



# **NO BANG FOR THE NEW TAX BUCK**

The Many Flaws of Proposition 88

By Lance T. Izumi & Rachel Chaney



# **NO BANG FOR THE NEW TAX BUCK**

The Many Flaws of Proposition 88

By Lance T. Izumi & Rachel Chaney

## **NO BANG FOR THE NEW TAX BUCK**

The Many Flaws of Proposition 88

By Lance T. Izumi & Rachel Chaney

October 2006

Pacific Research Institute  
755 Sansome Street, Suite 450  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Tel: 415/989-0833 | 800/276-7600  
Fax: 415/989-2411  
Email: [info@pacificresearch.org](mailto:info@pacificresearch.org)

Additional printed copies of this study may be purchased by contacting PRI at the addresses above, or download the pdf version at [www.pacificresearch.org](http://www.pacificresearch.org).

Nothing contained in this briefing is to be construed as necessarily reflecting the views of the Pacific Research Institute or as an attempt to thwart or aid passage of any legislation.

©2006 Pacific Research Institute. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or otherwise, without prior written consent of the publisher.

## **CONTENTS**

- 2** Introduction
- 4** Overview of Prop. 88
- 8** Fiscal Problems
- 14** Education Problems
- 24** Conclusion:  
Fiscally and Educationally Flawed
- 26** Endnotes
- 28** About the Authors
- 32** About the Pacific Research Institute

## **INTRODUCTION**

**Proposition 88**, the “Classroom Learning and Accountability Act” on the November 7 ballot, embodies the timeworn trope from the education bureaucracy: Increased government spending on public education will improve the system and produce better results. The initiative would impose a statewide parcel tax on every property owner in California, and funnel the revenue into programs in five different areas of education. State Superintendent of Public Instruction Jack O’Connell, one of the main supporters of Prop. 88, argues, “I think people still want to invest in public education, they want to invest in the future, and they want to invest in programs that work.”<sup>1</sup>

O’Connell’s sentiments may be correct, but the key question is whether Prop. 88 will ensure effective investment. Overall, government spending on education in California is running at record levels. The recently approved 2006-2007 state budget allocates \$55.1 billion to education — by far the largest part of the budget. That amount represents a 17-percent increase over state education spending just two years earlier. If local and federal tax dollars are added to state funding, then \$11,264 is spent per pupil per year in California, an increase of more than \$2,000 over per-pupil annual spending in 2002-2003.

To pay for all of this government spending, California levies some of the highest taxes in America. For example, the state has the nation’s highest top income tax rate and one of the highest sales tax rates.

Given the massive hikes in education spending and the high taxes already imposed on Californians, will the money raised by Prop. 88’s new statewide parcel tax make a difference in the performance of California’s schools and students? And is the tax itself equitable?

**OVERVIEW OF PROP. 88**

**Should Prop. 88 pass,** it will impose a \$50 statewide parcel tax on every property owner, effective July 1, 2007. It would be the first such tax in California since 1910 and the only statewide property tax of any kind in California (property taxes are currently levied at the local level). The estimated revenue for the state of California would be approximately \$450 million annually, which would be used to increase spending for specific areas of California's K-12 education system.

The proposition calls for a regressive flat tax on all property holders in the state. Parcels would be defined broadly as "any unit of real property in the State that receives a separate tax bill for ad valorem property taxes."<sup>2</sup> In addition to traditional homes and businesses, this definition would include possessory interests such as boat slips and weeklong time-share ownership. The only exemptions from the parcel tax would go to seniors and severely and permanently disabled persons who currently reside on their property and already qualify for a homeowner's exemption.

