

Welcome. You are listening to the UC Davis Center for Poverty Research Seminar Series. I am the Center's director, Anne Stevens. This series brings scholars and policy experts from around the country to discuss their work on poverty and poverty research. In October 2012 we hosted Heather Rose, a center faculty affiliate and associate professor of education at UC Davis.

She is also an adjunct policy fellow at the Public Policy Institute of California. Her research focuses on K through 12 education, school finance and academic standards and accountability. Here is Rose presenting her seminar. The California School Finance System leaves no children behind.

>> Well, I'm particularly happy to be here today.

How many of you were at the event last night that was co-hosted by the Poverty Center and the School of Education? So, there was a lot of talk about school finances. I was there so I feel now I have the opportunity to set the record straight on a few things so.

>> I needed my pot for the day so I don't walk around my house ranting like a crazy person, so this is good. So, I wanna talk about school finance issue through, the, the lens of this question, which is, how does our finance system help or, or not help poor children?

Is it leaving our poor students behind? And so if you want the quick answer, so you can just go on with your Friday afternoon, here's one answer for you: no.

>> For those of you who don't like that answer, I've got another answer, which is yes.

>> So all of that is just to say that by the end of that hour in 20 minutes, I'm not really going to give you a specific answer to this question.

I think it's pretty murky, but I wanted you to sort through some of the details that I think are important to think about when thinking about this issue in the first place. So before I get started with the nitty gritty, I wanna just sort of layout what the big education reforms have been over the last few decades in California.

In the 70's and 80's, the state was really focused on equalizing spending per person across school districts, so that was a big, there was a big push for that, and I'll sort of show you how far we've come. And in the 90's, the state was really focused on.

Sort of providing a fore for standing on education, providing more re-re, blah I can't talk, more resources for schools. And you sort of saw that happening with proposition 98. Then in sort of 2000. We really started focusing on setting academic standards for the students and the state and having a, a sort of a standards based accountability system and which has really led to the questions at hand today, which are, have we been providing schools with enough resources to meet those very specified standards now.

So sort of this question of enough. And then can we design a more rational system for allocating the money we have? So I'm going to sort of focus on the second part of that question which is the rationality of our finance system today. And so, I'm going to take a page out of Hilary's book here.

I think when you gave your talk you had this picture that had been driving your research questions over the last few years. So this is my picture that has really been, sort of, guiding my research over the last decade I would say. So every dot on this graph is an elementary school that, it's in 2007, and it's plotted based on the percentage of students in this school who, scored proficient or higher on the English language arts part of the California standards test.

So that's on the vertical axis. And then, across the horizontal axis, we have the percentage of economically disadvantaged kids in the school. So, today I want to talk about economically disadvantaged, the specific thing I mean is the percentage of students in the school who are on the free or reduced price lunch program and what that means in more practical terms is that they are, below, they come from families that are below 180% of the poverty line.

So, just to give you a, an example. In 2007 for a family of four the poverty line was about \$20,000. So we're talking about kids who are a less than about 38,000, Come from families that are earning less than about \$38,000 in California. So sort of put that in perspective.

So what this shows is that in district, or in schools where there are many more kids many fewer of them are scoring proficient on these tests. So this is sort of all feeding into this achievement gap that we have where poor students are not performing as well as the more affluent students in the state.

So this is sort of the guiding, the guiding picture I have in mind. So this, in this sense, to the extent that our finance system is related to this. You know, we are leaving quite a few kids behind. If you wanna look at a different measure of test scores, this sorta shows the same thing with the API score in the state.

This is the score that's assigned to every school based on a whole host of, of test. The school it ranges from 200 to 1,000. The goal for every school is and 800 and I think, if I kind of got crafty here. One of the things I wanted to show you is that if you look again this is the same measure of poverty.

The worst scoring schools up here are still far better than the best scoring schools where there are high numbers of kids in poverty. So this is sort of one of the, the fundamental driving issues, I think. So when we think about a school finance system I definitely wanna keep this in mind, and I also wanna keep a few principles in mind that would sort of, I don't know, be principles for a more coherent school finance system and they are, and I should actually say, too, please feel free to interrupt with questions throughout.

This is, it'll, it'll be more fun for me for sure, and for you too, probably. So those are the, those are the ground rules. But when we, so, when we think, though, that principles of a, of a school finance system in theory, one would be that we're actually meeting the needs of the, of the students so we're sort of giving them enough, enough.

