THE 2009
WOMEN IN POLITICS PROGRAM
A PROGRAM OF THE CALIFORNIA CENTER FOR CIVIC PARTICIPATION

June 14\textsuperscript{th}-17\textsuperscript{th}, 2009
SACRAMENTO, CA

MARRIOTT RESIDENCE INN, 1121 15\textsuperscript{th} STREET, SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

THIS PACKET BELONGS TO:

CALIFORNIA CENTER FOR CIVIC PARTICIPATION
Table of Contents

Preface ....................................................................................................................... 5
Team Roster .............................................................................................................. 6
About WIP & the California Center ........................................................................ 7
Acknowledgements ................................................................................................. 9
WIP Overview .......................................................................................................... 11
Interview Activity .................................................................................................... 13
Group Facebook ....................................................................................................... 15
Session Discussion Guides ..................................................................................... 17
Keynote .................................................................................................................... 19
Brainstorm Issues .................................................................................................. 21
Research Issues Session ......................................................................................... 23
Policy Team Presentations ....................................................................................... 25
Women Around the World Panel ............................................................................ 27

Introduction to the Issues ..................................................................................... 29
  Budget 1: Intro to the California Budget ............................................................... 31
  Budget 3: Health Care Cuts Statewide ................................................................. 35
  Budget 4: CalWORKS County Fact Sheet ........................................................... 37
  Education 1: Gender Discrimination .................................................................. 39
  Education 2: Race and Gender Affect Access to Sports .................................... 41
  Employment 1 Women In the Workplace ........................................................... 43
  Employment 2: Pay Inequity ............................................................................... 45
  Health 1: Women’s Health In CA Executive Summary ...................................... 47
  Health 2: Health Insurers Must Hall Gender Rating .......................................... 51
  Health 3: Gender Pricing ................................................................................... 53
  Violence Against Women 1: Domestic Violence Is ........................................... 55
  Violence Against Women 2: Teens & Intimate Partner Violence ....................... 59

Supplementary Materials ....................................................................................... 63
  Legislative Nomination Roster .......................................................................... 65
  Legislative Visit Preparation ............................................................................ 69
  Thank You Letters ............................................................................................. 71
  Overview of California Government .................................................................. 73
  Overview of Legislative Procedure ................................................................. 77
  Anatomy of a Bill ............................................................................................... 79
  Women In Politics Glossary ................................................................................ 81
  Downtown Sacramento Map ................................................................................ 85
  2009 Women In Politics Program Agenda ....................................................... 86
IN THIS SECTION
• How to use the handbook
• About Women In Politics and the California Center

WELCOME
Welcome to the 2009 Women In Politics Program, a four-day/three-night adventure into the world of California politics and public policy. This handbook is meant to inform your participation by presenting you with background information, useful insights and resources to gain a deeper understanding of the numerous elements and components that make up the world of California politics.

HOW TO USE THE HANDBOOK
This resource, 2009 Women In Politics Handbook, has two main parts:

1. Session Discussion Guides- provide a list of suggested questions and topic points for you to consider when thinking about some of the sessions that you will be participating in.

2. Background and Resource Guides- provide succinct summaries of relevant elements that you will learn about through the program including: The Issues, The Process, The Players, etc.

STAFF CONTACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candace</td>
<td>707-362-1469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacy</td>
<td>209-535-3622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle</td>
<td>916-230-8878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooke</td>
<td>323-683-2936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teala</td>
<td>530-945-1044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fransesca</td>
<td>310-406-6759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manpreet</td>
<td>209-620-9596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa</td>
<td>323-252-2601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millena</td>
<td>916-320-1281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky</td>
<td>323-799-0837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanny</td>
<td>323-482-8180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina</td>
<td>760-234-8226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below is a table for you to fill out your program instructor and team members contact information, so you can reach them at any point during the program. This is extremely useful during the program so make sure to fill it out!

**Team Roster**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Cell Phone</th>
<th>Room #</th>
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ABOUT WIP 

The Women In Politics (WIP) program brings together young women from all over California to learn about state politics through a four-day/three-night hands on exposure to the world that is the state Capitol. For the past three decades, the California Center has connected thousands of California youth with thousands of Capitol professionals through one-on-one appointments, panel sessions and workgroup discussions.

Through these and other interactive sessions, we create the opportunity for youth to learn about the politics, processes and issues directly from the people engaged in crafting California legislation and policy. The ability to incorporate this first hand experience and insight has been a cornerstone for the longevity and success of Women In Politics. Participants take this direct input, infuse information from written resources and discussion points brought up by their peers to identify innovative policy recommendations.

These policy recommendations are collected into a comprehensive Action Priorities document that the youth present to their legislators and other Capitol players. This element presents participants with a concrete opportunity to apply their newly acquired or refined knowledge by communicating their priorities and sharing them with key decision-makers.

Through each of these elements, Women in Politics strives to promote the importance of being an informed and active civic participant. During WOMEN IN POLITICS our goal is to have participants gain an understanding of the role of women in key political and social change efforts, as well as to develop an appreciation of important milestones in the evolution of the legal rights of women in our state and nation. Other specific goals that WIP strives to achieve include:

• Expand the understanding of key elements of the political system including the legislative, executive and judicial branches of government; as well as the role of lobbying organizations and the press.
• Promote the development of confidence and life-long leadership skills including communication, research, teamwork, negotiation and critical thinking.
• Help participants visualize and plan their own education, career and life path including what role they might have as contributors to their community, our nation and the world.
• Expose participants to a variety of positions on issues affecting women and their communities; and promote a life-long commitment to civic engagement

ABOUT THE CALIFORNIA CENTER

Women In Politics is a program of the California Center for Civic Participation. Established in 1980, the California Center is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization with a mission to empower young people to become vital participants in decision-making processes at all levels. The work of the California Center is founded on the belief that youth are resources to nurture and not problems to solve.

For More Information
Please visit our Website at www.californiacenter.org, or contact:
Candace Chwierut, Women In Politics Director
chwierut@californiacenter.org
916 443-2229
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- The General Process
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WHAT TO EXPECT

Expect the unexpected. Unlike other programs that bring students to the State Capitol and expose them to its inner-workings through scripted and "mock" activities, the Women In Politics program seeks to engage participants through a hands-on and engaging environment that allows the participants to discuss and think critically about the issues confronting our state. Never will Women In Politics participants be told how to think or what to say. Instead, the staff works diligently to provide participants with the tools that will allow students to arrive at their own conclusions.

Expect to be challenged. The ultimate goal for the Women In Politics program is to promote the development of an informed and engaged populace. We strongly feel that critical to this mission is the capacity to engage with each other in dialogue. Not everyone will agree with what you say; nor will you always agree with what is being said.

Nevertheless, these differences in opinion and perspective are the cornerstone to a healthy and vibrant democracy. Dialogue vs. Debate. Building on the previous principle, throughout the three-day program, we will be engaging with each other, with speakers and with decision-makers to learn and discuss the most relevant facts and information. At the heart of this exchange, Women In Politics staff and participants are asked to adhere to a policy of Dialogue and not Debate. The difference between these two may seem minimal on the surface, but once you dig a little deeper you will find that the implications for each are monumental.

- Dialogue can be defined as an exchange of ideas with the aim to learn; while
- Debate can be defined as an exchange of ideas with the aim to win

Given these subtle yet profound differences, we emphasize and ensure that discussions throughout the Women In Politics program are engaged in through dialogue and not debate.

THE GENERAL PROCESS

During the next four days, you and your peers will be participating in a number of dialogues and activities that will expand your understanding of the issues, processes and considerations that are made in developing policy and legislation at the State Capitol. The program is broken up into four distinct sections that make up the flow of the program. These sections are:

Preliminary Exposure: The first thing that we will do is get into Policy Teams. Each team
will be made up of anywhere from 6-10 participants. These participants will have an opportunity to explore, in greater depth, one of the five issue areas that we will be learning about during the program. This section will primarily consist of discussions based on basic information that will be provided and the experience and knowledge of your fellow Team members.

**Direct Research:** Building on these preliminary conversations, this section presents an opportunity to talk to experts and specialists that are presently working to impact your Teams issue area. These experts and specialists will be made up of a combination of Capitol Staffers, Researchers, Lobbyists and other Capitol Stakeholders, that have access to the latest information on your issue. This section will provide your team with an opportunity to ask questions and collect more in-depth information about your issue to inform the development of your Team’s Policy Action Priorities.

**Policy Development:** Now that your Team has had an opportunity to discuss and learn about the issue in more detail, this section will focus on taking this information and developing a set of Policy Action Priorities. These Policy Action Priorities will be made up of the recommendations that your Team has identified to improve the state’s ability to address the needs within your Team’s issue area.

**Policy Communication:** With the development of your Team’s Policy Action Priorities, the next step is to communicate them. During this section, we will take the opportunity to present your Team’s priorities with your peers. In addition, you will also be able to share these priorities with your Legislator during your legislative visit on the final day of the program and with additional stakeholders at the Women In Politics luncheon.

With each of these sections, we seek to model the steps that it takes to engage as an active civic participant. In addition, through this process, we hope to dispel any concerns or reservations that you may have regarding how to get involved.
Interview Activity

PURPOSE
To provide students with the opportunity to get to know one another, and to familiarize participants with the questioning and reporting skills they will be developing throughout the program.

DIRECTIONS
- Participants begin breaking out into 5 teams. Then with in each group participants will pair up (if there is an odd number there will be one group of 3). Partners will then take turns interviewing each other.
- Using the questions listed below for reference, each member of the team interviews the other person for five minutes. After five minutes, reverse interviewer roles for the next five minutes. Since you will be reporting about the person you interviewed, you may want to take notes, or test your memory and listening skills.
- After ten minutes, the interview sessions end. Each person then presents a one or two minute report on their new friend within the group.
- After everyone presents, the team will use the next page as a template to create a group FACEBOOK page. The page will represent a little piece of everyone in the group. Each team will then transfer the information on a large poster and briefly present to the large group.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

1. Where do you live? What town or city are you near? What is it like there? The land? The people? What do you like about where you live? What would you change?

2. Do you come from a large or small family? Are you the oldest or the youngest of your brothers and sisters?

3. What's the name of your school? How many students? What is the composition of the student body?

4. What career do you think you might enjoy? If you go to college, where do you think you might like to go?

5. Who is your favorite singer or actor?

6. What is your most embarrassing moment?

7. What current issues are you especially interested in? If you had absolute power for a day, which problem would you address first?
**Session Discussion Guides**

**In This Section**
- Keynote
- Brainstorm Discussion Guide
- Policy Team Brief Discussion Guide
- Policy Team Presentation Guide

The Session Discussion Guides are provided to assist you in deepening your understanding of the various discussions and activities that you will be participating in. We find that providing information regarding the setup, purpose and some suggested questions for each of the activities and discussion sessions allows for participants and facilitators to have a more in-depth discussion. Below is a brief breakdown of the content for each of the elements that make up the Discussion Guides.

