

**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**  
Olgalilia Ramirez  
Ian Johnson

**Consultant**  
Therresa Austin

**Committee Assistant**  
Maria Velez  
Irma Kam

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

## AGENDA

Wednesday, July 2, 2025  
9 a.m. -- 1021 O Street, Room 2100

### MEASURES HEARD IN FILE ORDER

- |      |        |                   |  |
|------|--------|-------------------|--|
| *1.  | SCR 82 | Niello            | Public higher education: artificial intelligence usage.  |
| 2.   | AB 7   | Bryan             | Postsecondary education: admissions preference: descendants of slavery.  |
| 3.   | AB 88  | Ta                | Student financial aid: Cal Grants: Middle Class Scholarship Program: eligibility: dependents of members of the armed services stationed outside of California. |
| 4.   | AB 90  | Jackson           | Public postsecondary education: overnight student parking.   |
| *5.  | AB 291 | Gipson            | Teachers: credentialed educator apprenticeship programs.   |
| *6.  | AB 598 | Gipson            | School safety: School Mapping Data Grant Program.  |
| *7.  | AB 821 | Gipson            | Pupil instruction: high school graduation requirements: career technical education.  |
| *8.  | AB 320 | Bennett           | Public social services: eligibility: income exclusions.  |
| 9.   | AB 347 | Kalra             | Pupil instruction: animal dissection.  |
| 10.  | AB 477 | Muratsuchi        | Fair Pay for Educators Act: local control funding formula: base grants: funding targets.   |
| *11. | AB 642 | Muratsuchi        | Emergencies proclaimed by the Governor: school employee catastrophic leave.(Urgency)   |
| *12. | AB 542 | Celeste Rodriguez | Continuation schools and classes: youth workforce development programs.  |

- |     |         |              |  |
|-----|---------|--------------|--|
| 13. | AB 602  | Haney        | Public postsecondary education: student behavior: drug and alcohol use: rehabilitation programs.                   |
| 14. | AB 694  | McKinnor     | Department of Industrial Relations: advisory committee: occupational safety and health.                            |
| 15. | AB 917  | Ávila Farías | County offices of education: school districts: average daily attendance of less than 250 pupils: permanent status. |
| 16. | AB 1111 | Soria        | Pupil transportation: schoolbuses: zero-emission vehicles: extensions: scrapping.                                  |
| 17. | AB 1224 | Valencia     | Teacher credentialing: substitute teachers: days of service.   |
| 18. | AB 1230 | Bonta        | Pupil discipline: expulsions: procedures.  |
| 19. | AB 1264 | Gabriel      | Pupil nutrition: particularly harmful ultraprocessed food: prohibition.  |

**\*Consent Items**

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

**Bill No:** SCR 82 **Hearing Date:** July 2, 2025  
**Author:** Niello  
**Version:** May 15, 2025  
**Urgency:** **Fiscal:** No  
**Consultant:** Lynn Lorber

**Subject:** Public higher education: artificial intelligence usage.

## SUMMARY

This resolution encourages the President of the University of California (UC), the Chancellor of the California State University (CSU), and the Chancellor for the California Community Colleges (CCC) to create a workgroup of faculty, staff, and administrators to review the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in higher education.

## BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the CCCs, the CSU, and the UC as the public segments of postsecondary education in the state. (Education Code (EC) § 66010.4 et seq.)
- 2) Requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) to convene a working group on AI, and requires that working group to develop expanded guidance and a model policy on AI for use by local educational agencies (LEAs). (EC § 33328.5)
- 3) Requires the Secretary of Government Operations, upon appropriation by the Legislature, to evaluate, among other things, the impact the proliferation of deepfakes has on state government, California-based businesses, and residents of the state, and the risks, including privacy risks, associated with the deployment of digital content forgery technologies and deepfakes on state and local government, California-based businesses, and residents of the state. (Government Code § 11547.5 et seq.)

## ANALYSIS

This resolution:

- 1) Encourages the President of UC, the Chancellor of CSU, and the Chancellor for the CCCs to create a workgroup of faculty, staff, and administrators to review the use of AI in higher education.
- 2) Resolves that the workgroup should do all of the following:

- a) Discuss strategies and best practices that lead to the acceptable use of AI in higher education while emphasizing academic honesty and ethical academic standards;
  - b) Discuss strategies and best practices for acceptable use of AI across the three segments of California public higher education;
  - c) Discuss strategies and best practices for the use of AI in academic studies, including, but not limited to, mitigating plagiarism and ethically using AI in academic assignments;
  - d) Discuss strategies and best practices for using AI as it relates to providing student academic support;
  - e) Discuss and strategize on ways to provide professional support to professors on using AI in student and faculty work;
  - f) Discuss and strategize on ways to provide professional support to professors on recognizing the use of AI in student work, including reliable technologies for checking student work, and how to work with students to appropriately inform students when professors believe AI was improperly used; and,
  - g) Discuss best practices for responding to violations of AI usage standards, with student participation in these discussions for relevant feedback.
- 3) Encourages the workgroup to do all of the following:
- a) Collaborate with faculty, administrators, and students at the higher education segments, as well as individuals who work in higher education outside of California and experts in AI;
  - b) Collaborate with liaisons from the statewide associated student bodies of the three segments of California public higher education; and,
  - c) Create a report and make public the strategies and best practices for AI usage agreed upon by the workgroup.

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the resolution.*** According to the author, “As we know, Artificial Intelligence (AI) is an emerging technology. The Legislature is working diligently on how California can be at the forefront of using AI, and that includes thinking through the impact this technology is having on our daily lives and how that may need to be limited in some instances. In the case of higher education, it is important to discuss the impact and best practices to be sure students can thrive in their educational journeys. Since AI can be used to do almost anything, including helping students cheat by allowing the student to pass off work created by AI as their own, it is vital our education systems are prepared and communicating on how to deal with these situations.

“In addition, professors/faculty are on the front lines trying to assess student mastery of the subject, and many are having a hard time catching work that was created by AI. In some classes, the use of AI is encouraged, while in others it is punished. It is time that they have access to the best practices and tools that will help ensure that students are applying what they learned in the classroom, and not just copying and pasting what an AI bot wrote for them.

“While each institution is working on the issue on their own, it is imperative they be communicating as a group due to California’s connected system. SCR 82 encourages dialogue amongst the CA higher education systems to help promote the best approaches in teaching, as well as regulations around the allowable usage AI. This is important for not only the student, but also faculty who are in uncharted waters. Convening a workgroup is in the best interest of all parties involved to work towards clear guidelines for usage.”

- 2) ***Existing workgroups and initiatives.*** The UC, CSU, and CCCs have each undertaken AI-related initiatives. Examples include:
- a) The UC convened the “UC Presidential Working Group on Artificial Intelligence” in 2020, which issued a final report in 2021 titled “Responsible Artificial Intelligence: Recommendations to Guide the University of California’s Artificial Intelligence Strategy.” The recommendations included in this final report include:
    - i) Institutionalize the UC Responsible AI Principles in procurement, development, implementation, and monitoring practices.
    - ii) Establish campus-level councils and support coordination across UC that will further the principles and guidance developed by this Working Group.
    - iii) Develop an AI risk and impact assessment strategy.
    - iv) Document AI-enabled technologies in a public database. [UC AI Working Group Final Report](#)
  - b) The CSU announced in February 2025 that it is creating an AI-empowered higher education system, using a comprehensive strategy and rooted in the AI Workforce Acceleration Board. <https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/news/Pages/CSU-AI-Powered-Initiative.aspx>  
 CSU Board of Trustees Joint Committee on Educational Policy & Finance presented the CSU Artificial Intelligence Strategy during the Board’s January 2025 meeting. <https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/board-of-trustees/MeetingHandouts/January%2027-29,%202025/EDPOL-FIN%20Item%20%20-%20AI%20Strategy%20-%20HANDOUT%20BOTv1.pdf>  
 The Academic Senate of the CSU called for a working group on AI in

higher education in 2023. <https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate/resolutions/2022-2023/3610.pdf>

- c) The CCC has established the Digital Center for Innovation, Transformation and Equity to represent a strategic approach to supporting the CCC's Vision 2030, including leading in innovation, harnessing the power of generative AI, public and private technology partnerships, and transforming the CCC's ability to serve students as they move into an AI-powered workforce. <https://www.cccco.edu/About-Us/Vision-2030/strategic-directions/GenAI-and-the-future-of-learning/AIPD>

Additionally, in November 2024, the California Education Learning Lab announced the recipients of the "AI Grand Challenge: Leveraging AI for Teaching and Learning" grants, aimed at fostering innovation in the use of AI to enhance curriculum and pedagogy within California's public higher education system. Nearly 75 institutions from the CCC, CSU and UC systems submitted 32 proposals. Five projects have been selected to receive grants of up to \$1.5 million each. The Foundation for California Community Colleges is administering the grants on behalf of the State. The awarded projects aim to create significant influence on teaching and learning experiences statewide and will strive to reach approximately 150,000 students and 13,500 faculty/instructors across California's public higher education institutions and beyond. The list of awarded projects and institutions can be found here: [AI Grand Challenge Grants Awarded – California Education Learning Lab](#)

*Committee staff notes that there is no inter-segmental workgroup related to the use of AI in higher education. This resolution encourages the UC President, the CSU Chancellor, and the CCC Chancellor to create a workgroup of faculty, staff, and administrators to review the use of AI in higher education.*

- 3) **Need for a higher education coordinating body.** As noted in this committee's analysis of SB 790 (Cabaldon, 2025), the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education in California created an oversight body, the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), which was tasked with providing fiscal and policy recommendations to the Governor and Legislature; monitoring and coordinating public institutions; and ensuring comprehensive statewide planning for higher education and effective use of resources. CPEC was dissolved after its funding was eliminated in the 2011-12 budget. This resolution is further demonstration for the need for a state-level higher education coordinating body.

- 4) **Prior legislation.**

SB 1235 (Gonzalez, 2024) would have required CSU Long Beach (CSULB), in consultation with other public institutions of higher education, to establish the Artificial Intelligence and Deepfake Working Group and annually report to the Legislature on its research and findings. It further authorized CSULB to develop a scoping plan in the first year to establish the topics that may be evaluated by, and the stakeholders that may be included in, the working group. SB 1235 was never heard.

AB 2652 (Muratsuchi, 2024) would have required the SPI to convene a workgroup related to AI in educational settings, for the purpose of developing guidance for LEAs on the safe use of AI in education. AB 2652 was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

**SUPPORT**

None received

**OPPOSITION**

None received

**-- END --**

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

<b>Bill No:</b>	AB 88	<b>Hearing Date:</b>	July 2, 2025
<b>Author:</b>	Ta		
<b>Version:</b>	January 6, 2025		
<b>Urgency:</b>	No	<b>Fiscal:</b>	Yes
<b>Consultant:</b>	Olgalilia Ramirez		

**Subject:** Student financial aid: Cal Grants: Middle Class Scholarship Program: eligibility: dependents of members of the armed services stationed outside of California.

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

## SUMMARY

This bill extends eligibility for the Cal Grant and Middle Class Scholarship (MCS) Program to dependents of a member of the United States (US) Armed Forces who maintains California as their state of legal residence even if the dependent member did not graduate from a California high school and who otherwise meets all other applicable eligibility requirements.

## BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) 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 California Community College 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 the Student Aid Commission. (Education Code (EC) § 69430 et al.)
- 2) 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.)
- 3) Establishes eligibility requirements for awards under the program for participating students attending qualifying institutions, including, among others, California residency requirements, as provided. (EC § 69411 and 69433.9.)
- 4) Establishes the MCS program under the administration of the Commission. Existing law 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:

- 1) Extends Cal Grant and MCS Program eligibility to a student who is a dependent child or spouse of a member of the US Armed Forces stationed outside of California on active duty, if:
  - a) The member of the US Armed Forces otherwise maintains California as their state of legal residence; and
  - b) The student meets all other eligibility requirements.

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) **Need for the bill.** According to the author, “AB 88 would apply to a deserving body of active service member who have been relocated outside of California but maintain their residency in California during their time in the service. With the current law as it is, if you are a dependent of a parent or guardian who is a military member and has temporarily moved outside of California due to official orders, you are not eligible for Cal Grants or the Middle-Class Scholarship Program, even if your parents maintain a California residence and continue to pay income and property taxes to the state.”
- 2) **State of legal residence.** The federal Servicemembers’ Civil Relief Act of 2003 grants active military members certain privileges and protections that allow them to maintain legal residency in one state while physically stationed in another state or outside of the country. The State of Legal Residence (SLR) is what the military service considers to be one’s true, fixed, and permanent residence. According to the US Military’s Staff Judge Advocate document, “What You Should Know About Your State of Legal Residence,” a service member’s SLR is the location where they intend to return and their permanent home after retirement. SLR also determines where a service member votes, pays taxes, registers vehicles, has their will probated, and whether or not they receive privileges from a state.

According to an example presented in the publication, a service member with SLR in Minnesota leaves the state on military orders but intends to return to Minnesota after leaving the military. Minnesota is the service member’s SLR, even though the service member is temporarily absent from it due to military orders. The service member may never be stationed in Minnesota during his or her military career, but Minnesota would remain the service member’s SLR.

Furthermore, the publication states that changing SLR is difficult. To alter SLR, three requirements must be met: 1) one must be physically present in the new state; 2) intend to remain in the new state permanently, or treat the location as a

permanent home, demonstrated by registering to vote, obtaining a driver's license, paying taxes, among other things; 3) and must demonstrate intent to abandon the old SLR.

This bill attempts to extend state aid eligibility specifically for Cal Grant and MCS to a child or spouse of a service member with SLR in California, which can be used at qualifying California-based institutions. It is unclear whether expanding eligibility to state aid programs could result in supplanting other forms of federal student aid currently available to defray college costs for the dependents of service members.

- 3) **The Cal Grant program.** The Cal Grant program is the state's largest financial aid program, it is intended to help students with financial need to cover college costs. The program offers multiple types of Cal Grant awards. The aid amount students receive depends on their award type and the segment of higher education they attend. Cal Grant A covers full systemwide tuition and fees at public universities and a fixed amount of tuition at private universities. Cal Grant B provides the same amount of tuition coverage as Cal Grant A in most cases, while also providing an "access award" for non-tuition expenses such as food and housing. Cal Grant C, which is only available to students enrolled in career technical education programs, provides lower award amounts for tuition and non-tuition expenses. Across all award types, larger amounts of non-tuition coverage are available to students with dependent children as well as current and former foster youth. Among the conditions for Cal Grant A and B entitlement award eligibility is the requirement that a student be a resident of California at the time of their high school graduation in order to qualify for an award. Additionally, any nonresident student who has spent at least three years in a California school and has graduated from a California high school may qualify for the program.
- 4) **MCS program.** MCS provides undergraduate students, including students pursuing a teaching credential, with a scholarship, and was recently revamped to account for cost of attendance, to attend a UC, CSU or CCC Bachelor's degree program. Currently, a CCC student pursuing an associate degree or certificate is not eligible for MCS. Students with family income and assets up to \$217,000 may be eligible. MCS California residency requirements are aligned with the Cal Grant program.
- 5) **The consideration of the federal SLR for state student aid remains ambiguous.** Most students apply for Cal Grant awards and MCS by submitting the free application for federal student aid (FAFSA), which is operated by the U.S. Department of Education and the Office of Federal Student Aid. An applicant may identify their SLR on the FAFSA. Seemingly, a student with a California SLR who has completed their application correctly, submitted a verified high school GPA by the deadline, and met all other eligibility requirements may receive award consideration. However, it is important to note that final determination of California residency requirements happens at the college or university. According to information provided by CSU within their system student residency is determined by their parents' residency and servicemembers often remain residents of California after they join the service, or switch their residency to California while stationed in the state as a result pay California income taxes

regardless of where they are stationed. Information from UC was not provided. It is not clear the extent to which having a California SLR has disqualified a student from California residency status for purposes of qualifying for resident tuition or aid programs. It is possible that the bill's provisions are clarifying and codifying an existing practice.

6) **Prior and related legislation.**

SB 67 (Seyarto, 2025) identical to this bill and AB 1793, would expand eligibility for the Cal Grant and MCS program to dependents of a US Armed Forces member who maintains California as their SLR, even if the dependent did not graduate from a California high school and otherwise meets all other applicable eligibility requirements. SB 67 has been referred to the Assembly Committees on Higher Education and Veterans Affairs.

AB 1793 (Ta, 2024) identical to this bill, would have expanded eligibility for the Cal Grant and MCS program to dependents of a US Armed Forces member who maintains California as their SLR, even if the dependent did not graduate from a California high school and otherwise meets all other applicable eligibility requirements. AB 1793 died in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

**SUPPORT**

California Association of Christian Colleges and Universities  
San Jose-Evergreen Community College District

**OPPOSITION**

None received

**-- END --**

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

<b>Bill No:</b>	AB 90	<b>Hearing Date:</b>	July 2, 2025
<b>Author:</b>	Jackson		
<b>Version:</b>	June 19, 2025		
<b>Urgency:</b>	No	<b>Fiscal:</b>	Yes
<b>Consultant:</b>	Olgalilia Ramirez		

**Subject:** Public postsecondary education: overnight student parking.

**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 requires that the governing board of each community college district (CCD) adopt a plan that meets certain criteria for offering an overnight parking program for purposes of allowing students to stay in their car overnight until an alternative is provided, and vote on its implementation indefinitely until the program is officially adopted. It further requires each campus that offers an overnight parking program to provide participants with information on housing services and resources. Finally, the bill requires each campus to report annually to the Chancellor’s Office on specified program outcomes.

## BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Requires each campus of the California State University (CSU) and requests each campus of the University of California (UC) to establish a position of a Basic Needs Coordinator and requires the basic needs coordinator to oversee and coordinate the provision of basic needs services to students from both on- and off- campus entities and to complete other assigned duties for the purposes of streamlining access for students to basic needs services, as defined. Establishes a basic needs center on CSU campuses and requests the UC to establish the center. Requires each CSU and requests each UC to report on specified basic needs services as provided to students and for the report to be submitted to the Legislature by March 1 of each year. (Education Code (EC) § 66023.4)
- 2) Establishes by July 1, 2022, Basic Needs Centers and the position of a Basic Needs Coordinator at California Community College (CCC) campuses to provide students with single point of contact for on-and off-campus basic needs services, as defined. (EC § 66023.5)
- 3) Requires each campus of the CSU and CCC and requests the UC to include on the internet website-based student account associated with the student’s attendance at the institution information, including the weblink, on the following public services and programs:

- a) The CalFresh program;
  - b) Resources as determined by the institution for county or local housing services, as defined; and,
  - c) Resources as determined by the institution for county or mental health services. (EC § 66027.6)
- 4) Stipulates any action taken by the local governing board of a CCD to procure insurance as required by the authority invested in the local governing board of the CCD by EC § 70902 and § 75003 and, where applicable, by § 989 to 991.2 of the Government Code. The governing board of the CCD will insure against all of the following:
- a) The liability, other than specified liability confined within the Labor Code as defined, of the district for damages for death, injury to a person, or damage or loss of property; and,
  - b) The personal liability of members of the board and of the officers and employees of the CCD for damages for death, injury to a person, or damage or loss of property caused by the negligent act or omission of a representative of the CCD within the scope of their office or employment. (EC § 72506)
- 5) Requires the CCC that provide on-campus housing to provide priority housing for current and former homeless youth and current and former foster youth. Requires the housing to be available year round and at no extra cost to the current and former homeless youth and current and former foster youth. The CCC is requested to develop a plan to ensure for current and former homeless youth, and current and former foster youth, to access housing resources throughout the year regardless of whether the campus has student housing. Defines homeless youth and states if a student is verified as a former homeless youth, the student shall retain the status for purposes of housing security for six years from the date of admission to the campus. (EC § 76010)
- 6) Requires a CCC campus that has shower facilities for student use to grant access, as specified, to those facilities to any homeless student who is enrolled in coursework, has paid enrollment fees, and is in good standing with the CCD. Requires the CCC to determine a plan of action to implement this requirement. (EC § 76011)
- 7) Prohibits a CCD or any officer or any employee of such CCD or board to be responsible or liable for conduct or safety of any student of the public school at any time when the student is not on school property unless the CCD has provided transportation to and from the school premise for a school function or school sponsored activity. If the CCD has taken a student from campus for a school sponsored activity or school function, the CCD shall be liable for the conduct or safety of the student only when the student is under the immediate and direct supervision of an employee of the CCD or local governing board. (EC § 87706)

- 8) Requires the CSU who provide on-campus housing to provide priority housing for current and former homeless youth and current and former foster youth. Requires the housing to be available year round and at no extra cost to the current and former homeless youth and current and former foster youth. The CSU is requested to develop a plan to ensure, current and former homeless youth and current and former foster youth, have access to housing resources throughout the year regardless of whether the campus has student housing. Defines for purposes of the section homeless youth and states if a student is verified as a former homeless youth, the student shall retain the status for purposes of housing security for six years from the date of admission to the campus. (EC § 90001.5)

## ANALYSIS

This bill:

### *Overnight Parking Plan Requirements*

- 1) Requires, by September 1, 2026, the governing board of each CCD to adopt, as part of the annual campus safety plan, a plan to offer an overnight parking program to students enrolled at each campus within the CCD. The bill states that it is the Legislature's intent that the plan provide overnight parking to students who are experiencing housing insecurity and allow students to stay in their cars overnight at designated parking lots and parking spots on campus as specified.
- 2) Requires that the plan be developed in consultation with the campus' basic needs coordinator and with the campus' security, and that it include all of the following:
  - a) A written agreement with campus' security for monitoring overnight parking lots and spots. The agreement is to include a procedure for reporting and responding to any threats to the safety of a participating student.
  - b) An overnight parking program application developed by the campus' basic needs coordinator. Eligible students are to acknowledge and agree to the rules for the overnight parking program in the application, and that any violation of these rules will result in the student's immediate removal from the parking program.
  - c) Designation of bathroom and shower facilities that will be made available to participating students and an agreement with custodial staff for the maintenance of those designated facilities.
  - d) A determination as to whether the CCD's governing board will prohibit use of recreational vehicles for parking under the program.
  - e) The designation of, but not limited to, at least one parking lot and at least

50 parking spots on campus for use by participating students under the program.

- f) Overnight parking program rules that a participating student must follow when using overnight parking facilities include the campus student code of conduct and a zero tolerance policy for intimidation, harassment, and the use of drugs or alcohol. A violation of the overnight parking program rules is to be reported and investigated in the same manner as a student code of conduct violation. A finding that the student violated rules is to be grounds for immediate removal from the parking program.
- g) A procedure for registering and verifying the identity of an eligible student and the student's vehicle through the issuance of an overnight parking permit at no cost to the student. This information is to be used solely for the purpose of implementing the overnight parking program and not to be disclosed for any other purpose, except pursuant to the specified court-issued warrant.
- h) Daily time of use or hours of operation requirements for overnight parking under the program that ensure that the daily time of use or hours of operation for overnight under the program align with campus operation hours. The bill requires that these requirements provide for parking to occur overnight and include a plan to maintain the overnight parking program during holidays and academic breaks.
- i) A procedure for issuing an overnight parking permit to students, including a specified timeframe in which the parking permit is valid. This timeframe is to be at least four weeks but not more than one semester or the quarterly equivalent.
- j) A requirement for the campus' basic needs coordinator to prioritize securing sustainable housing alternatives for participating students.
- k) A procedure for issuing an overnight parking permit to students, including:
  - i) A specified timeframe in which the parking permit is valid.
  - ii) A process for informing students about the bathroom and shower facilities designated and providing students with a copy of the overnight parking program required rules.
- l) A requirement for a campus' basic needs coordinator to prioritize securing sustainable housing alternatives for participating students.
- m) A procedure for students to apply for and obtain approval to participate in the overnight parking program. The procedure is to include a process for informing students about the designated bathroom and shower facilities and providing students with a copy of the overnight parking program rules.
- n) An estimation of the cost of implementing the overnight parking program.

*Voting Requirement*

- 3) Requires the CCD governing board, by December 31, 2026, to vote to establish an overnight parking program that aligns with the plan adopted.
- 4) Requires, if the majority of the governing board votes in favor of establishing an overnight parking program, a basic needs coordinator for each campus within the CCD is required to implement the plan immediately and commence accepting applications for the overnight parking program within three months of the vote.
- 5) Requires, if the majority of the governing board votes against establishing the overnight parking program, the governing board to vote annually on whether to establish an overnight parking program until its members vote in favor of establishing the overnight parking program.

*Resource and Support Services*

- 6) Requires each campus that offers an overnight parking program to do all of the following:
  - a) Send a stand-alone email to each of its students as specified describing available student housing services, and provide a description of these services at each campus student orientation.
  - b) Provide a description of available student housing services at each student orientation at the campus.
  - c) Provide a housing assistance tab that is clearly visible and easily accessible on the campus' internet website, as specified.
- 7) Requires a participating student to be granted access to overnight parking until the student is provided access to a sustainable housing alternative offered by a campus' basic needs coordinator.

*Liability Provision*

- 8) Provides that a campus that complies with the requirements of the bill is not civilly liable for a campus employee's good faith act or omission that fails to prevent an injury to a participating student that occurs in, or in close proximity to, and during the hours of operation of, overnight parking. The immunity provision does not apply to gross negligence, intentional misconduct, or violations of other laws.

*Reporting Requirements*

- 9) Requires each campus to report annually to the Chancellor's Office on specified outcomes.



- 10) Requires the Chancellor's office to report on the overnight parking programs based on the information provided in the campus report.

#### *Definitions*

- 11) Defines various terms for the purposes of the bill, including:
  - a) "Eligible student" to mean a student who meets both of the following requirements:
    - i) The student is enrolled in coursework at a community college offering an overnight parking program established pursuant to the bill.
    - ii) If not waived, the student has paid their enrollment fees.
  - b) "Participating student" to mean a student who has applied and is approved to use overnight parking facilities pursuant to an overnight parking program established pursuant to this section.

#### **STAFF COMMENTS**

- 1) **Need for the bill.** According to the author, "AB 90 seeks to provide a backstop and an alternative for emergency shelter, by allowing California community college students to stay overnight in their personal vehicles while parked on the campus of their college where they are a registered student. While emergency shelter in a vehicle is not ideal, just knowing a student may have a place to shelter, will go a long way to stabilizing their health and providing additional time to find a long term housing solution."
- 2) **State support for student basic needs programs.** To attend college, students face tuition costs as well as nontuition costs, including housing, food, transportation, books, and supplies. The Legislative Analyst's Office reports in its publication, "Trends in Higher Education—College Affordability," that campus food and housing expenses are the fastest-growing nontuition costs for undergraduates living off campus. To assist students with housing and food costs as well as address food and housing insecurity, the state appropriated funding for student basic needs programs. Commencing with the 2019-20 budget year, the state provided all three public higher educational segments, including CCCs, with ongoing General Fund augmentations to create rapid rehousing programs in partnership with community organizations. Within the CCC system, 27 of 116 colleges receive funding for rapid re-housing. These programs provide students who are homeless or at risk of homelessness with various services, including case management, emergency housing, and emergency grants. A recent study published in March 2025 by the Center for Equitable Higher Education found that students who participated were more likely to remain enrolled and graduate compared to their peers, and a majority had established stable housing in one year. To scale the program to more colleges, additional resources are needed.

Beyond rapid rehousing programs, all three public segments also have received ongoing state funds in recent years for basic needs assistance. Services provided on each campus vary but can include on-campus food pantries, meal vouchers, hotel vouchers for short-term housing needs, on-campus emergency housing, security deposit assistance, rental subsidies, and a case manager to help students secure long-term housing. Colleges have also built referral pipelines with local organizations that provide housing assistance.

In addition to providing ongoing support for basic needs programs, the state provided a substantial amount of one-time funding for the Higher Education Student Housing Grant program. As part of the 2022-23 budget agreement, the state provided a total of \$1.5 billion in one-time non-Proposition 98 General Fund for the first round of student housing grants. The CCC system has 14 campuses with on-campus housing in operation, six others are under construction, and 13 are in planning and design.

- 3) **Additional services and resources available for students facing homelessness.** In addition to supporting basic needs programs, existing law requires CCCs to provide the following services and make specific considerations for students who are currently or formerly homeless:
- a) Consider current or formerly homeless students for priority housing.
  - b) Consider current or formerly homeless students for first priority for residence in the housing facilities that are open for uninterrupted year-round occupation.
  - c) Grant priority for registration for enrollment.
  - d) Grant access to shower facilities.
  - e) Designate a Homeless and Foster Youth Liaison to assist current or formerly homeless students in applying for and receiving federal and state financial aid and available services.
  - f) Offer services and resources for students experiencing basic needs insecurity through an on-campus basic needs center with a designated coordinator. The role of the coordinator is to identify and link students to on- and off-campus housing, food, mental health, and other basic needs services and resources.

*The Committee may wish to consider whether it is appropriate for the state to mandate that colleges establish and manage overnight parking facilities that serve as temporary housing or whether an alternative solution, comparable to the student services or resources mentioned in this analysis, is merited.*

- 4) **Variation in campus capacity.** This bill calls for the development of a plan that permits students to stay in their car overnight. It outlines several requirements that the plan must fulfill, including an agreement with campus security for monitoring overnight parking areas and addressing any threats to student safety.

The plan must also allocate bathroom and shower facilities for participants, as well as establish rules of conduct. Additionally, at least one parking lot on campus must have a minimum of 50 designated parking spots for overnight parking. The CCC system consists of 116 colleges and 72 districts covering this state. Each college is unique in size, student enrollment and infrastructure capacity. Implementation of the required criteria may not be feasible for all colleges. For example, Cuyamaca College which currently offers a limited overnight parking option through a community based partnership currently has 11 available spaces all in a monitored lot near campus security. Meeting the 50 parking spot minimum required in the bill is not feasible for this small college with infrastructure limitations. This bill does not account for variation in campus size, infrastructure, or resources across the system. *The Committee may wish to consider whether providing greater flexibility to colleges around the parameters of the overnight night parking program, particularly on the minimum number of required spaces.*

- 5) **Repeated vote requirement.** This bill requires the creation of a plan but does not explicitly require the implementation of a program. Instead, it requires the CCD's governing board to annually vote on the implementation of the plan until its adoption. This approach sets a precedent for mandating repeated votes until the desired outcome is achieved. If this trend continues, it may lead to future legislation concerning the subscription of topics for consideration by local governing boards. *The Committee may wish to consider whether it is appropriate to require the governing board to conduct repeated votes for an indefinite period when program implementation is not approved.*
- 6) **Liability risks.** This bill stipulates that colleges complying with its requirements are not civilly liable for a CCD employee's good faith act or omission that fails to prevent an injury related to overnight parking. Opponents of this bill have raised concerns that the liability risks to colleges and students are too great. They cite challenges in enforcing participant conduct rules and guaranteeing the safety of students, particularly from weather conditions at certain times of the year and in certain locations. This bill has been also referred to the Committee on Judiciary, which has jurisdiction over legislation relating to courts, liens, claims, privacy, and consumer protection, and can more appropriately address issues relative to potential liability for colleges.
- 7) **Arguments in support.** The Student Senate for California Community Colleges, in part, states in their letter of support submitted to this Committee, "California's college students are facing unprecedented costs to attend school, driven by a historic rise in the price of housing. The impacts of this are extensive and among them may lead to students struggling to academically perform or even complete their education. The data also shows students who are facing homelessness or housing insecurity suffer from higher anxiety, poor physical health, and less access to healthy food. AB 90 aims to alleviate the housing insecurity of students attending California's public colleges and universities by allowing them to park overnight on campus while they work toward securing stable housing. It is also important to note that AB 90 is not intended to serve as a permanent solution to student homelessness, but rather as a companion effort to those ongoing by the CCC in finding California's college students a more suitable housing solution."

- 8) **Arguments in opposition.** According to their letter of opposition, the Community College League of California argues, in part, "...While we commend the author for his commitment to addressing student homelessness, we respectfully disagree with the proposed solution and instead urge resources to be directed toward proven and effective strategies for addressing student housing insecurity. In 2023, the League's CEO Affordability, Food & Housing Access Taskforce conducted the RealCollege survey, which revealed that many of our students face housing insecurity or homelessness. The resulting Basic Needs Report ended with a set of policy recommendations for lawmakers to consider, including proposals to expand and invest in student housing initiatives, increase coordination with local counties, strengthen partnerships with community-based organizations, identify and support student groups with disproportionately high basic needs insecurities, and equitably increase student access to state and federal financial aid. Unfortunately, AB 90 ignores these comprehensive recommendations and instead offers a remedy that doesn't address the root issue and potentially harms other remedies colleges are enacting. We believe that AB 90 poses significant challenges.."
- 9) **Amendments.** For purposes of addressing some of the concerns raised in this analysis, committee staff recommends that the bill be amended as follows:

- Provide greater flexibility to college campuses in determining the minimum number of parking spots required in the program.

Modify EC § 76013 (b)(5)(A). The designation of at least one parking lot and at least 50 parking spots on campus for use by participating students under the program. **The campus shall determine the total number of parking spots designated within the parking lot.**

- Eliminate the repeated vote requirement, maintain that the board hold the vote at least once, and clarify that the board may revisit the issue at its discretion.

Modify EC § 76013 (c)(1). On or before December 31, 2026, the governing board of each community college district shall vote to **determine if the community colleges within the district will establish** an overnight parking program that aligns with the plan adopted pursuant to subdivision (b).

Strike EC § 76013(c)(3) **if the majority of the governing board votes against establishing the overnight parking program pursuant to paragraph (1), the governing board shall vote each year, on or before December 31, on whether to establish an overnight parking program. The vote shall take place annually until the governing board votes in favor of establishing the overnight parking program.**

Add: **Nothing in this section prohibits the governing board of a community college district from revisiting the establishment of the**

**overnight parking program established in the bill to determine feasibility if not approved pursuant to paragraph EC § 76013 (C)(2).**

10) **Prior and related legislation.**

AB 1818 (Jackson, 2024) would have required the CCC Chancellor's Office and the CSU Chancellor's Office to each establish a pilot program to allow overnight parking on select campuses by students. AB 1818 died in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

AB 302 (Berman, 2019), would have required a CCC campus that has parking facilities on campus to grant overnight access to those facilities, on or before July 1, 2020, to any homeless student who is enrolled in coursework, has paid any enrollment fees that have not been waived, and is in good standing with the community college for the purpose of sleeping in the student's vehicle overnight. This bill was moved to the inactive file on the Senate Floor.