And the other is that we want to adjust for differences in cost. So, perhaps disadvantaged kids have extra needs and we should be supplying with more resources to address those or, labor costs might be higher and in some districts or others and we may want to address those with the school finance system as well, but we want to make these costs adjustments based on factors that a district can't control.

So if you go back to this picture, we don't necessarily want to give schools more money because their test scores are low because then they might not have an incentive to raise the test scores if they're going to lose the money. So we might want to give them more money because they have a lot of kids in poverty and not base those resource decisions on things that are uncontrollable by the schools themselves.

Okay, the other thing we want to do is allocate funds transparently. So we want to adjust for some big costs but not every single solitary difference between schools because it will sort of be back to the crazy system that we're currently in, which we'll talk more about in a second.

Once we sort of figure out what cost factors we want to adjust for, any district with the same set of characteristics should be getting the same amount of revenue afterwards. And then finally, and I'm not going to talk too much about this today, but there should be this balance between state and local authority and that's something else the state has been struggling with.

Yeah.

>> Let me ask you a question. On the measure of disadvantage, how accurate is it?

>> accuratish.

>> But, it's still for poor play.

>> It's just that. Yeah. So, okay. So, now that my daughter finally entered school; it comes from one pink piece of paper, where I check a box.

So, I mean, partially. So, that's, that's partially how accurate it is, Some districts are better than other at, at, at getting that information about But, if you actually look at different measures, If you look at, The title one measurements are

different count of poor kids in the school.

Which is less subjective than issuing reporting errors I think. We got a pretty high correlation with females represent I think. We are in the belt packet list. Where there are other of thing that are happening with some school district. If they special for that year, they just continue to report a 100% every year that they're after and actually this is.

I, I, I, I. This is an important point to bring up, that Maggie Weston is also here. And, Maggie has worked with me on all of this. She and, Johann Fausten and I have been doing this whole. I mean, this, sort of, comes from a series of projects, So, she is gonna answer all the tough questions, In the room.

And, we'll correct me, when I say anything that's off base. So is that, that's about right? Okay.

>> Is there any, for free or reduced price for lunch, is there ever any income verification? Audit or anything?

>> I don't know actually, to be perfectly honest.

>> We have to audit 10% of randomly audit 10% of Okay.

Good.

>> I think the view is that it's pretty sketchy, but yeah probably provided it right.

>> Yeah.

>> You know what I mean, and sketchy in terms of the actual.

>> And you know

>> verification. Yeah and you know, it covers a pretty big group of people.

You know, I got school attendance zone data at one point for a prior project and if you look at that you can actually get census income for the families in those school attendance zones, and. Okay, so my sample is fifty schools. So we're talking a limited sample. I think if you go back to a picture like this it kind of tightens that up a bit.

I mean these are pretty broad categories of poverty there. So it's an okish measure. It's kind of what got and it's a starting point but I think we can probably do better. Okay. So specifically what I want to focus on today is talking a lot about the current finance system that we have; kind of where the money comes from, how it's distributed and how that's related to poverty.

So kind of a school finance 101 talk. And then I want to relate this to the governor's new proposal for funding schools which is this idea of a weighted student formula which is really. The hot topic in school finance today in Sacramento and across the state. So that'll be fun to talk about, and finally we'll maybe get to this question of are our resources, adequate and, you know, w, we, we'll get there.

okay. Before though, I do want to turn the tables for a second, and take the attention off me and put it on you, and have you do this quick little quiz, which is, you can talk to your neighbors, that. Answer the following questions: What share of the federal budget is spent on education?

What share of the state budget is spent on education? And then, finally, think about it now from the school's perspective, what share of their budgets come from federal, state and then local discretionary sources? And by that I mean the sources that the school district could actually tap into if it wanted, you know, if it wanted to raise more money.

>> K through 12?

>> This is K through 12. Thank you. Take a minute. Talk. Talk amongst yourselves.

>> :>> No. Yeah. You can't talk to her.

>> 1%, 30%

>> What was that? State budget clarification would be the general funds. General funds. The general funds.

>> Oh for California.

>> Yeah, oh okay.

>> For California Yeah, a question. Or answer. What was that? Oh I just mean, what can a, what. Those are the only three things, so either the state or, the federal or the local. But, you'll see in a minute there's some murkiness between that was Yeah.

