20 90. Accordingly, there is substantial instability in education funding now
21 notwithstanding the passage of Proposition 98. In the last two years alone, education funding has been
22 cut by approximately \$17 billion.

23 The State’s Education Finance System Does Not Enable Districts to Provide the Required Education
24 Program and Thereby Denies Students An Opportunity to Meet the State’s Educational Goals

25 91. The State’s current education finance system prevents districts from providing
26 the required education program and denies students the opportunity to meet the State’s educational
27 goals.

The State's Education Finance System Is Not Designed to Support the Core Education Program Required by the State and Does Not Do So

92. Irrational policies and insufficient state funding prevent districts from providing all students with the programs and services necessary to meet the academic proficiency goals at the core of the required education program.

93. In order to provide the educational program required by the State, districts need sufficient funds to attract, retain and develop sufficient numbers of qualified teachers to maintain teacher-student ratios and class sizes that are appropriate to the task of meeting the State's academic standards. Instead, teacher-student ratios and class sizes are not determined by pedagogical or education policy factors, but are a function of available funding on a year-to-year basis.

94. Many students are unable to learn the necessary academic content because there are not enough teachers in each school to meet their needs. Districts have found that lower class sizes improve educational outcomes, especially in the early elementary grades and among disadvantaged students and English Learners. Not all districts can afford to implement this successful practice. Core academic subjects in many secondary schools are now being taught in classrooms with more than 40 students per teacher, and California schools rank last in the nation in teacher-student ratios for the core subjects in secondary school. Further, California schools serving 90% or more Latino, African-American, and American Indian students are the most likely to be critically overcrowded. Not surprisingly, California students score among the lowest of all states in national academic assessments.

95. While appropriate staffing ratios are essential, additional teacher training, staff preparation and professional development are also critical to improving educational outcomes. Ongoing professional development and training directly tied to the State's academic standards is necessary to ensure that classroom teaching is consistent with the State's academic goals and the needs of all students. Professional development is crucial to providing the instruction programs mandated by the State and, in particular, finding ways to improve the academic achievement of the lower performing students. To improve the quality of daily instruction, teachers need time for collaboration, data analysis and instructional preparation. However, the State has failed to enact funding policies that reflect, and appropriately fund, professional development needs. The lack of available funding for

1 these “discretionary” programs has led to the virtual elimination of structured, continuous professional
2 training and support for California teachers and principals.

3 96. Students need sufficient instructional time to master the State’s academic
4 program and obtain other essential skills and knowledge that come from a well-rounded education.

5 97. State experts have examined the curriculum and teaching methodologies and
6 determined the amount of instructional time necessary to reach proficiency on the material in the Math
7 and English Language Arts textbooks selected and approved by the State for grades K-8. For the early
8 primary grades, the recommended minimum instructional time in Math and English accounts for nearly
9 all the instructional time the State pays to provide – leaving little or no instructional time for Science,
10 Social Studies, Physical Education and other courses specifically required by State standards.

11 98. For English Learners – a quarter of California’s student population – the State
12 recommends additional instructional time to learn the required material. In early primary grades, if the
13 recommended minimum instructional time for English Learners for Math and English Language Arts
14 is added together, it exceeds the amount of instructional time the State pays to provide.

15 99. State funding policies are not designed to provide the amount of instructional
16 time the State itself deems necessary to become proficient in core academics, and funding amounts are
17 insufficient for this purpose.

18 100. The State has recently allowed for a reduction in the length of the school year,
19 which will result in even less instructional time for students in some districts. The decision to allow
20 for a reduced school year was based solely on budgetary concerns.

21 101. Many students must also deal with outdated materials while trying to meet
22 current education requirements. State funding policies and funding amounts fail to reflect the cost of
23 providing students with instructional materials and education technology consistent with teaching and
24 learning in the 21st century.

25 102. Even the cost of basic textbooks is not paid for by the State. The State has
26 implemented instructional material policies that require districts to periodically adopt and purchase
27 textbooks, but the State does not base instructional materials funding on any determination of the
28 actual costs of textbooks and supplemental materials. The State instructional materials program has

1 been consistently underfunded. The failure to provide funding that reflects the true cost of
2 instructional materials impedes the ability of districts to provide their students with current and
3 appropriate instructional materials.

4 State Funding Does Not Support Intervention Programs That Are Necessary to Provide All
5 Students An Opportunity to Attain Academic Proficiency

6 103. In order for all students to have an opportunity to achieve academic proficiency,
7 districts must provide supplemental and/or intervention programs that are tailored to the unique needs
8 of their students.

9 104. The current state education finance system does not account for differences in
10 student need or the cost of providing the supplemental and/or intervention programs necessary to
11 address these needs, such as programs aimed at students far below proficiency in English-Language
12 Arts and Math. As a result, districts lack sufficient funds to provide successful intervention programs
13 for all of their students who need them.

