

Vice-Chair
Ochoa Bogh, Rosilicie

Members
Cabaldon, Christopher
Choi, Steven S.
Cortese, Dave
Gonzalez, Lena A.
Laird, John

California State Senate

EDUCATION



SASHA RENÉE PÉREZ
CHAIR

Staff Director
Lynn Lorber

Principal Consultant
Olgallia Ramirez
Ian Johnson

Consultant
Theresa Austin

Committee Assistant
Maria Velez
Irma Kam

1021 O Street, Room 6740
(916) 651-4105
FAX: (916) 324-0917

AGENDA

Wednesday, June 11, 2025
9 a.m. -- 1021 O Street, Room 2100

MEASURES HEARD IN FILE ORDER

- | | | | |
|------|---------|---------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. | AB 243 | Ahrens | Postsecondary education: student financial aid dependency status: juveniles. |
| *2. | AB 313 | Ortega | Student financial aid: application deadlines: extension. |
| 3. | AB 322 | Ward | Pupil health: school-based health services and school-based mental health services. |
| 4. | AB 503 | Mark González | School facilities: Civic Center Act: direct costs.(Urgency) |
| *5. | AB 606 | Quirk-Silva | Certificated employees: professional services credential: out-of-state applicants. |
| *6. | AB 677 | Bryan | Pupil records: directory information. |
| 7. | AB 681 | Elhawary | California DREAM Loan Program: limits. |
| *8. | AB 927 | Sharp-Collins | County superintendent of schools: inspection of public schools.(Urgency) |
| 9. | AB 962 | Hoover | Pupil safety: comprehensive school safety plans: use of smartphones. |
| 10. | AB 1009 | Blanca Rubio | Teacher credentialing: administrative services credential: occupational and physical therapists. |
| *11. | AB 1216 | Education | Elementary and secondary education: omnibus. |
| 12. | AB 1306 | Muratsuchi | Teacher preparation programs: school districts and county offices of education: English learners. |
| *13. | AB 1438 | Gallagher | School finance: administrative employee-to-teacher ratio: Paradise Unified School District.(Urgency) |

***Consent Items**

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 243	Hearing Date:	June 11, 2025
Author:	Ahrens		
Version:	March 28, 2025		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Olgalilia Ramirez		

Subject: Postsecondary education: student financial aid dependency status: juveniles.

NOTE: This bill has been referred to the Committees on Education and *Judiciary*. A “do pass” motion should include referral to the Committee on *Judiciary*.

SUMMARY

This bill authorizes personnel at a county child welfare department, county probation department, or local educational agency (LEA), upon request of a youth formerly in the foster care or probation system, to provide information from the youth’s juvenile case file to an institution of higher education (IHE) to assist the youth’s attendance at that institution. It further requires a financial aid administrator to accept a sworn attestation as sufficient documentation for adjusting a financial aid applicant’s dependency status who is attending or applying to a California State University (CSU), California Community College (CCC), or University of California (UC) campus. Lastly, it makes any information received by an IHE confidential, and a violation of the confidentiality provisions subject to a misdemeanor of up to a \$500 fine.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the California Student Aid Commission (CSAC) for the purpose of administering specified student financial aid programs. (Education Code (EC) § 69510, et seq.)
- 2) Establishes the Cal Grant program, administered by the CSAC, to provide grants to financially needy students to attend a college or university. The Cal Grant programs include both the entitlement and the competitive Cal Grant awards. The program consists of the Cal Grant A, Cal Grant B, and Cal Grant C programs, and eligibility is based upon financial need, grade point average (GPA), California residency, and other criteria. Maximum award amounts for the CSU and the UC are established in the annual Budget Act and have traditionally covered all systemwide tuition and fees. Supplemental Cal Grant awards programs are available to students with dependents and former and current foster youth attending CSU, UC, or a CCC to assist with non-tuition costs, such as living expenses. (EC § 69430–69433 and § 69465-69470)
- 3) Establishes, the Cal Grant Reform Act commencing in the 2024-2025 fiscal year, if General Fund moneys over the multiyear forecasts are available to support ongoing augmentations and actions, and if funding is provided in the annual

Budget Act. Under the Act, the Cal Grant 2 and Cal Grant 4 programs are created. The Cal Grant 2 is for CCC students, and provides non-tuition support that grows annually with inflation. The Cal Grant 4 program is for students at the UC, CSU, and other institutions. The Act also states legislative intent that UC and CSU use institutional aid to cover non-tuition costs for their students. (EC § 69424, 69425, and 69428).

- 4) Requires the CSAC, through an interagency agreement with the Department of Social Services (DSS), to operate a federally-funded scholarship program that provides grant aid to California's current and former foster youth. Existing law requires funds to be used to assist students who are current and former foster youth, for career and technical training or traditional college courses. (EC § 69519)
- 5) Establishes the Middle Class Scholarship (MCS) Program to offset a portion of tuition costs for students attending the UC and the CSU. Starting in the 2022-23 academic year, MCS awards may be used to cover the total cost of attendance at UC and CSU. The maximum annual household income to qualify for an award is \$234,000 for dependent students in 2025-26. (EC § 70020, et seq.)
- 6) Specifies the categories of individuals who are authorized to inspect a juvenile case file, and authorizes only certain individuals to inspect a juvenile case file, including, among others, a local child support agency for the purpose of establishing paternity and establishing and enforcing child support orders and members of children's multidisciplinary teams, persons, or agencies providing treatment or supervision of the minor. (Welfare & Institutions Code § 827)
- 7) Prohibits, in federal law, funds from being made available under any applicable program to any educational agency or institution that permits the release of a student's education records, or the personally identifiable information contained therein, other than directory information, without the written consent of their parents. (20 U.S.C. 1232(b))
- 8) Specifies that a financial aid administrator has the authority to, on the basis of adequate documentation, make adjustments to the data used to determine a student's financial aid eligibility, based on "special circumstances or unusual circumstances." Further specifies that, in instances when the student or the student's parents or legal guardians are incarcerated, this documentation can be obtained with a documented phone call or a written statement from various officials, as specified. (20 U.S.C. 1087tt et seq.)

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Requires a financial aid administrator to accept a sworn attestation as sufficient documentation for determining eligibility under federal regulations, specifically for making adjustments for unusual circumstances to the dependency status of an applicant for student financial aid, who is attending, or applying to, a CSU, CCC, or UC campus.

- 2) Requests the UC Regents to adopt a policy to implement the bill's provisions.
- 3) Authorizes, to support a person who is or was previously adjudged a dependent or ward of the juvenile court, placed in foster care or on probation, or taken into the custody of the county probation department, in attending an IHE by assisting the person with tasks, such as applying, registering, enrolling, and obtaining financial aid or support, personnel at a county probation department or LEA to provide, upon request of the person, the IHE with either or both of the following:
 - a) A sworn attestation as defined to be used for the purpose of making an adjustment to a financial aid applicant's dependency status, as specified.
 - b) The information necessary to verify that the person is or was previously adjudged a dependent or ward of the juvenile court, placed in foster care or on probation, or taken into the custody of the county probation department.
- 4) Makes any information received by the IHE outlined in 3) above confidential, only to be shared among the IHE's personnel when necessary, and prohibits further disclosure or dissemination of that information by the IHE or its personnel.
- 5) Requires the IHE to retain the information received in a confidential file for three years after the person's last term of enrollment and thereafter destroy it.
- 6) Makes an intentional violation of the confidentiality provisions of the bill subject to a misdemeanor of up to a \$500 fine.
- 7) Defines, for the purpose of the bill, the following terms:
 - a) "Adjustment for unusual circumstances" to mean an unusual circumstances adjustment, as described in federal law as specified, regarding the dependency status of a financial aid applicant.
 - b) "Applicant" to mean a financial aid applicant attending, or applying to attend, the CSU, CCC, or UC.
 - c) "Financial aid" to mean any form of student financial aid or institutional financial aid.
 - d) "Financial aid administrator" to mean a financial aid administrator of the CSU, CCC, or UC for purposes of determining institutional financial aid of the applicant, or the CSAC for purposes of determining student financial aid of the applicant, as applicable.
 - e) "Institutional financial aid" to mean all institutional grant aid, including institutional student need-based and merit-based aid.
 - f) "Local educational agency" to mean a school district, charter school, or county office of education.

- g) “Sworn attestation” to mean a statement signed under penalty of perjury by an authorized representative of a LEA, county child welfare department, or probation department. The attestation shall include all of the following:
 - i) The name, organization, and title of the attester.
 - ii) A declaration that the attester has provided services, instruction, or assistance to the student.
 - iii) A declaration that the attester is familiar with the student’s relationship with their parent or parents, as defined in federal law.
 - iv) A declaration that, to the best of the attester’s personal knowledge, the student is either unable to contact their parent or parents, or contacting their parent or parents would pose a risk to the student.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) **Need for the bill.** According to the letter of support submitted by the County of Santa Clara to this Committee, “Under existing law, information related to a minor in juvenile court proceedings and child welfare systems is highly confidential, and access to case files is restricted to authorized individuals. Due to this youth involved in the juvenile justice or child welfare systems often encounter challenges when required to obtain proof of their financial independence, medical, disability, or other accommodations as part of their application or enrollment in higher education. These barriers disproportionately impact Latino and Black communities, which are overrepresented among system-involved youth. Currently, institutions of higher education in California are requesting a variety of different types of documentation from youth of financial independence.

“AB 243 addresses the challenges these youth face in providing necessary information during admissions, financial aid, enrollment, and accommodation processes. By requiring financial aid administrators at public higher education institutions in California to accept an attestation from local educational agencies, county probation departments, or welfare departments as sufficient documentation of financial independence, the bill streamlines access to affordable education for these students. This attestation approach also promotes consistent treatment of required information from students. For the rare instances in which the attestation is not sufficient, or where other information is needed to support the youth’s successful enrollment and education, the bill allows county or county office of education staff to disclose to higher education institutions limited information about the youth’s circumstances while maintaining confidentiality safeguards.”

- 2) **Why dependency status matters?** Establishing an applicant’s financial dependency status through the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) is necessary to determine their eligibility for student aid. Dependent students are considered to have parental support and must submit financial information for

both themselves and their parents. In contrast, independent students are deemed financially responsible for themselves and only need to provide their own financial information or, if applicable, that of their spouse. This distinction is important as it affects their Student Aid Index calculation, which in turn impacts the amount and type of financial aid for which the student may qualify.

- 3) **At the discretion of student financial aid administrators.** FAFSA uses specific criteria (age, marital status, military service, etc.) to determine financial dependency status, and not all students who live independently or support themselves qualify as independent under FAFSA rules. As noted within the Federal Student Aid Handbook there are some unique situations where financial aid administrators need to exercise their professional judgment in determining dependency. This includes when to perform dependency overrides to account for a student's unusual circumstances that warrant making a dependent student an independent student. Specifically, federal law distinguishes between different categories of professional judgment that may be exercised for special circumstances or unusual circumstances. As it pertains to this bill, unusual circumstances refers to the conditions that justify an adjustment to a student's dependency status based on a unique situation including human trafficking, refugee or asylee status, parental abuse or abandonment, parental or student incarceration. Financial aid administrators may use their professional judgement to make adjustments that are appropriate to each student's situation with appropriate documentation. New FAFSA rules require institutions to develop policies for reviewing professional judgment requests and must make students aware of their ability to request an adjustment for special or unusual circumstances.