All right. I know. Yeah, I should have gone to that clicker presentation. All right, all right. Yeah, I know. This is, this is like, I'm in school right now. I should know how to manage a room better, but, let's get back to two terms in here. So, Scott said he knew the answer for the part there, the federal budget.

No I didn't.

>> Sorry, you did.

>> The third question for the, for the federal,

>> Oh, oh, sorry.

>> National averages, but I didn't know California's.

>> So who wants to venture, an answer for the federal.

>> Less than one.

>> Less than one. How many,

>> It depends on how you treat loan guarantees.

>> I, yeah, okay. Don't,

>> K through twelve.

>> K through twelve.

>> K through,

>> Oh.

>> K through twelve.

>> Yeah.

>> Missed my. one percent.

>> Less than 1%. Okay, so we have some really low percentages here. What about the state budget and about the state budget specifically the general fund?

thirties? K through 12, got some thirties, we'll go with that. Let's see how we're doing so far. Oh baby.

>> But, what's the use around the face?

>> Sales on? Oh. We're starting with a federal. So, I'm not even. I'm not even gonna give you the right answer there.

So, education, in total, is about 3%.

>> Education in total?

>> Yeah. It's. Okay. So, small. Super small is my only point in that. And, I, and, I note. So it's sad to present this kind of stuff to people who really do public finance, so really small is the answer.

>> And state spending though in the general fund, K to, actually K to 14, so some of this is going to community colleges. It's a pretty small slice

>> right.

>> But it's about, it's, it's, you know, they get, oh no, I guess it isn't there, is it?

>> Yeah, that is K to 12. Yeah, so that's, it's about 40% of the, of the general fund. And this, this is sort of a rule set by proposition 98, so this is part of that 1980s reform where we wanted 40% of our budget to be, general fund to go to education, K to 12 education.

Okay, now if you think about it from the school's perspective, what share of its money is sort of dictated by the federal government, the state government, and then locally?

>> Oh yeah, sorry,

>> Can I ask a question?

>> Sure

>> When you say general fund is that the entire money that the state gets?

>> No.

>> Well, I thought the question was the of the entire money that's taken.

>> Yeah, so okay, you guys are calling me on a lot of technicalities here.

>> So, not entirely. And I, and to be per, and, so this is just a general fund, but it is a huge, you know, it's, it's a big part of the general fund.

So my point in all of this is really just to say it's not a huge Federal spending priority, it is a pretty big State spending priority. But then when you think about it from the perspective of the districts themselves, what portion are they getting, I mean because, you know, a small piece of a huge pie can still be a lot of money for a school district.

so, from the school district's perspective, where is it getting it's money? so, from how, so, what percentage from the state would you guys say, then? We'll just start with that one.

>> 80.

>> 80.

>> Yeah.

>> 80-ish percent? Those are good.

>> Yeah, so I'm just gonna, I'll cut to the chase here.

This is basically, I just want to talk about each four of the slices of the pie and learn about more detail. So state money, state controlled money makes up this huge revenue money piece that sort of general money that the school can spend on. Regular, every day expenses, sort of how much you spent.

These state categorical programs are, sort of have a lot of strings tied to them, but this, all of this is about 85% is coming from state controlled sources. The federal government supplies about 9% and then other local discretionary sources are about 6%. So i'll go into each of these slices, and sort of talk about, how, ya know, where the money comes from, and then how it's spent, based on the, the poverty level of school, of schools.

So far so good? All right. So I want to talk about this biggest chunk of money first, this revenue limit and revenue limit is kind of a funny, a funny terminology. The way these funds work is, the state has basically set a revenue goal for each school district, call it \$5,200.

And this is sort of an entitlement that every school district should get. The first way money flows into that is through, a big chunk is through property taxes based on the value of the property and the school district zones. Now with, because of prop 13 these property taxes are capped at 1% of the value of homes in the state, so that 1% is going to vary from school district to school district because the property values themselves vary across the different school districts.

And the other reason that that amount might vary is because the portion of that 1% that goes to school districts varies from school district to school district. The portion is set, based on whatever proportion school districts were getting of their property taxes back in the late 70s when proposition 13 was passed.

So there's a lot of reasons why. Say this chunk of money, is gonna vary from school district to school district. That's the first part that gets a school district up to that revenue limit, that revenue goal. After that, the state is just gonna fill in the rest. So it doesn't matter necessarily from the school district's perspective, if they get a lot of money from property taxes or they don't, because the state is just gonna fill in that difference.