Prop. 88 centers on the shaky premise that increased government spending is necessary to improve student achievement. It is intended to augment, not replace, current education spending. The money raised from Prop. 88 would be directed to a Classroom Learning and Accountability Fund within the state Treasury. The legislature would then distribute the money to school districts statewide on a per-student basis. The breakdown of the distribution would be as follows, assuming sufficient funds:

- \$175 million for class-size reduction
- \$100 million for textbooks and instructional materials
- \$100 million for the safety and security of students and teachers

- \$85 million for academic success facility grants
- \$10 million to create and sustain an “integrated longitudinal teacher and pupil achievement data system”

The proposition would set aside no more than two-tenths of 1 percent of collected revenues each year to distribute to counties to defray the costs of implementing the legislation. School districts would be held accountable for expenditures through a yearly independent audit that would be reviewed by the county superintendent and the superintendent of public instruction. This attempt at accountability is, however, limited. Prop. 88 does not require empirical evidence that increased government spending raises student performance, a key claim of its backers.

**FISCAL PROBLEMS**

**Prop. 88** is an extremely flawed piece of legislation. It sets dangerous fiscal precedents, it is poorly conceived, and it is unlikely to achieve its goal of improving California education. From a purely fiscal perspective, Prop. 88 poses the following problems:

## It Is Regressive

Prop. 88 assesses a flat \$50 tax on every parcel in the state of California. It is therefore a regressive tax, putting a disproportionate burden on lower-income people. Because the amount is fixed, individuals whose properties have less value would see a larger percentage increase in their yearly property tax than individuals whose properties have a higher value. For example, the owner of a small apartment who paid a yearly property tax of \$500 would see a tax increase of 10 percent. A millionaire with a large home who paid a yearly tax of \$5,000, on the other hand, would face an increase of only one percent.

The fixed-rate increase would create greater difficulties for low-income individuals, and would go almost unnoticed by big businesses and wealthy landowners. Millionaires and large businesses would be charged the same amount as struggling homeowners and small family businesses. This is an unfair system of taxation that would place an undue burden on low-income Californians who are already facing high taxes.

## It Undermines Proposition 13

In 1978, Californians passed Prop. 13 to shield property owners from egregious tax increases and to protect retirees and others with fixed incomes from being forced to sell their properties due to rising tax rates. Through Prop. 13, California voters put a cap on property taxes at one percent of the value of the property at time of purchase, plus limited increases to account for inflation. To alter property taxes, counties must achieve a two-thirds majority vote. Prop. 88 attacks the protections for property owners established by Prop. 13.

Prop. 88 also sets a dangerous precedent by creating an additional property tax. Should it pass, it would be only a matter of time before new taxes

were added that could easily erase the security provided by Prop. 13. Levying a statewide property tax, particularly a regressive one, threatens to reverse the hard-won achievements of Prop. 13. Most important, because Prop. 88 is a statewide proposal, it circumvents the two-thirds majority vote rule implemented in Prop. 13, and requires instead only a simple majority to pass.

## It Shifts Power to the State Level

Property taxes have traditionally been levied at the local level, and Prop. 88 would set another dangerous precedent by shifting the power of raising revenue away from local governments to the state of California. This would deprive local communities of a voice in the distribution of their residents' money — and communities that paid the parcel tax might not see their tax dollars reinvested in their own school systems, but instead distributed across the state. Communities would also lose a voice in the allocation of funds because only specific areas of education are eligible to receive Prop. 88 funding.

## It Creates Significant Record-keeping Problems for Counties

Prop. 88 exempts senior citizens and severely and permanently disabled persons who live on their property and are eligible for homeowner's exemptions. County assessors track those who receive a homeowner's exemption, but their records do not include all those who are eligible. Similarly, assessors do not have records of the age of property owners, and would therefore have to create a

new application form that would require significant documentation.<sup>3</sup> Even if they already had a homeowner's exemption, individuals would have to apply separately for a parcel tax exemption, and would have to provide paperwork to prove their age or disability. This would be time-consuming for individuals, and create extra paperwork and bureaucracy for county governments.

The exemptions could also create complications for own-your-own and cooperative developments, where a single tax bill is often issued for owners to divide among themselves. In this case, if one of the owners were eligible for exemption, it is unclear how the parcel tax would be handled. This, too, would create additional work for county governments.