**Setup**
This element provides some insight into what the session will consist of as it relates to the space and breakdown of the session. This will contain a description of the space and how the session will proceed (large group discussion, small group breakouts, etc).

**Purpose**
This element will provide some information about the purpose of the session. If you find yourself asking: "What are we supposed to be doing" take a look at this session first. If you still have questions, find the director or ask a peer.

**Suggested Questions**
This element will contain some sample questions that your team could refer to if you find that you are stuck or that you do not know how to continue the discussion. These "suggested questions" are exactly that **suggested**. Do not feel that you have to run down the list of questions. Simply refer to them if you find that the discussion is starting to get a little fuzzy.
**Keynote**

**Setup**

For this session we will be meeting in the designated large conference room at the hotel. The seating will be arranged in an auditorium style so that everyone is close to the speaker and able to hear and ask questions during the presentation. The speaker will be Elmy Bermejo. Ms. Bermejo will kick off the program with an introduction to what it is like being a Latina-woman in the political realm. Following the Keynote we will break up into your teams to debrief issues that were brought up during the keynote.

**Purpose**

The purpose for this session is to provide an introduction to women in politics. This keynote will help to frame the discussions and recommendations that your team will engage in during the program.
Brainstorm Issues

Setup
We will be meeting in the Hyatt Hotel in the Golden State conference room located at 1209 L Street. We will begin the session as a large group to go over some brief instructions, and then we will break out into our 5 teams. Each team will focus on one topic area. Each team should read through the materials provided in this handbook and discuss main ideas.

Frame the Issue
In thinking about your issue, what are some topics that come to mind for you? What are some of the different perspectives that relate to your issue— for example, what do you think other people think about the issue? Would they agree/disagree with your perspective?

Assessing the Perspectives
Based on the materials that are provided in this packet, what are some of the key topics that come up for your team’s issue area? Do you agree that these are the primary topics that need to be addressed? If yes, why? If not, why not and what should the focus be?

What are some questions you have about your issue topic?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Research Issues Session

Setup
Each team will be meeting with two speakers back to back to provide that team with some more up-to-date information and insight on their issue. Once the first round of speakers arrive, we will break up into our Issue Teams to meet with the relevant speaker. This small group discussion will be followed by a large group debrief, which will be followed by another small group discussion with a second speaker. After the second speaker each team will have an opportunity to debrief the entire session together.

Purpose
The purpose for this session is to connect each issue team with a Capitol Professional that is presently engaged in impacting their particular issue area is some capacity. The speaker may be a Capitol Staff Member, Lobbyist, Committee Consultant, etc. Along with gaining some more direct insight into your issue area, this session will provide you and your team to learn about different careers and backgrounds that may be of interests to you.

Suggested Questions
Make sure to take down the relevant information for each of the speakers. This would consist of: Name, Title, Office/Organization.

- How are you involved in, and what is your role within the policy-making process?
- What are some factors that are being considered by decision-makers on this topic?
- What led you to the role that you are in today?
- What are some key points to keep in mind regarding our issue?
- Do you have any other insights that might help us in our thinking and development of our policy recommendations?
Policy Team Presentations

Setup
This setting will be used to create your Action Priorities that will be presented to the participants and that will be typed up and ready for you to share with your legislator and others during the legislative meetings on Wednesday morning. There will be some time allocated to work as a team to prepare for the Team's presentation. This time will be followed by a Press Conference style presentation where each team will have an opportunity to present their Action Priorities and take questions from the audience.

Purpose
The purpose for this session is for each of the Teams to present what they have learned during the research sessions by sharing some background and offering up some Action Priorities for their issue. In addition, students will have an opportunity to build or strengthen their public speaking ability.

Presentation Flow
Please use these questions to inform the flow of your Team's presentation.

- Identify the issue that your Team has explored.
- What did you learn about the issue? Who is already involved in this area (organizations, legislators, etc.)?
- What are the Action Priorities that your Team is proposing for consideration to decision-makers?
- Why are these priorities important?
- Looking at your Action Priorities, what opposition can you anticipate? How do you plan on dealing with this?
Women Around the World Panel

SETUP
We will be meeting in a committee room inside the capitol for this session. This session will be a panel, so speakers will be seated at the front of the room and participants will be seated in a theater style arrangement.

PURPOSE
The “Women Around the World” panel session is intended to provide the young women with a more comprehensive view of the state of “women’s issues” by broadening their perspective from state and national to international issues. Our goal for this session is for the participants to develop a better understanding of the status, struggles and strides of women around the world. The panel will consist of a diverse group of 4 professional women. Each panelist will have 7 – 9 minutes to introduce themselves and discuss the prominent issues women face in their country. We will then open the discussion for question and answer time.

SUGGESTED DEBRIEF QUESTIONS
Make sure to take down the relevant information for each of the speakers. This would consist of: Name, Country/Culture, email.

• How do different cultures view the role of women?

• Are these views common to that region of the world or are they unique to that culture?

• Are these view religious based- or do they have some historical basis?

• Do women have political power in these countries? What does that power entail?

• Has power changed over time and how does this compare to women’s political power in the US?

• Have women in these countries influenced change?

• What is it like for immigrant women to live in the US? What are some of the barriers they face?
Introduction to the Issues

SOURCE: CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

This legislative agenda is presented by the organizations listed with the goals of ensuring equal opportunity in education and employment, economic justice, access to health care and freedom from violence.

BUDGET

Programs including CalWORKs, Medi-Cal, family planning, education, childcare, and food assistance are at risk of being cut. With the state in an economic downturn and unemployment at its highest in years, Californians are increasingly relying on safety net providers for critical services. Additional cuts will impact women and children and may the state more money than the immediate savings in budget reductions.

EDUCATION

AB 685 (Davis), AB 195 (Florez), SB 248 (Oropeza) Ensure better compliance with Title IX and state law prohibiting gender discrimination in education with respect to school construction projects, reporting, and posting of rights, respectively.

EMPLOYMENT

AB 793 (Jones) Ensures that victims of wage discrimination have a reasonable amount of time to pursue a discrimination action.
AB 849 (Swanson) Expands the California Family Rights Act to include additional family members for whom an employee may take leave to provide care.
AB 1000 (Ma) Requires employers to provide paid sick leave to all employees.
AB 1001 (Skinner) Prohibits employment discrimination based on family care-giving responsibilities.

HEALTH

AB 98 (De La Torre) Requires all health insurance policies to provide coverage for maternity and postpartum services.
AB 119 (Jones)& SB 54 (Leno) Prohibit gender discrimination in the pricing of health insurance policies.
SB 810 (Leno) Establishes a single-payer health care program to provide comprehensive, affordable health care for all California residents.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

SB 273 (Corbett) Ensures continued funding for domestic violence shelters and provision of services to all victims of domestic violence regardless of gender.
SB 588 (Committee on Public Safety) Continues the operation of the Sex Offender Management Board indefinitely.
Budget 1: Intro to the California Budget

IN THIS SECTION
- A letter from the Governor Outlining Budget Revenues
- Legislative Analyst Office’s Overview of Governor’s 2009-10 Budget

WIP & THE CALIFORNIA BUDGET
The 2009-10 Budget proved to be one of the most challenging pieces of legislation and policy discussions in decades. Why? The declining state of California and the Nation’s economy definitely played a part, but were there other issues that played a role? If there were, were they foreseeable? These are only a few of the questions that we will explore during the Women In Politics program.

The budget battle of 2009 demonstrated the fundamental importance of this one piece of the legislative puzzle on the whole of California’s policy landscape. Issues from education funding, to nursing home standards were shaken by the political wrangling and deal-making that was taking place behind closed doors. For this reason, Women In Politics is supporting a team of participants to develop a better understanding of the processes, players and issues that make up the California budget.

GOVERNOR’S LETTER TO THE LEGISLATURE
To paint a more vivid picture of the environment and emotions that surrounded the 2009-10 Budget discussion at the Capitol, on the following page you will find a letter from Governor Schwarzenegger outlining the urgency and need to shake off partisan ties and work together to finalize a budget.
GOVERNOR
ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER

May 11, 2009

Dear Senator Steinberg, Speaker Bass, Senator Hollingsworth and Mr. Villines,

In order to avert both a budget shortfall and a cash crisis, it is imperative that we begin work immediately to address these challenges. For that reason, I have decided to release the May Revision May 14, consistent with the traditional May Revision timeline.

The global economic crisis has hit almost every state, and many face historic budget deficits. Our state and our country are facing the deepest recession since the Great Depression. The impact of the economic crisis on California's budget is made even worse by a broken budget system that has plagued our state for the last generation.

Californians are sick and tired of hearing about deficits and our broken budget system. They believe Sacramento has failed them, and they are right to think so. Time after time, I have pushed for real, meaningful reforms to a system that does not serve its state well even in flush times and certainly does not serve it well in lean times.

We now face the leanest of times. California, for the first time since 1938, faces a decline in personal income. The budget, as adopted by the Legislature in late February, closed an unprecedented budget shortfall of $41.6 billion and provided for a reserve of $2.1 billion as of June 30, 2010. That budget arose from revenue estimates based on data through November 2008. Since that time, the severe economic downturn that California, like the rest of the nation, has been facing has worsened substantially. These changes in the state’s economic and revenue pictures have caused a significant new budget problem to emerge.

These developments have combined to create a projected budget gap of $15.4 billion that must be addressed. In addition, the budget-related measures on the May 19 special election have a combined General Fund value of $5.8 billion. If the initiatives fail, the size of the problem would grow to $21.3 billion.

Absent swift action, the state will be facing a very serious cash crisis. California may need up to $23 billion in cash solutions to ensure that all of the state’s bills can be paid in a timely manner.

Sincerely,

Arnold Schwarzenegger

Source: Governor Schwarzenegger Sends Letter to Legislative Leaders Outlining Budget Revenues; http://gov.ca.gov/press-release/12291/
Budget 2: Legislative Analyst Office’s Overview

Budget Gap Projected to Grow to $40 Billion

In November, the administration projected a $24 billion drop in revenues from the estimates in place a few months earlier when the 2008-09 Budget Act was adopted. Now, due to the worsening economy, the administration projects an additional $7 billion decline in revenues.

Combined with the state’s chronic operating shortfall and rising expenses, the administration projects that the state would end 2009-10 with a deficit of $40 billion, absent corrective action.

Additional Solutions Proposed In response to the budget shortfall, the administration in November proposed a package of budgetary solutions, including a large increase in the sales tax rate and deep reductions in education, health, and social services programs.

- The January budget proposes additional solutions, including:
  - Lowering the value of the dependent credit for income tax returns ($1.4 B)
  - Issuing revenue anticipation warrants to push part of the deficit to 2010-11 ($4.7 B).
  - Capturing further savings in K-14 education—through spending reductions, accounting changes, and cost deferrals ($4.5 B).
  - Seeking voter approval to redirect funds dedicated by prior initiatives ($0.5 B).

Legislative Analyst Office’s Comments

Outlook Turns Darker. Two additional months have passed since the administration’s original special session proposals. The overall budget problem has grown by another $12 billion. The state’s cash situation is now even more dire. The Legislature and Governor must act now to put the state’s finances back on track.