14 105. When students have access to focused intervention programs during the school
15 day, the lack of sufficient instructional time means that they are unable to receive instruction in other
16 critical academic areas. Since many intervention programs require additional time in English-
17 Language Arts and Math, the students in these programs are effectively denied instruction in Science,
18 Social Science and other core academic subjects.

19 106. Many districts have found after-school and summer programs to be effective
20 tools for improving student educational outcomes and providing some students additional instructional
21 and remedial time to reach proficiency. Chronic budget cuts and shortfalls and the lack of sufficient
22 general purpose funding have resulted in the elimination of many of these programs. Recent research
23 surveys show that high-poverty schools have been almost three times as likely as low-poverty schools
24 to eliminate summer school entirely.

25 107. Continuing education, alternative education, career technical education and
26 other non-traditional programs provide vital support for many students. However, State finance
27 policies and funding amounts prevent many districts from improving, expanding or even maintaining
28 these critical programs.

The Education Finance System Denies Students Necessary Support Services, Enrichment and Extracurricular Activities

108. Support services, enrichment and extracurricular activities are an integral, fundamental part of the education program, but erratic and insufficient State funding has reduced or eliminated these programs and services in many California schools.

109. There are not enough nurses available in California schools to provide basic health services for students. As a result of these shortages, non-medical administrative staff often must oversee medication and first aid administration.

110. In recent years, unstable and insufficient funding has forced districts to reduce the already inadequate number of academic and mental health counselors. As a consequence students do not have the necessary access to academic advice and counseling, basic mental health services and other services to reduce barriers to success and keep students in school.

111. Libraries and media centers provide essential access to the technology that students must master in order to effectively obtain, process and utilize information in the 21st century. Librarian and media specialist positions have been severely reduced or eliminated in most schools, leaving students virtually without instruction to develop these critical skills, and many media centers and computer labs are shut down completely because school districts lack the necessary funding to keep them open.

112. Though transportation is not required by the State, many districts must provide their students transportation services or, as a practical matter, the students will not be in school consistently and will be denied access to the education program. Districts receive funding for transportation that is in no way related to the costs, but instead is based upon an amount established in the 1980s. Adjustments to the funding have not kept pace with energy prices. Moreover, the funding amount is not connected to the enrollment growth or demographic changes that have occurred over the last 30 years. Neither the amount nor the distribution of transportation funding matches the needs of districts and their students.

113. The State has established content standards for visual and performing arts. Although courses in these subjects are often required for high school graduation, they are increasingly

1 being eliminated because of limited funding. School districts and schools that have retained these
2 programs have been increasingly forced to rely on parental contributions, auxiliary foundations or
3 other private fundraising to support them. The ability to raise the necessary funds varies among
4 districts, with economically disadvantaged districts facing greater challenges to retain these programs.
5 Schools in high-poverty communities have been much less likely to generate private funding, and, on
6 average, they have been less successful in passing parcel taxes, than schools in affluent communities.

7 114. Sports programs and other extracurricular activities have also been reduced over
8 the years. These programs are expected by parents and the community, and they are also often the
9 programs that help keep students engaged. Research has shown that students who participate in these
10 activities on a regular basis are more successful academically. Private contributions and fundraising
11 are being used to sustain these programs in some districts, with uneven results.

12 115. Career and Technical Education, also known as vocational education, can play
13 an important role in preparing students for employment outside of school. Many of these programs
14 have also been reduced or eliminated.

15 116. Programs such as Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB)
16 classes and Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) offer students opportunities to receive instruction
17 tailored to their academic needs and designed to help them fulfill their academic potential. State
18 funding for these programs is limited and has been shrinking over time.

19 The State Fails to Provide Sufficient Funding for the Programs Schools Must Implement

20 117. Funding for some key categorical programs does not reflect the actual cost of
21 providing the categorical program. Some expressly require district matching funds; unless districts
22 divert general purpose revenues to implement the programs, they receive no categorical funding for
23 them whatsoever. Categorical programs requiring substantial expenditures from district general
24 purpose funds include class size reduction, special education, instructional materials, transportation,
25 food services and deferred facilities maintenance, among others.

26 118. State support for each categorical program is also unpredictable from year to
27 year, as the State can and does frequently change rules and requirements for categorical program
28 qualification and reimbursement. Districts may thus have planned to qualify or be reimbursed for a

1 program, made expenditures or contractual commitments based on that plan, and then later receive less
2 funds than anticipated because of an intervening change to State rules.

3 119. The failure to provide full funding for categorical programs coincides with a
4 significant decline in districts' general purpose funding at the same time as programmatic expenses
5 have increased, particularly the costs of salaries and benefits for certificated (teaching) staff and non-
6 certified staff.

7 120. The State education finance system also fails to reflect the costs of a number of
8 federal programs and services which districts are legally required to implement. Although the State
9 requires district compliance with all federal requirements as a condition of the State's receipt of federal
10 funds, most federal mandates do not provide sufficient funding to pay for the required program or
11 service. The State has not provided additional funding necessary to allow districts to meet these costs.
12 Instead, the amount of the shortfall must be absorbed by districts.