This bill explicitly requires that a financial aid administrator at a California public higher education institution accept a sworn statement from the specified local agencies as sufficient proof for adjusting an applicant's dependency status thereby streamlining, in part, professional judgement determinations for foster youth or juvenile justice involved students. It further authorizes a LEA, county child welfare, or probation department to support these students in their pursuit of higher education by sharing limited information with financial aid administrators to verify their circumstances when requested by the student. Any information shared with the college must be kept confidential.

- 4) **Amendment.** Federal law allows for the documentation of a student's unusual circumstances to come from a variety of sources, including federal, state, county, and Tribal agencies, as well as from certain types of caseworkers and programs. For purposes of clarifying that financial aid administrators are not limited by the provisions of this bill, and that they can make adjustments using documentation from other sources as permitted by federal law, ***staff recommends that the bill be amended*** to add in the education code:

Nothing in this section prohibits a financial aid administrator from accepting other types of adequate documentation to substantiate a student's unusual circumstances in accordance with federal law 20 U.S.C. Sec. 1087tt(a)(3).

SUPPORT

County of Santa Clara (Sponsor)
Alameda County Office of Education
California Chamber of Commerce
California County Superintendents
CFT- A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO
Office of the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools
Youth Law Center

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 313	Hearing Date:	June 11, 2025
Author:	Ortega		
Version:	May 20, 2025		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Olgalilia Ramirez		

Subject: Student financial aid: application deadlines: extension.

SUMMARY

This bill allows the California Student Aid Commission (CSAC) to extend by 30 calendar days the application deadline for any financial aid program administered by CSAC if it determines that a delay in the opening of the Federal Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) has occurred.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes CSAC as the primary state agency for the administration of state-authorized student financial aid programs available to students attending all segments of postsecondary education. (Education Code (EC) § 69430 - 69433)
- 2) Requires CSAC to grant up to 30 additional days beyond an application deadline for any financial aid program administered by the Commission, if the Commission receives and approves a formal request to postpone the application deadline from a local educational agency or institution of higher education that is eligible to receive state funds for student financial assistance. It further requires that, in order to grant the requested extension, the Commission certify a qualifying event has occurred, such as a natural disaster. Lastly, current law authorizes the Commission to grant a financial aid program application deadline extension without it being requested if a state of emergency is declared. (EC § 69513.2)
- 3) If the FAFSA is not available on or before October 1, 2023, existing law extends the application deadline for financial aid programs administered by the Commission to April 2, 2024, for the 2024-25 award year only. It further extends the April 2, 2024 application deadline for financial aid programs administered by CSAC by an additional month. (SB 117 Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Section 22, Chapter 50, Statutes of 2023 and AB 1887 Cervantes, Section 22, Chapter 5, Statutes of 2024)
- 4) Creates the Cal Grant Program, and therein establishes the Cal Grant A Entitlement Awards, the Cal Grant B Entitlement Awards, the California Community College (CCC) Expanded Entitlement Awards, the CCC Transfer Entitlement Awards, the Competitive Cal Grant A and B Awards, the Cal Grant C

Awards, and the Cal Grant T Awards under the administration of CSAC. (EC § 69430 et al.)

- 5) Establishes the Cal Grant Reform Act, which revises and recasts the provisions establishing and governing the existing Cal Grant Program into a new Cal Grant Program. Specifies that the Act becomes operative only if General Fund moneys over the multiyear forecasts beginning in the 2024–25 fiscal year are available to support ongoing augmentations and actions, and if funding is provided in the annual Budget Act to implement the Act. (EC § 69504 et al.)
- 6) Establishes the Middle Class Scholarship (MCS) program under the administration of CSAC and makes an undergraduate student eligible for a scholarship award under the MCS if the student is enrolled at the University of California (UC) or the California State University (CSU), or enrolled in upper division coursework in a community college baccalaureate program, and meets certain eligibility requirements, including, among others, that the applicant meets the eligibility requirements for a Cal Grant. (EC § 70020 et al.)

ANALYSIS

This bill allows CSAC to extend by 30 calendar days the application deadline for any financial aid program administered by CSAC if it determines that a delay in the opening of FAFSA has occurred.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) **Need for the bill.** According to the author, “The delay caused by the FAFSA reform process and the uncertainty caused by the new federal administration are harming first-time college applicants. Students from working families rely on financial aid to afford college, and submitting the FAFSA and CADAA applications is their first step toward accessing aid. Automatically extending the deadline whenever the FAFSA is delayed will give working families and students across the state more time to apply, empowering them to continue their education and pursue their dreams.”
- 2) **The federal rollout of the new FAFSA.** In 2020, Congress mandated the United States Department of Education (USDE) to redesign and streamline the FAFSA application process for students applying for financial aid. The rollout of this new FAFSA application resulted in a delay in the opening of the application window over the past three years, leading to a shorter application period than usual. The situation raised concerns about the possible decreases in FAFSA completion rates and the loss of aid dollars for students caused by complications with the rollout. To address this issue, the state enacted legislation to push back the March 2 application deadline for state aid programs in 2023 (SB 117 Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 50, Statutes of 2023) by one month and again in 2024 (AB 1887 Cervantes, Chapter 5, Statutes of 2024), giving more time to students while the USDE worked on resolving key issues with the new FAFSA that affect students from mixed-status families. This action resulted in a May 2 deadline for the 2024-2025 award year only. Issues with the application continue to impact students, as the 2025-26 award application cycle also

experienced delays. The USDE announced on August 7, 2024, that the upcoming FAFSA form would not be open to all students until December 1, 2024 – about two months later than the typical release date. In this instance, CSAC granted a deadline extension using its administrative authority to respond to requests from an educational institution for postponement due to extenuating circumstances. This bill seeks to authorize CSAC to extend the application deadline by one month without needing legislative intervention or a request for postponement in any year when the opening of the FAFSA is delayed.

- 3) **Existing deadline extension authority.** Existing law requires CSAC to approve requests for extending the state aid deadline by up to 30 days from local education agencies and institutions of higher education when extenuating circumstances outside the control of students create adverse effects on students' ability to apply for aid by the statutory deadline. In 2021 and 2022, CSAC extended the deadline statewide using this process due to the COVID-19 emergency at the request of higher education institutions and many K-12 districts. As mentioned, it used this process again on February 6, 2025, to address delays in the application cycle for the 2025-26 award year. This bill expands CSAC's authority by specifically identifying a delay in the opening of the FAFSA as grounds for CSAC, upon its own initiative, to postpone the application deadline.
- 4) **Impact of the deadline extensions.** As noted in CSAC's letter of support submitted to this Committee, extending the state aid application deadline by an additional month in spring 2024 resulted in more than 102,000 first-time students applying for financial aid during the extended application window, which is a 28 percent increase.

SUPPORT

California Student Aid Commission (Sponsor)
 Alameda County Office of Education
 Alliance for a Better Community
 BLU Educational Foundation
 California Community Colleges, Chancellor's Office
 California Faculty Association
 California State Student Association
 California State University, Office of the Chancellor
 California Undocumented Higher Education Coalition
 Campaign for College Opportunity
 Central American Resource Center - Carecen - of California
 Central American Resource Center of Los Angeles
 CFT- A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO
 EdTrust-West
 First Gen Empower
 Go Public Schools
 Green DOT Public Schools California
 Hispanas Organized for Political Equality
 Immigrants Rising

Innercity Struggle
Institutional Solutions
John Burton Advocates for Youth
Legacy Bridge Community Development Corporation
Los Angeles Unified School District
Los Angeles United Methodist Urban Foundation
NextGen California
Northern California College Promise Coalition
Parent Institute for Quality Education
Public Advocates
San Bernardino Community College District
Southern California College Attainment Network
Student Senate for California Community Colleges
The Institute for College Access & Success
Unite-LA
University of California Student Association

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 322	Hearing Date:	June 11, 2025
Author:	Ward		
Version:	January 24, 2025		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Therresa Austin		

Subject: Pupil health: school-based health services and school-based mental health services.

SUMMARY

This bill requires the California Department of Education (CDE) to encourage local educational agencies (LEAs) to participate in programs that offer reimbursement for school-based health services and school-based mental health services, as specified.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Office of School-Based Health at the CDE for the purpose of assisting LEAs regarding the current health-related programs under the purview of the CDE, and requires the scope of the Office to include collaborating with the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) and other departments in the provision of school-based health services, and assisting LEAs with information on, and participation in specified school-based health programs. (Education Code (EC) § 49419)
- 2) Requires the governing board of any school district to give diligent care to the health and physical development of pupils, and authorizes it to employ properly certified persons to conduct this work. (EC § 49400)
- 3) Requires CDE to provide guidance and assistance to school districts to secure the voluntary assistance of local health professionals, schools of medicine, schools of public health, schools of nursing, voluntary health agencies, and other appropriate entities to provide pupil health screening and appropriate medical referrals, as well as provide health information to pupils and their parents. (EC § 33319)
- 4) Establishes the Medi-Cal program, administered by DHCS, under which eligible low-income individuals receive health care services. (Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) § 14000 et seq.)
- 5) Authorizes specified services provided by an LEA to Medi-Cal eligible students to be reimbursable under Medi-Cal through the Local Education Agency Billing Option Program (LEA BOP), including health and mental health evaluations, medical transportation, nursing services, occupational therapy, physical therapy, physician services, mental health and counseling services, school health aide

services, speech pathology services, audiology services, and targeted case management. (WIC § 14132.06)

- 6) Requires DHCS to amend its Medicaid State Plan with respect to the billing option for services by LEAs, to ensure that schools are reimbursed for all eligible services that they provide that are not precluded by federal requirements. (WIC § 14115.8)
- 7) Requires DHCS to examine methodologies for increasing school participation in the Medi-Cal billing option for LEAs so that schools can meet the healthcare needs of their students. Requires DHCS, to the extent possible, to simplify claiming processes for LEA billing. (WIC § 14115.8)
- 8) Establishes the Children and Youth Behavioral Health Initiative (CYBHI) and requires the DHCS to develop and maintain a school-linked statewide fee schedule for outpatient mental health or substance use disorder treatment provided to a student 25 years or younger at a school site, beginning January 1, 2024. Requires health care service plans, including a Medi-Cal managed care plan, or an insurer, to reimburse school-based services provided to one of its members according to the statewide fee schedule, regardless of whether the provider is within the plan's or insurer's contracted provider network. (WIC § 5961.4)

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Requires CDE to encourage LEAs to participate in programs that offer reimbursement for school-based health services and school-based mental health services, including but not limited to, both of the following:
 - a) The Medi-Cal Billing Option Program for LEAs, as specified.
 - b) The statewide fee schedule for school-linked outpatient mental health or substance use disorder treatment, as specified.
- 2) Defines "local education agencies" to mean a school district, county office of education, or charter school.
- 3) Makes other technical and clarifying changes.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, "Impacted especially by the COVID-19 pandemic, school-aged children have reported increased mental illnesses and physical health concerns. It is imperative that the state takes further action to support these youth by making concerted efforts to encourage local educational agencies' (LEAs) participation in the LEA Billing Option Program and Statewide

School-Linked Behavioral Health Fee Schedule. In doing so, there will be an increased access to and leveraging of funds for LEAs which, importantly, will expand access to critical health and mental health services for school-aged children.”