Generally Realistic Numbers, But Downside Risk. The administration’s budget generally is built upon reasonable numbers. There are, however, downside risks from further deterioration of the economy and state revenues, and from costs that the state is likely to incur but are not included in the Governor’s budget.

Reliance on Borrowing Comes With Major Uncertainty. The Governor’s budget heavily relies on access to the credit markets in order for the state budget to balance. In order for the plan to work, the state would need to obtain voter approval for a lottery measure, overcome legal questions, and issue billions of dollars of debt in a credit market in turmoil. Investors would need to be assured of the budget plan’s viability in order for these borrowing plans to work.
Opportunity to Use Early Ballot to Craft Budget Outline. The administration’s plan would seek voter approval for several measures at a June 2009 special election to achieve budget solutions. The Legislature should consider accelerating the election to earlier in the spring to provide more time to develop alternatives in case some measures are defeated. In addition, we recommend that the Legislature adopt even more ballot proposals to generate additional savings, provide greater budgetary flexibility, and reduce legal risks.

Governor’s Proposition 98 Approach Is a Mixed Bag. The Legislature can improve on the Governor’s approach to building the Proposition 98 budget by implementing categorical program and mandate reforms—rather than adopting across the board reductions, disregarding existing state priorities, and eliminating state mandate requirements on a wholesale basis. In addition, deferring costs into future years should only be used as a last resort.

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST OFFICE’S BOTTOM LINE

The Governor’s budget framework makes a good faith effort to close a colossal budget gap. The Legislature, however, can improve the plan by making further use of the ballot, adopting more strategic programmatic reductions and revenue increases, and reducing the reliance on borrowing. There are no easy paths to solving the crisis. But it is urgent that the Legislature and Governor act immediately to address a budgetary and cash situation that has the state on the edge of fiscal disaster.
Budget 3: Health Care Cuts Statewide

Source: California Budget Project www.cbp.org

More Than 1.9 Million Californians Could Lose Access To Health Coverage Under the Governor’s May Revision

At a time when the federal government is seeking ways to expand health coverage to more Americans, Governor Schwarzenegger has proposed substantial cuts that could result in more than 1.9 million Californians losing access to health coverage within three years\(^1\). In addition, these cuts would cause California to lose an estimated $2.3 billion in federal matching funds in 2009-10 alone. Specifically:

The Governor proposes to reduce state funding for the Medi-Cal Program by $1.0 billion in 2009-10 through unspecified changes that would likely include limits on eligibility for Medi-Cal services. The Administration would need permission from the federal government to make eligibility cuts, due to provisions in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). In the past year, the Governor has proposed three eligibility changes that could cause nearly 1 million Californians to lose access to health coverage (see table). While the Legislature previously rejected these proposals, all three could be included in the Administration’s proposed $1.0 billion reduction – a cut that would cause the state to lose an estimated $1.6 billion in federal funds in 2009-10 under ARRA’s enhanced matching rate of 61.59 percent.

The Governor also released, on May 26, a proposal to eliminate the Healthy Families Program as of August 1, 2009. Previously, the Governor proposed dropping 225,000 children from the program. If Healthy Families were eliminated, 942,000 California children who would otherwise have been covered as of June 30, 2010 – the end of the 2009-10 fiscal year – would not be covered, according to the most recent state estimate available, which likely understates the number of children affected. Eliminating the program would reduce General Fund spending by $369 million in 2009-10, but California would also lose approximately $685 million in federal matching funds.

Source: Department of Finance, Department of Health Care Services and Managed Risk Medical Insurance Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Cut</th>
<th>Number of Californians Affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medi-Cal Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require families to file paperwork four times per year for their children to retain health coverage</td>
<td>471,500 at full impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrict low-income working parents' eligibility for no-cost health coverage</td>
<td>433,600 at full impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit the number of seniors and people with disabilities with access to no-cost health coverage</td>
<td>73,400 in 2009-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Healthy Families Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate the program</td>
<td>942,000 as of June 30, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL IMPACT</strong></td>
<td>1,920,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) One potential cut, for example, would take 33 months to reach full impact. The more than 1.9 million estimate reflects state projections as of May 2008 and November 2008. Rising caseloads due to the economic downturn suggest that the actual number of Californians who could lose access to health coverage could exceed 2 million.
Governor Schwarzenegger has proposed to eliminate the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program, which provides cash assistance for eligible low-income families with children, while helping parents find jobs and overcome barriers to employment. Approximately four out of five CalWORKs recipients (78.5 percent) are children. If CalWORKs were eliminated, more than 1.1 million children and approximately 310,000 parents would lose monthly cash grants, along with employment services and child care assistance, effective October 1, 2009. Eliminating CalWORKs would reduce General Fund spending by $2.4 billion in 2010-11 — the first full year that CalWORKs would be eliminated — but California also would lose $3.9 billion in federal funds, for a combined loss of state and federal funding of $6.3 billion in 2010-11.

### Estimate of Impact of Eliminating the CalWORKs Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Number of Children and Parents Affected</th>
<th>Lost State and Federal Funds</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Number of Children and Parents Affected</th>
<th>Lost State and Federal Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>48,710</td>
<td>$210,896,000</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>50,540</td>
<td>$218,850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$82,000</td>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>5,020</td>
<td>$21,728,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amador</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>$3,806,000</td>
<td>Plumas</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>$2,115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>9,840</td>
<td>$42,621,000</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>82,390</td>
<td>$356,762,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaveras</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>$6,646,000</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>94,460</td>
<td>$409,022,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colusa</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>$2,484,000</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>$9,777,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>26,270</td>
<td>$113,741,000</td>
<td>San</td>
<td>126,520</td>
<td>$547,825,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Norte</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>$10,755,000</td>
<td>Bernardino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>2,870</td>
<td>$12,414,000</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>76,090</td>
<td>$338,146,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>84,610</td>
<td>$366,347,000</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>11,530</td>
<td>$49,945,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>$6,028,000</td>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>43,970</td>
<td>$190,375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>4,240</td>
<td>$18,361,000</td>
<td>San Luis</td>
<td>5,180</td>
<td>$22,429,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>13,720</td>
<td>$59,390,000</td>
<td>Obispo</td>
<td>6,270</td>
<td>$27,169,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inyo</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$1,305</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>6,270</td>
<td>$27,169,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern 53</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>$232,752,000</td>
<td>Santa</td>
<td>12,660</td>
<td>$64,819,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>$34,004,000</td>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>3,310</td>
<td>$14,322,000</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>39,510</td>
<td>$171,059,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassen</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>$5,626,000</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>6,140</td>
<td>$26,593,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>417,530</td>
<td>$1,807,894,000</td>
<td>Shasta</td>
<td>8,520</td>
<td>$36,873,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madera</td>
<td>8,480</td>
<td>$36,711,000</td>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$222,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>$10,898,000</td>
<td>Siskiyou</td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>$10,597,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariposa</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>$2,606,000</td>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>$71,449,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino</td>
<td>3,670</td>
<td>$15,909,000</td>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>8,720</td>
<td>$37,778,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>21,330</td>
<td>$92,337,000</td>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>32,020</td>
<td>$136,629,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modoc</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>$2,079,000</td>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>4,610</td>
<td>$19,953,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mono</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$357,000</td>
<td>Tehama</td>
<td>3,480</td>
<td>$15,051,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>15,440</td>
<td>$65,857,000</td>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>$2,360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>$7,461,000</td>
<td>Tulare</td>
<td>41,960</td>
<td>$181,687,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>$7,980,000</td>
<td>Tuolumne</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>$7,589,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statewide</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,453,450</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,933,318,000</strong></td>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>5,330</td>
<td>$23,077,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total number of recipients affected is based on the projected 2009-10 average monthly CalWORKs caseload (586,746) multiplied by the three-month average number of recipients per case receiving a cash grant in January, February, and March 2009 (2,484). County estimates of affected recipients are based on the three-month average of each county’s share of Californians receiving CalWORKs cash grants in January, February, and March 2009, the most recent months for which these data are available. Total estimated loss of funds reflects the projected state savings in 2010-11 due to eliminating the CalWORKs Program ($2.4 billion), combined with the loss of the state’s entire annual Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant ($3.7 billion) and a portion ($145 million) of federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds the state is estimated to receive in federal fiscal year 2010. County estimates of affected recipients are rounded to the nearest 10 and county estimates of loss of funds are rounded to the nearest 1,000. County estimates may not sum to totals due to rounding.

Source: CBP analysis of Department of Finance and Department of Social Services data
Gender Discrimination

Gender discrimination is any action that grants or denies opportunities, privileges, or rewards to a person solely on the basis of their sex. Although women have taken great strides professionally and socially, they are often subtly and consistently denied full access to the same opportunities as men. Such discrimination is illegal. Examples include pay and benefit disparity and difficulty securing employment or promotions despite qualification. In addition to advocating for change on a case by case basis, CWLC addresses gender discrimination outside the legal system through educational programs for women and the community.

Girls & Sports: A Winning Game

Even though both state and federal laws prohibit sex discrimination in sports programs in publicly funded educational institutions and recreational facilities, girls are still losing out on the playing field. CWLC lectures, issues policy briefs, and testifies before lawmakers about the need to vigorously enforce these laws. To enhance girls' preparedness for competitive sports, CWLC is one of the few organizations focused on equity at the K-12 level as well as those sponsored by city parks and recreational departments. Leading the way, CWLC successfully represented Alhambra high school girls in the first Title IX class-action sports lawsuit ever certified in California for high school students.

The CWLC has also created Time Out: Does your School Play Fair? A Title IX guide to inform women and young girls of their rights under the law, and to help them fairly assess whether their school or university is in compliance. The guide also includes steps women can take to address compliance issues at their school.

Educational Rights of Pregnant and Parenting Students

Despite legal protections against sex discrimination in education, pregnant and parenting students are routinely stigmatized, marginalized, and coerced into attending substandard, non-traditional schools. To protect students' rights, CWLC travels throughout California to train advocates, legal services attorneys, and school personnel on the educational rights of pregnant and parenting students, including their right to stay in school, participate in all extra-curricular activities, and receive child care and confidential family planning services. CWLC also advocates for innovative policy initiatives to protect the civil rights of pregnant and parenting students.
Education 2: Race and Gender Affect Access to Sports

Source: California Women’s Law Center www.cwlc.org

As CWLC advances the rights of California’s women and girls to play sports, we remain committed to examining the intersection between race and gender—advocating for females of color to ensure gender equity for all.

Passed in 1972 to prohibit sex discrimination in schools, Title IX has resulted in the tremendous increase of females playing sports. But have athletic opportunities increased for women of color at the same rates as for other women? According to a recent report by the Women’s Sports Foundation (WSF), the answer is a resounding “no.”

WSF’s “Title IX and Race in Intercollegiate Sport” Report found that there was a “cost” to being both female and a student of color:

- Compared with the percentage of women of color enrolled at NCAA institutions (24.9% of females), female athletes of color were underrepresented (14.8% of females). Moreover, if female athletes of color were denied sports opportunities based upon their sex alone, their participation rates would be at 19.2%.