13 121. While additional flexibility for some categorical spending was provided with the
14 most recent budget actions, the limited additional flexibility cannot offset the nearly \$17 billion
15 combined reduction in general purpose and categorical funding that resulted from those budget actions.
16 Despite the changes in programmatic requirements related to specific categorical programs (such as the
17 purchase of newly adopted instructional materials), districts are neither exempt from the State's
18 accountability system nor their obligation to provide all students an education that meets the academic
19 standards set by the State. Nor have any permanent changes been made to the funding system. The
20 new flexibility is temporary and is scheduled to expire in 2012-13 – at that point, districts will incur
21 significant costs to reestablish programs and services with no guarantee of sufficient funding to cover
22 those costs.

23 122. In addition to categorical requirements, the State has imposed dozens of
24 requirements for new programs and services.

25 123. Though the State is legally required to pay school districts for the costs of any
26 state-mandated programs or services, it has nonetheless refused to do so. Since 2002, the State has
27 appropriated only \$1,000 per program and "deferred" the balance owed to districts, now almost
28 \$3.6 billion.

1 Budget Instability and Irrational State Requirements Further Render the System Dysfunctional

2 124. The instability and unpredictability of state education funding makes budgeting
3 and long-range planning at the district level virtually impossible. Districts are effectively prevented
4 from implementing the comprehensive educational program adopted by the State with any continuity
5 from year to year and grade to grade.

6 125. Districts are required to adopt their budgets by July 1 of each year, but the State
7 Legislature typically does not adopt the state budget until later – sometimes months later. (Ed. Code,
8 § 42127.) Districts must therefore prepare their budgets each year without having any reliable idea
9 what funds they will actually receive from the State or what restrictions may be imposed on those
10 funds. This makes coherent planning for ongoing programs and services impossible.

11 126. Even in a good year, districts can only make estimates about their state funding.
12 If the state budget is late, or if mid-year cuts are imposed (as they have been in the last several years),
13 budgeting and management problems are compounded. Over the last several years, many districts
14 have had to develop multiple budgets each school year with different revenue, expenditure and
15 program assumptions, creating uncertainty for programs and staff.

16 127. The timing and unpredictability of the budget, coupled with additional State
17 personnel rules, disrupts classroom instruction and prevents continuity in instructional programs. A
18 district is required to provide teacher layoff notices by March 15, and make final termination decisions
19 by May 15. (Ed. Code, §§ 44949, 44955.) Because districts cannot predict their revenues with any
20 certainty, they must assume the worst case budget scenario and notify more teachers than might be
21 necessary that they may lose their jobs. In March 2009, roughly 26,000 teachers were notified that
22 they might not be retained; in March 2010, the number was approximately 22,000. Districts lay off
23 more teachers than they have to because of uncertain and unreliable budget projections, but end up
24 rehiring many of the laid-off teachers as temporary employees at the beginning of the next school year.

25 128. This process is devastating to school districts, their teachers and students. For
26 teachers who receive pink slips there are months of uncertainty, which leads some to leave the district
27 in search of a more financially-stable district and others to leave the profession all together. For those
28 teachers that are terminated and later rehired as temporary staff, they lose significant job security.

1 Teacher morale is adversely affected; high levels of teacher turnover frustrate the continuity of
2 teaching and learning and lead to poor outcomes for students. Even if the district is later able to rehire
3 teachers after the State has adopted a budget and the district has revised its budget, those teachers have
4 lost valuable time over the summer to prepare for the upcoming academic year.

5 129. The instability created by the State's budget process and related personnel rules
6 also exacerbates the inequitable distribution of experienced teachers. Districts with higher revenues
7 per student and/or more relative financial stability are able to recruit more experienced teachers and
8 other staff away from districts with lower revenues per student or less stability.

9 130. In response to chronic under-funding, many districts have attempted to levy
10 parcel taxes in order to provide basic education programs and services for their students. However, the
11 availability and success of parcel tax funding is uneven throughout the State and limited in scope.
12 Districts also resort to private fundraising for programs threatened with elimination, such as art, music
13 or sports. Others have formed auxiliary foundations to raise additional funds or obtain donations of
14 equipment or other resources. Funding from outside sources has steadily increased in recent years, and
15 has become increasingly necessary just to provide basic programs and services. The ability to raise the
16 necessary funds varies among districts, with economically disadvantaged districts facing greater
17 challenges to retain these programs.

18 Budget Cuts Have Made An Already Dire Situation Even Worse

19 131. Budget cuts over the last several years have created a true fiscal crisis for public
20 schools.

21 132. Public education has suffered a combination of on-going cuts, one-time cuts and
22 funding deferrals in recent years, and these reductions have differing impacts on the K-12 education
23 program over time.