**SUPPORT**

California Coalition for Youth  
 California Teachers Association  
 CFT - A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO  
 League of Women Voters of California  
 Oakland Privacy  
 Public Advocates  
 Student Homes Coalition  
 Student Senate for California Community Colleges

**OPPOSITION**

Allan Hancock College  
 Association of California Community College Administrators  
 Association of Chief Business Officials  
 Barstow Community College  
 Berkeley City College  
 Butte-Glenn Community College District  
 Cabrillo College  
 California Mobility and Parking Association  
 CEO Affordability, Food & Housing Access Taskforce/Real College California  
 Cerritos College  
 Chabot College  
 Chabot-Las Positas Community College District  
 Chaffey College  
 Citrus College  
 Clovis Community College  
 Coalinga College  
 Coast Community College District  
 College of Alameda  
 College of Marin

College of the Redwoods  
College of the Sequoias  
College of the Siskiyous  
Columbia College  
Community College Facility Coalition  
Community College League of California  
Contra Costa Community College District  
Copper Mountain College  
Cosumnes River College  
Cuesta College  
Cuyamaca College  
Cypress College  
Feather River College  
Folsom Lake College  
Foothill-De Anza Community College District  
Fresno City College  
Gavilan College  
Glendale Community College  
Grossmont College  
Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District  
Hartnell College  
Irvine Valley College  
Lake Tahoe Community College District  
Laney College  
Las Positas College  
Lassen Community College  
Lemoore College  
Los Angeles Community College District  
Los Rios Community College District  
Madera Community College  
Mendocino-Lake Community College District  
Merced College  
Merritt College  
Miracosta College  
Modesto Junior College  
Mt. San Antonio College  
Mt. San Jacinto College  
Napa Valley College  
North Orange Community College District  
North Orange County Community College District  
Ohlone College  
Palomar College  
Peralta Community College District  
Reedley Community College  
Rio Hondo College  
Riverside Community College District  
Sacramento City College  
Saddleback College  
San Bernardino Community College District  
San Diego City College

San Diego College of Continuing Education  
San Diego Community College District  
San Diego Mesa College  
San Diego Miramar College  
Santa Rosa Junior College  
Sierra College  
Solano Community College  
South Orange County Community College District  
Southwestern College  
State Center Community College District  
Taft College  
Ventura County Community College District  
Victor Valley College  
West Hills Community College District  
Woodland Community College  
Yosemite Community College District  
Yuba College  
Yuba Community College District

**-- END --**

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

**Bill No:** AB 291 **Hearing Date:** July 2, 2025  
**Author:** Gipson  
**Version:** June 24, 2025  
**Urgency:** No **Fiscal:** Yes  
**Consultant:** Ian Johnson

**Subject:** Teachers: credentialed educator apprenticeship programs.

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

## SUMMARY

This bill establishes the Credentialed Educator Apprenticeships Act, requiring the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and the Division of Apprenticeship Standards (DAS) to jointly disseminate, approve, and monitor credentialed educator apprenticeship programs in California.

## BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Teacher Residency Grant Program to support teacher candidates through one-year residencies in high-need areas, including special education, bilingual education, and Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM). (Education Code (EC) §44415)
- 2) Provides for the establishment of registered apprenticeship programs overseen by DAS within the Department of Industrial Relations. (Labor Code §3070 et seq.)
- 3) Requires DAS to evaluate and monitor apprenticeship programs and specifies that apprenticeships may be time-based, competency-based, or hybrid. (Labor Code §§3073.1, 3078.5)
- 4) Allows for apprenticeship sponsors to include local educational agencies (LEAs), institutions of higher education (IHEs), labor organizations, and nonprofits, and encourages alignment of apprenticeship programs with affirmative action and public sector workforce needs. (Labor Code §§3075, 3075.1)

## ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Establishes the Credentialed Educator Apprenticeships Act at the CTC.



- 2) Requires the CTC to partner with DAS to disseminate, approve, and monitor credentialed educator apprenticeship programs.
- 3) Requires the CTC to confirm that apprenticeship programs:
  - a) Partner with accredited educator preparation and, if applicable, induction programs.
  - b) Include at least 300 hours of paid on-the-job training prior to serving as an educator of record.
  - c) Require a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited institution before serving as an educator of record.
  - d) Provide at least 200 hours of mentoring and support annually.
- 4) Authorizes the CTC to issue apprenticeship certificates or permits to educator candidates who have cleared background checks but have not yet earned a credential.
- 5) Requires apprenticeship program applicants to submit documentation to DAS confirming partnership with a CTC-accredited program and compliance with program requirements, including a labor-management agreement.
- 6) Prohibits DAS from approving an apprenticeship program unless CTC confirms program requirements have been met.
- 7) Permits apprentices to concurrently hold classified positions, but prohibits performance of duties from other classified roles during apprenticeship hours.
- 8) Requires DAS to initiate deregistration if an associated preparation or induction program loses CTC accreditation.
- 9) Authorizes DAS and CTC to enter into a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to establish application review, data sharing, and oversight procedures.
- 10) Clarifies that this act does not apply to non-credential apprenticeship programs (e.g., childcare permits under EC §8301).
- 11) Requires DAS, in consultation with CTC, to adopt regulations consistent with Education Code requirements governing program approval, monitoring, and standards.

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “One of the many barriers to attaining a teacher credential is the costs related to obtaining a degree while trying to sustain oneself without an income during student teaching. With this bill, I believe that creating teacher residency apprenticeship programs can help alleviate one

of the many barriers to becoming a credentialed teacher and help districts develop high qualified and experienced educators from their own community. We also need to provide as many tools as possible to help districts fill their vacancies. AB 291 is intended to assist with the aforementioned hurdles.”

- 2) ***Addressing affordability and access barriers in teacher preparation.*** The unpaid nature of student teaching remains a significant obstacle for many prospective teachers, particularly those from low-income or underrepresented backgrounds. This bill proposes a framework to integrate paid, on-the-job experience into the credentialing pathway through formal apprenticeship models. While teacher residency programs also provide clinical experience, they do not always offer compensation at the level or structure of an apprenticeship. By aligning with federal and state apprenticeship funding mechanisms, the bill may help reduce financial burdens and make the pathway into teaching more accessible for a broader range of candidates.
- 3) ***Intersection with existing state initiatives.*** California has made substantial investments in teacher residencies and other programs designed to address teacher shortages in high-need fields. The Teacher Residency Grant Program, for example, provides up to \$25,000 per resident per year and targets special education, STEM, and bilingual education. This bill does not replace these initiatives but introduces a new option that is intended to complement and potentially expand upon them. However, residency programs and registered apprenticeships are governed by different funding structures and regulatory bodies, which may present coordination challenges during implementation.
- 4) ***Formalizing standards for a growing model.*** While some educator preparation programs have already sought to register as apprenticeship sponsors through DAS, existing law does not specify requirements for credentialed educator apprenticeships. This bill seeks to fill that gap by establishing minimum thresholds for paid on-the-job training, mentorship hours, and institutional partnerships. In doing so, it provides a framework for aligning educator apprenticeships with both Labor Code and Education Code requirements. Whether these thresholds are sufficient—or too rigid—to support high-quality and scalable models may depend on how they are operationalized by the CTC and DAS through future regulations.
- 5) ***Potential administrative and regulatory complexity.*** The bill tasks both the CTC and DAS with reviewing and approving educator apprenticeship programs. While the two agencies are authorized to enter into a MOU, the coordination of responsibilities—including review timelines, data collection, and oversight—may require substantial interagency planning. The bill also authorizes new types of apprenticeship permits or certificates, which are not currently in wide use. These new instruments will require clear guidance and integration into existing credentialing pathways.
- 6) ***Legislative context and fiscal implications.*** This bill follows prior efforts, including AB 694 (Gipson, 2024), which proposed a similar apprenticeship model but was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee. According to the Assembly Appropriations analysis, this bill would result in approximately

\$800,000 in combined annual costs to the CTC and DAS, in addition to one-time implementation costs. No funding is currently earmarked in the state budget for educator apprenticeship expansion, and the success of this model may ultimately depend on access to external funding streams, including state Apprenticeship Innovation Funding and federal grants.

**SUPPORT**

Children Now (Sponsor)  
California State University, Office of the Chancellor  
Californians Together  
Easterseals Northern California  
EdVoice  
NextGen California  
Partnership for Los Angeles Schools  
Public Advocates  
United Administrators of Southern California  
Western Governors University

**OPPOSITION**

None received

**-- END --**

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

**Bill No:** AB 598 **Hearing Date:** July 2, 2025  
**Author:** Gipson  
**Version:** March 17, 2025  
**Urgency:** No **Fiscal:** Yes  
**Consultant:** Ian Johnson

**Subject:** School safety: School Mapping Data Grant Program.

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

## SUMMARY

This bill establishes the School Mapping Data Grant Program, under the administration of the Office of Emergency Services (OES), to provide one-time grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to contract with vendors for school mapping data.

## BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Requires school districts and county offices of education (COEs) to develop and annually update comprehensive school safety plans for schools serving grades K–12. These plans must address procedures for disaster response, tactical incidents (e.g., active shooters), and consultation with first responders. (Education Code (EC) §§ 32281–32282)
- 2) Requires charter schools to develop school safety plans that include specified safety topics, including tactical responses. (EC §§ 47605, 47605.5)
- 3) Authorizes portions of safety plans involving tactical response procedures to be developed in consultation with law enforcement and kept confidential. (EC § 32281)
- 4) Protects student data through the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and provides liability protection for certain anti-terrorism technologies under the SAFETY Act. (20 U.S.Code § 1232g; Public Law 107-296)

## ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Establishes the School Mapping Data Grant Program, administered by OES, subject to an appropriation by the Legislature.

- 2) Authorizes OES to award one-time grants to LEAs to contract with qualified vendors that provide school mapping data.
- 3) Requires OES to determine the minimum data requirements for mapping programs eligible for grant funding.
- 4) Requires LEAs receiving grants to select a mapping program in collaboration with local public safety agencies and ensure it meets both the OES criteria and the needs of schools and first responders.
- 5) Allows OES to expend up to 5% of appropriated funds on administrative costs.
- 6) Defines key terms, including “school mapping data,” “local educational agency,” and “public safety agency.”

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “AB 598 will ensure safety on our K-12 campuses by providing our first responders with the technology and tools necessary to navigate the campus in the event of an emergency. In situations of life and death, every second matters. We need to provide emergency school mapping technology for our state’s first responders to efficiently navigate and communicate, especially through an unfamiliar building environment.”
- 2) ***Targeted Investment in Emergency Response Infrastructure.*** This bill proposes a state-funded, one-time grant program to support the adoption of digital school mapping tools, with the goal of enhancing emergency response capabilities on school campuses. While existing law requires schools to share safety plans and consult with first responders, current practice varies, and many school maps are reported to be outdated, inconsistent, or difficult to access in real time. This bill attempts to address this gap by funding contracts with qualified mapping vendors, under the oversight of the OES.
- 3) ***Scope and Implementation Issues.*** The bill leaves several key details to be determined by OES, including the definition of eligible mapping programs and how LEAs are to collaborate with local public safety agencies in vendor selection. The extent to which LEAs will receive guidance, technical assistance, or procurement support from the state remains unclear. While the one-time funding model helps contain costs, questions may arise regarding the ongoing maintenance and accuracy of the maps after the initial investment. Without a mechanism to ensure updates over time, the long-term utility of the mapping data could diminish.
- 4) ***Cybersecurity Risks and Data Management Concerns.*** As several committee analyses have noted, school mapping data—while potentially valuable to first responders—could also present cybersecurity risks if accessed by unauthorized individuals. The bill does not address data storage, access protocols, or the role of vendors in ensuring the security of sensitive facility information. Given the rise

in cyberattacks on both school districts and technology vendors, some observers may question whether appropriate safeguards will be in place before deployment.

- 5) ***No Evaluation Component Included.*** The bill does not require any study, pilot, or follow-up evaluation of the effectiveness of the mapping data in improving emergency response times or outcomes. As school safety experts have noted, relatively little research has been conducted on the actual impact of digital mapping on incident response. The absence of a reporting or evaluation requirement may limit the Legislature's ability to assess whether the intended benefits of this program are realized.
- 6) ***Equity and Access Considerations.*** By creating a grant program, the bill could help smaller or lower-resourced districts access tools that might otherwise be unaffordable. However, implementation may depend on LEA capacity to identify vendors, apply for funds, and coordinate with first responders. Some LEAs may be better positioned than others to take advantage of the program, potentially introducing variability in uptake.
- 7) ***Contingent on Funding Not Included in the Budget Package.*** The bill's implementation is contingent upon an appropriation by the Legislature. However, the 2025–26 legislative budget package does not include funding for the School Mapping Data Grant Program proposed in this bill. In the absence of a corresponding budget appropriation or trailer bill language, the program established by this bill would not move forward in the budget year. Future consideration may depend on the availability of one-time Proposition 98 or General Fund resources and the prioritization of school safety infrastructure among competing needs.

## **SUPPORT**

Alameda County Office of Education  
California Police Chiefs Association  
Los Angeles County Office of Education

## **OPPOSITION**

None received

-- END --

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

<b>Bill No:</b>	AB 821	<b>Hearing Date:</b>	July 2, 2025
<b>Author:</b>	Gipson		
<b>Version:</b>	April 1, 2025		
<b>Urgency:</b>	No	<b>Fiscal:</b>	Yes
<b>Consultant:</b>	Therresa Austin		

**Subject:** Pupil instruction: high school graduation requirements: career technical education.

## SUMMARY

This bill eliminates the sunset on the existing authorization for career technical education (CTE) courses to be used to satisfy the visual and performing arts (VAPA) or world language graduation requirement, thus extending it into perpetuity.

## BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Requires a student to complete all of the following while in grades 9-12 in order to receive a diploma of graduation from high school (each course having a duration of one year unless otherwise specified):
  - a) Three courses in English.
  - b) Two courses in science, including biological and physical science.
  - c) Two courses in mathematics.
  - d) Three courses in social sciences, including United States History and geography; world history, culture, and geography; a one-semester course in American government and civics; and a one-semester course in economics.
  - e) One course in VAPA, world language, *or until July 1, 2027, CTE*.
  - f) Two courses in physical education, unless the student has been exempt, as specified.
  - g) A one-semester course in ethnic studies beginning with students graduating in the 2029-2030 school year.
  - h) A separate, stand-alone one-semester course in personal finance that shall not be combined with any other course, beginning with students graduating in the 2030-2031 school year.

- i) Other coursework requirements adopted by the governing board of the school district. (Education Code (EC) § 51225.3)
- 2) With respect to (i) above, authorizes the governing board of a school district to, at its discretion, adopt a policy to exempt students from any additional coursework requirements it adopts. Establishes that it is the intent of the Legislature that the policy include a consultation with the student and the educational rights holder for the student regarding any impact of not fulfilling locally required coursework on the student's ability to gain admission to an institution of higher education. (EC § 51225.3(a)(2)(B))
- 3) Defines a course in CTE as a course in a district-operated CTE program that is aligned to the career technical model curriculum standards and framework adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE), including courses through a regional occupational center or program operated by a county superintendent of schools or pursuant to a joint powers agreement (JPA). (EC § 51225.3)
- 4) Requires a local educational agency (LEA), if it elects to allow a CTE course to satisfy the graduation requirement, before offering that alternative to students, to notify parents, teachers, students, and the public at a regularly scheduled meeting of the governing board of all of the following:
  - a) The intent to offer CTE courses to fulfill the graduation requirement.
  - b) The impact that offering CTE courses to fulfill the graduation requirement will have on the availability of courses that meet the eligibility requirements for admission to the California State University (CSU) and the University of California (UC), and whether the CTE courses to be offered are approved to satisfy those eligibility requirements
  - c) The distinction, if any, between the high school graduation requirements of the school district or county office of education (COE), and the eligibility requirements for admission to the CSU and the UC. (EC § 51225.3)
- 5) Beginning July 2, 2027, the high school graduation requirements no longer allow CTE as an option to fulfill the graduation requirement, instead of VAPA or world language. (EC § 51225.3)
- 6) Authorizes the Career Technical Education Incentive Grant (CTEIG) program as a state education, economic, and workforce development initiative with the goal of providing students in kindergarten through 12th grade with the knowledge and skills necessary to transition to employment and postsecondary education. (EC § 53070)
- 7) Authorizes the K-12 component of the Strong Workforce Program (SWP) to create, support, or expand high-quality CTE programs at the K-12 level that are aligned with the workforce development efforts occurring through the SWP, and authorizes, commencing with the 2018-19 fiscal year, and subject to an annual appropriation, \$150 million to be apportioned annually by the California Community College Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) to local consortia. (EC §



88827)

**ANALYSIS**

This bill extends indefinitely, the existing authorization for CTE course to be used to satisfy the VAPA or world languages graduation requirement.