- Female athletes of color were over-represented among college scholarship recipients compared to their representation in the total athlete population, but colleges adding additional sports teams for women added teams in which women of color were under-represented as participants. Seventy-seven percent of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletes and NCAA women’s teams added between 1981 and 1998 were in sports in which female athletes of color are moderately or severely underrepresented.

Title IX’s detractors have erroneously claimed that Title IX has been detrimental for students of color. Contrary to these claims, the WSF Report found that increases in participation opportunities for female athletes generally resulted in a 955% increase in participation opportunities from 1971 to 2000 for female college athletes of color. Moreover, when it comes to male athletes of color, their representation in NCAA varsity sports compared to their presence in the student body is proportional. As schools have reduced men’s sport opportunities to increase opportunities for females, more than 85% of the male teams schools have discontinued are in sports in which males of color are moderately or severely underrepresented.

But when it comes to sports, color-blind gender equity is incomplete justice. CWLC calls upon:

- Schools to add female teams for sports in which women of color participate at higher rates. Athletic administrators should educate themselves about which sports girls of color at feeder schools and local sports programs predominately play.

- Local Recreation and Parks boards should develop gender equity policies and vigorously them in their sports programs. As these programs are often the only sports opportunities for girls of color due to economic disparities that disproportionately affect communities of color and urban students.

- Researchers examining female sports trends must examine the interrelationship between race and gender. Without such an additional layer of inquiry, study results as to gender discrimination in sports are meaningless to affect all women and girls.

Call to Action!

Contact your state and local representatives to educate them about racial disparities in sports opportunities for females and tell them that you want greater enforcement of Title IX’s protections against discrimination in sports! California Assemblymember Jenny O’Rourke will soon release a report on female sports opportunities in California. This report is supposed to also examine sports opportunities for girls and women of color. Let Assemblymember O’Rourke know that you support her work and encourage her to work to implement the report’s recommendations! Assemblymember Jenny O’Rourke may be reached at: (916) 319-2095
WOMEN IN THE WORKPLACE

WOMEN ARE A SIGNIFICANT PART OF THE WORKFORCE

- Women account for 48% of the workforce.
- Three out of four women of childbearing age are now employed.
- 40% of working women are mothers with children under 18
- 58% of mothers with children under age 2 work
- 62% of mothers with children under age 6 work
- 70% of mothers with children under age 18 work
  Catalyst, Mothers’ Day Update on Working Moms (May 11, 1997)

WOMEN WORK TO SUPPORT THEMSELVES AND THEIR FAMILIES

- 70% of working women work out of economic necessity.
  US Census Bureau
- 41% of working-women are the solo providers for their households. They are single, divorced, separated or widowed. 28% have dependent children.
  1997 AFL-CIO survey, "Ask a Working Woman"
- Of the 68.5 million families in the United States in 1993, 12.4 million (18 %) were headed by women—8 million were white, 3.8 million were black, and 1.5 million were Hispanic.
  Nancy Campbell, “Women and Work,” Ohio State University Women’s Studies Department, 1998

Many Working Women Are Part of the Working Poor and Live in Poverty

- Women account for 48 percent of the labor force, but 59 percent of workers making less than $8 an hour.
- Nearly 4.5 million families with female heads of household were below the poverty level in 1993. This figure represents 35.6% of all families with female heads of household.
  Nancy Campbell, “Women and Work,” Ohio State University Women’s Studies Department, 1998
- Working women’s families have the lowest median income of all family types.
  US Census Bureau
- Fifty-seven million women were employed in 1994. The largest proportion still work in technical, sales, and clerical occupations. Of the 57 million, 41 million worked full time; nearly 16 million worked part-time. Two-thirds of all part-time workers were women. 3.3 million held more than one job to make ends meet.
  Nancy Campbell, “Women and Work,” Ohio State University Women’s Studies Department, 1998
- 18% of the general population lacks health insurance; however, 43% of women who work part-time and 34% of women over age 55 do not have health care coverage.
  Families and Work Institute’s 1998 Business and Work-Life Study
- Only 53% of employers provide at least some replacement pay during periods of maternity leave, a time when women need their paycheck the most.
  Families and Work Institute’s 1998 Business and Work-Life Study
Pay Inequity

Full-time, year-around working women earned only 77.5 cents for each dollar a man earned in 2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Gender</th>
<th>Earnings</th>
<th>Wage Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>$44,255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>$34,278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage Gap</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Reports, ACS-09, Income Earnings, and Poverty Data from the 2007 American Community Survey

Full-time, year-around working employees across race and gender in 2007:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Gender</th>
<th>Earnings</th>
<th>Wage Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Men</td>
<td>$47,113</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Women</td>
<td>$35,542</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Men</td>
<td>$35,652</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Women</td>
<td>$31,035</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Men</td>
<td>$29,239</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Women</td>
<td>$25,454</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Reports, ACS-09, Income Earnings, and Poverty Data from the 2007 American Community Survey


• The median weekly earnings of women who were full-time wage and salary workers were $538, or 80 percent of men’s $798. Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Women’s Bureau, Employment and Earnings, 2008 Annual Averages

Historical Statistics – ERA is currently looking for updated data in these categories

• Women earned less than men in 99% of all occupations for which data is available. Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1997 Annual Averages

• 76.8% of women who were medicine and health managers earned 74% of what men earned. Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Women’s Bureau, “Equal Pay: A Thirty-Five Year Perspective,” July 10, 1998
Health 1: Women’s Health In CA Executive Summary

This report examines important health concerns of nonelderly women (ages 18-64) in California, including their health status, selected health behaviors, health insurance coverage, usual source of care and access to health care. We address how these health measures vary among women by family income and by race/ethnicity, with a focus on women often disproportionately affected by lack of consistent policies that promote health and access to health care. We also look at differences by age group, to examine the changing health care issues and needs of women at different points in their lives.

This report uses data from the 2005 and 2001 California Health Interview Survey. The first section of the report examines women’s self-reported health status, activity limitations and health condition prevalence. Next, selected health behaviors—physical activity level, smoking, and alcohol use—are examined. The third section looks at the current state of health insurance coverage for women, including the characteristics of uninsured women. Finally, the report addresses issues of access to care: where women receive care; their use of safety-net providers; and their use of physician services and preventive screenings.

All comparative statements in the report reflect statistically significant differences (p<.05) unless otherwise noted.

SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

Health Status and Conditions

- Slightly under one in five women (17.9%) report fair or poor health and 14.1% have a health condition that limits one or more basic physical activities, such as walking, climbing stairs, reaching, lifting or carrying.
- Chronic health conditions affect all age groups, but most are more prevalent in women ages 55-64. Among these women, four in ten have been diagnosed with high blood pressure and arthritis in their lifetime, and more than one in ten have been diagnosed with asthma, cancer or diabetes. Over one-quarter of women ages 55-64 have a health condition that limits one or more of the basic physical activities.
- Asthma was the one health condition examined that did not increase by age. The asthma prevalence rate was nearly constant across age groups.
- Women with low incomes (family incomes below 200% Federal Poverty Level, FPL) generally have poorer health status than higher income women. They are three times as likely to report their health as fair or poor and, among those who are ages 45-64, have higher rates of several of the health conditions measured—arthritis, diabetes, heart disease and high blood pressure.
- Latinas, Asian/Pacific Islander women, American Indian/Alaska Native women and African-American women were all more likely to report fair or poor health than white women. And 30% of American Indian/Alaska Native women have a health condition that limits their basic activity level—the highest rate of any racial/ethnic group.
- Prevalence rates of the health conditions examined vary by racial/ethnic group, but generally American Indian/Alaska Native and African-American women have the highest rate of several of the health conditions measured.
- Among women ages 45-64, hypertension affects approximately one in three Latinas, Asian/Pacific Islander women, and white women; four in ten American Indian/Alaska Native women and over one-half of African-American women.
- Based on self-reported height and weight, 20.6% of women are obese and 25.5% are overweight. While the overall prevalence rate of obesity among nonelderly women did not increase between 2001 and 2005, the prevalence of obesity did increase for women ages 18-29, going from 12.4% in
2001 to 14.9% in 2005. This was the only age group that saw an increase.

- Higher rates of obesity are seen among women who are older, African American, have lower incomes, have not completed high school, and report their health as fair or poor.

**Selected Health Behaviors**

- One in three women obtains the recommended amount of regular physical activity; six in ten get some physical activity, but not the recommended level; and one in ten is inactive.

- American Indian/Alaska Native and white women are the most likely to get the recommended level of physical activity, and Latinas, Asian/Pacific Islander and African-American women are the least likely.

- 12.8% of women currently smoke cigarettes—approximately 1.4 million. The proportion of women who smoke in 2005 has decreased since 2001, when 14.9% smoked.

- Smoking prevalence is similar across age groups, but the proportion of women who have quit smoking increases with age. One in three women ages 55-64 is a former smoker, as are nearly one-quarter of women ages 45-54.

- The highest rates of smoking are among American Indian/Alaska Native women (25.8%), African-American women (17.7%) and white women (17.2%).

- 5.3% of women who do not themselves smoke are exposed to secondhand smoke in their homes.

- More than one-half of California women consume alcohol, with higher rates among white women and those with higher incomes. Among underage women (ages 18-20), 38.8% report having at least one alcoholic beverage in the past month.

- 12.3% of women report binge drinking (i.e., four or more drinks on one occasion during the past month), including 15.3% of women ages 18-20.

**Health Insurance Coverage**

- 22.3% of women—approximately 2.5 million—were uninsured for all or part of 2005, with the highest risk of being uninsured among those with low incomes, Latinas, non-citizens, single women, those in fair or poor health and younger women.

- Uninsured rates for women with family incomes below 100% FPL (44%) and at 100-199% FPL (41%), are four times higher than for women with family incomes 300% FPL and above (9.7%).

- The uninsured rate for Latinas is three times higher than the rate for white women (39.3% vs. 13.4%), and among the Latina ethnic groups examined, well over one-third of Salvadoran, Mexican and Guatemalan women were uninsured.

- Among the Asian ethnic groups examined, Korean women had the highest uninsured rate—38.1% were uninsured for all or part of 2005.

- Medi-Cal is an important coverage source for women with family incomes below 100% FPL (39.2%) and for single parents (29.3%), preventing even higher uninsured rates.

- The majority of uninsured women are low income (62.6%); 29.1% have family incomes below 100% FPL, and 33.5% have family incomes of 100-199% FPL.

- The proportion of women with employment-based coverage through a family member declined between 2001 and 2005, from 23.2% to 20.4%. During this same time period, the proportion with employment-based coverage through their own coverage (primary coverage) increased from 31.3% to 35.3%.

**Usual Source of Health Care and Utilization of Selected Services**

- Most women have a usual place where they seek medical care; for the majority of women it is a doctor's office or HMO setting, and a sizeable share use safety-net providers. But one in ten women lacks a usual source of care or "medical home."