- 2) ***LEA Medi-Cal Billing Option Program.*** LEA BOP is a voluntary program overseen by DHCS, in collaboration with CDE, which reimburses LEAs (school districts, county offices of education, charter schools, community colleges, and university campuses) for the federal share of the maximum allowable rate for approved health-related services provided by qualified health service practitioners to Medi-Cal eligible students. Services eligible for reimbursement under the program include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Audiology Services
- Health and Mental Health Evaluation
- Education Assessments
- Medical Transportation
- Nursing Services and Activities of Daily Living
- Nutritional Services
- Occupational Therapy
- Orientation and Mobility
- Physical Therapy
- Psychology and Counseling
- School Health Aide Services
- Speech Therapy
- Targeted Case Management
- Respiratory Therapy
- Vision

Reimbursement is based upon a fee-for-service model, and school expenditures for qualified services rendered are reimbursed at 50% of cost using federal Medicaid matching funds. Under the program, LEAs bill Medi-Cal for the direct medical services they provide to Medi-Cal eligible students. LEAs pay for the services and are reimbursed for the rate relative to the cost of each individual service from federal funds.

- 3) ***CYBHI Fee Schedule program.*** The CYBHI is a multiyear, \$4.7 billion effort at the core of the Master Plan for Kids’ Mental Health, aimed at overhauling the state’s mental health system and enhancing the pathways connecting families with the needed services. As part of the CYBHI, DHCS was tasked with establishing and maintaining a statewide multi-payer fee schedule for school-linked behavioral health (known as the CYBHI Fee Schedule), enabling LEAs and public institutions of higher education (IHEs) to receive funding for outpatient services rendered at a school or school-linked site. The CYBHI Fee Schedule program establishes the minimum rates at which managed care plans and insurers must reimburse LEAs and IHEs for the provision of covered services for a student at a school site or school-linked location, including on-campus, off-campus and mobile clinic locations. It also provides the appropriate billing codes, rates, and provider types for each service type billable as part of the CYBHI Fee Schedule program. Services provided as part of the fee schedule shall not be

subject to copayment, coinsurance, deductible, or any other form of cost sharing. To be eligible for covered services, children and youth must be:

- Under the age of 26;
- Enrolled in public TK-12 schools or IHEs (e.g., California Community Colleges); and
- Covered by Medi-Cal managed care plans, Medi-Cal Fee-for-Service, health care service plans, and disability insurers.

In addition to establishing the CYBHI Fee Schedule, DHCS was tasked with developing and maintaining a school-linked statewide provider network of school-site behavioral health counselors. Since its launch in January 2024, DHCS has approved four cohorts of LEAs to participate in the CYBHI Fee Schedule and statewide provider network, totaling to 485 LEAs serving roughly 3.6 million students enrolled across participating schools. As of May 1, 2025, DHCS has opened applications for its fifth cohort of LEAs and IHEs.

- 4) ***Encouraging participation.*** This bill would require CDE to encourage LEAs to participate in programs like LEA BOP and the CYBHI Fee Schedule. According to information provided by the author's office, the language of the bill is intended to provide CDE with the flexibility necessary to determine how to go about encouraging participation in a way that is efficient and cost effective. At present, CDE and DHCS host informational web pages for LEA BOP and the CYBHI Fee Schedule, respectively, to provide LEAs with application and enrollment process support.

- 5) ***Related legislation.***

AB 1955 (Ward, 2024) would have required the CDE to encourage LEAs to participate in programs that offer reimbursement for school-based health and mental health services. *AB 322 is identical to the introduced version of AB 1955 as introduced; however, AB 1955 was amended in the Assembly to address another issue before being heard in the Senate Education Committee.*

AB 483 (Muratsuchi, Chapter 527, Statutes of 2023) modified and imposed new requirements related to timelines, reporting, technical assistance, stakeholder engagement, and guidance for the LEA BOP, a program that allows schools to claim reimbursement for a portion of the cost of delivering health services to Medi-Cal eligible students.

AB 133 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 143, Statutes of 2021) established the CYBHI Act, including the development and maintenance of a statewide fee schedule for school-linked outpatient mental health and substance use disorder treatment, and, beginning January 1, 2024, requires the reimbursement providers of such services.

AB 563 (Berman, 2021) would have required CDE to establish an Office of School-Based Health Programs for the purpose of improving the operation of,

and participation in, school-based health programs, including the Medi-Cal Administrative Activities claiming process (SMAA) and the LEA BOP. Required that \$500,000 in federal reimbursements be made available for transfer through an interagency agreement to CDE for the support of the Office. *This bill was held in the Senate Education Committee.*

AB 130 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 44, Statutes of 2021) requires the CDE to establish the Office of School-Based Health no later than January 1, 2022, and specified the responsibilities of the office, including assisting LEAs with information on, and participation in, specified school-based health programs, including the LEA BOP; and to appoint a state school nurse consultant by January 1, 2022.

SUPPORT

Alameda County Office of Education
Association of Regional Center Agencies
California Association of School Psychologists
California Youth Empowerment Network
CFT- A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO
Health Officers Association of California
Los Angeles County Office of Education
National Alliance on Mental Illness
Office of the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools
San Diego Unified School District

OPPOSITION

California Family Council
One individual

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 503	Hearing Date:	June 11, 2025
Author:	Mark González		
Version:	February 25, 2025		
Urgency:	Yes	Fiscal:	No
Consultant:	Ian Johnson		

Subject: School facilities: Civic Center Act: direct costs.

SUMMARY

This bill, an urgency measure, permanently extends provisions of the Civic Center Act allowing school districts to recover direct costs—including proportional maintenance, repair, restoration, and refurbishment costs—for the use of nonclassroom school facilities and grounds by eligible organizations.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Civic Center Act, creating a “civic center” at each public school facility in California, enabling community access for supervised recreational activities, public meetings, and civic engagements. (Education Code (EC) §§ 38130, 38131)
- 2) Requires school districts to authorize use of their facilities by nonprofit organizations or groups promoting youth and school activities, such as the Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, parent-teacher associations, and recreational youth sports leagues. (EC § 38134(a))
- 3) Permits districts to charge such organizations fees covering direct costs associated with their use of facilities, provided districts first adopt a clear policy specifying applicable activities and costs. (EC § 38134(b))
- 4) Defines “direct costs” to include proportional shares of expenses related to supplies, utilities, janitorial services, employee salaries, and costs directly tied to operating and maintaining facilities. This also temporarily includes proportional shares of maintenance, repair, restoration, and refurbishment. However, this provision sunsets on January 1, 2025. (EC § 38134(g))

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Permanently eliminates the sunset date (currently January 1, 2025) for school districts’ ability to charge proportional maintenance, repair, restoration, and

refurbishment costs when community organizations use nonclassroom facilities and grounds.

- 2) Updates the definition of “direct costs,” clarifying allowable charges to include proportional shares of expenses specifically for:
 - a) Supplies, utilities, janitorial services, and district employee salaries directly related to the administration and operational upkeep of facilities and grounds used.
 - b) Maintenance, repair, restoration, and refurbishment expenses specifically for nonclassroom spaces and grounds like athletic fields, tennis courts, track venues, and outdoor basketball courts.
- 3) Excludes from maintenance and repair costs any use by after-school, tutoring, childcare, or instructional programs operated by or contracted with the district.
- 4) Requires districts to deposit collected funds into a dedicated special fund solely for the Act’s purposes, ensuring transparency and accountability.
- 5) Declares an urgency statute to maintain safe, accessible community facilities, effective immediately upon enactment.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “School districts struggle with adequate resources to maintain and preserve their facilities. The Civic Center Act, up until January 1, 2025, allowed school districts to charge for both the operating and maintenance costs relating to the use of school facilities by outside entities. Without the authorization to charge outside organizations for a prorated share of maintenance costs, school districts are being forced to take on the entire burden for all wear and tear to their facilities. School districts want to continue to be able to offer their facilities for community use, but they must be able to recoup some of the costs to ensure the facilities are safe and accessible to all for years to come.”
- 2) ***Rationale and historical context.*** The Civic Center Act originally sought to ensure community access to publicly funded school facilities for beneficial community activities without imposing significant fees. However, evolving economic circumstances and aging school infrastructure have made it increasingly burdensome for districts to absorb all associated maintenance costs without supplementary support. Initially adopted temporarily during budget downturns, the authorization to recover proportional maintenance and repair costs has now become an essential budgeting tool for many districts. This bill recognizes the ongoing financial realities districts face and provides them with a permanent, equitable funding mechanism, consistent with the Act’s community-minded intent.
- 3) ***Facility maintenance and community access.*** Public schools often serve as critical community hubs, hosting youth sports, civic events, and recreational

activities. Yet, frequent community use inevitably leads to increased wear and tear, which districts must then address through routine maintenance and repairs. Without the ability to proportionately recover these costs, districts face either degrading facility conditions or reallocating scarce educational resources away from students and classrooms to cover community-caused wear. This bill ensures schools remain accessible, safe, and well-maintained community assets without compromising educational funding.

- 4) ***Financial stewardship and transparency.*** The bill's requirement to place collected fees into a dedicated special fund provides critical transparency. This measure enhances fiscal accountability, enabling clear auditing and assurance that funds collected from community groups are used solely to offset the actual maintenance and operational costs directly associated with community use. This approach reassures stakeholders, fostering trust and continued support for community facility usage.
- 5) ***Equity considerations.*** This bill safeguards educational programs by exempting classroom-based and instructional activities from additional charges. By clearly delineating nonclassroom spaces (e.g., athletic fields, courts), this bill strategically targets fees toward areas where community use has the highest impact and where cost recovery is most justified. This helps ensure that educational opportunities and community activities coexist sustainably.
- 6) ***Urgency justification.*** The statutory authority for school districts to recover proportional maintenance and repair costs under the Civic Center Act expired on January 1, 2025. As a result, districts currently lack authority to charge these fees, potentially disrupting budget planning and limiting their ability to maintain facilities used by community groups. The urgency clause allows the bill to take effect immediately upon enactment, minimizing the gap in authority and helping districts avoid shifting these costs onto educational programs or restricting community access.

SUPPORT

Coalition for Adequate School Housing (Sponsor)
 Alameda County Office of Education
 Association of California School Administrators
 Beaumont Unified School District
 California Association of School Business Officials
 California Association of Suburban School Districts
 California School Boards Association
 California School Employees Association
 Castro Valley Unified School District
 County School Facilities Consortium
 Fontana Unified School District
 Jurupa Unified School District
 Los Angeles County Office of Education
 Los Angeles Unified School District
 Natomas Unified School District
 Office of the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools

Petaluma City Schools
Pittsburg Unified School District
Riverside County Public K-12 School District Superintendents
San Benito High School District
San Diego Unified School District
San Francisco Unified School District
Sierra Sands Unified School District
Small School Districts Association

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No: AB 606

Hearing Date: June 11, 2025

Author: Quirk-Silva

Version: March 28, 2025

Urgency: No

Fiscal: Yes

Consultant: Ian Johnson

Subject: Certificated employees: professional services credential: out-of-state applicants.