## It Includes Possessory Interests and Time-shares in Its Taxable Parcels

Prop. 88 defines a "parcel" as any property that receives a separate tax bill. This definition would include possessory interests such as boat slips or fairground concessionaire stations. Because no minimum value of properties to be taxed is set, some owners might see their tax bills double. For example, according to the president of the California Assessors' Association, more than 5,000 boat-slip owners in Los Angeles receive tax bills of \$50. Should Prop. 88 pass these individuals would have a bill of \$100 — an increase of 100 percent.

Time-shares would pose another potential problem. In some counties each time-share owner is given a separate property tax bill, which would mean that each one-week shareholder would be responsible for the \$50 parcel tax. In this

case, an individual unit could generate up to \$2,600, and a time-share owner would pay the extra \$50 for only one week of ownership. Other counties, however, bill the time-share association as a single unit. In these counties, each time-share would generate a total of \$50.<sup>4</sup>

## It Sets Aside Insufficient Funds for Counties to Implement Its Requirements

The problems presented above would create significant challenges for county assessors. Yet Prop. 88 sets aside only 0.02 percent of its revenue (or an estimated \$1 million) for all of California's 58 counties — a little more than \$17,200 per county per year. This amount would not begin to cover the costs of creating new forms, tracking and recording new data, and providing the infrastructure necessary to work out individual problems. Counties would have to cut into their own budgets to supplement this amount.

## It Would Last Indefinitely

There is no trial period or end date for the increased property tax, so taxpayers would continue to pay the parcel tax indefinitely. With the precedent of undermining Prop. 13 set, the amount could climb in the future. Even if there are no tangible improvements in California's education system, taxpayers would be responsible for the additional \$50 per year.

# **EDUCATION PROBLEMS**

**Prop. 88** represents an attack on the rights and protections of property owners in the state of California. It sets a dangerous precedent by undermining Prop. 13 and raising property taxes for Californians already burdened by high tax rates. It is poorly conceived and creates record-keeping nightmares for county assessors. And it unnecessarily transfers revenue-raising power from local governments to the state Legislature. In addition to all its fiscal problems, the proposition will not achieve its lofty goal. California's education system will not improve as a result of Prop. 88.

State Superintendent O'Connell admits that Prop. 88 is not a panacea, but says: "Will it help? Will it make a difference in students' educational opportunities? The answer is definitely yes."<sup>5</sup> However, a careful examination of where Prop. 88 sends its new tax dollars demonstrates that O'Connell's confidence is severely misplaced.

First, not all districts would benefit from added revenues generated by the new parcel tax. The funds would be allocated to districts according to a formula to be determined by the state Legislature based on the needs of individual districts. Thus, there is no guarantee a particular school would see any new funds.

The state Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) notes that much of the money would flow to districts that have more students with lower incomes, disabilities, or poor English-language skills.<sup>6</sup> Further, of the \$85 million a year allocated to facilities grants, the LAO estimates that only 40 regular public schools, serving less than one percent of regular public school students, would receive grant money.<sup>7</sup>

More important than Prop. 88's distribution shortcomings is the initiative's decision to funnel dollars only into certain education programs, some of very dubious worth. Worse, this added funding is not conditional on any reforms of the current, woefully imperfect public education system.

## Class-Size Reduction

Nowhere in California has so much spending been so misguided as in the effort to reduce the number of students in the classroom. Under the state's class-size reduction program, class sizes in grades K-3 have been lowered to 20 students. In 2006-07, nearly \$1.8 billion will be spent on this program — one of the priciest earmarked programs in the state education budget. Prop. 88 would pump in \$175 million a year in additional funds for class-size reduction, even though the program has yet to live up to its silver-bullet image as the key to improving student achievement.

California's class-size reduction law was enacted in July 1996. From 1996-1997 to 2006-2007, the state will have spent about \$16 billion on reducing class sizes. The program remains popular with lawmakers of both parties, education officials, and parents. Considering its popularity, it is no surprise that Prop. 88 allocates the biggest chunk of new tax revenues to the program, and parades this potential added funding front and center.