- Younger women, those with low incomes, Latinas and the uninsured are all more likely to lack a regular place to go for medical care.
• Safety-net providers serve as a primary source of care for 23.4% of women, approximately 2.6 million. One-third of women who were uninsured all or part of 2005 rely on safety-net providers as do four in ten women who receive Medi-Cal.

• While 87.3% of women had a physician visit in the past year, the uninsured and those with no usual source of care were much less likely to have seen a provider.

• 85% of nonelderly women had a Pap test within the past three years. Pap test rates are lower for young women, Asian/Pacific Islander women, and those with family incomes below 300% of the FPL.

• Pap test screening rates are lower for women receiving Medi-Cal and for uninsured women than for women with employment-based insurance.

• 77.4% of women ages 40-64 had a mammogram within the past two years. Mammography screening rates are lower for women ages 40-49, women with family incomes below 300% FPL, Asian/Pacific Islander women, Latinas and American Indian/Alaska Native women.

• Among women ages 40-64, mammography screening rates are lower for women on Medi-Cal and women who are uninsured.

The findings in this report highlight the considerable variation among California nonelderly women in their health conditions and health activities, health insurance coverage and measures of access to care. A sizeable portion of women face serious disparities—which persist across the indicators measured.
Health 2: Health Insurers Must Halt Gender Rating
Source: Sacramento Bee, Health insurers must halt Gender Rating
Published Tuesday, May 26, 2009

Obtaining health insurance coverage in California is hard enough. If you are a woman without employer-provided health insurance, or do not qualify for a public program, your only option is the individual insurance market, a market where insurers are free to charge women more than men for comparable coverage. This practice was banned nationally in the employer-provided benefits settling more than 30 years ago.

A report released in September by the National Women's Law Center (NWLC) found that women in California under 55 years old paid up to 39 percent more than men for the same health coverage. In California, two bills in the Assembly and Senate this year, Assembly Bill 119 (Jones) and Senate Bill 54 (Leno), aim to end this discriminatory and arbitrary practice of gender rating, which is unlawful in 10 other states.

Gender rating hurts women and can put affordable coverage completely out of their grasp. The economic data supporting this is clear. Women are much less likely than men to be insured through their jobs, 38 percent vs. 49 percent, respectively, meaning they are more likely to need to turn to the individual insurance market for coverage.

Women also have less buying power than men, earning on average 77 cents for every $1 earned by men, so the increased premiums require them to spend a much larger percentage of their income on health care coverage, if they can afford it at all.

Besides harming women and their families, gender rating hurts society as a whole. Women who are forced to forgo preventive care or cannot optimally manage other health conditions like diabetes experience higher rates of adverse pregnancy outcomes like premature birth and low birth weight. The costs of caring for these children are often paid for by the taxpayer.

The city and county of San Francisco is challenging gender rating because it places a greater burden on county governments when women are forced into getting their health care from San Francisco General Hospital and county clinics.

Insurers attempt to defend gender rating by stating that it is actuarially justified, reflecting actual differences in the costs of providing health care to women vs. men. They don't apply this logic to any other class, such as race. Regardless, the study by the NWLC showed this argument to be spurious. If indeed the reason for gender rating is based on the costs of care, then the differences in premiums charged should be comparable within a given market. They found, instead, wide variation in gender-based premiums across the country, with women paying anywhere from 4 percent to 48 percent higher premiums than men. Even within the same state there was wide variation in gender-based premiums. Women in Missouri could pay 15 percent to 140 percent more than men depending on the insurer.

Furthermore, in South Carolina and California only some insurers choose to gender-rate even though all are allowed by state law. This wide range of differences in premiums charged to women clearly demonstrates the discriminatory and arbitrary basis for the practice.

The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, District 9 (California), representing almost 5,000 OB/GYNs in the state, is committed to working to achieve health care coverage for all women in California. We are co-sponsors of AB 119 and SB 54 because we believe that a fairer private individual insurance market is a necessary component to achieve universal health care due to the number of our patients who rely on it as their only option to obtain health coverage.

Please call or e-mail Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger and urge him to sign AB 119 and SB 54 when they reach his desk later this summer.
HEALTH INSURANCE FOR WOMEN REMAINS BASTION OF ‘GENDER PRICING’

A self-employed 30-year-old woman living in midtown Sacramento could pay as much as $420 a year more for individual health insurance than a man – and the California Legislature is debating whether that’s fair.

The gender gap, known as “gender rating” by the insurance industry, recently has gained renewed attention. Last week, the insurance industry said it was willing to drop gender pricing – but only if the government requires every U.S. resident to obtain health insurance as part of a comprehensive health care overhaul.

“A lot of people didn’t know that insurers were charging women more than men, and how much more,” said Lisa Codispoti, a senior counsel with the National Women’s Law Center. Her group produced a report last fall exposing a gap in premiums paid by men and women for health insurance.

California outlawed gender-based pricing a decade ago for such services as dry cleaning and haircuts. But insurers were allowed to price coverage differently based on age, geography and other factors, including sex.

Health insurance is more important than a haircut, dry cleaning – or even automobile insurance, Codispoti said.

"People don’t die if they don’t have car insurance," she said. "There are things you can do to survive if you don’t have car insurance. Take the train, take the bus.”

Women’s advocates say gender rating is discriminatory and prevents many from obtaining health insurance, even though most concede that younger women typically seek health care services a little more frequently than men.

Whether that slight difference justifies the disparity in premiums is a matter of debate.

The outrage, though, isn’t exactly widespread, noted Marian Mulkey, a senior program officer for the California HealthCare Foundation, a philanthropic think tank based in Oakland.

In the past two years, the California Department of Managed Health Care said only nine people have called to complain about the matter.

"There isn’t a black-and-white answer in my book," Mulkey said. "It all depends on your standards of fairness and what you believe is the function of health insurance in spreading risks and sharing costs.”

If women are using a lot more health care, perhaps they should pay more, she said. On the other hand, Mulkey said, the higher cost could “be enough to deter some women teetering on the edge between buying and not buying.”

The city of San Francisco filed suit against the state in January seeking to outlaw gender rating, but it has put the matter on hold until the Legislature considers two bills – Senate Bill 54 and Assembly Bill 119, which would outlaw gender pricing – as soon as this week.

The Governor’s Office said it had not yet taken a position on the bills.

Employer-based insurance plans cannot charge workers differently based on sex. But in most states, including California, it’s a different matter for individual coverage typically bought by the self-employed, unemployed or those who work for companies that don’t offer benefits.

More than a fifth of California’s population of working-age women – nearly 2.4 million – went without health insurance in 2007, according to the Kaiser Family Foundation. Among low-income women, 39 percent had no coverage.

The federal stimulus package includes $24.7 billion that will pay 65 percent of COBRA health premiums for the recently unemployed and could help more women retain coverage under their former employer’s plans.
But many other women still buy individual policies directly from insurers, despite high deductibles, because premiums are often lower than COBRA plans.

Last week's turnover by the insurance industry came as momentum for health care change grows. Insurers do not want to be seen as an obstacle, and they're worried about a government-backed health plan that could siphon customers from commercial providers.

The statements on gender rating by insurers, however, come with strings attached, namely a mandate that would require the medically uninsured to purchase coverage.

"It will only work if we can get everybody covered. If we get everybody in the health care system, it changes everything," said Robert Zirkelbach, a spokesman for America's Health Insurance Plans, the industry's largest trade organization.

A universal health-care system with an individual mandate would help insurers spread the risk, he added.

The National Women's Law Center study looked at rates paid by men and women of similar age if they were enrolled in one of nearly 350 plans offered by insurance companies. In some cases, some women paid as much as 48 percent more than men.

The study compared premiums paid by 25-, 40- and 55-year-old men and women for plans with similar coverage, deductibles and co-pays but excluded maternity coverage.

Among 25-year-old women, the gender gap ranged from no difference to a 45 percent margin favoring men, while among 45-year-olds, the gap extended to 48 percent. Among 55-year-olds, the study showed a wider disparity, with some women paying as much as 22 percent less while others paid up to 37 percent more than men.

In some cases, even nonsmoking women paid more than men who smoked, according to the center's findings.

The California HealthCare Foundation conducted its own research but found available data too limited for a comprehensive study.

Still, a sampling showed that rates for 30-year-old men and women were as much as 28 percent apart, with men paying considerably less than women for insurance premiums.

The Bee found similar disparities using quotes generated by the same Web site, eHealthInsurance.com, that the National Women's Law Center used for its study.

A 30-year-old woman who lives in midtown Sacramento could pay between $59 and $296 monthly for a health plan, depending on the company and range of deductibles.

On average, she would pay nearly $9, or 8 percent, more per month than a man of similar age – although in some cases the gender gap was as much as 34 percent.

In one case, the woman would pay $10 less than a man if she bought a $72 PPO with a $3,500 deductible offered by Anthem.

On the other hand, she would pay $139 monthly – $35, or 34 percent, more than a man – for an Aetna policy with a $2,500 deductible.

In a written response to The Bee's questions, Aetna said that "rates can reflect the underlying differences in costs for men and women, by age, as documented in actuarial studies and general claims experience. ... Younger adult women tend to use slightly more health care services than men."

The company also noted that the gap narrows as people age. In fact, it said, most women begin paying less for health premiums in their 50s.
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE IS
A pattern of assultive and coercive behaviors, including physical, sexual and psychological attacks, and economic coercion that adults or adolescents use against their intimate partners.

PREVALENCE AMONG THE GENERAL POPULATION
Lifetime prevalence of physical and/or sexual abuse by an intimate partner is 25 percent for women and 8 percent for men.1

Prevalence Among the Seriously Mentally Ill
Research indicates that about 44 percent of women seen in outpatient mental health settings were physically abused as adults, and about 34 percent were sexually abused as adults.2
In one study of 66 female psychiatric inpatients, 44 percent had experienced physical assault as an adult (Byer et al 1987). Of those, 59 percent had been assaulted by an intimate partner.3
In another study of 69 inpatients (male and female) who had ongoing relationships with partners or family members, 63 percent reported ongoing victimization by a partner, and 48 percent reported physical abuse by a family member (Cascardi, et al 1987). Twenty-nine percent had experienced domestic abuse within the past year.4

ISSUES/CONCERNS
Women who have experienced domestic violence are more likely to be diagnosed with a variety of mental health problems, including post-traumatic stress disorder, sleep problems, depression, panic attacks, and insomnia. 5
Survival strategies for domestic violence survivors, who are often living in terror in their own homes, can often be misunderstood as maladjusted behavior. Such survival strategies can include, but are not limited to, self-medication, substance abuse, self-harm, depression, anxiety, extreme submission, and disassociation.
Research on hospital emergency rooms and psychiatric evaluation centers documents that conventional screening will identify only 15 to 25 percent of the battered women entering these services. 6

POLICY IMPLICATIONS
Believe the client’s statements about abuse, ensure that policies require full investigation of reported abuse and/or assault.
Develop policies that are client-centered, strength-based and empower the client.
Develop collaborative relationships between mental health services and domestic violence advocates. This includes cross training of staff, developing referral systems, establishing channels of communication, and collaborating to share resources and expertise.
Develop a protocol that requires routine screening and assessment for domestic violence and intimate partner abuse.
Adopt screening tools that are closed ended, specific and concrete, can be used routinely, and offer a combination of questions about different kinds of abusive behaviors highly associated with battering. 7 (See figure 1)

PRACTICE IMPLICATIONS
Many different screening tools have been developed. Because battered women frequently deny or minimize their abuse, experts recommend asking a range of questions that may be helpful in disclosing the abuse, including questions about emotional abuse, verbal abuse, physical abuse, and sexual abuse. Positive responses to preliminary questions should be followed up with specific questions. See figure 1 for a sample of screening and follow-up questions recommended for routine use in mental health services.8
Once identified, taking an abuse history is critical. It helps put the abuse in a broader context of the woman’s life, helps to identify the trauma she may be suffering, provides important information in developing a safety plan and can help the battered woman validate her experience and see the seriousness of her situation more clearly.9 See figure 2 for sample abuse history questions.
If abuse is suspected, before the client leaves you must assess her level of lethality and develop a safety plan. Contact your local domestic violence agency for a lethality assessment check-list and a safety plan check-list. At a minimum, ask the client:

- Is the abuser waiting for her at the clinic when she leaves?
- Does the abuser have a weapon?
- Does she feel safe leaving the clinic?
- Does she feel safe at home?
- Are her children safe?