And so, what this actually looks like for a couple of specific districts here, take Oakland, this is how much Oakland gets towards that goal, in terms of its share of local property taxes, so the State is actually putting in a lot of state aid for Oakland's revenue limit.

San Francisco, they actually make it up to that \$5200 mark pretty close with just their property taxes alone. So the state is actually giving them just a pretty small. And now I have additional aid but then there's a place like Newport Mesa, whose, when you take their share of property taxes it actually exceeds this amount and goes all the way up over \$8,000 and so they basically get their revenue limit, amount of \$5200, and they get to keep all that extra.

So that's called an excess tax district. They have taxes in excess of that state goal, and they get to keep it. Now, don't get too worried about this. Last night, it became the big topic of conversation. I, I, I felt like there were claims that if we. Just did away with this one issue of our school finance system we could fix everything.

But we really can't. If we take, if you basically took all the excess taxes across the state, divided em up among all the kids, you'd basically have a little sliver like about that, it's about \$70 a kid state wide. So, so this is sort of the statewide average picture where about a third of the money is coming from property taxes, about two thirds from state aid and that tiny little sliver is excess taxes, that because these excess tax districts they're also sometimes called basic aid districts just in case you've heard that terminology thrown around.

The reason that they are called basic aid districts was because, although, they're meeting their revenue limit with their taxes alone, they were still entitled to a tiny little bit of state aid, they got the on-, only the basic part of the state aid, which was like a couple, maybe it was like four, \$120, either state aid.

But nothing else, no other state aid above and beyond that. So just to point out a few of these places, because I think people are kind of interested in them sometimes, here's a list of the top 24, unified districts, with excess taxes. So, always value unified basically has excess taxes in the amount of \$2,500 per people but there's only 37 kids there, so not very, I mean, we could probably not worry about them.

As you can kind of see, St. Helena's kind of in there in Napa County, they got, they have \$9000 dollars of, excess taxes. These are the top 24, actually once you get down below this one, the amount it, there's, like nine others that have. I've, I've, one moment.

Yeah. Nine others that have excess taxes, you know, somewhere between 100 and \$900. And one thing that actually happens, some of the reasons why a district might be called an excess tax district now, just remember we have that \$5200 revenue limit, amount, the goal. And if the district had gotten all of its all of that revenue and that access taxes, it would be, wouldn't be getting any state aid.

Well, what happened with some of the budget cuts recently is that the state declined, decreased as revenue limits. And so by just simply dropping the amount that the state was targeting for every school district, some school districts were sort of thrown into this category. But not necessarily having become better off, any other sense.

So, just, yeah.

>> Just to ground California relative to the rest of the U.S., if you go back a slide, what's the national average for the share of costs that are.

>> Property versus state? I mean, I know it's much higher, but. Just how much of an outlier are we?

>> Yeah. So, actually, this is something that Maggie and I are working on thanks to, actually, one of the Poverty Center GSR grants and we were really trying to look at this nationwide. And it's kind of tricky because in California we have this, this issue where, although we have this 1% property tax, that is considered a local tax with the federal data.

It essentially is this statewide tax. It's not a local discretionary tax in the sense that a school district could raise there. Property tax rate and get more revenue in that sense. So, trying to get a better handle on which, you know, how to classify money as sort of under the state per view or local per view.

So, I don't know, can you.

>> I assume 44% local, 44% state, the rest is eight, whatever it might-  
>> Yeah. Kind of more like half and half.  
>> Only in twelve states have a majority.  
>> Thank you. Yeah.  
>> So how does like Toronto agree to limit their green.

Range, and were people spending How does this tax

>> How does  
>> fit in with that.

>> So, so the Serrano versus Priest des, lawsuit was basically what lead to this equalization push in California in the first place. And the way that kind of worked was the state said, we wanna have this revenue limit of, I'll just say \$5200 per candidate and at that point there was some districts that were really close to that, and some districts that were really far away from it.

What that meant was that if you were far away from that limit you were allowed to set a tax rate that you could grow to that limit a lot faster than if you were really close to it. So, it's kind of a, a, it was a limit in the sense that districts, not many districts were there yet and it wanted districts to get there within a certain amount of time and to close that, make sure that all districts were spending within \$100 per people of each other.