Support for the program stems from the belief that smaller classes mean more individualized attention and instruction for students, less disruption in the classroom, and better learning. The ultimate goal of the program, says the state Department of Education, is to "increase student achievement, particularly in reading and mathematics."<sup>8</sup> Yet, under these criteria, the program has come up short.

Unlike most state education programs, the class-size reduction program has an attached research component. A consortium of top research organizations, including RAND, the American Institutes of Research, WestEd, Policy Analysis for California Education, and EdSource, analyzed data relating to the program and issued its capstone report in 2002. Its conclusions were not encouraging.<sup>9</sup>

After the full implementation of class-size reduction in 2001, the consortium tracked achievement gains in cohorts of students that were exposed to different amounts of class-size reduction from kindergarten to the third grade.

The consortium found that whether using statewide average test scores or more refined school-level analysis, there was no association between the total number of years a student had been in reduced-size classes and differences in academic achievement.<sup>10</sup>

In its school-level analysis, the consortium compared a group of schools where successive cohorts of students all had reduced-size classes in grades 1-3 with a second group of schools where cohorts of students had different exposures to reduced-size classes. The consortium found that math test scores increased for both groups over time and that the increases were almost exactly the same.<sup>11</sup> According to the consortium, the increase in scores for the students in reduced-size classes “cannot be explained by [class-size reduction, or CSR,] at all.”<sup>12</sup>

Further, “the results were similar when we examined reading and language scores and when we focused the analysis on schools with high percentages of minority students.”<sup>13</sup> The report also stated, “we did not find greater effects among disadvantaged students.”<sup>14</sup> The report subheading says it all: “New school-level analysis finds no relationship between CSR exposure and student achievement.”<sup>15</sup>

Acknowledging the popularity of reduced class sizes, the consortium observed that “the lack of clear relationship between CSR and student achievement will be disappointing.”<sup>16</sup> This disappointment has not changed in the years since the consortium issued its report. California Secretary of Education Alan Bersin recently noted, “The research is clear that class-size reduction, in and of itself, does not improve student achievement.”<sup>17</sup> Given the expense of the current program and the lack of clear empirical support for its effectiveness, the last thing that seems prudent would be to raise new tax dollars and pour them, as Prop. 88 would do, into a still unproven program.

One possible reason the class-size reduction program has failed to have a positive impact is the effect the program has had on the quality of teachers in

the classroom. Class-size reduction requires the hiring of more teachers, which changes the composition of the state's teaching corps. In 1995-1996, the year before the class-size reduction law was passed, most schools, including those in disadvantaged neighborhoods, had fully credentialed teachers. After the enactment of class-size reduction, more teachers with emergency credentials were hired and distributed unevenly in schools. According to the consortium report, by 2000-2001, more than one in five K-3 teachers were not fully credentialed in large urban schools with high percentages of low-income, non-English-speaking, or minority students.<sup>18</sup>

Further, the disparity among experienced teachers between schools with high- and low-income students increased after class-size reduction was implemented. This development is unsurprising considering the natural tendency of more experienced teachers to use their seniority to leave disadvantaged schools for new teaching openings created by class-size reduction in higher-income schools. RAND researcher Brian Stecher, one of the authors of the consortium report, recently commented on the impact of class-size reduction on teacher quality: "You needed to pay attention to where the teachers were going to come from to reduce class size. If you couldn't supply well-qualified teachers, then the potential benefits of the change might not be realized."<sup>19</sup> Yet, despite this reality, Prop. 88 does not contain separate, directed funding for increasing the number of high-quality teachers in California.

It is important to note that Prop. 88 funding is not restricted to the existing K-3 class-size reduction program. In its analysis, the LAO says tax dollars from the initiative can be used for any class-size reduction effort. "For example, the funds would be sufficient to reduce the average class size of fourth grade classrooms by about four students (reducing it from a statewide average of about 29 students to 25 students)."<sup>20</sup> Yet if Prop. 88 funds were used to reduce

class sizes in other grades, as the LAO suggests, the impact would be even less than that of the money spent on K-3. The limited evidence from Tennessee that exists on the efficacy of class-size reduction suggests that student performance increases only if class sizes are reduced to about 15 students, significantly fewer than the 20-student limit in California's K-3 program, and far short of the 25 students indicated in the LAO's fourth-grade example.