24 133. The LAO estimates that the K-12 programmatic funding provided in 2007-08
25 was \$49.7 billion after accounting for deferrals and other one-time funding sources. Adjusted for
26 COLA and growth, the State would have had to spend \$52.6 billion in 2008-09 and \$54.6 billion
27 in 2009-10 to maintain the education programs and services provided in 2007-08. Instead, the state
28 provided programmatic spending of \$47.9 billion in 2008-09 and \$42.4 billion in 2009-10. The 2008-

1 09 reduction is \$4.8 billion, or more than \$800 per student. In 2009-10 that is a cut of \$12.1 billion,
2 which is over \$2,000 per student. Over the last two budgets, the cumulative impact of the cuts is
3 nearly \$17 billion.

4 134. One-time federal “stimulus” funds have somewhat mitigated the impact of
5 recent budget cuts, but these funds will expire in 2011-12. The level of education cuts will grow if, as
6 is likely, the state is not able to restore state funding when the one-time federal stimulus funding ends.

7 135. The cumulative effect of the State’s recent budget cuts has led to massive
8 disruptions to core programs and services and has effectively denied many students meaningful access
9 to the State’s comprehensive educational program. In particular, the budget cuts have forced districts
10 to take drastic measures, including the following:

- 11 • lay off thousands of teachers, resulting in larger class sizes in all grades and
12 courses;
- 13 • eliminate or dramatically reduce badly needed intervention programs, including
14 summer and after-school programs, for students unable to demonstrate
15 proficiency in standards-based assessments of core academic subjects or at risk
16 for failing the High School Exit Exam;
- 17 • eliminate or significantly reduce course offerings, particularly electives such as
18 art, music and athletic programs;
- 19 • delay and reduce purchases of essential instructional materials, computers and
20 other educational resources;
- 21 • make draconian cuts to non-teaching staff – including school counselors,
22 librarians, nurses, assistant principals, computer lab technicians, instructional
23 aides, custodians and secretaries – resulting in elimination of critical support
24 services for students;
- 25 • eliminate virtually all training and support for principals and teachers, including
26 teachers in core academic subject areas;
- 27 • defer needed facilities maintenance resulting in undesirable learning
28 environments and increased future costs; and

- significantly reduce budget reserves leaving districts unprepared to cope with any future uncertainties or emergencies.

136. Simply remaining fiscally solvent is now a major challenge for school districts.

State statutes require school districts to annually certify their finances, and certification ratings indicate the status of a district's fiscal health. A "qualified" or "negative" certification rating indicates that a district is threatened with financial instability or insolvency. In 1997-98, the finances of eight districts were certified as "qualified" or "negative." In 2009-10, that number jumped to 162. That number is expected to continue to grow as the State implements further cuts to education funding.

The State Has Been Given Clear Notice that the Current Funding System is Harming Students

137. Education finance plays a crucial – indeed, indispensable – role in determining the quality of education. As the California Supreme Court recognized more than thirty years ago, “[t]here is a distinct relationship between cost and the quality of educational opportunities afforded . . . differences in dollars do produce differences in pupil achievement.” (*Serrano v. Priest* (1976) 18 Cal.3d 728, 748.)

138. The relationship between funding and the ability to provide educational resources based on student needs is not abstract. California's per-pupil funding is among the lowest in the nation, while California's employment market imposes significantly higher than average personnel costs. Teachers and other educators are the most essential components of a successful school system, therefore personnel costs are the largest portion of school district budgets. When these factors of low funding and high costs are considered together, it is clear that California operates one of the most severely under-resourced school systems in the country.

139. The State has been well aware of the significant problems caused by its failure to address fundamental problems with its educational finance system, but has failed to act.

140. Most recently, in 2005, the “Getting Down to Facts” project was commissioned by the Governor’s Committee, the Secretary of Education, the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the legislative leadership. This project was led by Stanford University and included research by scholars from 32 institutions. Based on research conducted between September 2005 and March 2007,

1 the report succinctly summarized a critical problem: “Quite simply, the finance and governance
2 system is broken and requires fundamental reform . . .”

3 141. The “Getting Down to Facts” studies also concluded that “[t]he state school
4 finance system is extraordinarily complex and has no coherent conceptual basis . . . That is, it is not
5 intentionally designed for meeting state education goals or meeting student needs.”

6 142. The Governor’s Committee also observed that the State’s finance system “[d]oes
7 not ensure that sufficient resources reach students according to their needs” and that “more funding is
8 needed to meet the needs of students, particularly those who have been underserved by the system to
9 date. . . . Our current system is not equitable; it is not efficient; and it is not sufficient for students who
10 face the greatest challenges.” In particular, the reports to the Governor’s Committee confirmed that
11 districts with high percentages of economically disadvantaged students and English Learners do not
12 have sufficient funds to reach the same student performance levels as other districts. Budget cuts since
13 that Report have resulted in less, not more, funding.

14 143. In January 2008, Superintendent of Public Education Jack O’Connell released a
15 report from his P-16 Council entitled “Closing The Achievement Gap,” which concluded: “Access to
16 high-quality educational experience is the right of every student and the responsibility of the state.
17 Today, the State of California has not lived up to this commitment for all students, particularly poor,
18 racial/ethnic minority students; English learners; and students with disabilities.” The Report confirmed
19 that “huge disparities in achievement exist among California’s student subgroups” and that “[a]lthough
20 California maintains some of the highest standards in the nation for what students are expected to
21 know and be able to do, its schools are significantly underfunded.”