Documentation is critical for women seeking legal protection, redress or custody of their children. Documentation of abuse should be detailed and specific, highlighting circumstances, tactics, time, place, effect, and injury of battering incidents. Include information derived from the abuse history, a lethality checklist and a safety plan.

Other than post-traumatic stress disorder, any diagnosis should be made cautiously. Diagnosis can be used against the client by the batterer, particularly related to child custody issues.

Documentation should also include the client’s strengths in surviving the abuse and important cultural factors as they affect the individual client.

Domestic Violence Resources

California Partnership to End Domestic Violence, http://www.cpedv.org; helpline, M-F 9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m., (800) 524-4765; business phone, (916) 444-7163. National Domestic Violence hotline (800) 799-SAFE (7233).

For additional screening tools, see the following Web sites:
- http://www.aafp.org/afp/20040515/poc.html

---

**Figure 1: Taken from Condolfo, Edward G. Assessing Women Batterer in Mental Health Services, Sage Publications, 1998 pg. 69. The titles of these two questionnaires were changed to fit the format of this document.**

**Sample Screening and Follow-up Questions**

**Screening Questions**

1. Are you in any danger at home or from your partner?
2. Does your partner have an angry outburst or temper tantrums?
3. Has your partner stopped you from going places or seeing people?
4. Has your partner threatened to harm you, your children, or your relatives?
5. Has your partner ever pushed, grabbed, slapped, or hit you?
6. Has your partner ever pressured you into sexual acts against your will?

**Follow-Up Questions**

Note: Each screening question above with a positive response should be followed with probes for the most recent incident, duration, frequency, affect, for example.

1. When was the most recent incident?
2. How long has this been going on?
3. How often has it happened in the last six months?
4. How has it made you feel? How has it hurt you physically?
5. What help or assistance have you sought?
6. How do you feel about calling the police or going to court to receive assistance?
### Figure 2: Abuse History

Below is a list of the critical categories to include when taking an abuse history.

- **Isolation**
  - Keeping the victim from going to a job, school, church, or from seeing family and friends.
  - Taking away the victim’s ID cards or driver’s license.
  - Following the victim around.
  - Opening the victim’s mail.
  - Monitoring phone calls or removing the telephone.

- **Financial Control**
  - Denying access to money.
  - Forcing the victim to beg and plead for money.
  - Using about money or hiding it.
  - Preventing the victim from working.
  - Stealing the victim’s money.
  - Not providing sufficient money for expenditures.
  - Ruminating or preventing the woman from getting credit.
  - Threatening to deprive her receipt of AFDC.

- **Intimidation**
  - Threatening the woman by certain gestures and looks.
  - Smashing or throwing things.
  - Destroying the woman’s possessions.
  - Hurting or killing pets.
  - Playing with weapons to scare the woman.
  - Threatening to kill the woman, children or himself.
  - Threatening to have the woman deported, if immigrant or refugee status.

- **Emotional Abuse**
  - Putting the woman down.
  - Calling the woman names.
  - Denigrating the woman in front of family and friends.
  - Making the woman feel stupid.
  - Blaming the woman for what he did wrong.

- **Sexual Abuse**
  - Forcing the woman down.
  - Calling the woman names.
  - Humiliating the woman in front of family and friends.
  - Making the woman feel stupid.
  - Blaming the woman for what he did wrong.

- **Sexual Abuse**
  - Reducing the woman’s sexual performance or response.
  - Pressuring the woman to do sex acts that make her uncomfortable.
  - Threatening to sexually molest the child.
  - Pressuring the woman to copy pornographic magazines.
  - Pressuring the woman to watch pornographic videos.
  - Raping or threatening to rape.

- **Physical Abuse**
  - Pushing, shoving, grabbing or hitting.
  - Stepping, punching, choking, biting, breaking up
  - Use of objects or weapons against the woman.

---

**Endnotes:**

31. Warshaw, Carol, MD, Barnes, Holly, MA, Domestic Violence, Mental Health and Trauma: Research Highlights, April 2003.
32. Ibid
33. Chamberlain, Linda
35. Ibid
36. Gondolf, Edward W. pg. 68-69
37. Ibid, pg. 73
38. Warshaw, Carol
39. Gondolf, Edward W. pg 90-91
40. Ibid pg. 89
Violence Against Women 2: Teens & Intimate Partner Violence

2009 Women In Politics

Source: Family Violence Prevention Fund’s The Facts on Teenagers and Intimate Partner Violence
http://www.statusofwomen.ca.gov/Userfiles/1172.1/teenagers2.pdf

Dating violence affects women regardless of their age, but teens are particularly vulnerable. In fact, women age 16 to 24 experience the highest per capita rate of intimate partner violence.1 Teen dating violence is prevalent and teens may also be exposed to domestic violence in their homes. Teens and young adults who are disconnected from social supports such as school, family, and work are at particular risk for domestic violence.

In a study of eighth and ninth graders, 25 percent indicated that they had been victims of dating violence, including eight percent who disclosed being sexually abused.2

Approximately one in five female public high school students in Massachusetts reported ever experiencing physical and/or sexual violence from dating partners.3

In a survey of 232 high school girls, 17.8 percent of the subjects indicated that they had been forced to engage in sexual activity against their will by a dating partner.4

Among female students between the ages of 15-20 who reported at least one violent act during a dating relationship, 24 percent reported experiencing extremely violent incidents such as rape or the use of weapons against them.5

Girls who reported that they had been sexually or physically abused were more than twice as likely as non-abused girls to report smoking (26 percent versus ten percent), drinking (22 percent versus 12 percent), and using illegal drugs (30 percent versus 13 percent). In addition, 32 percent of girls who had been abused reported bingeing and purging, compared to 12 percent of girls who had not been abused.6

In a study of 724 adolescent mothers between the ages of 12-18, one of every eight pregnant adolescents reported having been physically assaulted by the father of her baby during the preceding 12 months. Of these, 40 percent also reported experiencing violence at the hands of a family member or relative.7
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MORE FACTS ON TEEN DATING VIOLENCE

DATING VIOLENCE
In a study of eighth and ninth graders, 25 percent indicated that they had been victims of dating violence, including eight percent who disclosed being sexually abused.1

Approximately one in five female public high school students in Massachusetts reported ever experiencing physical and/or sexual violence from dating partners.2

Women aged 16-24 experience the highest per capita rate of intimate partner violence.3

SEXUAL VIOLENCE
In a survey of 232 high school girls, 17.8 percent of the subjects indicated that they had been forced to engage in sexual activity against their will by a dating partner.4

Of 273 high school students surveyed in the Chicago area, 16 percent identified past sexual victimization by a dating or ex-dating partner within the last year.5

Among female students between the ages of 15-20 who reported at least one violent act during a dating relationship, 24 percent reported experiencing extremely violent incidents such as rape or the use of weapons against them.6

PREGNANCY AND FAMILY PLANNING
Teens are at a higher risk of abuse during pregnancy than adult women: 21.7 percent of teens experience abuse as opposed to 15.9 percent of adults.7

High school girls reporting experiences of violence from dating partners were found to be approximately 4 to 6 times more likely than their non-abused peers to have ever been pregnant.8

In a study of 724 adolescent mothers between the ages of 12-18, one of every eight pregnant adolescents reported having been physically assaulted by the father of her baby during the preceding twelve months. Of these, forty percent also reported experiencing violence at the hands of a family member or relative.9

In a study of young mothers on public assistance, half (51 percent) reported experiencing birth control sabotage by a dating partner.10

The experience of interpersonal violence is correlated with rapid repeat pregnancy (RRP: defined as pregnancy onset within 12-24 months of the previous pregnancy outcome,) among low-income adolescents. In a study of 100 women aged 13-21 receiving prenatal care, those who experienced any form of abuse during the year-long study were substantially more likely to miscarry than were their non-abused peers, and spontaneous abortion was also very strongly associated with RRP.11

EFFECTS
Younger girls report more severe violence—62 percent in girls aged 11-15.12

Female teens cause more minor injuries to their partners than male teens, but are also likely to receive more significant physical injuries and are more likely to be sexually victimized by their partners.13

HEALTH CARE
Of 2,224 ninth to twelfth graders surveyed, 76 percent wanted the ability to obtain confidential health care, but only 45 percent perceived their regular provider to provide this, and only 28 percent had discussed confidentiality explicitly.14

Sixty percent of abused girls said they felt doctors should talk to them about sexual and physical abuse, but only 21 percent of abused girls reported ever having a discussion with their health care provider about physical or sexual abuse. Only seven percent of abused girls said they had told their physician about being abused.15
LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, TRANSGENDERED AND QUEER YOUTH

In a survey of gay, lesbian and bisexual students, 40 percent answered 'yes' to the question, "Have you ever been hurt physically or sexually by a date or someone you were going out with?" 16

In a survey of gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and queer identified youth, 49 percent of the respondents reported feeling abused by a partner in a past relationship. 17

ALCOHOL/DRUG ABUSE, EATING DISORDERS AND SUICIDE

Girls who reported that they had been sexually or physically abused were more than twice as likely as non-abused girls to report smoking (26 percent versus 10 percent), drinking (22 percent versus 12 percent), and using illegal drugs (30 percent versus 13 percent). In addition, 32 percent of girls who had been abused reported bingeing and purging, compared to 12 percent of girls who had not been abused. 18

Suicide ideation and actual suicide attempts were approximately 6 to 9 times as common among adolescent girls who reported having been sexually and physically hurt by dating partners. 19

SCHOOL

In a study of young women at a shelter for displaced teens aged 12-20, 44.4 percent of non-battered women were attending school, whereas only 22 percent of battered women were in school. Fifty percent of the non-battered women reported that they made good grades, whereas only 34.1 percent of the battered women reported good academic performance. 20

64. Thum, K., et al. (2003). Queer Youth Relationship Violence, Community United Against Violence and Lavender Youth Recreation & Information Center, California State Department of Health Services.
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In seeking to provide you with further information that both relates directly to the program and that can be used to broaden your knowledge of California government, we have provided some supplemental materials for your viewing pleasure.
Legislative Nomination Roster

Assemblymember
Mike Villines

Assemblymember
Isadore Hall

Assemblymember
Jerry Hill

Assemblymember
Nancy Skinner

Assemblymember
Tony Mendoza

Assemblymember
Mary Salas
Assemblymember Alyson Huber

Senator Dave Cogdill

Senator Roderick Wright

Senator Lois Wolk

Senator Darrell Steinberg

Senator Mimi Walters
Senator Christine Kehoe

Senator Ellen Corbett
Legislative Visit Preparation

This document provides a framework for you and your team to use to prepare for your legislative visit. These are by no means set-in-stone guidelines for what you need to do before, during or after the meeting, but they do help to provide you with a slight sense of what you might want to be thinking about.