SUMMARY

This bill requires the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) to issue a preliminary professional services credential with a specialization in pupil personnel services (PPS) to an out-of-state applicant who meets specified requirements.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the minimum requirements for a services credential with a PPS specialization as a bachelor's or higher degree from a regionally accredited institution, a fifth year of study, and any required professional preparation—including completion of a commission-approved program of supervised field experience or equivalent training. (Education Code (EC) § 44266)
- 2) Authorizes the holder of a PPS credential to provide school counseling, school psychology, child welfare and attendance services, and school social work, among other services, at all grade levels. (EC § 44266)
- 3) Requires the CTC to award credentials across categories such as basic teaching, adult and vocational education, specialty instruction, and school services, including PPS roles. (EC § 44275)

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Establishes a preliminary professional services credential with a PPS specialization for out-of-state candidates who:
 - a) Hold a bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited institution,
 - b) Possess a valid out-of-state PPS credential in school counseling, school social work, or school psychology,
 - c) Have passed a criminal background check pursuant to California law.

- 2) Specifies that the preliminary credential:
 - a) Is valid for two years,
 - b) May be renewed once for an additional two years if the holder demonstrates satisfactory progress as determined by the employing local educational agency (LEA).
- 3) Requires the CTC, by August 1, 2026, to maintain and publish an up-to-date checklist outlining the requirements and procedures for obtaining a California PPS credential for out-of-state credentialholders.
- 4) Authorizes the CTC to approve a professional preparation program for PPS credentials offered by an LEA, provided it meets CTC standards of quality and effectiveness.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “As a teacher for over 30 years, I know how important our support staff specialists are in helping students thrive. Every student deserves access to the mental health and academic support they need to succeed. California’s outdated credentialing process should not stand in the way of getting trained professionals into our schools. AB 606 breaks down unnecessary barriers, streamlines hiring, and ensures students, especially in rural and underserved communities, receive the support they deserve.”
- 2) ***Creates credential parity for PPS roles.*** California currently allows out-of-state teachers to receive a preliminary credential while completing remaining California-specific requirements. This bill extends that two-tier structure to PPS roles, such as school counselors, psychologists, and social workers, who currently must submit extensive documentation or pursue additional coursework before employment. The change could eliminate hiring delays and reduce administrative burdens for both candidates and LEAs.
- 3) ***Addresses mental health workforce shortages.*** California falls far short of nationally recommended staffing levels for school-based mental health professionals. According to 2018-19 data from the California Department of Education:
 - a) Counselor-to-student ratio was 576:1 (recommended: 250:1),
 - b) Psychologist ratio was 948:1 (recommended: 500–700:1),
 - c) Social worker ratio was 6,936:1 (recommended: 250:1),
 - d) Nurse ratio was 2,205:1 (recommended: 750:1).

This bill’s pathway could help bring trained professionals into schools faster—particularly in rural or underserved areas—without compromising credential quality, provided local oversight and renewal standards are robust.

- 4) ***Aligns with broader state initiatives.*** The state has invested heavily in student mental health through efforts such as the Children and Youth Behavioral Health Initiative and grant-funded partnerships between schools and community health providers. Increasing the pool of PPS-credentialed staff is a logical and needed complement to those investments.
- 5) ***Maintains appropriate safeguards.*** By requiring a valid out-of-state credential, a background check, and LEA-determined progress standards for renewal, the bill aims to strike a balance between accessibility and rigor. The CTC's checklist requirement should also improve transparency and efficiency in the application process.

SUPPORT

Association of California School Administrators (Co-Sponsor)
California Association of School Counselors (Co-Sponsor)
California Association of School Psychologists (Co-Sponsor)
California County Superintendents (Co-Sponsor)
Alameda County Office of Education
California Association of School Business Officials
California Charter Schools Association
California School Nurses Organization
Los Angeles Unified School District
Office of the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
School Employers Association of California
SELPA Administrators of California
Tulare County Office of Education

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 677	Hearing Date:	June 11, 2025
Author:	Bryan		
Version:	February 14, 2025		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	No
Consultant:	Lynn Lorber		

Subject: Pupil records: directory information.

NOTE: This bill has been referred to the Committees on Education and *Judiciary*. A “do pass” motion should include referral to the Committee on *Judiciary*.

SUMMARY

This bill authorizes directory information of a student identified as a homeless child or youth to be disclosed to facilitate an eye examination by a nonprofit eye examination provider or a free oral health assessment hosted by schools, unless the parent or student accorded parental rights has provided written notice to the school that they do not consent to the physical examination.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Prohibits, pursuant to the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), federal funds from being provided to any educational agency or institution which has a policy or practice of permitting the release of a student’s educational records to any individual, agency, or organization without the written consent of the student’s parents. FERPA exempts from the general parental consent requirement certain kinds of disclosures, including disclosures to state and local officials for the purposes of conducting truancy proceedings, a criminal investigation, auditing or evaluating an educational program, or in relation to the application for financial aid. (United States Code, Title 20, Section 1232g and Code of Federal Regulations, Title 34, Sections 99.31)
- 2) Prohibits a school district from permitting access to student records to a person without parental consent or under judicial order, with some exceptions. (Education Code (EC) § 49076)
- 3) School districts are *required* to permit access to records relevant to the legitimate educational interests of specified requesters, including:
 - a) School officials and employees of the districts, members of a school attendance review board and any volunteer aide (as specified), provided that the person has a legitimate educational interest to inspect a record.

- b) Officials and employees of other public schools or school systems where the student intends to or is directed to enroll.
 - c) Other federal, state and local officials as specified.
 - d) Parents of a student 18 years of age or older who is a dependent.
 - e) A student 16 years of age or older or having completed the 10th grade who requests access.
 - f) A district attorney, judge or probation officer, in relation to truancy proceedings.
 - g) A district attorney's office for consideration against a parent for failure to comply with compulsory education laws.
 - h) A probation officer, district attorney, or counsel of record for a minor, in relation to a criminal investigation or in regard to declaring a person a ward of the court or involving a violation of a condition of probation.
 - i) A county placing agency when acting as an authorized representative of a state or local educational agency.
 - j) A student 14 years of age or older who meets specified criteria.
 - k) An individual who completes specified items of the Caregiver's Authorization Affidavit and signs the affidavit for the purpose of enrolling a minor in school.
 - l) An agency caseworker or other representative of a state or local child welfare agency, or tribal organization, that has legal responsibility, in accordance with state or tribal law, for the care and protection of the student.
 - m) A foster family agency with jurisdiction over a currently enrolled or former student, a short-term residential treatment program staff responsible for the education or case management of a student, and a caregiver who has direct responsibility for the care of the student, including a certified or licensed foster parent, an approved relative or nonrelated extended family member, or a resource family. (EC § 49076)
- 4) School districts are *authorized* to release information from student records to the following:
- a) Appropriate persons in connection with an emergency if the information is necessary to protect the health or safety of a student or other person.
 - b) Agencies or organizations in connection with the application of a student for, or receipt of, financial aid.

- c) The county elections official for the identification of students who are eligible to register to vote.
 - d) Accrediting associations in order to carry out accrediting functions.
 - e) Organizations conducting studies on behalf of educational agencies or institutions for the purpose of developing, validating or administering predictive tests, administering student aid programs, and improving instruction.
 - f) Officials and employees of private schools or school systems where the student is enrolled or intends to enroll.
 - g) A contractor or consultant with a legitimate educational interest who has a formal written agreement or contract with the school district regarding the provision of outsourced institutional services or functions by the contractor or consultant. (EC § 49076)
- 5) Requires school districts to adopt a policy identifying categories of directory information that may be released, and authorizes directory information to be released according to the local policy. School districts are required to provide notice at least annually of the categories of information that the school plans to release and of the recipients. *The release of directory information is prohibited if the parent has notified the school district that the information is not to be released. Further, the release of directory information regarding a student identified as homeless is prohibited unless a parent or student with parental rights has provided written consent that directory information may be released.* (EC § 49073)
- 6) Defines “directory information” as one or more of the following: student’s name, address, telephone number, date of birth, email address, major field of study, participation in officially recognized activities and sports, weight and height of members of athletics teams, dates of attendance, degrees and awards received, and the most recent previous public or private school attended by the student. (EC § 49061)

ANALYSIS

This bill authorizes directory information of a student identified as a homeless child or youth to be disclosed to facilitate an eye examination by a nonprofit eye examination provider or a free oral health assessment hosted by schools, unless the parent or student accorded parental rights has provided written notice to the school that they do not consent to the physical examination.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “AB 677 will increase access to on-campus vision and dental screenings for unhoused students by exempting these youth—solely for the purpose of these screenings—from requirements that prohibit the sharing of their directory information. This information is necessary

for these screenings to be conducted by providers; however, due to current restrictions in statute, it cannot be released without written parental consent, which is often difficult to obtain in the case of unhoused students. This leads to the underutilization of on-campus vision and dental screenings amongst these vulnerable youth. AB 677 removes a barrier that will allow unhoused students to access the essential vision and dental screenings they need and deserve.”

- 2) **Opt-in vs. opt-out.** Existing law prohibits the release of directory information if a parent has notified the school district that the information is not to be released (opt-out), and also prohibits the release of directory information regarding a student identified as homeless unless a parent or student with parental rights has provided written consent that directory information may be released (opt-in).

This bill authorizes the release of directory information regarding a student identified as homeless specifically for the purposes of facilitating an eye exam or oral health assessment unless the parent has provided written notice to the school that they do not consent to the physical exam (opt-out). This bill aligns opt-out policies for both housed and unhoused students regarding the release of directory information for the purposes of conducting vision and dental screenings.

- 3) **Author’s amendments.** The author would like to amend this bill to (1) require the recipient of data to ensure the data is only used for the authorized purpose; and, (2) provide that, for families experiencing homelessness, reports of a defect identified in the vision and dental screening should be made by alternative communication channels rather than mail whenever possible.
- 4) **Vision screening and oral health assessment currently required for school enrollment.** Existing law requires a parent or guardian of a first-grade student, within the first 90 days of the school year, to provide a certificate, signed by a medical professional, documenting that the child has received a health check-up within the last 18 months (Health and Safety Code § 124085). The health examination required for school entry includes a vision screening, completed by the child’s regular healthcare provider. The parent or guardian may submit a signed waiver stating they are unwilling or unable to obtain a health screening for the child. School districts are required to exclude children from school for up to five days, if the parent has not provided the health documentation or waiver. In the case of students experiencing homelessness, a school is required to immediately enroll the student even if they do not have required documents such as required health records, pursuant to both federal and state law.

Existing law requires a student to provide proof of having received an oral health assessment by a dental health professional within the 12 months prior to initial enrollment (EC § 49452.8). Parents or guardians may be excused from this requirement if the dental assessment could not be completed due to an undue financial burden, lack of access to a dentist, or if the parent does not consent to such an assessment. Existing law requires that homeless students be immediately enrolled regardless of whether they have required health records.