State Superintendent Jack O'Connell may tout "programs that work," but there is no conclusive, quantitative evidence that class-size reduction has resulted in higher student achievement in California. Prop. 88 ignores this lack of proof and funnels more tax dollars into this program. That is a strange way to "invest" in the welfare of California students.

## Instructional Materials

Though there is little evidence that reducing class sizes improves student performance, there is a strong link between classroom achievement, and textbooks and instructional materials aligned with the state's rigorous academic content standards. Under Prop. 88, \$100 million a year in new tax money would go to buying new standards-aligned textbooks and materials approved by the state Board of Education. Although such an expenditure would likely be more effective than spending more money on class-size reduction, the question is whether schools are spending existing textbook funds wisely and whether a new tax should be the source of increased funding.

The state currently spends more than \$400 million a year to buy instructional materials, which works out to about \$66 per student. According to the LAO, this amount is enough to purchase one new core textbook for most students in

most grades every school year. Yet, state Superintendent O’Connell and Reed Hastings, former president of the state Board of Education and a principal mover behind Prop. 88, contend in their ballot statement in favor of the initiative that “Students in one-third of California classrooms don’t have a textbook to take home — and many don’t even have a textbook to use in class.”<sup>21</sup> Though this may be true, and anecdotal evidence from teachers, parents, and students seems to bear it out, the point remains that if the state is currently allocating enough money for every student to have a new textbook, the lack of such materials at individual schools may be more a failure of local district priorities and decision-making than inadequate funding by the state.

EdSource, a nonpartisan educational research organization, recently surveyed principals at high- and low-performing schools in California. According to its report, “Those more likely to be from high-performing schools more often said their districts ensure that the school has up-to-date instructional materials . . . and enough instructional materials for all students.”<sup>22</sup> EdSource also surveyed teachers: “The same was true for teachers who tended to confirm these perceptions, reporting that every student in their classroom has a copy of the current version of the textbook in language arts and math and that the principal ensures that the teachers have adequate classroom materials.”<sup>23</sup> The implication is that the lack of instructional materials in poor-performing schools may stem from bad discretionary decision-making on the part of local district officials and school principals about spending the dollars currently available to them. If this is the case, then the solution is not more textbook spending, as Prop. 88 advocates, but better spending decisions by local officials.

Even if one were to accept the premise that more spending on instructional materials is warranted, it still does not justify a new tax to pay for it. As noted, California will spend nearly \$1.8 billion this year on a class-size reduction

program that for 10 years has failed to generate significant improvement in student achievement. If such programs were eliminated or at least downsized, more money would be available for programs such as instructional materials that do have a positive impact on student achievement.

## School Safety

No one disputes that students need a safe learning environment in order to excel in the classroom. The question is how to achieve that environment. Many schools have shown that simply by increasing student academic achievement, they have seen a dramatic decline in student behavior and safety problems. Also, as in the area of instructional materials, even if more money for school safety is warranted, it is not clear that a new tax on Californians should pay for it.

The state currently spends nearly \$665 million a year on after-school and safety programs. Prop. 88 would allocate an additional \$100 million for such programs. In its research on high-poverty, high-performing public schools, both regular and charter, the Pacific Research Institute (PRI) has found that principals at such schools report few safety and discipline problems.<sup>24</sup> Despite the fact that many of these schools are in high-crime, often gang-infested areas, such as Inglewood, Pacoima, or Oakland, it turns out that higher achievement is linked to better student behavior and less crime.

A chicken-and-egg problem thus presents itself: Do schools perform poorly because of bad student behavior and school crime, or does poor academic achievement spur bad behavior and poor school safety? The high-poverty, high-performing schools studied by PRI argue for the latter, which calls into question the spending priorities of Prop. 88.