1. Try to get to know your member, their voting record, most recent activities, and be familiar with their priorities. A staff person can often send you the member’s latest press releases, articles, and other helpful information. This can be done ahead of time, but you can also just ask the representative about what their thoughts are on your topic.

2. Do what you can to learn of any bias or special circumstances the member has – is she/he an adoptive parent, a teen parent, a doctor, or a doctor’s spouse, etc. If you have access to this information, great. If you don’t, don’t worry about it. The goal is really to try to pitch your issue in a way that will make it easy for the representative to connect with it.

3. When you walk into the office, introduce yourself to the office secretary, and tell them you are there for a meeting to at "9:30AM with the Senator/Assemblymember or Staff (Name)".

4. Once you are greeted, shake hands and thank the legislator or staff for taking the time to meet with you. Then begin introducing yourself with some background information (your school/community, age, grade). Then explain why you are here today: "I am here a part of the Women In Politics program, and for the past 4 days we have been learning about issues impacting women and our community. Some issues that are important to me are..."

5. Though you will have thought about specific agenda items before the visit, take this opportunity to share about yourself and your school/community/city and possibly other issues that the member may ask about or that you are interested in.

6. Going back to the issue that you have learned about, ask what you can do to show support to effect the implementation of what you would like to see– generate constituent letters, provide information on issues, etc.

7. Don’t forget to ask for something concrete from the member – a site visit, co-sponsorship of a bill, a floor statement, or a vote.

8. Follow-up with a thank you that restates the commitments made by both you and the member.

9. Ask the member for impressions and predictions about your issues, the local political scene, and the latest on what’s happening in the Capitol.

10. Say thank you – first, last and always.

11. When meeting with a staffer, all of the above apply!
Thank You Letters

Thanks to the generosity of contributors to our scholarship fund, you have had the opportunity to come to the Women In Politics program. We enjoyed having you here! In order to express your appreciation for this opportunity, we are requesting that you prepare a letter of thanks to your state legislator who recommended you. By preparing this letter—and acknowledging your sponsor within—you will help us increase the odds that your sponsor will renew their support next year. Below is all of the necessary information, suggestions and directions below. Please return this letter to the Women In Politics program director. The California Center will forward copies to your state legislator and sponsor. Thanks!

**SUGGESTED CONTENT-FORMAT:** So that all your letters are not the same, please feel free to use your own words, or mix up the order. **Please be creative and sincere and don’t forget to mention your sponsor in the letter.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Legislator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City State Zip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dear Assemblymember or Senator (Last Name),

On June 14 – 17th, I had the opportunity to attend the Women In Politics program in Sacramento. I’m writing to express my appreciation for recommending that I receive the scholarship to attend this program that was provided by [insert name of Sponsor].

Include 2-4 sentences about how - why you benefited from the experience.

Include 2-4 sentences about specific highlights of the program (certain issue or speaker, particular activity, other students, workshop or instructors, chance to see Capitol, Old Sacramento, etc.)

Include 2-4 closing sentences, again thanking the legislator and sponsor, and encouraging them to continue to make this opportunity available to other students in the future. *If you are willing, you can say you are available to make presentations about the program to others who would consider sponsoring youth in the future).*

Sincerely,

Your Name, Grade or Age
School
Email

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City State Zip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dear Sponsor,

On June 14 – 17th, I had the opportunity to attend the Women In Politics program in Sacramento because of the scholarship that you made possible. I’m writing to express my appreciation for having provided me with this wonderful opportunity to learn politics about and connect with my peers and Capital Professionals during the past four days.

Include 2-4 sentences about how - why you benefited from the experience.

Include 2-4 sentences about specific highlights of the program (certain issue or speaker, particular activity, other students, workshop or instructors, chance to see Capitol, Old Sacramento, etc.)

Include 2-4 closing sentences, again thanking the sponsor, and encouraging them to continue to make this opportunity available to other students in the future. *If you are willing, you can say you are available to make presentations about the program to others who would consider sponsoring youth in the future).*

Sincerely,

Your Name, Grade or Age
School
Email
Overview of California Government

Constitutional Basis

The basic form of law in California is a republic, governed by democratically elected state Senators and Assembly members. The governing law is a constitution, interpreted by the California Supreme Court, whose members are appointed by the Governor, and ratified at the next general election. The constitution can be changed by initiatives passed by voters. Initiatives can be proposed by the governor, legislature, or by popular petition, giving California one of the most flexible legal systems in the world. The constitution makes the California legislature bicameral, with a Senate and an Assembly.

The Legislature and the Executive Branch

The Governor has the powers and responsibilities to: sign or veto laws passed by the Legislature, including a line item veto; propose a state budget; give the annual State of the State Address and grant pardons for any crime, except cases involving impeachment by the Legislature.

As part of the system of checks and balances, the Legislature has statutory influence over the funding, organization, and procedures used by agencies of the executive branch. It also has the authority to appoint citizens to policy-making committees in the executive branch and to designate members of the Legislature to serve on agency boards. Many appointments made by the governor are subject to legislative approval.

The Big Five

The Big Five is an informal institution of California government, consisting of the governor, the Assembly speaker, the Assembly minority leader, the Senate president pro tempore, and the Senate minority leader. Members of the Big Five meet in private to discuss bills pending in the legislature. Because the party caucus leaders in California’s legislature also control the party’s legislative campaign funds, the leaders wield tremendous power over their caucus members. They are thus usually able to guarantee their caucus’s votes in Big Five meetings. Therefore, if all five members agree to support a Bill, it will likely pass into law.

Redistricting

California’s legislature has engaged in some rather unusual redistricting practices. The result is that virtually all Assembly and Senate district lines have been drawn in a way so as to favor one party or the other, and it is rare for a district to suddenly shift party allegiance. The state government is dominated by the Democratic Party, which controls the heavily populated coastal cities in Central and Southern California. The Republican Party is stronger in the Central Valley, most rural areas, and certain conservative suburban areas like Orange County.

Judicial Branch

The judicial system of California is the largest in the United States that is fully staffed by professional law-trained judges; a person must be admitted to practice law before they can become a judge in California. The state judiciary has approximately 1,600 judges that hear
over 8 million cases each year (with the assistance of 19,000 staff members and 400 judicial "equivalents" like commissioners and referees).
In comparison, the federal judicial system has only about 840 judges. Although New York and Texas technically have more judicial officers, a large number of them are not attorneys and have no formal legal training.
California's system is divided into three levels, with the Supreme Court and Courts of Appeal serving as appellate courts reviewing the decisions of the Superior Courts.

CODIFICATION IN CALIFORNIA

In 1872, under the influence of David Dudley Field, California began codifying its laws. California was one of the earliest American states (the first was New York), to codify its statutes into named codes (Civil Code, Code of Civil Procedure, and so on).

Prior to the 1840s, legislatures in all common law jurisdictions passed "Acts" in a completely haphazard manner and published them in the order passed. The result was that to determine what the current statutory law was, a lawyer would have to find the earliest relevant act and then trace a path from past to present through a series of acts passed at different dates to determine which rules had been expanded, overruled, or superseded. The advantage of a code is that once the legislature gets into the habit of writing acts as amendments to the code, then the official copy of the code will reflect what the current statutory law is.

Since then, virtually all states and the federal government have followed the lead of California and New York and codified their statutes. However, they have preferred to write a single code with a universal numbering system. Today, only California, New York, and Texas have systems of separate subject-specific codes.

Many of the code sections have become famous throughout the U.S., like Business and Professions Code Section 17200 (unfair competition), Code of Civil Procedure Section 425.16 (anti-SLAPP special motion), Penal Code Section 187 (murder), and Penal Code Sections 667 and 1170.12 (both codifying the state three-strikes law). Also, the Federal Rules of Evidence were inspired by the success of the California Evidence Code.
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Overview of Legislative Procedure

A legislative bill is a proposal to change, repeal, or add to existing state law. An Assembly Bill (AB) is one introduced in the Assembly; a Senate Bill (SB), in the Senate. Bills are designated by a number. The numbers are assigned in the order of introduction in each house. For example, AB 16 refers to the sixteenth bill introduced in the Assembly. The numbering starts afresh each session. The name of the author, the legislator who introduced the bill, becomes part of the title. The legislative procedure, is divided into distinct stages:

Drafting
The procedure begins when a Senator or Assembly Member decides to author a bill. A legislator sends the idea for the bill to the California Office of the Legislative Counsel, where it is drafted into bill form. The draft of the bill is returned to the legislator for introduction.

Introduction or First Reading
A bill is introduced or read the first time when the bill number, the name of the author, and the descriptive title of the bills are read on the floor of the house. The bill is then sent to the Office of State Publishing. No bill except the Budget Bill may be acted upon until 30 days have passed from the date of its introduction.

Committee hearing
After introduction, a bill goes to the rules committee of the house, where it is assigned to the appropriate policy committee, appropriate to the subject matter, for its first hearing. During the committee hearing the author presents the bill to the committee, and testimony may be heard in support or opposition to the bill. The committee then votes on whether to pass the bill out of committee, or that it be passed as amended. Bills may be amended several times. It takes a majority vote of the committee membership for a bill to be passed and sent to the next committee or to the floor.

Fiscal committee
The bill will have to be heard in the Fiscal committee if the bill contains an appropriation or has financial implications for the state.

Second reading
A bill recommended for passage by committee is read a second time on the floor of the house. Ordinarily there is little or no debate. If a bill is amended at this stage, it may be referred back for another committee hearing.

Floor vote
A roll call vote is taken. An ordinary bill needs a majority vote to pass. An urgency bill or a bill with fiscal implications requires a two-thirds vote.