SUPPORT

Los Angeles Unified School District (Sponsor)
Alameda County Office of Education
American Academy of Pediatrics, California
Association of California School Administrators
California County Superintendents
California Dental Association
Health Net and its Affiliated Companies
Office of the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools
Santa Clara County School Boards Association

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 681	Hearing Date:	June 11, 2025
Author:	Elhawary		
Version:	February 14, 2025		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Olgalilia Ramirez		

Subject: California DREAM Loan Program: limits.

SUMMARY

This bill increases the amount a graduate student may borrow under the California DREAM Loan Program in a single academic year, in the aggregate, and establishes an overall borrowing limit in the aggregate for both undergraduate and graduate programs.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the California Student Aid Commission (CSAC) for the purpose of administering specified student financial aid programs. (Education Code (EC) § 69510, et seq.)
- 2) Authorizes, beginning January 1, 2013, AB 540 students to be eligible to apply for, and participate in, any student financial aid program administered by the State of California to the full extent permitted by federal law. (EC § 66021.6)
- 3) Authorizes, AB 540 students attending University of California (UC), California State University (CSU), or the California Community Colleges (CCC) to be eligible to receive a scholarship derived from nonstate funds, as received by the respective segment for the purpose of scholarships. (EC § 66021.7)
- 4) Establishes the DREAM Loan Program at UC and CSU campuses that elect to participate in the program. Under the program, an AB 540 student meeting specified requirements, including demonstrating financial need, may obtain a loan of up to \$4,000 per academic year, up to a maximum of \$20,000 as an undergraduate student; and, no more than \$20,000 as a graduate student. The repayment term for the loan is 10 years, and repayment commences following a six-month grace period beginning when the student graduates or ceases to maintain at least half-time enrollment. Eligibility for deferment or forbearance of loan repayments is consistent with the federal direct student loan program. (EC § 70033)
- 5) Specifies that the proportion of program funding used for instructional programs and for graduate programs be determined at the discretion of the participating institution and that priority be given to loans for instructional programs. Current law further defines “instructional programs” to mean a program of study that

results in the award of a baccalaureate degree or undergraduate certificate, or undergraduate coursework in a program of study leading directly to a first professional degree for which no baccalaureate degree or undergraduate degree is awarded. (EC § 70032 (i) and § 70034 (a)(6))

- 6) Requires, by January 1, 2020, UC and the CSU campuses participating in the state DREAM Loan Program to adopt procedures allowing a borrower to select an income-based repayment plan for the repayment of a DREAM Loan. (EC § 70034 (d)).
- 7) Requires the annual Budget Act to allocate funding to participating institutions based on the number of AB 540 students who applied for state financial aid in the prior academic year. Participating institutions must at least match the state allocation using the institution's discretionary funds. Both the state and local funding is deposited into a DREAM revolving fund. Loan repayments are also deposited into the revolving fund and are intended to reduce the annual state and campus contributions equally. (EC § 70035).
- 8) Authorizes, commencing with the 2024-25 academic year, a CSU or UC campus that participates in the DREAM Loan Program to award DREAM grants to eligible students if that campus has unawarded funds in the institution's DREAM Loan revolving fund that were new state, institutional matching, or loan repayment funds deposited during the previous academic year. (EC § 70035.5)

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Increases the borrowing limit under the DREAM Loan Program for a student who is enrolled in a graduate program from up to \$4,000 to up to \$20,500 within a single academic year.
- 2) Increases the aggregate borrowing limit under the DREAM Loan Program for a student enrolled in a graduate program from no more than \$20,000 to no more than \$118,500.
- 3) Establishes a \$138,000 overall borrowing limit under the DREAM Loan Program for both undergraduate and graduate programs.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) **Need for the bill.** According to the author, "The DREAM Loan Program helps undergraduate students but doesn't account for the higher costs of graduate education. As a result, many undocumented students are forced to take on private loans or forgo graduate school altogether.

"AB 681 expands loan limits, making the DREAM Loan a more viable option for undocumented graduate students and more closely aligning it with federal loan programs they cannot access. This change will create greater access to higher

education and career advancement, empowering individuals to achieve the American Dream.”

- 2) **California DREAM Loan program.** Existing law establishes the California DREAM Loan Program, a voluntary campus-based student loan program patterned after the Federal Direct Loan Program. Both the state and the university are to contribute (1:1 match) to the loan fund until the program becomes self-sustaining. This program serves undocumented AB 540 students at UC and CSU who, under the terms of the California Dream Act, became eligible for state and institutional grant programs but are ineligible for federal student loan programs. The Legislature provided \$2.5 million in UC’s annual budget for the program, which has been matched by UC each year. Since 2016-17, the state has not allocated funding for the loan program in the budget to CSU. Instead, to maintain the program, CSU rolled over unexpended funds from the 2015-16 academic year and funded the difference with lottery funds. During the 2023-2024 academic year, 351 CSU undergraduates received an average award of \$3,329, and 89 graduate students received an average of \$3,570. For the UC, in the 2023-2024 academic year, 603 recipients received an average award of \$3,183 for both undergraduate and graduate students. Under current law, a student can borrow up to \$4,000 annually, not to exceed \$40,000 in the aggregate. This bill attempts to increase borrowing limits significantly by five times more for graduate students.
- 3) **Loan program undersubscribed.** As noted in the Assembly Appropriations Committee analysis, the DREAM loan revolving fund is divided for use by the UC and CSU. For the UC, the fund contains \$2.5 million in state contributions and \$2.5 million in matching funds from the UC. The UC Office of the President reports, of the total \$5 million available to prospective applicants each year, an average of \$2.4 million in loan funds went un-awarded in fiscal years 2021-22 through 2023-24. At CSU, the fund contains a total of \$2 million available for loans across the entire system. In fiscal year 2023-24, the CSU awarded a total of \$299,870 in DREAM loans to graduate students and \$1.47 million total for undergraduate and graduate students. It is not clear to Senate Committee staff why the program is undersubscribed. However, UC notes in their letter of support that graduate programs range in cost from \$45,000 to \$115,000 annually. The current DREAM loan limit is set at \$4,000 per year, or \$40,000 for the entirety of the program, including undergraduate and graduate degrees. UC asserts that these graduate students are left to pursue private loan options, and that the proposed limits more closely mirror federal loan limits for graduate students. The 2024-25 Federal Student Aid Handbook cites the annual and aggregate federal loan limits as \$20,500 (subsidized) and \$138,500 (subsidized and unsubsidized).
- 4) **DREAM loan to grant option.** Under existing law, established by SB 633 (Gonzalez, Chapter 622, Statutes of 2023), a campus may establish a grant program with unused DREAM loan funds. Each participating institution determines the award amounts for their students, not to exceed the student’s remaining financial need associated with the total cost of college attendance. Under existing law, a DREAM grant awarded to a student does not count against the annual or aggregate borrowing limits established for the DREAM Loan program. The CSU has not utilized the grant program option because the

institution relies heavily on the revolving nature of the loan funds to sustain the program. UC used the option, and in its first year of implementation, six UC campuses reported that approximately 1,311 students received a DREAM grant award, with an average total amount of \$2,965 per student across those campuses. Since the grant program relies on unused funds from the loan program, it is unclear how the proposed increases in the loan limits outlined in this bill would affect its development.

SUPPORT

University of California (Sponsor)
Asian Americans Advancing Justice Southern California
California Chamber of Commerce
California Faculty Association
California State University, Office of the Chancellor
Hispanas Organized for Political Equality
Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities
University of California Student Association

OPPOSITION

Los Angeles County Taxpayers Association
Two individuals

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 927	Hearing Date:	June 11, 2025
Author:	Sharp-Collins		
Version:	March 28, 2025		
Urgency:	Yes	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Lynn Lorber		

Subject: County superintendent of schools: inspection of public schools.

SUMMARY

This bill, an urgency measure, (1) extends the timeline by which county superintendents of schools must visit and complete the textbook and instructional materials review of the schools identified for inspection, from within the fourth week of the school year to within the eighth week of the school year; and (2) requires the prioritization of schools to be reviewed, as specified.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Requires the county superintendent of schools to do all of the following, among other duties:
 - a) Visit and examine each school in the county at reasonable intervals to observe its operation and to learn of its problems.
 - b) Identify a list of schools, beginning with the 2021–22 fiscal year, for which the county superintendent, or a designee, shall inspect annually, and submit an annual report to the governing board of each school district that describes the state of the schools in the county. The list established in the 2021–22 fiscal year shall also be used as the list established in the 2022–23 and 2023–24 fiscal years. The list of schools shall be reestablished in the 2024–25 fiscal year and again every three fiscal years thereafter.
 - c) Report the results of the visits and reviews on a quarterly basis to the governing board of the school district. The results of the visits and reviews shall include the determinations of the county superintendent for each school regarding the status of all of the circumstances listed in #2, teacher misassignments and teacher vacancies.
 - d) Enforce the use of state textbooks and instructional materials and of high school textbooks and instructional materials through a review that must be completed by the fourth week of the school year.

- 2) Establishes the priority objective of the visits is to determine the status of all of the following circumstances:
 - a) Sufficient textbooks.
 - b) The condition of a facility that poses an emergency or urgent threat to the health or safety of students or staff.
 - c) The accuracy of data reported on the school accountability report card with respect to the availability of sufficient textbooks and instructional materials, and the safety, cleanliness, and adequacy of school facilities. (Education Code (EC) § 1240)
- 3) Requires the list of schools described in #1(b) to be compiled as follows:
 - a) The Superintendent shall include on the list all schools that were most recently identified for comprehensive support and improvement and additional targeted support and improvement pursuant to the federal Every Student Succeeds Act, or identified as low performing under the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act or any subsequent amendments to that act.
 - b) The Superintendent shall include on the list all schools where 15% or more of the teachers are holders of a permit or certificate, such as a temporary or short-term permit, a substitute permit, a waiver, an intern credential, or any other authorization that is a lesser certification than a preliminary or clear California teaching credential.
 - c) The list of schools exclude alternative schools and other schools accepted for participation in the Dashboard Alternative School Status program by the California Department of Education. (EC § 1240)