**STAFF COMMENTS**

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “With a contemporary twist, AB 821 aims to bring back “shop classes” to California schools that would offer an additional path to students who choose to not pursue higher education. This will, statistically speaking, also help those who decide to go to college. Research shows that students who have more access to CTE are directly linked to better grades and attendance, as well as a decrease in the school-to-prison pipeline.”
- 2) ***High school graduation requirements.*** Since the 2012-2013 school year, LEAs have been authorized to accept a CTE course as an optional high school graduation requirement in lieu of the VAPA or world languages requirement, subject to adoption by their respective governing boards. At the time, the authorization was set to sunset in 2017. However, it was subsequently extended twice, resulting in the current sunset date of January 1, 2028.

*This bill eliminates the sunset of the CTE graduation requirement authorization. However, notably, the bill does not require a school or school district that currently does not offer CTE courses to establish new CTE programs.*

- 3) ***What is Career Technical Education?*** CTE prepares students for the world of work by introducing them to workplace competencies and making academic content accessible through hands-on contexts. Along the way, students develop career-relevant, real-world 21st-century skills. CTE is a program of study that involves a multiyear sequence of courses integrating core academic knowledge with technical and occupational knowledge, providing a pathway to postsecondary education and careers.

In California, CTE programs are organized into 15 industry sectors, encompassing 58 pathways that outline the necessary knowledge and skills required for each sector. These sectors include:

- Agriculture and Natural Resources
- Arts, Media, and Entertainment
- Building and Construction Trades
- Business and Finance
- Education, Child Development, and Family Services
- Energy, Environment, and Utilities
- Engineering and Architecture
- Fashion and Interior Design

- Health Science and Medical Technology
- Hospitality, Tourism, and Recreation
- Information and Communications Technology
- Manufacturing and Product Development
- Marketing, Sales, and Services
- Public Services
- Transportation

These programs often involve partnerships between high schools, businesses, and postsecondary institutions, offering pathways to employment and various degrees. CTE courses and pathways may be offered in comprehensive high schools with CTE programs and through regional CTE programs or centers operated by JPAs or COEs. Some CTE programs are integrated with academic programs in a “linked learning model,” and community colleges and technical institutes also offer CTE at the postsecondary level.

- 4) **California CTE Model Curriculum Standards.** In 2013, the SBE adopted the revised California CTE Model Curriculum Standards to assist schools in developing high-quality curriculum and instruction to help ensure that students are career and college ready and to prepare them for future careers. The Model Curriculum Standards were developed with input from more than 1000 stakeholders from business, industry, and both postsecondary and secondary education to ensure the updated, research-based CTE standards would be world-class; meet the demands of the twenty-first-century workplace; help students make a smooth transition into colleges and universities; and prepare graduates to successfully compete in the global community. The standards, written for grades seven through twelve, specify learning goals in 58 career pathways organized around 15 industry sectors (listed in Comment 2).
- 5) **The current state of CTE and work-based learning in California.** California has significantly expanded support for CTE and work-based learning over the last decade, both through the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) and through nearly \$500 million in ongoing state categorical programs. The two largest are the CTE Incentive Grant (CTEIG) and the K–12 SWP, each distributing hundreds of millions of dollars annually to help schools expand CTE access, align instruction with workforce needs, and develop partnerships with industry and community colleges. These are layered on top of LCFF funding, which already includes a high school base rate adjustment to reflect the higher cost of CTE programs.
- 6) **California’s Master Plan for Career Education.** In 2023, Governor Newsom called for the development of a new Master Plan for Career Education, urging state agencies and institutions of higher education to build and strengthen education and training pathways. The Master Plan features a primary area of action to develop career pathways for high school and college students, encouraging TK-12 and postsecondary agencies to provide experiential learning opportunities, shorten the timeline to a career, alleviate financial pressures, and empower individuals to actualize their dreams.

7) ***Related and prior legislation.***

SB 638 (Padilla, 2025) creates the CTE and Career Pathways Grant Program, administered by the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI), to support LEAs serving high-need areas. This bill also establishes the California Education and Workforce Development Coordinating Entity (Coordinating Entity) within the Government Operations Agency to serve as the statewide planning and coordinating body for CTE, career pathways, and workforce development. *SB 638 is pending in Assembly Education Committee.*

SB 845 (Perez, 2025) makes several changes to the state's framework for CTE and work-based learning, including: (1) revising the process for updating model CTE curriculum standards by requiring consultation with CTE teachers and labor representatives; (2) expanding the authority of LEAs, including state special schools, to offer and award credit for work-based learning activities beginning in grade 10; (3) establishing an interagency workgroup to develop occupational frameworks for youth apprenticeships; and (4) requiring the CDE to collect data on work-based learning participation, subject to an appropriation. *SB 845 is pending in the Assembly Education Committee.*

SB 612 (Valladeres, 2025) would have required students to complete a separate, stand-alone one-semester course in CTE in order to graduate from high school beginning with students graduating in the 2031-32 school year. *SB 612 was held in Senate Education Committee.*

AB 185 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 571, Statutes of 2022) extended the sunset on the use of a CTE course to meet a graduation requirement to July 1, 2027.

SB 1123 (Leyva, Chapter 53, Statutes of 2016) extended the sunset on the option for students to fulfill a high school graduation requirement by successfully completing a CTE course for an additional five years.

AB 1330 (Furutani, Chapter 621, Statutes of 2011) established the option for students to fulfill a high school graduation requirement by successfully completing a CTE course.

SB 253 (Wyland, 2010) would have added the option for students to fulfill the VAPA high school graduation requirement by successfully completing a career technical education course. *SB 253 died on the Assembly Floor.*

AB 2446 (Furutani, 2010) would have added the option for students to fulfill the VAPA high school graduation requirement by successfully completing a CTE course. *AB 2446 was vetoed by Governor Schwarzenegger, whose veto message read:*

*“Improving and expanding Career Technical Education opportunities has been among my highest priorities. While I am supportive of the author's intent to give career technical education a prominent place in high school*

*graduation priorities, the final version of this bill omitted my Administration's proposed amendments that were intended to limit the new costs to school districts. Therefore, I am concerned that this bill could be construed to impose higher costs without a fund source, which could also be interpreted as a state reimbursable mandate. Given that school budgets are very constrained due to the recession, adding new costs at this time is not advisable."*

AB 554 (Furutani, 2009) would have increased the number of courses required for high school graduation from 13 to 14 and offered students a choice between a VAPA course, foreign language, or CTE to fulfill the additional course requirement. *AB 554 was held under submission in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.*

SB 672 (Torlakson, 2008) would have required high schools participating in the California Enhanced Instructional Time Program, as specified, to adopt a graduation policy requiring students to complete two CTE courses. *SB 672 was held in Assembly Education Committee.*

**SUPPORT**

Association of California School Administrators  
California Teachers Association  
Career Technical Education Joint Powers Authority Coalition  
College Board  
Los Angeles Unified School District  
Oakland Unified School District  
United Administrators of Southern California

**OPPOSITION**

None received

**-- END --**

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

**Bill No:** AB 320 **Hearing Date:** July 2, 2025  
**Author:** Bennett  
**Version:** June 18, 2025  
**Urgency:** No **Fiscal:** Yes  
**Consultant:** Lynn Lorber

**Subject:** Public social services: eligibility: income exclusions.

## SUMMARY

This bill prohibits any compensation awarded to a student member of a county board of education or school district governing board from being considered as income or an asset for the purposes of determining eligibility for award for means-tested programs.

## BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Authorizes the submission to the county board of education or governing board of a school district a student petition requesting the board to appoint one or more student members to the governing board. (Education Code (EC) § 1000 and § 35012)
- 2) Authorizes a county board of education or school district governing board to award a student member either or both of the following:
  - a) Elective course credit is based on the number of equivalent daily instructional minutes for the student member's services provided.
  - b) Monthly financial compensation as determined by the governing board. (EC § 1090 and § 35120)
- 3) Establishes the federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, which provides block grants to states to develop and implement their own state welfare-to-work programs designed to provide cash assistance and other supports and services to low-income families. (United States Code (USC), Title 42, § 601 et seq.)
- 4) Establishes under federal law the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) to promote the general welfare and to safeguard the health and wellbeing of the nation's population by raising the levels of nutrition among low-income households. (7 USC § 2011 et seq.)
- 5) Limits SNAP to households whose income limits their access to nutritious foods and defines what is considered income for the purposes of SNAP eligibility.

(Code of Federal Regulations, Title 7, § 273.9)

- 6) Establishes the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program to provide cash assistance and other social services for low-income families through the federal TANF program. Under CalWORKs, each county provides assistance through a combination of state, county, and federal TANF funds. (Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) § 11200 et seq.)
- 7) Establishes income, asset, and real property limits used to determine eligibility for the CalWORKs program, and CalWORKs grant amounts, based on family size and county of residence. (WIC § 11150-11160 and § 11450 et seq.)
- 8) Exempts the following from being considered as income for purposes of CalWORKs eligibility:
  - a) Income that is received too infrequently to be reasonably anticipated.
  - b) Income from a college work study program.
  - c) An award or scholarship provided by a public or private entity to or on behalf of a dependent child based on the child's academic or extracurricular achievement or participation in a scholastic, educational, or extracurricular competition. (WIC § 11157)

## ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Exempts, to the extent permitted by federal law, any compensation awarded to a student member of a school district governing board or county board of education from being considered as income or assets when determining eligibility and benefit amount for any means-tested program, including, but not limited to, CalWORKs, CalFresh, General Assistance, Medi-Cal, and Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants, and any scholarships for public colleges and universities, including, but not limited to, Cal Grant awards, Chafee grant awards, Middle Class Scholarship Program awards, California College Promise Grants, California State University Educational Opportunity Program grants, Community College Extended Opportunity Programs and Services grants, and grants from the University of California or the California State University.
- 2) Exempts from consideration as income and resources, for purposes of determining eligibility for CalWORKs, CalFresh, General Assistance, Medi-Cal, and Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants, to the extent permitted by federal law, any compensation awarded to a student member of a school district governing board or county board of education.

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, "AB 320 expands on the provisions of AB 824 (2021), which allowed high school students to petition for a seat on their

local County Boards of Education and Charter School Governing Boards. We have since discovered that compensation earned by student board members is considered 'income' in means-tested programs, making some students ineligible for the aid they had previously qualified for. AB 320 ensures that any compensation awarded to a pupil member of a county board of education is not counted as income for means-tested aid programs, such as Cal-Works and Medi-Cal."

- 2) **CalWORKs and CalFresh.** As described in the Senate Human Services Committee's analysis of this bill, CalWORKs is California's version of the federal TANF program. CalWORKs provides temporary cash assistance aimed at moving children out of poverty and helping qualified low-income families meet their basic needs, such as rent, clothing, utility bills, food, and other items needed to ensure children are cared for at home and safely remain with their families. Eligibility for CalWORKs is based on family size, income level, and region. Families must show economic hardship through income and asset tests.

CalFresh is California's version of SNAP, an entitlement program that provides eligible households with federally-funded monthly benefits to purchase food. CalFresh food benefits are 100% federally funded. Monthly benefits per household vary based on household size, income, and deductible living expenses - with larger households generally receiving more benefits than smaller households and relatively higher-income households generally receiving fewer benefits than lower-income households.

Under current federal and state laws, certain types of income are considered exempt in the CalWORKs program, which means they are not counted when calculating a person's program eligibility for the program and cash benefit amount they receive. Exempt income includes:

- a) Income that is received too infrequently to be reasonably anticipated.
- b) Income from college work-study programs.
- c) An award or scholarship provided by a public or private entity to or on behalf of a dependent child.
- d) Federal pandemic unemployment compensation.
- e) Income or stipends paid by the United States Census Bureau, a governmental entity, or a non-profit organization for temporary work related to improving participation in the decennial census that is earned in the year preceding a decennial census and during the year of the decennial census.
- f) Income from specified Guaranteed Income programs.

*This bill creates an exemption in the section of the Welfare and Institutions Code governing CalWORKs for the income student representatives receive for serving on the governing board of a school district or county board of education. This bill*

*also creates an overall exemption for this income source from consideration for eligibility for any means-tested program including CalFresh, scholarships, and education related grants, to the extent allowed by federal law. While this is likely allowable for CalWORKs, the fact that the income is paid with county or school district funds means it will likely continue to be considered for CalFresh eligibility determinations (pursuant to federal law).*

- 3) **Related legislation.** AB 42 (Bryan, 2025) would make any grant, award, scholarship, loan, or fellowship benefit from a private source given for educational purposes exempt from consideration as income or resources for the purposes of CalWORKs and CalFresh eligibility and award determination. AB 42 is pending in the Senate Human Services Committee.

### **SUPPORT**

Los Angeles County Office of Education (Sponsor)  
County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors  
County Welfare Directors Association of California  
Junior Leagues of California State Public Affairs Committee

### **OPPOSITION**

None received

-- END --



---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

<b>Bill No:</b>	AB 347	<b>Hearing Date:</b>	July 2, 2025
<b>Author:</b>	Kalra		
<b>Version:</b>	March 18, 2025		
<b>Urgency:</b>	No	<b>Fiscal:</b>	Yes
<b>Consultant:</b>	Therresa Austin		

**Subject:** Pupil instruction: animal dissection.

## SUMMARY

This bill, beginning July 1, 2026, strengthens the opt-out and notification rights of students enrolled in a course of study that uses live or dead animals for the purposes of dissection; requires the California Department of Education (CDE) to develop a template for students to use to opt-out of dissections; and makes compliance with the opt-out subject to the Uniform Complaint Procedures (UCP).

## BACKGROUND

Existing Law:

- 1) Requires each teacher teaching a course that utilizes live or dead animals or animal parts to inform students of their rights to refrain from animal dissection. (Education Code (EC) § 33225.4)
- 2) Requires that a student's objection to participating in an educational project pursuant to this section be substantiated by a note from his or her parent or guardian. (EC § 32255.1 (f))
- 3) Requires a student with a moral objection to dissecting or otherwise harming or destroying animals, or any parts thereof, to notify his or her teacher regarding this objection, upon notification by the school of his or her rights. (EC § 33225.1 (a))
- 4) States that if the student chooses to refrain from participation in an education project involving the harmful or destructive use of animals, and if the teacher believes that an adequate alternative education project is possible, the teacher may work with the student to develop and agree upon an alternate education project for the purpose of providing the student an alternate avenue for obtaining the knowledge, information, or experience required by the course of study. (EC § 32255.1 (b))
- 5) Requires that the alternative education project require a comparable time and effort investment by the student, and prohibits it from being more arduous than the original education project as a means of penalizing a student and for students choosing an alternative educational project to pass all examinations of the respective course of study in order to receive credit for that course of study. If

such tests require the harmful or destructive use of animals, permits a student to seek alternative tests. (EC § 32255.1 (c) & (e))

- 6) Prohibits discrimination against a student based upon his or her decision to exercise his or her rights to object to refrain from dissection. (EC § 32255.1(d))
- 7) Defines “animal” to mean any living organism of the kingdom Animalia, beings that typically differ from plants in capacity for spontaneous movement and rapid motor response to stimulation by a usually greater mobility with some degree of voluntary locomotor ability and by greater irritability commonly mediated through a more or less centralized nervous system, beings that are characterized by a requirement for complex organic nutrients including proteins or their constituents that are usually digested in an internal cavity before assimilation into the body proper, and beings that are distinguished from typical plants by lack of chlorophyll, by an inability to perform photosynthesis, by cells that lack cellulose walls, and by the frequent presence of discrete complex sense organs. (EC § 32255 (a))
- 8) Defines “alternative education project” to include the use of video recordings, models, films, books, and computers, which would provide an alternate avenue for obtaining the knowledge, information, or experience required by the course of study in question. Defines “alternative education project” to include “alternative test.” (EC § 32255 (b))
- 9) Defines “pupil” to mean a person under 18 years of age who is matriculated in a course of instruction in an educational institution. For the purpose of asserting the student’s rights and receiving any notice or response, defines “student” to include the parents of a matriculated minor. (EC § 32255 (c))
- 10) Requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) to establish and implement a system of complaint processing, known as the UCP, for specified educational programs. (EC § 33315)

## ANALYSIS

This bill:

*Definitions – Operative July 1, 2026*

- 1) Redefines “Alternative education project” to “Alternative assignment or assessment” to mean and include the use of video recordings, three-dimensional models, films, books, interactive simulation software and computers, and assessments of knowledge that would provide an alternate avenue for obtaining the knowledge, information, or experience required by the course of study in question.”
- 2) Defines “Dissection” to mean the viewing of the, or act of, cutting into the body of an animal cadaver to study its anatomical structure. Specifies that “Dissection” does not include fixed histological samples of any species, including, but not

limited to, plain or stained microscope slides, owl pellets, human autopsy viewing, and plastinated human organs.