22 144. The LAO issued a 2009 report demonstrating the disconnect between the State’s
23 educational aspirations and the reality, stating that: “California’s existing approach for helping these
24 [economically disadvantaged] students fails on virtually every score,” and observing that the State
25 approach “[d]oes not link funding to the prevalence and severity of academic barriers and the cost of
26 overcoming them” and “[i]s neither centered around improving academic achievement nor well-
27 integrated into the state’s overall accountability system.”

1 145. In sum, the State has long been on notice that fundamental change to its
2 educational finance system and funding policies are necessary to guarantee that all students in
3 California have equal access to the State's prescribed educational program and an equal opportunity to
4 meet the proficiency standards set by the State, but has failed to take action.

5 On-Going Constitutional Violations Require Judicial Action

6 146. Article I, sections 7(a) and 7(b); article IV, section 16(a); article IX, sections 1,
7 5, and 6; and article XVI, section 8 of the California Constitution establish that all school-aged
8 children of the State of California have the fundamental right to a free education in a "system of
9 common schools" that provides a "general diffusion of knowledge and intelligence essential to the
10 preservation of the rights and liberties of the people." The right to a free education must be provided
11 on an equal basis to all children, permitting all children the opportunity to develop the skills and
12 capacities necessary to achieve economic and social success in our competitive society, participate
13 meaningfully in political and community life, and to become informed citizens and productive
14 members of society.

15 147. The operation of the public system of education is a matter of state concern.
16 Notwithstanding the delegation of various responsibilities to local school officials, the State has a non-
17 delegable duty to keep up and support the system of common schools required by article IX and to first
18 set aside from all state revenues the money necessary for the support of the public school system as
19 required by article XVI, section 8(a) of the California Constitution.

20 148. The State has a duty to provide a system of common schools in which the
21 constituent parts are aligned with each other and operate harmoniously and with a unity of purpose.
22 Having developed a comprehensive education program with specific academic standards "based on the
23 knowledge and skills that pupils will need in order to succeed in the information-based, global
24 economy of the 21st century," the State has a duty to develop and implement a funding system that
25 supports the education program and allows districts to deliver the required course of study. State
26 funding must support a system of common schools that provides all students an opportunity to progress
27 from grade to grade and reach proficiency in the State's academic standards. The State has breached
28 this duty to keep up and support the system of public schools.

1 149. The State has made funding for public education in California overwhelmingly,
2 reliant on state monies and state-determined allocations of local property tax revenues apportioned in
3 accordance with state-created funding formulas. These funding formulas are based on historical
4 benchmarks that are unrelated to the actual costs of providing the state-required educational program.
5 The current funding formulas and the ways in which those funds are distributed to districts fail to
6 ensure that districts can, in fact, provide the programs and services that the State requires the districts
7 to provide for all students.

8 150. The State has prescribed the contents of the current educational program and
9 devised an accountability system that holds school districts accountable for ensuring that students
10 reach proficiency on the State's content standards. But the State has failed to provide funding in an
11 amount or through distribution mechanisms that allow districts to provide the required academic
12 program. Chronic under-funding is a primary cause of numerous programmatic and operational
13 deficiencies, including the following:

- 14 • Districts cannot maintain appropriate teacher-student ratios and appropriate class
15 sizes;
- 16 • Districts are unable to offer sufficient instructional minutes in core academic
17 subject courses and necessary preparatory classes to all students, including the
18 additional instructional time necessary for English Learners;
- 19 • Districts cannot recruit and retain sufficient numbers of qualified teachers,
20 particularly for hard-to-staff subjects such as Mathematics, Science and Special
21 Education;
- 22 • Districts cannot operate long-term quality professional development programs
23 and utilize mentor teachers so as to properly train and monitor teachers in all
24 classrooms;
- 25 • Districts cannot design and implement necessary intervention and remedial
26 programs which require long-term planning and continuity in order to be
27 effective;

- Districts cannot provide all students appropriate instructional materials, including access to computers and educational technology, to effectively communicate and deliver course content;
- Districts cannot design and maintain safe, secure and clean school environments conducive to learning; and
- Districts must constantly juggle and frequently cut back core, enrichment and intervention programs, leading to discontinuity in these programs and in student progress from one year to the next.

9 151. The State's failure to fulfill its constitutional duty to establish a functional
10 system of common schools, with funding that supports the educational program, denies California's
11 children their fundamental right to an education.