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Extends the timeline, from within the fourth week of the school year to within the eighth week of the school year, by which a county superintendent of schools must complete the textbook and instructional materials review of schools that are identified on the list established in the 2024–25 fiscal year.
- 2) Requires the county superintendent to prioritize reviewing schools for which the county superintendent has received information from a survey, a complaint filed through the uniform complaint process, or any other reliable source that the school does not have sufficient textbooks, or that a facility of the school poses an emergency or urgent threat to the health or safety of students or staff, or is not in good repair.
- 3) Includes an urgency clause in order to ensure a sufficient timeframe to conduct the annual inspection of schools beginning in the 2025–26 school year.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “California’s *Williams v. California* settlement established fundamental requirements for all schools: well-maintained facilities, qualified teachers, and adequate learning materials. Due to the pandemic, the number of schools requiring Williams inspections is projected to grow by approximately 90%, reaching 3,400 schools across California, placing a significant burden on County Offices of Education. Rushing through inspections risks overlooking critical deficiencies in facilities, instructional materials, and teacher assignments—issues that disproportionately impact students in low-income communities. Extending the inspection period from four to eight weeks is essential to ensure thorough evaluations, helping vulnerable students avoid unsafe learning environments and ensuring access to fundamental conditions for learning.”
- 2) ***Williams v. State of California.*** The *Eliezer Williams, et al., vs. State of California, et al. (Williams)* case was filed as a class action in 2000 in San Francisco County Superior Court. The plaintiffs included nearly 100 San Francisco County students, who filed suit against the State of California and state education agencies, including the California Department of Education (CDE). The basis of the lawsuit was that the agencies failed to provide public school students with equal access to instructional materials, safe and clean school facilities, and qualified teachers. A settlement agreement was reached in 2004; five bills implemented this agreement. The *Williams* settlement agreement:
 - a) Established minimum standards and accountability systems regarding school facilities, teacher quality, and instructional materials;
 - b) Prohibited the operation of the “Concept 6” calendar program which provided 163 days of classroom instruction, instead of 180 days;
 - c) Required the Uniform Complaint Procedures (UCP) to allow students, teachers, and others to submit complaints about insufficient instructional materials, teacher vacancies and misassignments, and unsafe or unhealthy facilities conditions;
 - d) Required the county superintendent of schools to conduct annual inspection visits within the first four weeks of the school year for schools ranked in deciles one to three of the Academic Performance Index (API) to determine compliance with the new instructional materials and facilities standards and whether the schools’ School Accountability Report Cards (SARC) accurately reported this data;
 - e) Required county superintendents of schools to review teacher misassignments;
 - f) Required SARCs to be posted online and in paper form, and include accurate and current information regarding sufficiency of instructional materials, the number of teacher misassignments and vacancies, and the

condition of school facilities;

- g) Updated K-12 audits and audit guides; and,
 - h) Provided up to \$800 million beginning in the 2005-06 fiscal year for districts to repair facility conditions that threatened health and safety, and approximately \$25 million in 2004-05 for a one-time comprehensive facilities needs assessment of schools ranked in the bottom three deciles under the 2003 statewide API. Funding for this program became unrestricted pursuant to SBX3 4 (Ducheny, Chapter 12, Statutes of 2009), enacted in February 2009.
- 3) ***Frequency of school inspections.*** Existing law requires county superintendents of schools to visit and inspect schools identified on the “*Williams list*.” Existing law requires the review for sufficient textbooks or instructional materials to be completed by the fourth week of the school year. Existing law does not specify a point in the school year by which other reviews (facilities, teacher misassignments, and accuracy of SARC data) must be completed.
- This bill extends the timeline by which county superintendents must conduct the inspection of schools on the 2024-25 “Williams list” relative to sufficient textbooks and instructional materials to within the first eight weeks of the school year. The 2024-25 list determines which schools a county superintendent must inspect for the 2025-26, 2026-27 and 2027-28 school years. The 2024-25 “Williams list” contains 3,396 schools, an increase of more than 1,513 schools, over the previous version of the list from 2021.*
- <https://www.cde.ca.gov/eo/ce/wc/willamsmonitoring.asp>
- 4) ***Author’s amendments.*** The author would like to amend this bill to (1) clarify that the timeline extension applies only to the review of textbooks and instructional materials, and (2) that the reviews of issues for which the superintendent received a complaint or other reliable information about an insufficiency are to be prioritized within the first four weeks of the school year when practicable.

SUPPORT

California County Superintendents (Co-Sponsor)
 Los Angeles County Office of Education (Co-Sponsor)
 Public Advocates (Co-Sponsor)
 Alameda County Office of Education
 Orange County Board of Education
 Small School Districts Association

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 962	Hearing Date:	June 11, 2025
Author:	Hoover		
Version:	February 20, 2025		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	No
Consultant:	Therresa Austin		

Subject: Pupil safety: comprehensive school safety plans: use of smartphones.

SUMMARY

This bill establishes that if the provisions of a local educational agency's (LEA) adopted comprehensive school safety plan (CSSP) address student smartphone use, those provisions shall not conflict with the existing mandatory smartphone use and access requirements, as specified.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Requires the governing body of a school district, county office of education (COE), or charter school to develop and adopt a policy by July 1, 2026, to limit or prohibit the use of smartphones by students while they are at school or under the supervision of a school employee, and to update the policy every five years. (Education Code (EC) § 48901.7(a))
- 2) Prohibits an LEA's adopted smartphone use policy from restricting a student's use of a smartphone under any of the following circumstances:
 - a) In the case of an emergency, or in response to a perceived threat of danger;
 - b) When a teacher or administrator grants permission to a student to possess or use a smartphone, subject to any reasonable limitation imposed by that teacher or administrator;
 - c) When a licensed physician and surgeon determines that the possession or use of a smartphone is necessary for the health or well-being of the student; or
 - d) When the possession or use of a smartphone is required in a student's individualized education program (IEP). (EC § 48901.7(b))
- 3) Requires each school district or COE to be responsible for the overall development of all CSSPs for its schools operating kindergarten or any of grades 1 through 12. (EC § 32281)

- 4) Requires that the CSSP include an assessment of the current status of school crime committed on school campuses and at school-related functions and identification of appropriate strategies and programs to provide or maintain a high level of school safety and address the school's procedures for complying with existing laws related to school safety, including child abuse reporting procedures; disaster procedures; an earthquake emergency procedure system; policies regarding pupils who commit specified acts that would lead to suspension or expulsion; procedures to notify teachers of dangerous pupils; a discrimination and harassment policy; the provisions of any schoolwide dress code; procedures for safe ingress and egress of pupils, parents, and school employees to and from school; a safe and orderly environment conducive to learning; and rules and procedures on school discipline. (EC § 32282)
- 5) Requires the CSSP to be submitted annually to the school district or COE for approval and requires a school district or COE to notify the California Department of Education (CDE) by October 15 of every year of any school that is not in compliance. (EC § 32288)

ANALYSIS

This bill establishes that if an LEA's CSSP contains provisions addressing student use of smartphones, those provisions shall not conflict with the mandatory use and access requirements established in law.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, "AB 3216 was signed into law in 2024 requiring all schools to adopt a student smartphone policy limiting their use during the school day by July 2026. With this forthcoming requirement, there is anticipated confusion in regards to any potential conflicts between student smart phone policies and school safety plans when responding to an emergency. AB 962 would provide that unless a school's Comprehensive Safety Plan includes language that addresses student smartphone use during a school emergency, the student smartphone access requirements set by law in 2024 must apply. Eliminating this confusion will ensure smooth coordination amongst emergency responders (police, fire, EMTs) and school officials, and further protect the collective safety of students, teachers, and administrators."
- 2) ***Comprehensive School Safety Plans.*** LEAs, COEs, and charter schools serving students in grades kindergarten through 12 are required to develop and maintain a CSSP designed to address campus risks, prepare for emergencies, and create a safe, secure learning environment for students and school personnel.

The law requires designated stakeholders to annually engage in a systematic planning process to develop strategies and policies to prevent and respond to potential incidents involving emergencies, natural and other disasters, hate crimes, violence, active assailants/intruders, bullying and cyberbullying,

discrimination, and harassment, child abuse and neglect, discipline, suspension and expulsion, and other safety aspects.

The law requires that each school update and adopt its CSSP by March 1 annually. Before an LEA, COE, or charter school adopts their CSSP, the schoolsite council or school safety planning committee must hold a public meeting at the schoolsite to allow members of the public to express an opinion about the school safety plan. The schoolsite council or school safety planning committee must also notify the local mayor and representatives of the following:

- a) The local school employee organization.
- b) The parent organization at the school site, including the parent-teacher association and parent-teacher clubs.
- c) Each teacher organization at the school site.
- d) The student body government.
- e) All persons who have indicated they want to be notified.

Once the public meeting has been held and the CSSP is adopted, the school must submit its CSSP to its respective LEA or COE for approval. LEAs and COEs must annually notify the CDE by October 15 of any schools that have not complied with requirements. Statute also requires the CDE to develop and post on its website best practices for reviewing and approving school safety plans.

- 3) ***School smartphone use policies.*** Since the passage of AB 272 (Muratsuchi, Chapter 42, Statutes of 2019), LEAs have had the explicit authorization to adopt policies to limit or prohibit student use of smartphones while they are on a schoolsite or are under the supervision of an LEA employee. Alongside this authorization, AB 272 also established circumstances under which a pupil *shall not* be prohibited from possessing or using a smartphone. These circumstances are as follows:

- a) In the case of an emergency, or in response to a perceived threat of danger.
- b) When a teacher or administrator of the school district, COE, or charter school grants permission to a pupil to possess or use a smartphone, subject to any reasonable limitation imposed by that teacher or administrator.
- c) When a licensed physician and surgeon determines that the possession or use of a smartphone is necessary for the health or well-being of the pupil.
- d) When the possession or use of a smartphone is required in a pupil's IEP.

With the passage of AB 3216 (Hoover, Chapter 500, Statutes of 2024), this authorization afforded to LEAs became a requirement, thus requiring the

governing boards of LEAs, to develop and adopt a smartphone use policy by July 1, 2026, and update that policy every five years thereafter.

- 4) ***Mixed messaging.*** This bill aims to address a point of confusion that has arisen as LEAs prepare to adopt smartphone use policies in compliance with the new requirement. According to the bill's proponent, the Association of California Schools Administrators:

"The CSSP, developed in collaboration with school communities and emergency responders, often includes policy limiting student smartphone use during emergencies unless at the direction of school personnel. This is for several reasons including mitigating the spread of misinformation as well as protecting against location sharing that could inadvertently increase the risk for a student and those around them.

".. [C]urrent law related to student smartphone use policies provides some exceptions to restricting smartphone use, including in the case of an emergency, or in response to a threat of danger. Our members have expressed concerns about potential inconsistencies with their CSSP and we believe addressing the issue now will help ensure a more seamless policy adoption and revision process."

Examples of CSSP provisions that address smartphone use during emergencies include the following:

"While in the area under threat, all cell phones, beepers and hand-held radios should be turned off since many explosive devices can be triggered by radio transmissions. Bomb threat experts recommend no radio transmission within 500 feet of a device, or suspected location of a device. Use of any electronic device within the 500' restriction zone must be cleared in advance with the Incident Commander."

"In the event of an emergency, the safety and well-being of the students is the top priority. In certain emergency situations, students will be allowed access to their cell phones, and staff will ensure that students can use their devices when it is deemed safe and necessary."

"This measure (smartphone use) is intended to allow students to communicate with their families to give and receive important updates. Our staff is trained to assess emergency situations and will guide students appropriately to ensure that the use of cell phones does not interfere with safety protocols or emergency procedures."

According to information provided by the author's office, the bill intends to eliminate confusion caused by these conflicts by specifying that if an LEA's adopted CSSP addresses smartphone use in a way that is counter to the adopted smartphone use policy and the mandatory use and access requirements discussed in Comment 3, then the CSSP's provisions take precedence.

This intent is again emphasized in the letter submitted by the Association of California School Administrators, indicating the following:

“To be clear, AB 962 does not seek to create additional content for the CSSP, nor mandate smartphone restrictions in emergencies. Rather, the measure seeks to limit confusion by stating that a CSSP may address smartphone use in an emergency as a *permitted exception* to mandatory access requirements” [emphasis added].