*Requires Written Notice to Pupils, Parents, and Guardians – Operative July 1, 2026*

- 3) Requires each teacher teaching a course that utilizes live or dead animals or animal parts for purposes of dissection, or a public school on behalf of the teacher, to provide written notice to each pupil and the pupil's parent or guardian of the pupil's rights that include all of the following information as part of the written notification:
  - a) A pupil's right to refrain from participating in an assignment or assessment involving the dissection of animals.
  - b) The prohibition of impact on a pupil's grades as a means of penalizing the pupil for exercising their right to opt-out.
  - c) A pupil's right to request any sourcing information provided by the vendor or provider of the animals and information about the chemicals used to preserve animals for dissection to which the student may be exposed.
  - d) The complaint procedures..
- 4) Requires CDE to develop a template that a teacher, or a public school on behalf of the teacher, may use to provide written notice to the students and make that template available on its internet website by the start of the 2026-2027 school year.

*Expands Applicability of Opt-Out Right – Operative July 1, 2026*

- 5) Specifies that the rights and requirements of this bill shall apply to all levels of instruction in all public schools operating programs in kindergarten or any of grades 1 to 12, inclusive, including, but not limited to, public schools operated by school districts, COEs, charter schools, or state special schools, to the extent that the public school chooses to offer a course of study that uses live or dead animals or animal parts for purposes of dissection.

*Encourages Schools to Explore the Use of Alternative Methods*

- 6) Encourages public schools to explore using effective alternative methods in lieu of using live or dead animals or animal parts for dissection in a course of study, by July 1, 2028; except in classes and activities that are conducted as part of a program of agricultural education that provide instruction on the care, management, and evaluation of domestic animals.

*Allows Complaints to be filed under the UCP – Operative July 1, 2026*

- 7) Expands the scope of the UCP process to allow complaints related to pupils' rights to refrain from participation in an assignment or assessment involving the dissection of animals and to choose an alternative assignment or assessment.

*Repeals and Replaces Existing Law*

- 8) Makes existing relevant sections of law pertaining to a pupil's' rights to refrain from dissection inoperative on July 1, 2026, and repeals said provision as of January 1, 2027.

**STAFF COMMENTS**

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “the lessons of anatomy are an important scientific teaching in a student's academic career. However, with the advancements in educational technology, alternative methods can still reach the same educational outcome without having to rely on costly animal dissection kits. California law allows students to opt out of animal dissection and request an alternative assignment but they are not made aware of their right and often times feel obligated to participate. AB 347, the CLASS Act will require teachers to provide students with a written notice informing them of their right to opt-out and those that choose to opt out should receive a comparable assignment to get the same educational outcome. Every student in California has a right to receive an equitable education and should not be denied the same opportunities as their peers. The CLASS Act will empower students to be informed and make decisions best suited for their academic careers.”
- 2) ***Existing animal dissection opt-out rights for students.*** Since 1988, students in California have had the right to opt-out of animal dissection. Despite this right, many students are not aware of their right to opt out of animal dissection. In 2015, a nationwide survey was conducted among 1,178 high school and middle school biology teachers and 500 students to understand the current use of animal dissection and its alternatives, as well as attitudes toward these practices. The survey, entitled “[Evaluation of Educator & Student Use of & Attitudes toward Dissection & Dissection Alternatives](#),” found that only 53% of teachers in states with opt-out laws reported that their schools had corresponding opt-out policies. Further, 29% reported that their school did not have such a policy, and 18% were unsure. The study also found that 90% of teachers indicated that less than 5% of students requested alternatives to dissection, while 14% of students reported that they had refused to dissect or requested an alternative. Research suggests that although only a small number of students will object to dissection, many other students may not want to participate but are afraid to voice their opposition due to fear of a failing grade, embarrassment, or challenging the authority of their teacher.

*Under existing law, teachers teaching a course that includes dissections must inform students of their right to opt-out and request an alternative. This bill requires that that notification be provided in writing and requires CDE to develop a notification template that includes information about the following: the student's right to opt-out; the prohibition against penalization for opting out; the student's right to request sourcing information about the animals used for dissection as well as the chemicals used to preserve the specimen; and information about the UCP. Teachers, or public schools on behalf of the teacher, may use this template*

*to provide the required written notification or use an alternative mode of written notification.*

*The bill also strengthens the protections students have against penalization for requesting an alternative by making such incidences subject to a UCP complaint.*

A UCP complaint is a written and signed statement alleging a violation of federal or state laws or regulations, which may include an allegation of unlawful discrimination, harassment, intimidation, or bullying.

- 3) **Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS).** In 2013, the State Board of Education (SBE) adopted the NGSS as the state's science content standards. Compared to California's previous science standards, NGSS shifts the focus of instruction from rote memorization of scientific information to the cultivation of critical thinking skills, the interconnected nature of science, and the application of learning. These focuses are translated into the three dimensions of NGSS standards: core scientific ideas (disciplinary core ideas), the correlation of critical concepts across disciplines (cross-cutting concepts), and the implementation of processes used by professional scientists (science and engineering practices).

The NGSS standards and the state's science curriculum framework do not specifically direct teachers on teaching science content, nor do they mention animal dissection. However, activities such as dissection align well with some of the critical instructional features of the state's new standards:

- a) Learning is intended to be hands-on, collaborative, and in an integrated environment rooted in inquiry and discovery.
  - b) Instruction is grounded in student-centered learning, which enables students to think independently, problem-solve, communicate, and collaborate, in addition to learning important scientific concepts.
  - c) The goal of instruction is for students to engage with and explain real-world phenomena and to design solutions using this understanding of the disciplinary core ideas.
- 4) **Animal Dissection.** Animal dissections have been used for biology instruction in American classrooms since the 1920s. Many teachers and education professionals maintain that there is no substitute for the hands-on learning experience of dissection. Survey data from *Evaluation of Educator & Student Use of & Attitudes toward Dissection & Dissection Alternatives* (also discussed in Comment 2) found that most teachers (84%) and students (76%) reported using dissection in their classrooms, although nearly half of educators indicated that dissection is decreasing at their school.

Many individuals find learning easier when they can engage in physical activities. The hands-on dissection approach enables students to see, touch, and explore various organs, fostering a deeper understanding of biological systems. This understanding can lead to a deeper comprehension of human biology when applied to the human body. Although there are differences between the

intricacies of the human body and those of other animals, many internal systems can work similarly. The internal structure of a small animal can be compared to a simplified human body, providing insights into the human body's internal workings. Dissections of frogs, for example, can demonstrate the organ systems of complex organisms, as the frogs' organs are similar enough to those of humans to provide valuable insights.

- 5) ***Alternatives to Dissection.*** Several alternatives to traditional dissection instruction exist, such as interactive software, tablet applications, videos, lifelike models, and virtual reality applications. Some specific examples of alternative programs include Expandable Mind Software, Froggipedia, and Biosphera. In addition, there are loan programs and databases that provide alternative materials, such as Animalearn's Science Bank, the National Anti-Vivisection Society's BioLEAP Lending Program, the Ethical Science Education Coalition's Alternatives Loan Library, the International Network for Humane Education (InterNICHE), and the Norwegian Inventory of Audiovisuals (NORINA).

Numerous studies have compared the effects of dissection versus alternative methods, and a review of studies published between 2005 and 2020 showed that students using non-animal models performed at least as well as, and in some cases, better than, those using animal dissection.

*This bill requires teachers to provide an alternative assignment or assessment if a student exercises their right to refrain from the dissection. This alternative assignment or assessment shall require a comparable time and effort investment by the student and shall not, as a means of penalizing the student, be more arduous than the original dissection assignment or assessment.*

*This bill also encourages public schools to explore effective alternatives to the use of live or dead animal dissection in their courses of study by July 1, 2028. Notably, encouragement does not amount to a requirement for schools to use alternatives. Furthermore, this encouragement includes an exception for classes and activities conducted as part of a program of agricultural education that provides instruction on the care, management, and evaluation of domestic animals.*

- 6) ***Costs associated with animal dissection and alternatives.*** Animal dissection—regardless of whether it is taught through the use of real animal specimens or alternatives—poses a potential cost to schools. It is worth restating that nothing in the Education Code or the NGSS requires that dissections be part of instruction. Dissection proponents express concern about the expense of offering alternatives to dissection and believe that access and equity issues may occur at certain schools due to inadequate hardware and connectivity. Dissection opponents counter that although obtaining alternatives, including software licenses, has upfront costs, these eventually pale in comparison to the yearly expense of acquiring animals and other supplies, and some free or inexpensive items are readily available.

The Assembly Education Committee analysis provided the following comparison of both one-time and ongoing costs of animal dissection and one software-based alternative.

*“The comparison is based on a class of 30 students, with either one student per computer or two students working together on the dissection of a frog. Costs are from current websites for the Digital Frog 2.5 software and the Carolina Biological Supply Company.*

*“As of 2019, the one-time cost of Digital Frog 2.5 software for 30 students was \$625.00 for a lifetime license, or \$253.00 for an annual subscription. In addition, there are unknown technology costs, for computers and wireless access, some of which have already been incurred. Apart from replacement and upgrading of computers, there were no ongoing costs for use of the Digital Frog 2.5 software if a lifetime license is purchased, and for a subscription, the annual cost is \$253.00.*

*“Schools often purchase dissection kits which include both the animal specimen and dissection equipment. As of 2019, a class set of 15 frog dissection kits from Carolina Biological Supply cost \$192.75 (\$12.85 each) per year. These kits included all supplies necessary for dissection, except for gloves (\$17.95 for 100), goggles (\$56.00 for 15, which could be reused), paper towels, aprons (\$33.80 for 100), and cleaning supplies.”*

- 7) **Arguments in support.** In their joint letter of support, People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals and Social Compassion in Legislation argue:

*“AB 347 aims to strengthen students’ right to opt out of participating in animal dissection by requiring teachers to provide them with written notice of that right; allows students to request information regarding where the animals used in dissection are obtained and what chemicals students would be exposed to; and to ensure that their grades will not be affected by their choice to complete an alternative, animal-free assignment. The bill also encourages schools to explore more effective, ethical, economical, and environmentally friendly non-animal teaching method by 2028.*

*“Students, educators, administrators, and legislators are increasingly seeking modern ways to accomplish the goals of anatomy education, including by using interactive computer software programs or hands-on realistic models.*

*“California law currently places the burden on students to speak up about their concerns regarding animal dissection, even though young people often face peer pressure, are frequently bullied for being different from their classmates, and typically don’t want to experience confrontation with a teacher or school leadership. PETA hears from young people who are upset by dissecting animals and, as a result, are distracted and unable to learn the requisite material. Reluctant students participate out of fear of real or perceived retaliation or ostracism from their teachers and peers. Studies show that some students, especially girls, are even dissuaded*

*from pursuing careers in science because they're so traumatized by the experience of dissecting animals in the classroom. Using non-animal methods creates a more inclusive, trauma-informed learning environment that doesn't risk alienating those who might be uncomfortable participating in classroom experiments on animals."*

- 8) **Arguments in opposition.** In their joint letter of opposition, the National Science Teaching Association (NSTA) and Hands-On Science Partnership (HOSP) argue:

*"Effective learning of STEM concepts requires hands-on learning in the biology, chemistry, and physics classrooms. In addition to structures and functions, dissection allows students to understand variation in organisms – a key concept to understanding evolution by natural selection. Science educators are professionals and they are in the best position to determine when to use—or not use—dissection activities. NSTA and HOSP strongly oppose regulations or legislation that would completely eliminate an educator's decision-making role regarding dissection or would deny students the opportunity to learn through actual animal dissection.*

*"Assembly Bill AB-347 would prevent and prohibit science teachers and students who want to participate in dissections from having the right or ability to do so; create time, resource, and financial burdens on already stressed teachers and schools; is duplicative of existing law; and creates unfair bias against dissection."*

- 9) **Related legislation.**

AB 2640 (Kalra, 2024) would have required local educational agencies to provide notifications related to the dissection of animals in schools and required the CDE develop a template for students to use to opt out. *This bill was held in Senate Appropriations Committee.*

AB 1586 (Kalra, 2019) would have prohibited students enrolled in public or private schools from dissecting, or viewing the dissection of, animals in the study of biological sciences. *This bill was held in the Assembly Education Committee.*

HR 28 (Dababneh, 2019) encourages the SPI to ensure the incorporation of humane education in the core curriculum, and resolves that compliance with existing law regarding humane education should include educating students on principles of kindness and respect for animals.

AB 2507 (Speier, Chapter 65, Statutes of 1988) establishes a right of students to opt out of animal dissection and authorizes a teacher to work with the student to develop and agree upon an alternate education project for the purpose of providing the student an alternate avenue for obtaining the knowledge, information, or experience required by the course of study.



**SUPPORT**

People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (Co-Sponsor)  
Social Compassion in Legislation (Co-Sponsor)  
Angel's Furry Friends Rescue  
Animal Legal Defense Fund  
Animal Rescuers for Change  
Animal Wellness Action  
Berkeley Animal Rights Center  
Better Together Forever  
Born Again Animal Rescue and Adoption  
CFT - A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO  
Compassionate Bay  
Concerned Citizens Animal Rescue  
Feline Lucky Adventures  
Giantmecha Syndicate  
Greater Los Angeles Animal Spay Neuter Collaborative  
Hugs and Kisses Animal Fund  
Latino Alliance for Animal Care Foundation  
Leaders for Ethics, Animals, and the Planet  
Los Angeles County Office of Education  
Los Angeles Democrats for the Protection of Animals  
Michelson Center for Public Policy  
NY 4 Whales  
Pibbles n Kibbles Animal Rescue  
Plant-Based Advocates  
Project Minnie  
Real Good Rescue  
Seeds 4 Change Now Animal Rescue  
Senior Citizens for Humane Education and Legislation  
Start Rescue  
Students Against Animal Cruelty Club - Hueneme High School  
The Animal Rescue Mission  
The Canine Condition  
The Pet Loss Support Group  
The Spayce Project  
Underdog Heroes, Inc.  
Women United for Animal Welfare

**OPPOSITION**

National Science Teaching Association

**-- END --**

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

**Bill No:** AB 477 **Hearing Date:** July 2, 2025  
**Author:** Muratsuchi  
**Version:** June 23, 2025  
**Urgency:** No **Fiscal:** Yes  
**Consultant:** Ian Johnson

**Subject:** Fair Pay for Educators Act: local control funding formula: base grants: funding targets.

## SUMMARY

This bill establishes new Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) base grant targets for the 2036–37 fiscal year and declares the Legislature’s intent to fully fund these targets over time to increase schoolsite staff salaries.

## BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the LCFF as the primary funding mechanism for school districts and charter schools, consisting of a base grant per unit of average daily attendance (ADA), with adjustments for grade span, supplemental funding for unduplicated pupils (English learners, low-income students, and foster youth), and a concentration grant for districts with high proportions of unduplicated pupils. (Education Code (EC) § 42238.02)
- 2) Establishes a separate LCFF formula for county offices of education (COEs), including operations grants and alternative education base grants. (EC § 2574)
- 3) Requires base grant amounts and add-ons to be adjusted annually for inflation based on the Implicit Price Deflator for State and Local Government Purchases. (EC § 42238.02, § 2574)
- 4) Sets current LCFF base grant targets for 2023–24 at approximately:
  - a) \$10,951 for grades K–3 (includes 10.4% class size reduction adjustment)
  - b) \$10,069 for grades 4–6
  - c) \$10,367 for grades 7–8
  - d) \$12,327 for grades 9–12 (includes 2.6% career-technical education adjustment)

**ANALYSIS**

This bill:

- 1) Establishes new aspirational LCFF base grant targets, effective for the 2036–37 fiscal year, as follows:
  - a) \$14,879 per ADA for grades K–3
  - b) \$15,104 per ADA for grades 4–6
  - c) \$15,551 per ADA for grades 7–8
  - d) \$18,023 per ADA for grades 9–12
- 2) Declares the intent of the Legislature to:
  - a) Fully fund these targets by 2036–37 through the annual budget process.
  - b) Increase LCFF allocations for necessary small schools (NSS), COEs, and transitional kindergarten, consistent with the new targets.
  - c) Use this funding to support salary increases for certificated and classified schoolsite staff at school districts, COEs, and charter schools, subject to local bargaining.
- 3) Expresses that the current LCFF targets, established in 2013 and reached in 2018–19, are inadequate to close the wage gap between school employees and similarly educated professionals in other fields.

**STAFF COMMENTS**

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “According to the author, “In countries such as Finland, Australia, Canada, and Singapore, teaching is a highly competitive profession. Teacher salaries are comparable to those in fields like engineering, law, and business. In Finland, teaching is the most sought-after profession, with intense competition for entry. Only 1 in 4 applicants is accepted into teacher training programs overall, and for primary school teacher preparation, the acceptance rate is just 1 in 10. AB 477 will increase school staff salaries to help close the growing wage gap between teachers and similarly educated professionals in other fields. Over the past decade, this gap has widened, and raising school employee salaries is a necessary step toward correcting this long standing inequity.”
- 2) ***A long-term signal about educator compensation.*** This bill aims to establish a decade-long roadmap for increasing LCFF base grant targets, which serve as the primary source of general purpose revenue for local educational agencies (LEAs). By setting new aspirational funding levels for the 2036–37 fiscal year and explicitly tying them to schoolsite employee compensation, the bill seeks to address long-standing concerns about educator pay and the state’s ability to

recruit and retain qualified school staff. These concerns have been amplified in recent years by growing teacher shortages, persistent gaps in classified staffing, and an overall decline in interest in education careers among young people.