12 152. The California Constitution prohibits the maintenance and operation of the
13 common public school system in a way that denies basic educational equality to any students. The
14 insufficient, irrational and unstable aspects of the State's funding system prevent districts from
15 effectively delivering the required educational program, an impact that falls disproportionately on
16 economically disadvantaged students, racial or ethnic minority students, English Learners, and students
17 with disabilities. Districts are prevented from implementing programs and services based on student
18 needs, which denies students equal access to the educational program and an equal opportunity to learn
19 the content prescribed in State-established standards. Having set a prevailing statewide standard for
20 education by requiring proficiency in meeting the State-established content standards, the State also
21 bears the responsibility for ensuring that all students have access to an education that provides them
22 with an opportunity to attain proficiency in meeting the required standards. The State has failed in this
23 duty.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

25 (By Plaintiff/Intervenor Against Defendants for Violation of Sections 1 and 5 of Article IX of the
26 California Constitution: Duty to Provide and Support the System of Common Schools)

27 1. Plaintiff/Intervenor incorporates by reference the foregoing paragraphs of this
28 Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

2. Defendants have violated their duty under sections 1 and 5 of article IX of the California Constitution to “provide for a system of common schools” that is “kept up and supported” by the State using “all suitable means.”

3. Defendants have violated their constitutional duty to provide and support the “system of common schools” by failing to provide and sufficiently fund an education finance system that is intentionally, rationally and demonstrably aligned with the goals and objectives of the State’s prescribed educational program and the costs of ensuring that all children of all needs have the opportunity to become proficient according to the State’s academic standards and the opportunity to develop the skills and capacities necessary to achieve economic and social success in our competitive society, participate meaningfully in political and community life and to become informed citizens and productive members of society.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(By Plaintiff/Intervenor Against Defendants for Violation of Sections 1 and 5 of Article IX of the California Constitution: The Fundamental Right to Education)

4. Plaintiff/Intervenor incorporates by reference the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

5. By failing to keep up and support public education, Defendants have violated the fundamental right of all California children to a free education that provides a “general diffusion of knowledge and intelligence essential to the preservation of the rights and liberties of the people,” ensures the opportunity to become proficient according to the State’s academic standards and ensures the opportunity to develop the skills and capacities necessary to achieve economic and social success in our competitive society, participate meaningfully in political and community life and to become informed citizens and productive members of society.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(By Plaintiff/Intervenor Against Defendants for Violation of Sections 7(a) and 7(b) of Article I and Section 16 of Article IV of the California Constitution: Equal Protection of the Laws)

6. Plaintiff/Intervenor incorporates by reference the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

7. Defendants have violated sections 7(a) and 7(b) of article I and section 16 of article IV of the California Constitution by failing to provide and support an education finance system that provides all California school children equal access to the State's prescribed educational program and an equal educational opportunity to become proficient in the State's academic standards.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(By Plaintiff/Intervenor Against Defendants for Violation of Section 8(a) of Article XVI of the California Constitution: The Duty to “First Set Apart”)

8. Plaintiff/Intervenor incorporates by reference the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

9. By failing to intentionally and rationally determine and provide the amount of funding necessary to support the State's prescribed education program and the education needs of all students, Defendants have violated their duty under section 8(a) of article XVI of the California Constitution to ensure that from each year's State revenues there shall "first be set apart the moneys to be applied by the State for support of the public school system."

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff/Intervenor respectfully requests the following relief:

1. The issuance of declaratory judgment as follows:

a. Article I, sections 7(a) and 7(b); article IV, section 16(a); and article IX, sections 1, 5 and 6 of the California Constitution establish that all school-aged children of the State of California have the fundamental right to a free education in a “system of common schools” that provides a “general diffusion of knowledge and intelligence [] essential to the preservation of the rights and liberties of the people.” The “system of common schools” shall be open to all children on an equal basis and shall permit all children the opportunity to develop the skills and capacities necessary to achieve economic and social success in our competitive society, participate meaningfully in political and community life and to become informed citizens and productive members of society;

b. Article IX, sections 1, 5 and 6 and article XVI, section 8 of the California Constitution impose a duty on the State of California to ensure that the “system of common schools” is “kept up and supported” using “all suitable means.” and to first set apart the revenues

necessary to achieve this purpose and support the education program the State has prescribed pursuant to its constitutional authority;

c. Article I, sections 7(a) and 7(b); article IV, section 16(a); and article IX, sections 1, 5 and 6 of the California Constitution impose upon the State of California the duty to provide and support an education finance system that provides all children with equal access to the State's prescribed educational program and an equal educational opportunity to become proficient in the State's academic standards and develop the skills and capacities necessary to achieve economic and social success in our competitive society, participate meaningfully in political and community life and to become informed citizens and productive members of society;

d. The State of California has failed to meet its constitutional duty to keep up and support a “system of common schools” because it does not provide and sufficiently fund an educational finance system that is intentionally, rationally and demonstrably aligned with the goals and objectives of the State’s prescribed educational program and the costs of ensuring that all children of all needs have the opportunity to become proficient according to the State’s academic standards and to develop the skills and capacities necessary to achieve economic and social success in our competitive society, participate meaningfully in political and community life and to become informed citizens and productive members of society;

e. The State of California has failed to meet its constitutional duty to first set apart sufficient financial resources to ensure that all schools and school districts of the State can provide the prescribed education program to all school-aged children in the State; and

f. The State of California has failed to meet its constitutional duty to provide and support an educational finance system that provides all children equal access to the State's prescribed educational program and an equal educational opportunity to become proficient in the State's academic standards.