However, the current language of the bill does not achieve this intended outcome. The bill states the following:

“If one or more parts of a comprehensive school safety plan address the use of smartphones by pupils, those parts shall not conflict with subdivision (b) of Section 48901.7.”

This language may result in further confusion as its plain reading would lead one to conclude that the mandatory access and use provisions enshrined in EC § 48901.7(b) would take precedence, and the conflicting CSSP provisions would therefore need to be amended to comply with existing law.

To bring the language of the bill in closer alignment with the intended policy outcome, **the author wishes to make the following amendment:**

- a) Strike the contents of this bill; and
- b) Recast the provisions within EC § 48901.7(b)(1) to specify the mandatory access and use provision during an emergency or a perceived threat apply *unless explicitly addressed within a CSSP pursuant to EC § 32282*.

5) ***Prior and related legislation.***

AB 3216 (Hoover, Chapter 500, Statutes of 2024) requires the governing body of a school district, a county office of education (COE), or a charter school to adopt a policy to limit or prohibit the use by its pupils of smartphones, except in specified circumstances.

AB 272 (Muratsuchi, Chapter 42, Statutes of 2019) provides that a student shall not be prohibited from possessing or using a smartphone under specified circumstances, and authorizes governing bodies to adopt a policy to limit or prohibit the use of smartphones by students while at school.

SB 1253 (Figueroa, Chapter 253, Statutes of 2002) allows school district governing boards to regulate the possession and use of electronic signaling devices (cell phones, pagers, etc.) by pupils while on campus or attending school functions.

SUPPORT

Association of California School Administrators
California Association of School Business Officials
California IT in Education
California School Nurses Organization
Small School Districts Association

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 1009	Hearing Date:	June 11, 2025
Author:	Blanca Rubio		
Version:	February 20, 2025		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Ian Johnson		

Subject: Teacher credentialing: administrative services credential: occupational and physical therapists.

SUMMARY

This bill authorizes occupational therapists (OTs) and physical therapists (PTs) who meet specified requirements to be eligible for a preliminary administrative services credential.

BACKGROUND

Existing law specifies the following minimum requirements for obtaining a preliminary administrative services credential. (Education Code §44270)

- 1) Possession of one of the following:
 - a) A valid teaching credential, including student teaching.
 - b) A valid designated subjects credential in career technical education, adult education, or special subjects with a bachelor's degree.
 - c) A valid services credential in pupil personnel, health, clinical or rehabilitative services, or as a teacher librarian.
 - d) A credential issued prior to December 31, 1971, authorizing services similar to those above.
- 2) Completion of three years of successful full-time experience in classroom teaching, pupil personnel, health, clinical or rehabilitative services, or as a librarian.
- 3) Completion of an approved specialized administrative preparation program or internship.
- 4) Current employment in an administrative role post-preparation.

Existing law requires that a preliminary administrative credential is valid for five years and nonrenewable.

Under current law, there is no credential required or offered specifically for OTs and PTs to provide mandated related services in schools. Consequently, OTs and PTs cannot

meet the current statutory credential requirement to pursue administrative services credentials, thereby limiting their career advancement into formal leadership roles.

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Adds a valid occupational therapy license (issued by the California Board of Occupational Therapy) or physical therapy license (issued by the Physical Therapy Board of California) and verification of basic skills as a pathway to qualify for a preliminary administrative services credential.
- 2) Allows three years of experience as a school-based OT or PT to satisfy the existing experience requirement for a preliminary administrative services credential.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “Occupational Therapists (OTs) and Physical Therapists (PTs) have been providing related services to students in public schools since the 1970s and are the only Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) mandated professionals not included in a credential opportunity afforded to teachers and all other related services providers. This is based on a statute that was written at a time prior to IDEA and districts’ employment of OTs and PTs. Currently, OTs and PTs working in school systems are not authorized to obtain a base credential, thereby rendering them ineligible to pursue an administrative services credential or participate in many higher-level positions. Creating a pathway for OTs and PTs who desire to obtain an administrative services credential will allow qualified personnel an opportunity to move into administrative roles and share their unique expertise at a leadership level.”
- 2) ***Historical Credentialing Gap.*** This bill addresses a credentialing gap arising from historical frameworks that predate widespread school-based employment of OTs and PTs. While these professionals are mandated by federal IDEA law to provide specialized support services, unlike similarly situated professionals—such as school psychologists, nurses, counselors, and speech-language pathologists—they remain excluded from credential eligibility. Establishing an administrative credential pathway aligns the credentialing opportunities for OTs and PTs with other specialized service providers already eligible for administrative roles.
- 3) ***Credential Requirement vs. Credential Opportunity.*** The Governor’s prior veto message on AB 2725 (Rubio, 2024), a substantively similar measure, raised an important distinction: there is currently no explicit state requirement that OTs and PTs must hold an administrative services credential to assume supervisory or administrative roles in school districts. School districts retain local discretion to create supervisory roles or assign administrative duties to these professionals based on human resources policies or collective bargaining agreements. However, this flexibility has not resulted in uniform professional recognition,

equitable salary schedules, or clear pathways to certificated administrative positions for OTs and PTs across the state.

- 4) ***Professional Equity and Career Mobility.*** Given its context, this bill appears primarily motivated by goals of professional equity and career advancement. By providing OTs and PTs access to the administrative services credential, the bill seeks to enable these professionals to advance into certificated leadership roles, fostering greater parity with other related-service providers. This change may also have ancillary benefits, such as improved retention and recruitment of highly skilled therapists within the public education system, ultimately enhancing student support through more diversified administrative expertise.
- 5) ***Addressing Prior Legislative Concerns.*** Although this bill seeks to address professional equity, the Governor's veto of the substantively similar AB 2725 (Rubio, 2024) expressed skepticism about the need for a legislated statewide credential pathway for OTs and PTs. The veto message emphasized that there is no state requirement for these professionals to hold an administrative services credential in order to serve in supervisory roles, and encouraged the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) to develop distinct pathways for license holders without traditional teacher preparation backgrounds.

As part of the Governor's 2025-26 May Revision budget proposal, funding is proposed to support this direction. Specifically, the proposal includes \$455,000—\$322,000 of which is ongoing—and two new positions for the CTC's Professional Services Division to support work related to updating and adding a non-teaching pathway to the Administrative Services Credential. The proposal also includes \$133,000 in one-time funding for convening a temporary workgroup to inform this process.

This budget proposal signals the Administration's intent for the CTC to take up this issue through its own processes. However, this funding has not yet been adopted by the Legislature, and any final decision will be subject to the outcome of budget negotiations and reconciliation with the Administration. Depending on how that process unfolds, the author may wish to consider whether to proceed with this bill in parallel, delay action pending the outcome of the CTC's workgroup, or clarify how the bill complements or accelerates those efforts.

SUPPORT

California Physical Therapy Association (Co-Sponsor)
Occupational Therapy Association of California (Co-Sponsor)
Association of California School Administrators
San Francisco Unified School District
SELPA Administrators of California

OPPOSITION

None received

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 1216	Hearing Date:	June 11, 2025
Author:	Committee on Education		
Version:	May 27, 2025		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Lynn Lorber		

Subject: Elementary and secondary education: omnibus.

SUMMARY

This bill, the annual K-12 policy omnibus bill, makes numerous technical, clarifying, conforming, and other non-controversial revisions to a number of provisions related to education throughout statute.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

State preschool program

- 1) Establishes eligibility for the California state preschool program based on specified criteria, and provides that after all families meeting specified criteria have been enrolled, programs may provide services to two-, three-, and four-year-old children in families who do not meet any of the specified criteria. (Education Code (EC) § 8208)

Single subject credential and supplementary authorization

- 2) Defines “single subject instruction” as the practice of assignment of teachers and students to specified subject matter courses, as is commonly practiced in California high schools and most California junior high schools.
- 3) Provides that the holder of a single subject teaching credential or a standard secondary credential or a special secondary teaching credential, is eligible to have a subject appear on the credential as an authorization to teach this subject, of the credential holder either:
 - a) Has completed 20 semester hours of coursework or 10 semester hours of upper division or graduate coursework approved by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) at a regionally accredited institution of higher education in any subject commonly taught in grades 7 to 12, other than the subject for which the credential holder is already certificated to teach, or;

- b) Has been verified as having subject matter competence for any subject commonly taught in grades 7 to 12, other than the subject for which the credential holder is already certificated to teach. (EC § 44256)

Governing board adoption of smartphone policy

- 4) Requires the governing body of a school district, a county office of education, or a charter school to develop and adopt by July 1, 2026, and update every five years, a policy to limit or prohibit the use by its students of smartphones while the students are at a schoolsite or while under the supervision and control of an employee or employees of that school district, county office of education, or charter school. (EC § 48901.7)

Physical education instruction

- 5) Requires all students, except those excused or exempted, to attend the courses of physical education for a total period of time of not less than 400 minutes each 10 schooldays. Authorizes the governing board of a school district that maintains any of grades 6 to 12 to adopt a policy providing for an alternate term schedule for physical education courses, if specified conditions are met. (EC § 51222)

ANALYSIS

This bill is a K-12 education policy omnibus bill, which makes technical, clarifying, conforming, and other non-controversial revisions to a number of provisions in the Education Code. Specifically, this bill:

State preschool program

- 1) Updates an incorrect cross-reference relative to eligibility for services to two-, three-, and four-year-old children in families who do not meet any of the specified eligibility criteria.

Single subject credential and supplementary authorization

- 2) Strikes “other than the subject for which the credential holder is already certificated to teach” relative to single subject credential holders adding a supplementary authorization.

Governing board adoption of smartphone policy

- 3) Changes references from “county offices of education” to “county boards of education.”

Physical education instruction

- 4) Changes references from “days” to “schooldays.”

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Purpose of the elementary and secondary education omnibus bill.*** Each year, there is typically a K-12 education omnibus bill that makes various technical, conforming, clarifying, and non-controversial revisions to the Education Code and other areas of statute related to education. Typically, staff with the Senate and Assembly education policy, fiscal and budget committees (and their minority consultants), the Department of Finance, the California Department of Education, the Legislative Analyst's Office, and other similarly situated state government offices, identify statutes in existing law which need updating or correcting and propose corrections. Custom and practice provide that if offices or entities object to a proposed provision in the omnibus bill, that particular provision is prohibited from inclusion.
- 2) ***Single subject credential and supplementary authorization.*** Existing law provides that the holder of a single subject teaching credential is eligible to have a subject appear on the credential as an authorization to teach a subject, if the credential holder has met specified conditions relative to coursework or competency in a subject *other than the subject for which the credential holder is already certificated to teach.*

Existing law is confusing and may be interpreted to mean that someone with a single subject credential cannot add a supplementary authorization if the subject area of the supplementary authorization is subsumed within the broad statutory subject area. For example, existing law may imply that the holder of a Single Subject Credential in Mathematics cannot add the supplementary authorization in Computer Science to their credential because computer science is a subsumed subject under the mathematics authorization. *This bill clarifies that a single subject credential holder can add a supplementary authorization in any of the specific subjects.*

- 3) ***Related legislation.***

SB 619 (Committee on Education, 2025) is the annual higher education omnibus bill that corrects technical errors and oversights and makes numerous non-controversial and conforming changes to various provisions of the Education Code. SB 619 is pending in the Assembly Higher Education Committee.