Again, even if more money for school safety programs were needed, the \$100 million a year allocated by Prop. 88 for such programs is a tiny fraction of the money spent by the state on ineffective programs. Changing the state's spending priorities, not adding a new tax, would be the best and most economical way to pay for more safety programs.

## Facility-Related Grants

Prop. 88 proposes \$85 million in annual facility grants to both charter and regular public schools that have not received any facility funding from state general obligation bonds. While such schools may be in need of added facilities funding, it should be noted that some of these schools may have benefited from the many local bonds passed in recent years. And the November ballot includes a huge state general obligation bond for education facilities.

From 1998 to 2005, a hefty \$31.7 billion in local school bonds was approved. The approval process has also been made easier by voter approval of a state initiative, pushed by Prop. 88 financier Reed Hastings, that lowered the passage requirement for a local bond from a two-thirds majority to 55 percent. Some of the schools that have so far not received state general obligation bond money may have received some of this local bond money, or may more easily receive local money in the future because of the lowered vote requirement.

Proposition 1d on the November ballot would provide \$10.4 billion in additional state general obligation bond money for education facilities. If approved, some of this money may go to the schools that have not received such state funds in the past. It is instructive that the former head consultant to the Prop. 88 campaign has advised Reed Hastings to drop active financial support for the initiative in favor of more active backing of Prop. 1d.<sup>25</sup>

Finally, it is always possible to fund facilities from the state budget on a “pay-as-you-go” basis. Given the misspending of current state education dollars, it would not be difficult to redirect \$85 million from existing funds to facilities for schools targeted by Prop. 88.

## Data System

The last bit of money raised by the new parcel tax under Prop. 88 would go to the establishment of a data system that would collect and maintain longitudinal student- and teacher-level data. This system would allow the state to measure student and teacher performance over time, a laudable goal and much needed in order to ensure better accountability. However, the \$10 million per year provided by Prop. 88 to fund this data system is a microscopic drop in the current state education budget. A new statewide parcel tax, with all its downsides, is not the way to pay for such a system. Redirection of current spending should be the route for future funding on this item.

**CONCLUSION:  
FISCALLY AND EDUCATIONALLY FLAWED**

Prop. 88 is extremely flawed both fiscally and educationally. On the fiscal side, a statewide parcel tax is regressive, would damage the protections instituted by Prop. 13, would create a bureaucratic and funding nightmare for local governments, and would unfairly tax ordinary people such as time-share owners. On the education side, the initiative would funnel money into programs that have not been demonstrated to improve student achievement and that could be funded by redirecting current funds from ineffective programs.

The LAO has pointed out, "Research and experience suggest that how we spend available education resources is at least as important as how much we spend on education."<sup>26</sup> It is clear that Prop. 88 would spend its new tax dollars badly, by simply putting more money into ineffective programs and by not requiring any reforms of the current system. The result would be little, if any, improvement in the academic performance of California's children.

Prop. 88 supporter Jack O'Connell says, "People will vote it up or down on its merits."<sup>27</sup> If he gets his wish, then the proposition's lack of merit, as laid out in this paper, bodes ill for its chances.