2. Enter a permanent injunction compelling the Defendants to design, enact, fund and implement a system of public school finance:

a. That is intentionally, rationally and demonstrably aligned with the goals and objectives of the State's prescribed educational program and the costs of ensuring that all children

1 of all needs have equal access to the State's prescribed educational program and an equal educational opportunity to become proficient in the State's academic standards and develop the skills and capacities necessary to achieve economic and social success in our competitive society, participate meaningfully in political and community life and to become informed citizens and productive members of society; and

6 b. That provides all school-aged children with equal access to the State's prescribed educational program and an equal educational opportunity to become proficient in the State's prescribed academic content standards.

9 3. Retain continuing jurisdiction over this matter until such time as the Court has 10 determined that the defendants have fully and properly fulfilled its orders.

11 4. An award of costs, disbursements and reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses 12 pursuant to section 1021.5 of the California Code of Civil Procedure and any other applicable 13 provision of law.

14 5. Such other relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

15
16 Dated: July 15, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

17 Karen Getman
18 Margaret R. Prinzing
19 REMCHO, JOHANSEN & PURCELL, LLP

20 By: 
21 Karen Getman

22 Attorneys for Plaintiff/Intervenor
23 California Teachers Association

24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury that:

I am a citizen of the United States, over the age of 18, and not a party to the within cause or action. My business address is 201 Dolores Avenue, San Leandro, CA 94577.

On July 15, 2010, I served a true copy of the following document(s):

[Proposed] Complaint in Intervention

on the following party(ies) in said action:

William F. Abrams
Sandra C. Zuniga
Bingham McCutchen LLP
1900 University Avenue
East Palo Alto, CA 94303-2223
Phone: (650) 849-4400
Fax: (650) 849-4800
Email: william.abrams@bingham.com

Attorneys for Individual Plaintiffs

William S. Koski
Youth and Education Law Project
Mills Legal Clinic, Stanford Law School
559 Nathan Abbott Way
Stanford, CA 94305
Phone: (650) 724-3718
Fax: (650) 723-4426
Email: bkoski@law.stanford.edu

Deborah B. Caplan
Joshua R. Daniels
Olson Hagel & Fishburn LLP
555 Capitol Mall, Suite 1425
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 442-2952
Fax: (916) 442-1280
Email: Deborah@olsonhagel.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs CSBA/ELA, ACSA,
California State PTA, and Districts*

Abbas Hajela
1201 "K" Street, Suite 710
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 669-5404
Fax: (877) 842-3453
Email: abeh@sia-us.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs CSBA, ACSA, and
California State PTA*

1 Edmund G. Brown Jr.
2 Attorney General of California
3 Douglas M. Press
4 Senior Assistant Attorney General
5 Ismael A. Castro
6 Supervising Deputy Attorney General
7 1300 I Street, Suite 125
8 PO Box 944255
9 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550
10 Telephone: (916) 323-8203
11 Facsimile: (916) 324-5567
12 Email: Ismael.Castro@doj.ca.gov

13 *Attorneys for Defendants/Respondents*

14 **BY UNITED STATES MAIL:** By enclosing the document(s) in a sealed envelope or
15 package addressed to the person(s) at the address above and
16 depositing the sealed envelope with the United States Postal Service, with the
17 postage fully prepaid.
18 placing the envelope for collection and mailing, following our ordinary business
19 practices. I am readily familiar with the businesses' practice for collecting and
20 processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is
21 placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business
22 with the United States Postal Service, located in San Leandro, California, in a
23 sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid.
24 **BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY:** By enclosing the document(s) in an envelope or
25 package provided by an overnight delivery carrier and addressed to the persons at the
26 addresses listed. I placed the envelope or package for collection and overnight delivery at
27 an office or a regularly utilized drop box of the overnight delivery carrier.
28 **BY MESSENGER SERVICE:** By placing the document(s) in an envelope or package
29 addressed to the persons at the addresses listed and providing them to a professional
30 messenger service for service.
31 **BY FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION:** By faxing the document(s) to the persons at the
32 fax numbers listed based on an agreement of the parties to accept service by fax
33 transmission. No error was reported by the fax machine used. A copy of the fax
34 transmission is maintained in our files.
35 **BY EMAIL TRANSMISSION:** By emailing the document(s) to the persons at the email
36 addresses listed based on a court order or an agreement of the parties to accept service by
37 email. No electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful
38 was received within a reasonable time after the transmission.