SUPPORT

None received

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No: AB 1306
Author: Muratsuchi
Version: April 21, 2025
Urgency: No
Consultant: Ian Johnson

Hearing Date: June 11, 2025

Fiscal: Yes

Subject: Teacher preparation programs: school districts and county offices of education: English learners.

SUMMARY

This bill authorizes the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) to approve local teacher preparation programs operated by school districts or county offices of education that lead to an English learner-related authorization—specifically, the Crosscultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD) certificate, English Learner Authorization (ELA), or a bilingual authorization.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Requires the CTC to issue an authorization for a teacher to provide instruction to English learners, including instruction in English language development (ELD) and specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE). (Education Code (EC) § 44253.4)
- 2) Establishes minimum requirements for earning such an authorization, including possession of a valid teaching credential, completion of approved coursework or examinations, and, in the case of bilingual authorization, demonstrated proficiency in both English and another language. (EC §§ 44253.3 and 44253.7)
- 3) Requires the CTC to adopt program standards governing coursework in areas such as second language acquisition, cross-cultural instruction, and human relations, and to offer alternative routes to certification, including the California Teacher of English Learners (CTEL) examination. (EC §§ 44253.5 and 44253.7)
- 4) Restricts the authority to offer coursework leading to English learner-related authorizations to regionally accredited institutions of higher education.
- 5) Authorizes district internship programs as an alternative route to a teaching credential but does not currently permit local educational agencies (LEAs) to operate CTET, CLAD, or bilingual authorization programs.

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Authorizes the CTC to approve teacher preparation programs offered by school districts and county offices of education that lead to a CLAD certificate, ELA, or bilingual authorization, including a CTCL program.
- 2) Requires the CTC to apply the same standards for program approval as those used for institutions of higher education.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “In 2017, the California State Board of Education unanimously approved the English Learner Roadmap Policy to guide local educational agencies in effectively educating the state’s diverse English learners. A key goal of this policy was to strengthen teacher training. However, eight years later, California continues to experience a significant shortage of teachers, particularly those with bilingual certification. AB 1306 addresses this issue by allowing school districts and county offices of education to offer bilingual certification programs that meet existing state standards. By expanding access to bilingual certification, this bill ensures that more teachers receive the specialized training necessary to support California’s English learners.”
- 2) ***Access to English learner authorizations amid persistent workforce shortages.*** California has long faced challenges in ensuring a sufficient supply of teachers authorized to serve English learners. While many newly credentialed teachers earn integrated English learner authorizations through their initial training, pathways to expand those authorizations—particularly for departmentalized ELD instruction or bilingual instruction—remain relatively limited. By allowing LEAs to offer preparation programs subject to existing state standards, this bill expands the number and geographic distribution of training options without altering credentialing requirements or competencies.
- 3) ***Continues a trend of LEA-based credentialing options.*** In recent years, the Legislature has approved several bills permitting LEAs to offer credential programs traditionally reserved for postsecondary institutions, including for school nurses (AB 815, Luz Rivas, Chapter 668, Statutes of 2021), pupil personnel services (AB 606, Quirk-Siva, 2025), and administrators (AB 959, Hadwick, 2025). AB 1306 is consistent with this direction, provided that programs undergo the same CTC review and approval processes, and does not create a separate or lower bar for authorizations. It reflects an ongoing policy question about whether LEAs should act as direct providers of professional preparation, particularly in high-need credential areas.
- 4) ***Creates potential for more flexible and affordable options for prospective teachers.*** LEA-based preparation programs may offer practical advantages, such as evening or weekend schedules, reduced tuition costs, and stronger connections to local employment opportunities. This flexibility may be particularly important for classified staff or paraprofessionals seeking to transition into teaching roles with specialized authorizations. However, the success of such programs will likely depend on the capacity of LEAs to meet and maintain

rigorous preparation standards over time, as well as on continued oversight by the CTC.

- 5) ***Maintains state oversight and uniform program standards.*** Although the bill expands who may offer English learner-related preparation programs, it does not alter the substance of the required training or the standards used to evaluate programs. The CTC will continue to apply its existing quality and effectiveness standards when reviewing LEA-based programs. The bill is also limited in scope—it applies only to three specific types of authorizations and does not affect the broader credentialing landscape.

SUPPORT

Los Angeles Unified School District (Sponsor)
Association of California School Administrators
California Teachers Association
Californians Together
EdTrust-West
Office of the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools
Small School Districts Association
Sobrato Early Academic Language

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 1438	Hearing Date:	June 11, 2025
Author:	Gallagher		
Version:	March 28, 2025		
Urgency:	Yes	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Ian Johnson		

Subject: School finance: administrative employee-to-teacher ratio: Paradise Unified School District.

SUMMARY

This bill, an urgency measure, exempts the Paradise Unified School District (PUSD) from fiscal penalties associated with exceeding the statutory cap on administrative employee-to-teacher ratios for fiscal years 2024–25 through 2026–27. It also requires the district to report on its staffing ratios, reasons for noncompliance, and progress toward meeting the required ratio by 2026–27.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Exempts the PUSD from any reduction in state support due to exceeding the administrative employee-to-teacher ratio for the 2021–22 through 2023–24 fiscal years. (Education Code (EC) § 41404.5)
- 2) Defines “administrative employee” as a certificated school district employee who is not classified as a teacher or pupil services employee. (EC § 41401)
- 3) Defines “pupil services employee” as a certificated employee who provides direct services to pupils and holds a services, health, or librarian credential, including counselors, psychologists, nurses, and librarians. (EC § 41401)
- 4) Defines “teacher” as a certificated employee who provides direct instruction to pupils full-time, including special education teachers, substitute teachers, and instructional specialists, and includes designated instructional preparation time. (EC § 41401)
- 5) Establishes maximum administrative employee-to-teacher ratios of 9:100 for elementary districts, 8:100 for unified districts, and 7:100 for high school districts. (EC § 41402)
- 6) Requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) to annually calculate, for each district, the number of administrative employees and teachers—excluding those funded by federal or categorical funds—and determine whether the district exceeds the allowable ratio. (EC § 41403)

- 7) Excludes from the ratio calculation any employees mandated under a court-ordered integration plan for San Diego Unified School District. (EC § 41403)
- 8) Requires the SPI to calculate the reduction in state support based on the ratio of state aid to total general fund income, the average salary of administrative employees, and the number of administrators in excess of the maximum allowed. (EC § 41404)
- 9) Reduces a district's second principal apportionment by the penalty amount if the number of administrative employees exceeds the allowable ratio. (EC § 41404)
- 10) Exempts school districts with over 400,000 average daily attendance (ADA) as of the 2016–17 second principal apportionment from the penalty for fiscal years (FYs) 2019–20 through 2021–22, provided they submit reports with historical ratio data and plans for compliance by FY 2023–24. (EC § 41404.5)
- 11) Requires the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) to report its administrative-to-teacher ratio for FYs 2011–12 through 2022–23 and to submit annual progress reports for FYs 2024 and 2025 documenting steps toward compliance by FY 2025–26. (EC § 41404.5)

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Extends PUSD's existing exemption from Education Code Section 41404 penalties through FY 2026–27.
- 2) Requires the district to submit a report by September 1, 2026, to the California Department of Education (CDE), Department of Finance, and the appropriate legislative committees, including:
 - a) Ratios for FYs 2024–25 through 2026–27;
 - b) Reasons for noncompliance and estimated student impacts;
 - c) A plan to meet ratio requirements by the end of FY 2026–27;
 - d) Progress updates toward compliance.
- 3) Declares the legislation necessary due to the ongoing recovery from the 2018 Camp Fire, which devastated the district.
- 4) Enacts the bill as an urgency statute to ensure uninterrupted state funding during PUSD's rebuilding phase.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “AB 1438 recognizes the unique circumstances PUSD is navigating and ensures that schools can focus on rebuilding, supporting students, and maintaining essential services without the threat of funding cuts due to administrative staffing ratios. Stability is crucial for students who have already experienced so much disruption in their lives. By allowing PUSD the flexibility to retain necessary staff and avoid punitive financial penalties, we are giving these students a better chance at academic success and long-term recovery. This legislation is not just about funding—it’s about ensuring that Paradise schools have the resources and support needed to provide students with a safe, consistent, and high-quality education as they rebuild their futures. Now more than ever, we must stand with Paradise and give these students every opportunity to succeed.”
- 2) ***What is the administrator-to-teacher ratio and why does it matter?*** California law imposes a cap on the number of administrative employees a school district may have in relation to its number of teachers. The cap is meant to ensure that state education funds are primarily directed toward classroom instruction rather than central office staffing. The statutory limits are 9 administrators per 100 teachers in elementary districts, 8 per 100 in unified districts, and 7 per 100 in high school districts. Each year, the CDE calculates whether districts are within these ratios, and if not, imposes a fiscal penalty by reducing the district’s state apportionment.
- 3) ***Why does the state enforce this ratio?*** The ratio reflects a long-standing policy judgment that the majority of education spending should go toward instruction and student services, rather than administration. While it doesn’t reflect qualitative assessments of administrative effectiveness, it functions as a fiscal safeguard—especially important in a system where the state provides most of the funding for K–12 schools. The penalty structure incentivizes districts to prioritize instructional staffing unless specific circumstances justify otherwise.
- 4) ***When and why has the Legislature granted exemptions?*** Although the ratio has been in statute for decades, the Legislature has carved out temporary exemptions for certain districts facing extraordinary circumstances. For example, LAUSD received a multi-year exemption through the 2019 budget to give the district time to adjust its staffing levels following years of reform efforts and funding volatility. Similarly, PUSD received a three-year exemption (2021–24) in recognition of the district’s need to rebuild after the devastating Camp Fire of 2018.
- 5) ***What makes Paradise Unified’s situation unique?*** The Camp Fire destroyed over 10,000 homes and severely damaged or leveled most of the school facilities in the Paradise area. Enrollment plummeted, dropping from over 3,400 students pre-fire to about 1,700 shortly afterward. As the town slowly rebuilds, PUSD has begun reopening schools to accommodate returning families, including an elementary campus slated to open in 2024–25. This reopening, while a sign of hope and progress, drives up the need for administrators—principals, office

managers, and support staff—at a faster rate than the district can hire teachers or grow its enrollment base.

If the district were held to the standard ratio today, it would face a penalty of roughly \$245,000 in 2024–25, increasing as more schools come online. According to the district, the local teachers union supports current staffing levels and understands the operational challenges involved in rebuilding a small-town school system essentially from scratch.

- 6) ***What does this bill do that prior exemptions didn't?*** Rather than a one-year reprieve or a permanent change, this bill provides a three-year exemption window tied to transparent reporting. PUSD must document its ratios, explain its staffing decisions, and show progress toward meeting the standard ratio by the end of the 2026–27 fiscal year. This approach maintains accountability while acknowledging the realities of post-disaster recovery and the importance of stable school operations.

SUPPORT

Small School Districts Association

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --