

**ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-2432-98/TEKR
October 9, 1998

Resolution on Proposition 8

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University oppose the November 3, 1998, California Ballot Proposition 8 entitled, "Public Schools: Permanent Class Size Reduction. Parent-Teacher Councils. Teacher Credentialing. Pupil Suspension for Drug Possession. Chief Inspector's Office. Initiative Statute"; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge campus senates, faculty, staff, administrators, and students to help inform voters of the importance of opposing the November 3, 1998, California Ballot Proposition 8.

RATIONALE: This proposition is bad public policy. Here are some possible consequences if this measure passes:

- *Ballot Proposition 8 would diminish local control of K-12 education and would take curriculum out of the hands of educators.*
- *It would create an unnecessary State Office of the Chief Inspector of Public Schools with no ongoing accountability. The individual filling this office would be appointed by the governor for a ten-year term.*
- *It would confuse the responsibilities of school site councils and principals.*
- *It would increase the already rigorous qualifications that must be met by teachers in California.*
- *It would remove flexibility in dealing with student disciplinary problems.*
- *Costs could be in the millions of dollars for the State of California; it is estimated that the Office of the Chief Inspector alone could cost from \$15 million to \$20 million annually; the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) could incur costs in the millions of dollars to provide subject-matter tests to all new K-12 teachers, and possibly an additional \$20 million if the state interpreted the initiative to require testing of current teachers; reviewing lesson plans could result in costs for school districts in the range of several millions of dollars annually.*

Approved Unanimously – October 9, 1998