- 3) ***Wage gap trends and national context.*** Data from the Economic Policy Institute and others consistently show that teachers earn significantly less than similarly educated professionals. In 2021, the nationwide teacher wage penalty reached a record 23.5%, with an even larger gap for male teachers. While retirement and health benefits offset some of this disparity, the total compensation penalty remains substantial and contributes to ongoing challenges with teacher recruitment and retention. International comparisons underscore how far the U.S. lags in elevating the status and financial stability of educators. Countries like Finland, Singapore, and Canada have made strategic, long-term investments in educator pay and preparation—resulting in stronger applicant pipelines, lower turnover, and, in some cases, improved student outcomes.
- 4) ***Statutory targets vs. constitutional funding limits.*** While this bill amends Education Code sections to establish new LCFF target base grant levels, it does not change the Proposition 98 constitutional funding guarantee or appropriate any funds. Any actual increases in school funding would remain subject to annual budget negotiations and revenue availability. By codifying these new targets, the bill functions as a statement of legislative intent rather than a binding fiscal commitment. It also sends a signal to LEAs that future increases are expected to be used to raise schoolsite staff salaries—a move that may strengthen local bargaining positions, even in the absence of additional funds.
- 5) ***Implications for budget trade-offs.*** The Assembly Appropriations Committee estimates the cost of fully funding these new targets at approximately \$38 billion in ongoing Proposition 98 General Fund by 2036–37. While that level of funding may be achievable under certain revenue growth scenarios, it would likely crowd out other Proposition 98 priorities—including early education expansion, targeted interventions, or support for students with disabilities. Moreover, adopting aggressive new LCFF targets could inadvertently incentivize LEAs to make salary commitments in anticipation of future funding that may not materialize, particularly if the state experiences a recession or prolonged period of declining enrollment.
- 6) ***Recent Research Offers a Student-Centered Roadmap for Strengthening the LCFF.*** Since its enactment in 2013, the LCFF has been widely recognized as a transformative shift toward equity, local flexibility, and student need-based funding. As the state looks ahead to the next phase of LCFF’s evolution, researchers and policy experts have consistently cited a set of priorities for improving the formula. Reports from the Learning Policy Institute (2023, 2025), Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), and independent researchers such as Hahnel and Humphrey have emphasized strategies such as boosting concentration grants for districts with the highest need, exploring a transition from attendance- to enrollment-based funding, and enhancing fiscal transparency to ensure dollars reach students in underserved communities.

Several of these studies also highlight the importance of improving compensation to address workforce shortages—particularly in high-need schools and hard-to-staff roles—as one part of a broader equity strategy. However, these recommendations typically frame salary investments within the context of improving student outcomes, workforce stability, and learning conditions. While this bill reflects a clear intent to address educator compensation, it approaches that goal by establishing new LCFF funding targets focused exclusively on staff salaries, without integrating broader strategies that research suggests could strengthen equity or support academic achievement.

As policymakers consider how to build on the LCFF’s foundation, the Committee may wish to weigh how this proposal aligns with—or diverges from—the student-centered reforms emerging from recent research and field experience.

**SUPPORT**

California School Employees Association (Co-Sponsor)  
California Teachers Association (Co-Sponsor)  
CFT - A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO (Co-Sponsor)  
American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees  
California State Council of Service Employees International Union  
Oakland Unified School District  
Partnership for Los Angeles Schools

**OPPOSITION**

California Association of School Business Officials  
California School Boards Association  
Office of the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools

-- END --

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

**Bill No:** AB 642 **Hearing Date:** July 2, 2025  
**Author:** Muratsuchi  
**Version:** June 23, 2025  
**Urgency:** Yes **Fiscal:** No  
**Consultant:** Ian Johnson

**Subject:** Emergencies proclaimed by the Governor: school employee catastrophic leave.

## SUMMARY

This bill, an urgency measure, authorizes school employees to donate catastrophic leave to another employee impacted by a state of emergency declared by the Governor.

## BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Authorizes the governing board of a school district, county office of education (COE), or charter school to establish a catastrophic leave program.
- 2) Permits employees to donate accrued sick or vacation leave to another employee experiencing a catastrophic illness or injury, or caring for an affected family member.
- 3) Requires employees to exhaust all accrued leave and provide verification before receiving donated leave.
- 4) Allows districts, COEs, and charter schools to adopt implementing rules, including limits on duration (up to 12 months), and to negotiate program terms through collective bargaining. (Education Code § 44043.5)

## ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Establishes the authority of the governing board of a school district, COE, or charter school to implement a catastrophic leave program that permits employees to donate eligible leave credits to another employee who is impacted by a state of emergency declared by the Governor.
- 2) Defines “state of emergency” as one proclaimed by the Governor pursuant to Chapter 7 of Division 1 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

- 3) Requires the same conditions and administrative rules as existing catastrophic leave programs, including employee verification, exhaustion of paid leave, donation minimums, a 12-month maximum usage period, and irrevocability of transfers.
- 4) Declares the bill to be an urgency statute and provides for immediate effect upon enactment.

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “As we continue to face more frequent and severe natural disasters, it is important that we provide school employees with the support they need during emergencies and ensure that displaced students can continue their education with minimal disruption. AB 642 will help ensure that California’s education system can respond quickly and effectively to the challenges posed by state-declared emergencies.”
- 2) ***Fills a clear policy gap exposed by recent natural disasters.*** Existing law allows for the donation of leave credits in cases of catastrophic illness or injury, but does not contemplate circumstances where employees are unable to work due to a natural disaster, such as wildfire, flood, or earthquake. This bill addresses this shortcoming by permitting the use of donated catastrophic leave during declared states of emergency. According to data from the Los Angeles County Office of Education, nearly 120 employees in districts such as Pasadena, Arcadia, and Glendale were left without sufficient leave after the 2025 wildfires. This bill would offer affected employees a source of support while recovering or stabilizing their personal circumstances.
- 3) ***Preserves local discretion and existing safeguards.*** The bill does not mandate the creation of new catastrophic leave programs but instead expands the scope of programs that governing boards may voluntarily establish. It preserves the core elements of existing law — such as requiring employees to exhaust their own leave before receiving donations, setting limits on the duration of use, and allowing governing boards to define verification and administrative procedures. These guardrails help ensure appropriate use and local oversight.
- 4) ***Cautionary note on scope and verifiability.*** Although the bill includes a definition of “state of emergency,” it leaves the interpretation of whether an individual employee was “impacted” largely up to local determination. That flexibility is important for implementation, but could introduce variation in how the benefit is administered. The bill appropriately allows each LEA to establish its own verification requirements, which should help mitigate any concerns about inconsistent or overly broad application.

**SUPPORT**

Los Angeles County Office of Education (Sponsor)  
Alameda County Office of Education  
California Teachers Association

**OPPOSITION**

None received

**-- END --**



---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

**Bill No:** AB 542 **Hearing Date:** July 2, 2025  
**Author:** Celeste Rodriguez  
**Version:** June 23, 2025  
**Urgency:** No **Fiscal:** No  
**Consultant:** Ian Johnson

**Subject:** Continuation schools and classes: youth workforce development programs.

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

## SUMMARY

This bill authorizes school districts operating continuation high schools or continuation education classes to offer youth workforce development programs on one or two weekdays per week, provided students are enrolled in at least 15 hours of class attendance per week.

## BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes that a school day in a continuation high school is 180 minutes and prohibits crediting students with more than 15 hours of attendance per week. (Education Code (EC) § 46170)
- 2) Sets minimum school day requirements for grades 9–12 at 240 minutes, with exceptions for continuation high schools and students in work experience education programs. (EC § 46141)
- 3) Requires students to be under the immediate supervision and control of certificated staff to count instructional time for average daily attendance (ADA). (EC § 46300, § 47612.5)
- 4) Authorizes school boards to offer and supervise work-based learning and experience education programs, and provide liability coverage. (EC § 51760, § 51760.1)
- 5) Defines “work-based learning” as using the workplace to connect school experiences with real-life work activities and career opportunities. (EC § 51760.1)
- 6) Establishes requirements for supervising off-campus work experience and outlines criminal background checks for adults in work-based learning settings. (EC § 45125.1)

**ANALYSIS**

This bill:

- 1) Allows continuation high schools or continuation education classes to offer youth workforce development programs one or two days per week.
- 2) Requires students to be enrolled in at least 15 hours of classroom instruction per week to participate.
- 3) Requires school districts to track student attendance and participation while engaged in the program.
- 4) Defines a “youth workforce development program” as one implemented under the supervision of certificated staff that enables students to earn academic credit or an industry certificate while engaging in workplace experiences or training.
- 5) Requires programs to be aligned with student skills and in-demand careers, include both technical and soft skills, and be offered in partnership with one or more of the following:
  - a) A community college district.
  - b) An adult education program.
  - c) A regional occupational program or center.
  - d) A workforce development program accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.
  - e) An organization offering industry-recognized certifications.
- 6) Encourages priority for programs that lead to industry-recognized certificates or credentials.
- 7) Specifies that supervision includes shared oversight between the worksite supervisor and certificated school personnel.

**STAFF COMMENTS**

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “Continuation schools play a key role in the success of students as they provide a more flexible and supportive environment. For example, students may have familial obligations, be employed, have different learning styles or other needs, and are behind on credits needed for graduation. These schools serve diverse student populations across the state and provide additional support that a traditional high school cannot provide.

“AB 542 aims to allow students the flexibility to pursue workforce development programs, which will expand employment opportunities. By amending current law, a governing board of a school district will be able to augment the five day

instruction schedule while maintaining the state required instruction time at continuation schools. This flexibility supports various employment pathways for students after graduation as well as economic growth in communities and across the state.”

- 2) ***Leveraging flexibility for a high-need student population.*** Continuation high schools serve students who are at risk of not completing high school and who often face multiple barriers to academic success, such as credit deficiencies, family obligations, and the need to work. This bill builds on the structural flexibility of continuation education—particularly its 180-minute minimum school day and 15-hour weekly cap on attendance—to give students more access to work-based learning without jeopardizing instructional time or ADA compliance.
- 3) ***Aligned with Career Technical Education (CTE) and dropout prevention goals.*** Research suggests that work-based learning can re-engage disconnected students and improve postsecondary transitions. By encouraging partnerships with workforce-aligned organizations and prioritizing credentialed outcomes, this bill echoes recommendations from the state’s CTE Master Plan and the broader push to offer more career pathways in secondary education.
- 4) ***A question of who gets these opportunities.*** While the bill creates new options for continuation schools, its benefits may ultimately depend on local capacity and partnerships. Schools in urban districts with robust employer networks may be well-positioned to offer paid internships, certifications, and mentoring. Rural or smaller districts, by contrast, may struggle to build comparable experiences. Implementation support—from state agencies or regional intermediaries—could help ensure that youth workforce development programs are not limited to a few well-resourced schools, but rather equitably available to continuation students across California.
- 5) ***Arguments in support.*** The Los Angeles Unified School District, sponsor of this bill, argues that AB 542 provides much-needed flexibility for students in continuation schools—many of whom are balancing school with work, parenting, or other life challenges. LAUSD contends that the current five-day instructional schedule limits students’ ability to access high-quality, full-day workforce training opportunities. By allowing one or two days per week to be allocated to supervised workforce development while still meeting the 15-hour weekly instruction minimum, the bill enables students to pursue industry-aligned job training without compromising their path to a diploma. Supporters also emphasize that the bill aligns with the state’s Master Plan for Career Technical Education and promotes a more equitable, career-connected learning model for a historically underserved student population.

## SUPPORT

Los Angeles Unified School District (Sponsor)  
Association of California School Administrators  
County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors  
Power CA Action

San Diego Unified School District  
Sharefest

**OPPOSITION**

None received

**-- END --**

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

<b>Bill No:</b>	AB 602	<b>Hearing Date:</b>	July 2, 2025
<b>Author:</b>	Haney		
<b>Version:</b>	June 16, 2025		
<b>Urgency:</b>	No	<b>Fiscal:</b>	Yes
<b>Consultant:</b>	Olgalilia Ramirez		

**Subject:** Public postsecondary education: student behavior: drug and alcohol use: rehabilitation programs.

## SUMMARY

This bill requires the University of California (UC) Regents, the California State University (CSU) Trustees to adopt student behavior policies by July 1, 2026, that exempt students seeking medical treatment for personal drug or alcohol use from disciplinary action if they complete an approved rehabilitation program.

## BACKGROUND

### *Existing Federal law:*

- 1) Establishes the U.S. Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act. Requires, as a condition for federal funding, that institutions of higher education implement a program to prevent the use of illicit drugs and abuse of alcohol by students and employees. The program must include a standard of conduct policy that prohibits the use of illicit drugs and alcohol by students and employees on the campus and at institutional activities and requires there to be clear disciplinary sanctions for the violation of the drug and alcohol policy. (United States Code Title 20, Chapter 28, Subchapter I, Part B, Section 1011i)

### *Existing State law:*

- 1) Establishes the UC as a public trust to be administered by the Regents and grants the Regents full powers of organization and governance subject only to legislative control as necessary to ensure the security of funds, compliance with terms of its endowments, and the statutory requirements around competitive bidding and contracts, sales of property, and the purchase of materials, goods, and services. (Article IX, Section (9) (a) of the California Constitution)
- 2) Stipulates no provision of the Donahue Higher Education Act shall apply to the UC unless the UC Regents adopts the provision. (Education Code (EC) § 67400)
- 3) Establishes the CSU system, made of 23 campuses, and bestows upon the CSU Trustees, through the Board of Trustees, the power, duties, and functions with respect to the management, administration, and control of the CSU system. (EC § 66606 and § 89030 et. seq.)

- 4) Establishes the California Community Colleges (CCC) under the administration of the Board of Governors of the CCC, as one of the segments of public postsecondary education in this state. The CCC shall be comprised of community college districts. (EC § 70900)
- 5) Establishes that CCC districts are under the control of a board of trustees, known as the governing board, who has the authority to establish, maintain, operate, and govern one or more community colleges, within its district as specified. (EC § 70902)
- 6) Requires the CCC, CSU, UC College of the Law, San Francisco, UC, and any postsecondary education institution receiving public funds for student financial aid to authorize the appropriate officials on each campus to compile records of all occurrences reported to campus police, campus security personnel, or campus safety authorities of and arrests for, crimes that are committed on campus and that involve violence, hate violence, theft, destruction of property, illegal drugs or alcohol intoxication. (EC § 67380 (a) (1))
- 7) Requires the CCC, CSU, and UC to adopt specific rules and regulations governing student behavior, along with the applicable penalties for violations of rules and regulations. The institutions shall adopt procedures by which all students are informed of such rules and regulations with applicable penalties. (EC § 66300)
- 8) Requires health centers on campus of the CCC and CSU to provide two doses of opioid overdose reversal medication to each housing facility and sorority/fraternity housing on campus. Establishes training for residential advisors and housing managers for how to use the opioid reversal medication. Requires students to be notified each semester or term of the location of the opioid overdose medication on campus. States the primary concern of the CCC and CSU is to keep students safe and that disciplinary measures will not be imposed for incidents that result from the use of the overdose reversal medication. (EC § 67384.5)
- 9) Requires the governing board of each CCC district and the Trustees of the CSU, and requests the Regents of the UC to do the following:
  - a) Collaborate with campus-based and community-based recovery advocacy organizations to provide educational and prevention information provided by the State Department of Public Health about opioid overdose during the campus orientation. The educational and prevention materials should include information about the location of fentanyl test strips and opioid overdose reversal medication on campus.
  - b) Notify students of the locations of fentanyl test strips on campus via email.
  - c) Have each campus health center do the following:
    - i) Apply to use the statewide standing order issued by the State Public Health Officer to distribute dosages of a federally approved

opioid overdose reversal medication and to participate in the Naloxone Distribution Project;

- ii) If approved, distribute the federally approved opioid overdose medication in accordance with the terms and conditions of the State Department of Health Care Services;
- iii) Stock and distribute fentanyl strips with written instructions on how to properly use the fentanyl test strips. (EC § 67384)

## ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Requires, in adopting the policies governing student behavior, the UC Regents and the CSU Trustees to place in the highest priority the health, safety, and well-being of the campus community and, by July 1, 2026, adopt, or provide for the adoption of, policies governing student behavior that:
  - a) Exempt a student receiving medical treatment for the personal use of drugs or alcohol from disciplinary action with respect to the use of drugs or alcohol in violation of the policies governing student behavior, provided the student completes an appropriate rehabilitation program.
  - b) Offer a student who violates drug or alcohol use policies the chance to complete an appropriate rehabilitation program.
- 2) Prohibits the exemption from disciplinary actions and the requirement that the student be offered a chance to complete a rehabilitation program from applying to a student who receives medical treatment for personal drug or alcohol use and is subject to disciplinary sanction(s) for additional violations of policies governing student behavior.
- 3) Requires that in order for the exemption on disciplinary action and the requirement that the student be offered a chance to complete a rehabilitation program to apply to a student who is in violation of the institution's drug and alcohol use policies, the student be required to participate in an appropriate rehabilitation program with the timeframe set by the campus administrator overseeing student disciplinary actions. The bill requires that if the student does not complete the appropriate rehabilitation program, they are to be subject to disciplinary action in accordance with the institution's policies governing student behavior.
- 4) Provides that nothing in the bill prohibits the institution from including in the student's administrative file information about the appropriate rehabilitation program completed and the exemption from disciplinary action.
- 5) Limits the number of times that the exemption from disciplinary action and the requirement that the student be offered a chance to complete a rehabilitation program may be applied to a student to once in an academic semester, quarter,

or term as defined by a campus. The bill requires that for subsequent violations in the same academic semester, quarter, or term the student be subject to disciplinary proceedings, at the conclusion of which the institution may impose disciplinary action or offer the student the chance to complete an appropriate rehabilitation program.

- 6) States that it is the intent of the Legislature for a campus of the CSU and the UC to provide restorative justice practices for disciplinary proceedings for violations of the institution's rules and regulations related to drug and alcohol use, when deemed appropriate based on the totality of the circumstances.
- 7) States that the bill does not in any way modify or affect the requirements under state or federal law for the reporting of crimes that occur on campus as it pertains to drug possession, drug manufacturing, drug distribution, and drug use.
- 8) Defines "appropriate rehabilitation program" to mean an appropriate counseling, treatment, rehabilitation, or other diversion program, and may include, but is not limited to, participating in meetings with a school counselor or attending a drug education group.

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) **Need for the bill.** According to the author, "AB 602 confronts California's campus overdose crisis head-on by removing the threat of academic punishment for students who seek emergency help. Every second counts during an overdose, yet too many students hesitate to call 911—paralyzed by fear that saving a life could cost them their education. This bill makes one thing clear: no student should ever have to choose between saving a life and protecting their future. AB 602 empowers students to act without fear, breaks the cycle of silence and shame, and lays the foundation for safer, more compassionate campuses across California."
- 2) **College campuses maintain codes of student conduct.** Existing law requires public higher education institutions to adopt rules and regulations governing student behavior. Typically, these codes of conduct include consequences for drug and alcohol use. Disciplinary action may include expulsion or suspension but may also include satisfactory completion or participation in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program. Some campuses, like UC Davis, have adopted medical amnesty policies known as the Aggies Act to align with California's Good Samaritan law. Specifically, it covers incidents where a student experiencing an alcohol- or drug-related overdose seeks medical assistance or any other person who, in good faith, seeks medical assistance on behalf of the person experiencing the overdose. The student who experienced the medical emergency may be assigned to a professional counselor for a consultation. Amnesty applies once the incident qualifies for the Aggies Act and the student meets counseling requirements. The author asserts that there is no uniform policy across the CSU or UC systems regarding medical amnesty in overdose situations from academic or disciplinary sanctions. Further, while California's 911 Good Samaritan Law provides limited criminal immunity in overdose situations, those protections do not extend to disciplinary actions taken by colleges and



universities. This bill attempts to extend a similar amnesty protection for students seeking medical help for substance abuse.

- 3) **Efforts to prioritize student well-being.** The State has adopted measures to address substance abuse on college campuses. Current law, established by SB 367 (Hurtado, Chapter 218, Statutes of 2022), mandates that campuses distribute opioid overdose reversal medication and provide educational resources and preventive information about opioid overdose, including the use and location of the medication on campus. Additionally, AB 1841 (Weber, Chapter 942, Statutes of 2024) sought to expand access to opioid overdose reversal medication in student housing and requires training for residential advisors and house managers. The sponsors of this measure, the UC Student Association, argue that these policies do not fully protect students from disciplinary action when seeking or administering lifesaving aid. They also assert that this legal gap, combined with inconsistent disciplinary policies, has created a crisis on California college campuses—where students are forced to choose between saving a life and protecting their academic future.
- 4) **Promotes restorative justice practices.** This bill seeks to align with efforts that encourage students to seek medical help in emergencies without the fear of facing strict disciplinary action or academic penalties. Under this measure, students who breach substance use policies are mandated to participate in a rehabilitation program within a timeline established by a campus administrator. This program may include counseling, treatment, rehabilitation, or other diversion programs such as participating in meetings with a school counselor or attending a drug education group. Notably, the medical amnesty does not apply if the student also violates any other behavioral policies, such as committing acts of violence. The bill specifies that a student may utilize medical amnesty once per semester, which is more frequent than the provisions under the Aggies Act, allowing its use only once in a two- year period.

## SUPPORT

University of California Student Association (Co-Sponsor)  
Youth Power Project (Co-Sponsor)  
California Youth Empowerment Network  
Drug Policy Alliance  
Mental Health America of California

## OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

**Bill No:** AB 694 **Hearing Date:** July 2, 2025  
**Author:** McKinnor  
**Version:** June 11, 2025  
**Urgency:** No **Fiscal:** Yes  
**Consultant:** Lynn Lorber

**Subject:** Department of Industrial Relations: advisory committee: occupational safety and health.

## SUMMARY

This bill requires the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) to contract with the University of California (UC), Berkeley Labor Occupational Health Program and the UC, Los Angeles Labor Occupational Safety and Health Program, to conduct a study to evaluate the understaffing and vacancies within the Division of Occupational Safety and Health, and make recommendations on policies to inform the consideration and establishment of career pathways to the Compliance Safety and Health Officer classification.

## BACKGROUND

- 1) Authorizes, pursuant to the California Occupational Safety and Health Act, the enforcement of effective health and safety standards, assisting and encouraging employers to maintain safe and healthful working conditions, and by providing for research, information, education, training, and enforcement in the field of occupational safety and health. (Labor Code § 6300-6413.5)
- 2) Establishes the Division of Occupational Safety and Health (known as Cal/OSHA) within DIR to, among other things, propose, administer, and enforce occupational safety and health standards. (Labor Code § 6300 et seq.)
- 3) Establishes the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, within DIR, to promote, adopt, and maintain reasonable and enforceable standards that will ensure a safe and healthful workplace for workers. (Labor Code § 140-147.6)
- 4) Establishes the UC as a public trust to be administered by the Regents of the UC; and, grants the Regents full powers of organization and government, subject only to such legislative control as may be necessary to ensure security of its funds, compliance with the terms of its endowments, statutory requirements around competitive bidding and contracts, sales of property and the purchase of materials, goods and services. (California Constitution, Article IX, § (9)(a).
- 5) Requires the DIR to contract with UC, Los Angeles Labor Center to conduct a study evaluating opportunities to improve worker safety and safeguard employment rights in the janitorial industry. Authorizes UC to subcontract the responsibility for conducting the study to other specified entities. (Labor Code §

1429.6)

- 6) Requires the UC, Los Angeles Labor Center and its subcontractors, if any, to issue a report no later than May 1, 2026, that includes information on the janitorial workforce such as data on injuries, demographics, workers' compensation, and production rates based on cleaning frequency. (Labor Code § 1429.6)

## ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Requires DIR to contract with the UC, Berkeley Labor Occupational Health Program and the UC, Los Angeles Labor Occupational Safety and Health Program, within 120 days of an appropriation by the Legislature, to conduct a study to evaluate the understaffing and vacancies within Cal/OSHA and make recommendations to DIR, the Department of Human Resources, and the Legislature on policies the state shall use to inform the consideration and establishment of career pathways to the Compliance Safety and Health Officer classification.
- 2) Authorizes UC to subcontract, in whole or in part, the responsibility for conducting the study to another academic institution. Requires the entity or entities with which a contract or subcontract is entered into to conduct the study in the manner described in this bill.
- 3) Requires UC and any subcontractors, in conducting the study, to consider and be guided by the recommendations of the advisory committee (see #s 6-14), if any, only so long as the recommendations would not substantially increase the cost of the study or cause the report (see #s 4-5) to be issued after the required submission date.

### *Report*

- 4) Requires the UC and its subcontractors, if any, to issue a report that includes, but is not limited to, all of the following:
  - a) Literature review compiling existing research related to Cal/OSHA's understaffing and vacancy problem, impacts of these problems at statewide, regional, or industry levels, and models for workforce development programs that could increase the career pathways for Compliance Safety and Health Officers.
  - b) An analysis to identify primary causes of Cal/OSHA's Compliance Safety and Health Officer vacancies.
  - c) Recommendations to address Cal/OSHA's Compliance Safety and Health Officer understaffing and vacancies, including recommended timeline and strategies to implement a workforce training program. Requires the study and committee, in making these recommendations, to consider all of the

following:

- i) How to improve the effectiveness of hiring and retention and decrease the hiring time for Cal/OSHA's Compliance Safety and Health Officer positions.
  - ii) A summary of all relevant Cal/OSHA Compliance Safety and Health Officer position responsibilities, skills, and tasks, as provided by Cal/OSHA or through interviews with certified safety and health officials.
  - iii) An analysis of different workforce development and training models including third-party certification and apprenticeship.
  - iv) Identification of current programs, institutions, or organizations in the field that could partner in a new workforce development training program and what role they could play.
  - v) An analysis of external workforce populations who may have matching skill sets and experience that would make them effective candidates for a Compliance Safety and Health Officer workforce training program, including linguistic and cultural competencies that match the diverse California workforce. This may include an analysis of the level of fit between these candidates and current minimum qualifications.
  - vi) Recommendations on Compliance Safety and Health Officer qualities and skills that would encourage worker engagement with Cal/OSHA based on data collected from low-wage and immigrant workers.
  - vii) Identification of core curriculum components for the eventual development of a workforce training program for Compliance Safety and Health Officers.
- 5) Requires the report to be completed 18 months after entering into the contract with UC, and requires DIR to post the completed report on Cal/OSHA's website and forward the completed report to the members of the advisory committee, the Governor, and the Chairs of the Assembly Committee on Labor and Employment and the Senate Committee on Labor, Public Employment and Retirement.

*Advisory committee*

- 6) Requires UC to convene an advisory committee to make recommendations regarding the scope of the study, and provide the findings and recommendations to Cal/OSHA.
- 7) Requires the advisory committee to meet at least once while the study is being conducted, and at least two times to review findings and recommendations. The committee shall hold at least one public meeting while the study is being

conducted and one additional public meeting to gather input on recommendations and findings. Cal/OSHA, the Department of Human Resources, and the Division of Apprenticeship Standards shall provide timely responses to requests for information from the committee.

- 8) Requires the advisory committee to be composed of at least 15, and not more than 17, members, and shall include all of the following members:
  - a) One member from Cal/OSHA.
  - b) One member from the Department of Human Resources.
  - c) One member from the Division of Apprenticeship Standards.
  - d) One member for each representing union of Cal/OSHA's enforcement and administrative classifications, including one member for the representing union for safety engineers, one member for the representing union for industrial hygienists, and one member for the representing union for administrative staff in Bargaining Unit 1.
  - e) One member from a statewide organization that represents labor unions in the high-risk industries of the building and construction trades, and one member for the representing union for proprietary workers from California refineries to advise on the Division of Occupational Safety and Health Process Safety Management Unit.
  - f) One member from a statewide organization representing public and private sector unions whose membership includes workers subject to the occupational health and safety provisions of the Labor Code.
  - g) Three members from community-based non-profit organizations that have at least five years of experience advocating on behalf of workers to address health and safety issues in the workplace, and represent diverse geographies.
  - h) One member from the California Community Colleges with experience in workforce development training for health and safety-related careers.
  - i) One member from an academic institution.
  - j) One member who has worked for or on behalf of employers in California related to compliance with occupational health and safety provisions of the Labor Code and related regulations for more than five years, and who has more than five years of experience in either interacting with or working with Cal/OSHA staff.
- 9) Requires at least two members of the advisory committee to represent areas of the state with high proportions of workers who are at high risk of unhealthy or unsafe working conditions due to immigration status, language barriers, geographic isolation, and high violation industries, as determined by UC,

including, but not limited to, the San Joaquin Valley area.

- 10) Requires Cal/OSHA, the Department of Human Resources, and Division of Apprenticeship Standards to appoint the members representing Cal/OSHA, the Department of Human Resources, and the Division of Apprenticeship Standards, from their respective agencies.
- 11) Requires the representing labor organizations to appoint the members in # 6d from their respective organizations.
- 12) Requires UC to appoint the organizations in # 6e and 6f to the advisory committee, and those organizations shall appoint their designated members.
- 13) Requires UC to appoint the members in # 6 g-j to the advisory committee by selecting an individual who submits an application with, and developed by, UC.
- 14) Requires the advisory committee, to hold at least one meeting within 60 days of entering into the contract with UC.

#### *General provisions*

- 15) Provides that implementation of this bill is subject to an appropriation made by the Legislature for the express purpose of this bill.
- 16) States legislative intent to develop recommendations for the design of a Cal/OSHA Compliance Safety and Health Officer workforce development pipeline program, and any relevant policy improvements to aid in the effective implementation of that program, in order to expand and diversify the candidates who may fill these positions and therefore improve health and safety enforcement outcomes in the state of California. This effort is intended as part of a multipronged strategy that should complement, and in no way delay, current and ongoing efforts to address staffing issues of Cal/OSHA.
- 17) States legislative findings and declarations relative to an ongoing, multiyear understaffing and vacancy crisis, particularly in their enforcement division, within Cal/OSHA, and the dependence of the health and safety of California workers depending on a fully staffed Cal/OSHA.

#### **STAFF COMMENTS**

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “Ensuring workplace safety starts with having the necessary enforcement personnel to protect workers from hazardous conditions. Cal/OSHA’s staffing shortages have weakened enforcement, leaving workers, especially those in high-risk industries, without adequate oversight and protection. AB 694 takes a critical step toward strengthening workplace safety by assessing how to recruit and train a more diverse and experienced inspector workforce. By creating pathways for new safety inspectors and expanding language access, this bill helps ensure Cal/OSHA can effectively serve all workers, regardless of industry or

background.”

- 2) ***Cal/OSHA Duties and Responsibilities.*** As noted in the Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee’s analysis of this bill, Cal/OSHA is tasked with protecting and improving the health and safety of workers in California through, among other things, the setting and enforcement of standards, providing outreach, education and assistance to workers and employers, as well as issuing permits and approvals for various things. A key element of Cal/OSHA’s responsibilities is the enforcement of health and safety standards which are investigated based on the following:
- a) Complaints filed by workers, reports of serious violations received from law enforcement, or reports of accidents resulting in a serious injury or illness or death.
  - b) Targeted and programmed inspections in high hazard industries with high rates of preventable injuries and illnesses.
  - c) Citations, special orders, and orders to take special actions after an investigation of hazards in a workplace.
  - d) Orders prohibiting use where there is an imminent hazard.
- 3) ***Cal/OSHA Vacancies and Understaffing.*** As noted by the Assembly Labor and Employment Committee analysis of this bill, “Cal/OSHA continues to suffer from significant understaffing and high turnover, particularly in its enforcement division. The CSHO [Compliance Safety and Health Officer] position—critical for conducting field investigations of worker complaints of health and safety violations-- has one of the highest vacancy rates across the division. According to DIR’s internal data, as of August 2024, Cal/OSHA had 124 vacant CSHO positions, constituting a 46% vacancy rate. The vacancy rate is even higher in certain geographic areas. For example, the Santa Ana office had a 73% vacancy rate while the San Francisco office had a 66% vacancy rate. Even more troubling is the ratio of CSHO to worker in California—1 inspector to every 130,000 workers. This ratio is much higher than in the neighboring states of Washington and Oregon, which have ratios of 1 to 26,000 workers and 1 to 24,000 workers, respectively. To put it another way, perhaps more starkly, California employs 7.7 CSHOs *per million workers*.”

“Cal/OSHA’s staffing crisis has affected its ability to conduct inspections and effectively enforce the health and safety laws designed to protect workers. A 2022 annual evaluation of Cal/OSHA’s programs, conducted by federal OSHA, found that the division is failing to proactively inspect workplaces and prevent work-related accidents. According to the evaluation, ‘Cal/OSHA cannot conduct planned inspections of high hazard employers at the national average<sup>1</sup>’ due to short staffing. Only 18.5 percent of Cal/OSHA’s inspections are programmed

---

<sup>1</sup> Miller, Maya. “Overworked and Underprotected: Cal/OSHA is experiencing a staffing crisis. Here’s how that endangers California workers.” Sacramento Bee, February 22, 2024, updated January 7, 2025.

compared to a national average of 40 percent.<sup>2</sup> The lack of proactive inspections can contribute to dire outcomes for workers—from preventable injuries to death. In fact, over 500 workers in California were killed on the job in 2022.<sup>3</sup>

- 4) ***Cal/OSHA Pending State Audit.*** As noted in the Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee’s analysis of this bill, the impact of DIR’s staff vacancies were highlighted through a May 2024 State Auditor report on the Labor Commissioner’s Office (LCO) titled, “*Inadequate Staffing and Poor Oversight Have Weakened Protections for Workers.*”<sup>4</sup> Among other things, the State Auditor reported that field offices have insufficient staffing to process wage claims – some offices had a vacancy rate of 30 percent or more. The Auditor estimated that the LCO needs hundreds of additional positions under its existing processes to resolve its backlog and that contributing to the high vacancy rate is an ineffective and lengthy hiring process and non-competitive salaries for several positions.