## ENDNOTES

- 1 "Education Tax Plan in Setback," *Sacramento Bee*, September 14, 2006.
- 2 Proposition 88, Sec. 4 (c).
- 3 Letter from California Assessors' Association to Assemblyman Johan Klehs, August 16, 2006.
- 4 Letter from California Assessors' Association to Assemblyman Johan Klehs, August 16, 2006.
- 5 "Education Tax Plan in Setback," *Sacramento Bee*, September 14, 2006.
- 6 Proposition 88, "Analysis by the Legislative Analyst," p. 77.
- 7 Proposition 88, "Analysis by the Legislative Analyst," p. 78.
- 8 See <http://www.cde.ca.gov/classize/facts.htm>.
- 9 G.W. Borhnstedt and B.M. Stecher eds., "What We Have Learned About Class Size Reduction," Sacramento: California Department of Education, 2002.
- 10 *Ibid.*, 35-36.
- 11 *Ibid.*, 36.
- 12 *Ibid.*, 36.
- 13 *Ibid.*, 36.
- 14 *Ibid.*, 37.
- 15 *Ibid.*, 35.
- 16 *Ibid.*, 36.
- 17 "Will Bill to Cut Class Size Help? The Jury Is Still Out, Experts Say," *Sacramento Bee*, August 31, 2006.
- 18 G.W. Borhnstedt and B.M. Stecher eds., "What We Have Learned About Class Size Reduction," Sacramento: California Department of Education, 2002, p. 40.
- 19 "Will Bill to Cut Class Size Help? The Jury Is Still Out, Experts Say," *Sacramento Bee*, August 31, 2006.
- 20 Proposition 88, "Analysis by the Legislative Analyst," p. 78.
- 21 Proposition 88, "Argument in Favor of Proposition 88," p. 80.
- 22 "Similar Students, Different Results: Why Do Some Schools Do Better," EdSource, June 2006, p. 11.
- 23 "Similar Students, Different Results: Why Do Some Schools Do Better," EdSource, June 2006, p. 11.
- 24 See Lance T. Izumi, K. Gwynne Coburn, and Matt Cox, "They Have Overcome: High-Poverty, High-Performing Schools in California," Pacific Research Institute, September 2002, and Lance T. Izumi and Xiaochin C. Yan, *Free to Learn: Lessons from Model Charter Schools* (San Francisco: Pacific Research Institute, 2005).
- 25 "Education Tax Plan in Setback," *Sacramento Bee*, September 14, 2006.
- 26 "Analysis of the 2000-01 Budget Bill," Legislative Analyst's Office, Sacramento, February 2000, p. E-65.
- 27 "Education Tax Plan in Setback," *Sacramento Bee*, September 14, 2006.

## **ABOUT THE AUTHORS**

## **Lance T. Izumi**

Director, Education Studies; Senior Fellow in California Studies

Lance T. Izumi is Senior Fellow in California Studies and Director of Education Studies at the Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy (PRI), California's premier free-market public-policy think tank based in San Francisco. He is the co-author of the book *Free to Learn: Lessons from Model Charter Schools* (Pacific Research Institute, 2005). He is the author of several major PRI studies, including the *California Education Report Card: Index of Leading Education Indicators* (1997, 2000 and 2003 editions), *Developing and Implementing Academic Standards* (1999), *Facing the Classroom Challenge: Teacher Quality and Teacher Training in California's Schools of Education* (2001), *They Have Overcome: High-Poverty, High-Performing Schools in California* (2002), and *Putting Education to the Test: A Value-Added Model for California* (2004).

In 2004, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger appointed Mr. Izumi as a member of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. In 2005, the California State Senate confirmed Mr. Izumi to this position by unanimous 34-0 vote. Mr. Izumi serves as the chair of the Board's economic

development and vocational education committee. He is also the Board's representative to the California Post-secondary Education Commission. In 2003, United States Secretary of Education Rod Paige appointed Mr. Izumi to the Teacher Assistance Corps, a task force of experts assigned to review state teacher quality plans as they relate to the federal No Child Left Behind Act. He also served as a member of the Professional Development Working Group of the California Legislature's Joint Committee to Develop a Master Plan for Education.

Mr. Izumi is the co-editor of two books: *Teacher Quality* (Hoover Institution Press and Pacific Research Institute, 2002) and *School Reform: The Critical Issues* (Hoover Institution Press and Pacific Research Institute, 2001). He is the chapter co-author of "Fixing Failing Schools in California" in *Within Our Reach* (Rowman and Littlefield, 2005) and "State Accountability Systems" in *School Accountability* (Hoover Institution Press, 2002).

Mr. Izumi is a former visiting fellow in education studies at the London-based Institute for Economic Affairs. He has also served as a consultant on welfare reform to the California Department of Social Services, a consultant on juvenile crime to the Governor's Office of Criminal Justice Planning, and as co-chair of the governor's competitiveness task force on juvenile justice education reform.

For ten years, Mr. Izumi was a regular contributor to the "Perspectives" opinion series on KQED-FM, the National Public Radio affiliate in San Francisco. His articles have been published in the *Notre Dame Journal of Law, Ethics and Public Policy*, *Harvard Asian American Policy Review*, *National Review*, *Wall Street Journal Europe*, *Sunday Times* (of London), *Los Angeles Times*, *Investor's Business Daily*, *San Francisco Chronicle*, *California Journal*, *Los Angeles Daily News*, *San Diego Union-Tribune*, *Los Angeles Daily Journal*, *Orange County Register*, *Sacramento Bee*, *San Francisco Daily Journal*, and many other publications.

Prior to going into the think-tank world, Mr. Izumi served as chief speechwriter and director of writing and research for California Governor George

Deukmejian. He also served in the Reagan administration as speechwriter to United States Attorney General Edwin Meese III.

Mr. Izumi received his juris doctorate from the University of Southern California School of Law and his master of arts in political science from the University of California at Davis. He received his bachelor of arts in economics and history from the University of California at Los Angeles.

## **Rachel Chaney**

Policy Fellow, Education Studies

Rachel Chaney is a policy fellow in education studies at the Pacific Research Institute. She is currently a doctoral student in American history at University of California, Davis. She graduated with honors and distinction from Stanford University in American history and earned her masters' degree in Chinese History from Stanford University. After completion of her masters' she taught high school in East Oakland, California for two years before coming to PRI.

**ABOUT THE PACIFIC RESEARCH INSTITUTE**

**The Pacific Research Institute** champions freedom, opportunity, and personal responsibility by advancing free-market policy solutions. It provides practical solutions for the policy issues that impact the daily lives of all Americans. And it demonstrates why the free market is more effective than the government at providing the important results we all seek – good schools, quality health care, a clean environment, and economic growth.

Founded in 1979 and based in San Francisco, PRI is a non-profit, non-partisan organization supported by private contributions. Its activities include publications, public events, media commentary, community leadership, legislative testimony, and academic outreach.

## Education Studies

PRI works to restore to all parents the basic right to choose the best educational opportunities for their children. Through research and grassroots outreach, PRI promotes parental choice in education, high academic standards, teacher quality, charter school, and school finance reform.

## Business and Economic Studies

PRI shows how the entrepreneurial spirit – the engine of economic growth and opportunity – is stifled by onerous taxes and regulations. It advances policy reforms that promote a robust economy, consumer choice, and innovation.

## Health Care Studies

PRI proposes market-based reforms that would improve affordability, access, quality, and consumer choice. PRI also demonstrates why a single-payer, Canadian model would be detrimental to the health care of all Americans.

## Technology Studies

PRI advances policies to defend individual liberty, foster high-tech growth and innovation, and limit regulation.

## Environmental Studies

PRI reveals the dramatic and long-term trend towards a cleaner, healthier environment. It also examines and promotes the essential ingredients for abundant resources and environmental quality property rights, markets, local actions, and private initiative.

# DECISION2006

## POLICY BRIEFS



**Keep Tobacco Money  
Out of Our Hospitals**  
Proposition 86

By John R. Graham



**All Pain, No Gain**  
Proposition 87

By Amy Kaleita & Tom Tanton



**No Bang for the New  
Tax Buck**  
Proposition 88

By Lance T. Izumi & Rachel Chaney



**No Clean Sweep**  
Proposition 89

By K. Lloyd Billingsley



**Righting Property  
Wrongs**  
Proposition 90

By Steven Greenhut

To obtain more information on these policy briefs, please contact Susan Martin at 415.955.6120 or [smartin@pacificresearch.org](mailto:smartin@pacificresearch.org). To learn more about the Pacific Research Institute and its publications, please visit [www.pacificresearch.org](http://www.pacificresearch.org)



DECISION**2006**



PACIFIC  
RESEARCH  
INSTITUTE

755 Sansome Street, Suite 450 | San Francisco, California 94111

415/989-0833 | 800/276-7600 | [www.pacificresearch.org](http://www.pacificresearch.org)