Second house
If it receives a favorable vote in the first house, a bill repeats the same steps in the other house. If the second house passes the bill without changing it, it is sent to the governor's desk.
Resolution of Differences (concurrence or conference)
If a measure is amended in the second house and passed, it is returned to the house of origin for consideration of amendments. The house of origin may concur with the amendments and send the bill to the governor or reject the amendments and submit it to a two-house conference committee. If either house rejects the conference report, a second (and even a third) conference committee can be formed. If both houses adopt the conference report, the bill is sent to the governor.

Governor's action
Within 12 days after receiving a bill, the governor may sign it into law, allow it to become law without his/her signature, or veto it.

Overrides
A vetoed bill is returned to the house of origin, where a vote may be taken to

California Law and effective date
Each bill that is passed by the Legislature and approved by the Governor is assigned a chapter number by the Secretary of State. These chaptered bills are statutes, and ordinarily become part of the California Codes. Ordinarily a law passed during a regular session takes effect January 1 of the following year. A few statutes go into effect as soon as the governor signs them; these include acts calling for elections and urgency measures necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety.
SHOWS DATE AND LOCATION (HOUSE) EACH TIME THE BILL IS AMENDED

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE-1997-98 REGULAR SESSION

ASSEMBLY BILL No. 1216

Introduced by Assembly Member Granlund

February 28, 1997

An act add Sections 1008.5 and 5090.5 to the Education Code, relating to schools.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST
Existing law specifies that vacancies on governing boards of school districts or community college districts are caused by specified events. Existing law provides a procedure for filling a vacancy on the governing board of a school district or community college district, or on a county board of education. This bill would provide that in the event a person who holds office as a member of the governing board of a school district or community college district, or as a member of a county board of education, is elected or appointed to the governing board of a different school district or community college district, or to a different county board of education, the person's term on the first board is terminated upon taking the oath of office for the second board and the position would be deemed vacated. The bill would provide that the vacated position shall be filled, as specified.


The People of the State of California do enact as follows:

1 SECTION 1. Section 1008.5 is added to Code to Read:

1008.5 In the event a person who holds an office as a

TEXT OF BILL. THIS IS THE ACTUAL WORDING WHICH WILL BECOME PART OF THE CALIFORNIA PENAL CODE.
Women In Politics Glossary

Amendment: An addition to or deletion of language in a bill.

Appropriation: Money set aside by formal action, for a specific use.

Assembly: The 80-member Lower House of the State Legislature. Members serve two-year terms with a limit of three terms.

Author: The legislator who submits a bill.

Bicameral: A legislature consisting of two houses. (Senate/Assembly)

Bill: A proposed law or statute usually referred to as AB (Assembly bill) or SB (Senate bill).

Bill Room: Room in Capitol basement where citizens can obtain copies of bills, files and other publications free of charge.

Bond: Ballot measure whereby voters determine whether money may be borrowed by the state in order to fund a particular project, e.g., railway transit or public school construction. The state sells "bonds" to the public and uses the money to fund these projects. The public can later cash in the bonds and collect interest on them.

Budget: Suggested allocation of state moneys presented annually by the Governor, for consideration by the Legislature; compiled by the Department of Finance, in conjunction with Directors of State Departments.

Caucus: A group of lawmakers who meet to discuss common problems. These include party caucuses, minority group caucuses and regional caucuses.

Chapter: A bill that has been enacted into law. It is given a number, its chapter number being different from its bill number, based on the order in which it is passed.

Co-author: A member/legislator who places his/her name on a bill as supporter of a measure but who does not normally present argument for the measure before the committee.

Committee: Group of legislators who meet to discuss and hear testimony on proposed bills. Three key committees are:

1. Policy - one of numerous policy committees which handles bills according to their specific subject matter.
2. Fiscal - handles the annual state budget and all other bills with either direct or implied cost to the state.
3. Standing - hear testimony on bills and may or may not recommend passage.

Constituent: Citizen residing within the district of a legislator.

Constitutional: A proposed change in the state constitution to be submitted to the voters.
Amendment:

Dead: When a bill fails passage.

Ex officio: By virtue of one's office or position.

File: The pamphlet printed each legislative day that lists bills that may be debated in committee and on the house floor.

Gerrymandering: To divide a voting area during reapportionment so as to give an unfair advantage to a particular political party, politician or voting group.

Grassroots: Arising from public support. "Grassroots campaigning" involves mobilizing public support for a particular political candidate or ballot issue through actions such as door-to-door campaigning, local rallies and parades, and poster, banner and button displays.

Gubernatorial: Referring to the governor or his/her office.

Incumbent: The current holder of a public office.

Index: The pamphlet or book listing bills by subject.

Initiative: Provides voters with the power to propose a law or to propose a change in the state constitution. Must receive 6 million signatures of registered state voters before being placed on the ballot for statewide approval or rejection.

Interim hearing: A hearing on a subject area held when the Legislature is not formally in session. Sending bills to "interim hearing" is usually just a polite way of killing a measure, since most are never actually set for another hearing.

Legislator: Member of either house of the Legislature who proposes new laws and votes in favor of or against new laws proposed by other members.

Legislature: Comprised of two houses - the Assembly and the Senate - which are responsible for solving the problems of the state by the passage or rejection of proposed new laws, through the appropriation of funds, and through the confirmation or rejection of the governor's appointees.

Line-item veto: The power, usually held by the governor, to reduce or eliminate specific items in a budget or proposed piece of legislation. Is subject to two-thirds overriding vote of the Legislature.

Lobbyist or Legislative Advocate: Individual who attempts to influence legislators and other officials to take a particular stand on an issue.

Logrolling: The mutual exchange of favors among legislators when voting on or proposing a bill. A legislative practice whereby a particular bill may encompass several matters of individual importance by numerous legislators in order to secure its passage by the necessary number of votes.
**Lt. Governor:** Designated by the state constitution as president of the Senate; however he/she has no role in the routine business of the Senate and votes only when there is a 20-20 tie. Also takes over in event of Governor’s absence.

**Ordinance:** A city statute or regulation; a municipal law

**Override:** Rejection of the Governor’s veto of a bill. Must be by a two-thirds majority of each house in the Legislature.

**Petitioner:** Individual given the task of acquiring signatures of registered voters in order to put a particular initiative on the ballot.

**Pork barrel:** The practice of gaining benefits for one's own district. A particular piece of legislation which may include additional (i.e., other than specified) appropriations or fiscal advantages for an individual (group of) legislator(s) and his/her (their) district(s).

**President Tempore:** Responsible for the overall administration of the Senate. Elected by the Pro Senate, the Pro Temp chairs the Senate Rules Committee, promotes the prompt disposition of bills and other business before the Senate, and acts as its president in the absence or disability of the lieutenant governor.

**Proposition 140:** Commonly referred to as the "term limits" law, this legislation mandates that California public officials may only hold office for a designated number of terms. For example, the Governor may only be re-elected once, i.e., he/she holds office for only two four-year terms.

**Quorum:** Number of members required to be present before business can be transacted: 21 in Senate and 41 in Assembly.

**Reapportionment:** After the state census is taken every ten years, the state constitution requires the Legislature to adjust district boundary lines in the following year according to the changes in population. Districts of a particular type must be reasonably equal in population.

**Recall:** To remove any state or local elected official from office by circulating petitions and asking for a recall election.

**Referendum:** Process by which voters may place a measure passed by the Legislature on a statewide ballot for voter approval or rejection; such a measure is temporarily suspended, pending a decision of the voters.

**Resolution:** A legislative proposal that does not have the force of law but conveys the sentiments of the Legislature.

**Senate:** The 40-member Upper House of the Legislature. Members serve four year terms with a limit of two terms.

**Speaker of the Assembly:** Presiding officer of that body, is elected by the majority of members to run the day-to-day administrative activities of the Lower House. The Speaker presides over the Assembly during legislative sessions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Speaker Pro Tempore:</strong></th>
<th>Elected by the Assembly to perform leadership duties during the Speaker's absence. The speaker pro tem is an ex officio member of the rules committee with no vote.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statute:</strong></td>
<td>An established rule or law; a law passed by a legislative body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statutory Initiative:</strong></td>
<td>Qualifies for the ballot if petitions are signed by a registered voters equal in number to 5% of the votes cast for candidates in the last election.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Veto:</strong></td>
<td>Power held by the Governor by which he/she may reject a bill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SUNDAY, JUNE 14th</strong></th>
<th><strong>MONDAY, JUNE 15th</strong></th>
<th><strong>TUESDAY, JUNE 16th</strong></th>
<th><strong>WEDNESDAY, JUNE 17th</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00-1:00 Marriott Residence Inn Conference Room</td>
<td>7:30-8:15 Marriott Dining Area</td>
<td>7:30-8:15 Marriott Dining Area</td>
<td>7:45-8:30 Marriott Dining Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-1:30 Check-In</td>
<td>8:30-9:00 Breakfast</td>
<td>8:30-9:00 Capitol</td>
<td>8:30-9:00 Marriott Lobby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-3:00 Lunch and Mingle</td>
<td>9:00-10:00 Review of the Day</td>
<td>9:00-10:00 Check Luggage</td>
<td>9:15 Transfer to State Capitol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-3:45 Welcome and Orientation</td>
<td>8:45-9:00 State Capitol Tour</td>
<td>10:15-11:45 Capitol North Steps</td>
<td>9:30-10:30 Capitol Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45-4:00 Interview Workshop</td>
<td>11:00-12:00 Job Shadow</td>
<td>11:00-12:00 Lunch</td>
<td>10:45-11:15 Eureka Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00-4:30 Break</td>
<td>12:00-1:00 K Street</td>
<td>12:00-1:00 Lunch</td>
<td>11:30-1:00 Chop's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00-5:30 Check into Rooms</td>
<td>1:00-1:15 Cathedral</td>
<td>1:15-2:30 Capitol Room</td>
<td>1:00-1:30 Marriott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:15-6:30 Transfer to Dinner</td>
<td>1:30-1:45 Hyatt Hotel, Golden</td>
<td>3:00-5:00 CA Women's Museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30-8:00 Kasbah Restaurant</td>
<td>2:00-3:00 State Conference Room</td>
<td>5:00-5:30 Museum Tour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00-9:30 Dinner</td>
<td>3:00-3:30 Presentations</td>
<td>5:30-6:30 Marriott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30-10:00 Flex Time</td>
<td>3:30-4:00 Day Two Debrief and Evaluation</td>
<td>6:30-8:00 Chicago Fire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30-10:00 Ready for Bed</td>
<td>4:00-6:00 Flex Time before Dinner</td>
<td>8:00-9:00 Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-1:00 Lunch</td>
<td>6:00-6:15 Transfer to Dinner</td>
<td>9:30-10:00 Ready for Bed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-1:15 Regroup and Transfer</td>
<td>6:15-7:45 Vallejo's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-1:45 Energizer</td>
<td>7:45-9:00 Marriott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-3:00 Team Issue Discussion</td>
<td>9:30-10:00 Flex Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-3:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30-4:00 Day Two Debrief and Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00-6:00 Flex Time before Dinner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00-6:15 Transfer to Dinner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:15-7:45 Vallejo's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:45-9:00 Marriott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30-10:00 Ready for Bed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2009 Women In Politics Program Agenda**