That there's some technicalities there. And now I'm not making correct, I'm gonna show, now she'll see if I was really listening to her when she was giving me the, the details on this. That the rule was that, I think, 90% of school districts had to be within that and 90% of students had to be within that \$100 band and if you adjust that \$100 band for inflation, which it was.

We're kind of right now, at a \$400 band. And, and so, actually, if you look at, revenue limits, we, we've broken this up by, these are elementary districts, these are high school districts, and these are unified districts, so let's just take this slice right here first. There are large, medium, and small, and these are just box-and-whisker plots that are sort of showing you, where half of are, this is the 75th percentile, this is the 25th percentile of, students.

Actually in these districts, but basically large unified districts there's all, there's almost no variation in revenue limit funds for them. So that's where most of the students are. Medium unified you get a little bit of spread. small unified you're still kind of, you know, most of the kids are within that few hundred dollars of e, of each other.

And then you, you have some outliers. So by and large this source of funding has been pretty equalized across districts, the one big difference though, is that that those revenue limits are different for unified districts than they are for high school districts and elementary districts. So high school districts have a higher revenue limit, it's just over 6,000.

Unified districts have a revenue limit or goal of about \$5,200 and elementary districts are closer to \$5,000. So you'll get differences in school spending based on the type of school district that you are. And those are sort of, born into the The, the distribution formula because the surround of decision, you know, sort of set these revenue limits in that way.

Does that answer your question? Okay, so, so this is just sort of overall how these funds are, are distributed. But, but I really wanted to focus on is well how is this related to poverty? Oh. But I guess I didn't wanna do that yet. Because why I just, I wanna focus when I, when I go through this on, on unified district.

Just to sorta keep the grasp a little bit simpler. So, just to put this in perspective, the state has unified districts that serve k to 12, elementary districts which are usually k up until you get to high school, and high school districts after that. About 67% of students are in unified districts.

That's where most kids are. About 20% in elementary and about 10% in high school districts. And, so i'm gonna focus the pictures on this, but, the other ones look pretty, pretty similar. And so if we look at this question of, of revenue limit funds. So thi-, these are revenue limit funds up here, on a per people basis.

This again is that measure of poverty, the percent of kids on free, or reduced price lunch. here, every circle is a school

district and the size of the circle is based on the enrollment in that school district. So, this big school district right here is Los Angeles. It's got about 10% of the students in the whole state, so that's pretty big.

And this is really just to show you that limit funds have been pretty equalized, it's a pretty straight line across here, by district type. So, so these are just the unified district, there's not much variation. If anything, these districts at the high end of the poverty distribution get a tiny bit more.

If you run a regression you get an intercept of about 5300 with a slope of about 25. But, this is if you don't include the excess taxes. If you actually include the excess taxes in that definition of revenue limits. What happens is, you get a few more affluent districts with some of those excess taxes.

So, you actually get a neg, if you were to a, I mean it doesn't really show up here visually that well. But if you run a regression, you actually get sort of a negative relationship now between funding and poverty. And you get an intercept of about 5,600, with a negative slope of about 354.

Meaning that basically every poor kid is getting about \$354 less on average, than a kid who would not be classified as poor in, with this definition. So, revenue limits, the big chunk of money, pretty equalized, but those excise taxes made that more off-limit. Kids are getting a little bit more.

So, what?

>> It's a big influence at 5%?

>> Oh. Thank you.

>> This is a pretty big effect.

>> We'll come back. So that's sort of the general funding for schools. Sort of the on going regular educational expenses but then we have that other set of categorical programs that make up got, like, \$2000 worth of the overall funding.

And there are at least 60 different categorical programs in the state. This is, the biggest one here is Special Education, and Economic Impact Aid is about 8% of the slice. That is basically doled out based on whether a kid, is, is poor or not. That definition is, also takes into Maggie, I'm going to let you give that definition because you'll remember it better than I.

If you're English learners and- -

>> and title one.

>> --title one, either of those. And you can get double counted, and it's about \$300 per eligible kid. Class size reduction is another categorical program. This is to give schools additional money to reduce their class size in grades kindergarten through third.

There's like adult education programs. So, lots of really tiny programs, had one little, yeah, so about 75 % of the funds in this program though, come from the ten biggest programs. So a lot of big programs giving a lot of money, but lots of little tiny programs. With lots of little strings attached that, when you talk to school districts kind of drives them crazy.

so, if we look, though, at how this money is dis, if you take all of this and actually, I'm not gonna quite take all of it, I'm gonna take Special Education out. It's kind of hard sometimes to think about Special Education and what part of the money comes from the State, and what part of the money comes from the Fed.