39 I declare, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on
40
41 July 15, 2010, in San Leandro, California.

42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
8010
8011
8012
8013
8014
8015
8016
8017
8018
8019
8020
8021
8022
8023
8024
8025
8026
8027
8028
8029
8030
8031
8032
8033
8034
8035
8036
8037
8038
8039
8040
8041
8042
8043
8044
8045
8046
8047
8048
8049
8050
8051
8052
8053
8054
8055
8056
8057
8058
8059
8060
8061
8062
8063
8064
8065
8066
8067
8068
8069
8070
8071
8072
8073
8074
8075
8076
8077
8078
8079
8080
8081
8082
8083
8084
8085
8086
8087
8088
8089
8090
8091
8092
8093
8094
8095
8096
8097
8098
8099
80100
80101
80102
80103
80104
80105
80106
80107
80108
80109
80110
80111
80112
80113
80114
80115
80116
80117
80118
80119
80120
80121
80122
80123
80124
80125
80126
80127
80128
80129
80130
80131
80132
80133
80134
80135
80136
80137
80138
80139
80140
80141
80142
80143
80144
80145
80146
80147
80148
80149
80150
80151
80152
80153
80154
80155
80156
80157
80158
80159
80160
80161
80162
80163
80164
80165
80166
80167
80168
80169
80170
80171
80172
80173
80174
80175
80176
80177
80178
80179
80180
80181
80182
80183
80184
80185
80186
80187
80188
80189
80190
80191
80192
80193
80194
80195
80196
80197
80198
80199
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229
80230
80231
80232
80233
80234
80235
80236
80237
80238
80239
80240
80241
80242
80243
80244
80245
80246
80247
80248
80249
80250
80251
80252
80253
80254
80255
80256
80257
80258
80259
80260
80261
80262
80263
80264
80265
80266
80267
80268
80269
80270
80271
80272
80273
80274
80275
80276
80277
80278
80279
80280
80281
80282
80283
80284
80285
80286
80287
80288
80289
80290
80291
80292
80293
80294
80295
80296
80297
80298
80299
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229
80230
80231
80232
80233
80234
80235
80236
80237
80238
80239
80240
80241
80242
80243
80244
80245
80246
80247
80248
80249
80250
80251
80252
80253
80254
80255
80256
80257
80258
80259
80260
80261
80262
80263
80264
80265
80266
80267
80268
80269
80270
80271
80272
80273
80274
80275
80276
80277
80278
80279
80280
80281
80282
80283
80284
80285
80286
80287
80288
80289
80290
80291
80292
80293
80294
80295
80296
80297
80298
80299
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229
80230
80231
80232
80233
80234
80235
80236
80237
80238
80239
80240
80241
80242
80243
80244
80245
80246
80247
80248
80249
80250
80251
80252
80253
80254
80255
80256
80257
80258
80259
80260
80261
80262
80263
80264
80265
80266
80267
80268
80269
80270
80271
80272
80273
80274
80275
80276
80277
80278
80279
80280
80281
80282
80283
80284
80285
80286
80287
80288
80289
80290
80291
80292
80293
80294
80295
80296
80297
80298
80299
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229
80230
80231
80232
80233
80234
80235
80236
80237
80238
80239
80240
80241
80242
80243
80244
80245
80246
80247
80248
80249
80250
80251
80252
80253
80254
80255
80256
80257
80258
80259
80260
80261
80262
80263
80264
80265
80266
80267
80268
80269
80270
80271
80272
80273
80274
80275
80276
80277
80278
80279
80280
80281
80282
80283
80284
80285
80286
80287
80288
80289
80290
80291
80292
80293
80294
80295
80296
80297
80298
80299
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229
80230
80231
80232
80233
80234
80235
80236
80237
80238
80239
80240
80241
80242
80243
80244
80245
80246
80247
80248
80249
80250
80251
80252
80253
80254
80255
80256
80257
80258
80259
80260
80261
80262
80263
80264
80265
80266
80267
80268
80269
80270
80271
80272
80273
80274
80275
80276
80277
80278
80279
80280
80281
80282
80283
80284
80285
80286
80287
80288
80289
80290
80291
80292
80293
80294
80295
80296
80297
80298
80299
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229
80230
80231
80232
80233
80234
80235
80236
80237
80238
80239
80240
80241
80242
80243
80244
80245
80246
80247
80248
80249
80250
80251
80252
80253
80254
80255
80256
80257
80258
80259
80260
80261
80262
80263
80264
80265
80266
80267
80268
80269
80270
80271
80272
80273
80274
80275
80276
80277
80278
80279
80280
80281
80282
80283
80284
80285
80286
80287
80288
80289
80290
80291
80292
80293
80294
80295
80296
80297
80298
80299
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229
80230
80231
80232
80233
80234
80235
80236
80237
80238
80239
80240
80241
80242
80243
80244
80245
80246
80247
80248
80249
80250
80251
80252
80253
80254
80255
80256
80257
80258
80259
80260
80261
80262
80263
80264
80265
80266
80267
80268
80269
80270
80271
80272
80273
80274
80275
80276
80277
80278
80279
80280
80281
80282
80283
80284
80285
80286
80287
80288
80289
80290
80291
80292
80293
80294
80295
80296
80297
80298
80299
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229