So for the rest of this talk we're just going to ignore the special education funds for a minute, but just know that there were some form in how we allocated special education revenue not that long ago and it's pretty much doled out on an equal per pupil. Based as the cost these things called SELPAs, which are Special Education Local Plan Areas.

So sort of groups of districts that are part of these SELPAs, the SELPAs get em money sort of on a per kid rate, and then that group sort of decides how it's gonna spend those funds. So, these categorical funds if you look at how they're related to poverty there is a pretty steep positive slope here where more disadvantaged kids are getting more money on it.

On average that means about an extra 18 hundred dollars per poor, per poor child. So really strong relationship with poverty here. So revenue limit funds, not that I mean, revenue limit funds you don't really get the, the picture that these are pretty strong positive relationships. The next slice of the pie I wanna talk about are federal programs.

And, here, Title I is the biggest of the federal programs. And that is also a program designed to help poor children. So, we should probably expect to see a pretty steep upward slope there, as well. And, you kind of, you kind of do, you sort of don't see much of a slope here, but it definitely is.

Cuz you're getting more federal funds as your poverty level increases and certainly out here you can see that district with more disadvantaged students end up with a lot more federal revenue. Question? And okay

>> Are you doing weighted or unweighted

>> These are weighted, actually, yeah. So yea the, the, slopes that I'm showing you are weighted.

>> Part of it's hard because of my. form this one, yeah. But if you go back to the.

>> It's fine, it's fine

>> Yeah. No, it definitely pulls things up and I mean that, I think that.

>> That's good. I think you're doing it fine.

>> Yeah.

And then it's certainly also important when we've, and then keep that in mind when we come back to talk about what, what, what the state's been talking about in terms of school financial fund, later, because, certainly what's happening in L.A. it's kind of a driving force about what.

That's possible to do statewide. okay, and then lastly little sliver I wanna gonna talk about here are the local revenue sources. And so these are you know, if you're like, leasing or renting out is when you know. Stuff that it has access to. That makes it about 5% and it can also raise parcel taxes because these are not based on the value of your land, but based on whether you have a unit of land or not.

And so that makes up about 10% of those local fees, so. So, you know, we're talking overall this part of of the pie's about \$600 per pupil, so that's about \$60 per pupil statewide. So, pretty small in terms of revenue raising capabilities on a statewide basis.

>> What's the

>> Excess property tax things end up?

They're in the revenue limit chunk. They're in that big, in the first thing that we saw. Yeah. So,

>> That's so interesting. I think probably most people's priors parcel tax would be the majority of those.

>> Yeah, it's a pretty tiny piece. So if you actually look. Here, I just pulled out a few to give you a taste of who's getting these.

So, so, yeah, L.A. has no parcel taxes. Berkeley has a, they, they end up raising about \$3,000 per student in parcel taxes.

>> Right, exactly.

>> Davis is about 800 and so, you can, I mean, this is just a, just to give you sort of a, a sense here, there aren't that many districts that actually have partial I think I, did I count them this morning.

There are a hundred districts, I guess, with partial taxes that end up providing more than a hundred dollars per, per student. So, I guess that's about 10% of districts have something. But not necessarily a lot. And it could be that some of those districts, for whatever reason, are sort of lower on the revenue limit side of things in the first place.

So,. So, you wouldn't wanna read too much into just this one piece of of the pie. And if you look then, at what's happening with local revenue, taking all those sources together and we look at the same picture, you kinda get this negative slip. For more affluent districts, true, those various forms are able to raise more money locally than districts

with high levels of, of poverty.

So we have these sort of counter. Countervailing sources of you know, federal and state categorical programs really are targeted toward, for students that are going to districts, in the way that you would expect That means that other sort of local and Funds aren't.

>> I'm Anne Stevens, the director of the center for poverty research at UC Davis, and I want to thank you for listening.

The center is one of three federally designated poverty research centers, in the United States. Our mission is to facilitate non-partisan, academic research on domestic poverty. To disseminate this research and to train the next generation of poverty scholars. Core funding comes from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

For more information about the center, visit us online at [poverty.ucdavis.edu](http://poverty.ucdavis.edu).