In response to similar issues facing Cal/OSHA, the chair of the Assembly Labor and Employment Committee, Assemblymember Liz Ortega, submitted an audit request to the Joint Legislative Audit Committee (JLAC) to examine the urgent staffing crisis at Cal/OSHA. The audit was approved by JLAC and is expected to be completed sometime this summer. Among other things, the pending Cal/OSHA audit will include a review of the following:

- a) The nature and number of complaints that Cal/OSHA receives;
- b) The number of workplace complaints that Cal/OSHA investigated;
- c) The number of complaints investigated that resulted in a citation and resulting fines and amounts actually collected;
- d) The average time from the receipt of a complaint to initiating an investigation and to closing the complaint;
- e) Whether the fines serve as an effective tool to encourage compliance with health and safety laws; and,
- f) A review of Cal/OSHA’s staff vacancies.

The results of this audit could help inform UC’s study and the advisory committee process, proposed by this bill, as they study the staffing issues at Cal/OSHA and make recommendations for creating more effective pipelines into the CSHO classification.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Fatal Work Injuries in California- 2022.

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.auditor.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/2023-104-Report.pdf>



**SUPPORT**

California Farmworker Coalition (Co-Sponsor)  
California Labor for Climate Jobs (Co-Sponsor)  
Southern California Coalition for Occupational Safety and Health (Co-Sponsor)  
350 Bay Area Action  
Alchemist CDC  
American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees  
Asian Pacific Islander Forward Movement  
Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen  
California Certified Organic Farmers  
California Climate & Agriculture Network  
California Climate and Agriculture Network  
California Coalition for Worker Power  
California Food and Farming Network  
California Immigrant Policy Center  
California League of United Latin American Citizens  
California Nurses Association  
California Nurses for Environmental Health & Justice  
California School Employees Association  
California Teachers Association  
Caps-UAW  
Center for Ecoliteracy  
Center for Food Safety  
Central California Environmental Justice Network  
Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy  
Centro Binacional Para El Desarrollo Indígena Oaxaqueño  
Ceres Community Project  
CFT - A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO  
Clean Carwash Worker Center  
Communities for a Better Environment  
Community Alliance With Family Farmers  
Farm2people  
Food Access LA  
Fullwell  
Greenpeace USA  
Heal Food Alliance  
Industrious Labs  
International Association of Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation Workers  
LA Food Policy Council  
Latino Coalition for a Healthy California  
Leadership Counsel Action  
Lideres Campesinas  
Marin Food Policy Council  
Mixteco Indigena Community Organizing Project  
National Council for Occupational Safety and Health  
National Employment Law Project  
National Union of Healthcare Workers  
North Bay Jobs With Justice  
Nurse Alliance of SEIU California

Pesticide Action & Agroecology Network  
Professional Engineers in California Government  
Roots of Change  
San Francisco Bay Physicians for Social Responsibility  
Santa Clara Wage Theft Coalition  
SEIU California  
Sierra Harvest  
SoCalCOSH  
Stand.earth  
Strippers United  
Sunflower Alliance  
TODEC Legal Center  
UAW Region 6  
UFCW - Western States Council  
United Steelworkers District 12  
United Steelworkers Local 675  
What We All Deserve

**OPPOSITION**

None received

**-- END --**

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

**Bill No:** AB 917 **Hearing Date:** July 2, 2025  
**Author:** Ávila Farías  
**Version:** February 19, 2025  
**Urgency:** No **Fiscal:** No  
**Consultant:** Ian Johnson

**Subject:** County offices of education: school districts: average daily attendance of less than 250 pupils: permanent status.

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

## SUMMARY

This bill changes when some certificated employees earn permanent status by eliminating distinctions based on a district’s size and allowing service in any regional occupational center or program (ROCP)—not just those operated by a single school district—to count toward permanent status.

## BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Requires most certificated employees in school districts with an average daily attendance (ADA) of 250 or more to be classified as permanent after two years of satisfactory service and reelection for a third year. (Education Code (EC) § 44929.21)
- 2) Permits, but does not require, school districts with fewer than 250 ADA to grant permanent status after three years of service and reelection for a fourth year. (EC § 44929.23)
- 3) Applies a two-year probationary period for permanent status to county office of education (COE) teachers only if the COE has ADA of 250 or more. (EC § 1296)
- 4) Prohibits service as an instructor in classes conducted at a ROCP from counting toward permanent status in a school district, but provides an exception allowing such service to count if the ROCP is operated by a single school district. (EC § 44910)
- 5) Includes a number of employment and dismissal provisions that apply differently to certificated employees whose probationary period began before the 1983–84 fiscal year or to those employed in small school districts or COEs.

**ANALYSIS**

This bill:

- 1) Requires certificated employees in school districts and COEs with fewer than 250 ADA to be granted permanent status after two years of employment and reelection for a third year, consistent with the probationary period applicable to larger local educational agencies (LEAs).
- 2) Repeals Education Code Section 44910, which currently prohibits service as an instructor in an ROCP from counting toward permanent status in a school district, except when the ROCP is operated by a single school district.
- 3) Adds a new version of Section 44910 that affirms service in any ROCP counts toward permanent status in a school district, without distinguishing the ROCP's operator.
- 4) Repeals or amends various Education Code sections that apply only to employees whose probationary period began before the 1983–84 fiscal year, including provisions that establish alternative dismissal procedures or longer probationary timelines in small school districts.
- 5) Makes conforming changes to provisions governing dismissal, suspension, reassignment, and employment contracts to align with the bill's permanent status requirements and apply due process protections uniformly across all LEAs.

**STAFF COMMENTS**

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “California is a diverse state with a diverse student body. Having a teaching staff that reflects the diversity of its students is essential for creating an inclusive and supportive learning environment.

“When students see teachers who share their cultural, racial, or linguistic backgrounds, it fosters a sense of belonging and shows them that their identities are valued. Diverse teachers bring varied perspectives and experiences, enriching classroom discussions and helping address biases or gaps in traditional curricula. Representation also encourages greater understanding and connection, as teachers can draw on their own experiences to build meaningful relationships with students. A diverse teaching body not only promotes inclusivity, but also prepares all students to thrive in a multicultural society by modeling empathy, understanding, and respect for differences.

“AB 917 will ensure that deserving educators and school employees in all school districts and county offices of education have an opportunity to achieve permanent employment status— providing career stability, workforce retention, and increasing the diversity of California's education workforce.”

- 2) ***What does permanent status mean?*** Permanent status provides certificated employees with due process protections against dismissal or non-reelection. A

permanent employee may only be dismissed for statutorily defined causes and is entitled to a hearing before a Commission on Professional Competence if dismissal is challenged. Permanent status also affects how employees are treated during reductions in force, including rights related to seniority, bumping, and notice. These protections are intended to promote stability in the workforce, discourage arbitrary employment decisions, and support the retention of qualified staff. At the same time, they can limit an employer's flexibility to reassign or reduce staff based on shifting programmatic needs.

- 3) ***Why have certain employees historically been excluded from permanent status?*** California law has long varied permanent status eligibility based on school size, probationary start date, and program type. For example, until recently, adult education teachers were excluded from attaining permanent status. AB 897 (McCarty, Chapter 548, Statutes of 2023) removed this exclusion for adult education teachers employed by school districts, provided they serve at least 75% of full-time equivalent hours. Legislative discussion around AB 897 noted that adult education programs have historically been categorically funded and often operated outside traditional TK–12 staffing and accountability structures, contributing to their exclusion from permanent status provisions.

Similarly, instructors in ROCPs have long been excluded from the permanent status pathway unless the ROCP was operated by a single school district. AB 2245 (Juan Carrillo, Chapter 956, Statutes of 2024) amended this framework by requiring, commencing July 1, 2025, that service as an instructor in classes conducted at an ROCP operated by a single school district be included in computing the service required to attain permanent employee status at that school district, ensuring that employment relationships are recognized when the operator and employer are the same.

The ongoing expansion—first via AB 897 for adult education and then AB 2245 for single-district ROCP instructors—suggests a broader legislative interest in eliminating carve-outs that were historically justified by funding instability, part-time staffing patterns, or the specialized governance of certain programs. This bill continues this trend by eliminating distinctions based on district size and removing operator-based limitations on which ROCP instructors may accrue service credit toward permanent status.

- 4) ***Arguments for expanding permanent status eligibility.*** Proponents of expanding eligibility argue that permanent status offers basic job protections that should apply to all certificated employees, regardless of the size of their employing agency or the structure of the program in which they teach. They note that temporary or probationary employment can discourage retention, particularly in hard-to-staff positions. Supporters also contend that distinctions based on ADA thresholds or employment start dates are outdated and arbitrary, and that funding instability should be addressed through budget and program reforms rather than limiting employee rights. In the context of ROCPs, they argue that as funding has shifted into the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), instructors should be treated like other high school educators.

- 5) **Arguments for maintaining some exclusions.** Opponents of expanding permanent status argue that in small districts and specialized programs like ROCPs, staffing needs are more variable and sensitive to funding changes, making rigid employment protections harder to manage. In the case of ROCPs, industry alignment is critical, and course offerings may need to change rapidly in response to labor market trends. Critics argue that permanent status can reduce a program’s ability to phase out outdated courses and replace instructors whose skillsets are no longer aligned with evolving needs. Additionally, some joint powers authority (JPA) operated ROCPs do not receive direct state funding, relying instead on competitive grants like the Career Technical Education Incentive Grant (CTEIG) and the K–12 Strong Workforce Program, which can vary significantly year to year.
- 6) **Should district size or program type matter?** This bill raises the broader question of whether distinctions in permanent status eligibility based on district size or program type remain appropriate. On one hand, applying uniform tenure rules across all LEAs promotes fairness and predictability for certificated employees performing similar work. On the other hand, the operational realities of small school districts, COEs, and ROCPs may justify different approaches to probation and tenure.

There are approximately 200 school districts and 22 COEs with fewer than 250 units of ADA. Under current law, these small LEAs are exempt from the standard two-year probationary timeline and are not required to grant permanent status at all—though they may do so after three years, at their discretion. Removing that exemption would require these LEAs to make tenure decisions earlier, which could be challenging given limited administrative capacity, small applicant pools, and enrollment volatility.

For COEs in particular, ADA tends to be low even when they operate many programs and employ sizable certificated workforces, because COEs only receive ADA—and generate LCFF funding—for specific high-need student populations, such as those in juvenile court schools or county community programs. As a result, the 250-ADA threshold may exclude COEs that serve many students through specialized programs. Requiring earlier tenure decisions for COEs with technically “low” ADA could create obligations that are not well-aligned with their program structure or funding streams.

- 7) **Potential implementation issues: Who grants permanent status when service is in an ROCP?** This bill replaces the current exclusion in Education Code Section 44910 with an affirmative provision stating that service in any ROCP counts toward permanent status in a school district. However, the bill does not specify how that service is to be credited—or by whom—when the ROCP is operated by an entity other than a single school district or when the instructor is not employed by a school district.

ROCPs in California are operated under different governance models. Some are run by a single school district, others by a COE, and others by a JPA composed of multiple school districts. Instructor employment arrangements vary

accordingly—some are employees of a school district, others of a COE, and others of the JPA itself.

These governance and employment structures create ambiguity under the bill's current framework. For example:

- a) If the instructor is employed by a JPA, which school district—if any—is responsible for granting permanent status? Is it a member district of the JPA? A designated lead agency? The student's district of residence?
- b) If the instructor is employed by a COE, is the COE required to grant permanent status, or must a school district do so based on service outside its direct employment structure?

As currently drafted, the bill could be interpreted to require a school district to grant permanent status to an individual with whom it has no employment relationship. This could create legal and administrative conflicts, particularly if districts are required to confer status on instructors over whom they have no employment relationship or direct oversight.

To address this ambiguity, **staff recommends amending the bill** to clarify that permanent status may only accrue to instructors employed by a school district or COE. This approach aligns with the existing structure of certificated employment law and avoids extending tenure obligations to JPAs, which are not currently subject to Education Code provisions governing teacher tenure, evaluation, or dismissal.

## SUPPORT

California School Employees Association  
 California State Council of Service Employees International Union  
 CFT - A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO

## OPPOSITION

Association of California School Administrators  
 California Association of School Business Officials  
 California Association of Suburban School Districts  
 California County Superintendents  
 California School Boards Association  
 Career Technical Education Joint Powers Authority Coalition  
 CAROCP: the Association of Career and College Readiness Organizations  
 Central Valley Education Association  
 Chino Valley Unified School District  
 Claremont Unified School District  
 Coastline ROP  
 College and Career Advantage  
 Cutler-Orosi Joint Unified School District  
 Dinuba Unified School District  
 Eden Area ROP

Kings Canyon Unified School District  
Kingsburg Joint Union High School District  
Mission Valley ROP  
Orange County Department of Education  
Parlier Unified School District  
Riverside County Office of Education  
San Bernardino County District Advocates for Better Schools  
Sanger Unified School District  
School Employers Association of California  
Selma Unified School District  
Small School Districts Association  
Small Schools Districts' Association  
Tri-Cities Regional Occupational Program  
Tri-Valley Regional Occupational Program  
Upland Unified School District  
Valley Regional Occupational Program

**-- END --**



---

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

**Bill No:** AB 1111 **Hearing Date:** July 2, 2025  
**Author:** Soria  
**Version:** April 30, 2025  
**Urgency:** No **Fiscal:** Yes  
**Consultant:** Ian Johnson

**Subject:** Pupil transportation: schoolbuses: zero-emission vehicles: extensions: scrapping.

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

### SUMMARY

This bill expands eligibility for exemptions from California’s 2035 zero-emission schoolbus mandate and modifies requirements related to the scrapping of replaced schoolbuses.

### BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Requires, commencing January 1, 2035, 100% of all newly purchased or contracted schoolbuses by a local educational agency (LEA) to be zero-emission vehicles (ZEVs), where feasible. (Education Code § 17927)
- 2) Authorizes an LEA to request a one-time extension of up to five years if ZEV operation is not feasible due to both terrain and route constraints, subject to review and approval by the California Air Resources Board (CARB), in consultation with the California Department of Education (CDE) and the Energy Commission.
- 3) Allows a “frontier” LEA—defined as serving fewer than 600 average daily attendance (ADA) or operating in a county with fewer than 10 persons per square mile—to request up to five annual extensions beginning in 2040, with the final extension expiring no later than January 1, 2045.
- 4) Establishes the Hybrid and Zero-Emission Truck and Bus Voucher Incentive Project (HVIP), which provides grants to LEAs for ZEV schoolbus purchases and infrastructure. \$375 million was appropriated in 2023–24 for bus purchases and \$125 million for charging infrastructure, with funding available for encumbrance through June 30, 2029. (AB 181 Committee on Budget, Section 121 of Chapter 52, Statutes of 2022, as amended)

- 5) Requires LEAs receiving HVIP funding to scrap replaced internal combustion schoolbuses within 24 months of delivery of the replacement vehicle, with an exception for buses that are no more than 25 years old and are transferred to another LEA eligible for a ZEV extension.
- 6) Requires the Department of General Services to establish statewide contracts for ZEV schoolbuses that incorporate “high road” labor standards related to wages, training, classification, benefits, and worker protections.

## ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Expands extension eligibility for the ZEV purchase mandate to include “small school districts” with fewer than 2,501 ADA, in addition to existing eligibility for frontier LEAs.
- 2) Authorizes new reasons for granting ZEV mandate extensions, including:
  - a) Lack of sufficient charging or fueling infrastructure.
  - b) Lack of access to qualified repair and maintenance services.
- 3) Allows annual extensions for small school districts from 2040 to 2045 under the same conditions currently afforded to frontier LEAs.
- 4) Permits limited reuse of replaced fossil-fuel schoolbuses instead of mandatory scrapping, if both of the following apply:
  - a) The bus is no more than 25 years old at the time of ZEV delivery.
  - b) Ownership is transferred to an LEA eligible for an extension.
- 5) Requires LEAs requesting extensions to demonstrate that their daily schoolbus routes cannot feasibly be served by available ZEV technology.

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “In 2023, the Legislature passed and the Governor signed into law California’s mandate to convert its school buses to zero-emission vehicles by 2035. This new requirement recognized that some areas of the state faced barriers to implementation that required more consideration such as terrain and route constraints in rural areas and gave more time for compliance to accommodate these areas. Unfortunately, not all barriers to the implementation of this requirement were given full consideration at the time of its passage.

“School districts, especially those in rural areas, attempting to prepare for the 2035 deadline have encountered serious limitations in existing electrical infrastructure to support needed charging stations and concerns regarding the

capacity of local firefighters to deal with burning electric vehicle batteries. Additionally, the pending zero-emission requirement has led school bus manufacturers to wind down diesel bus production, making it difficult if not impossible for districts that qualify for a longer implementation period to find busses to operate during that extra time. AB 1111 seeks to give districts both additional time to meet California's new zero emission standards, a more robust consideration of which districts are not ready due to limited electrical infrastructure or fire protection and allows school districts making the switch to zero emission busses early to furnish their still functional decommissioned busses to districts unable to make the switch at this time. This will ensure a smoother transition to zero-emission buses for California's schools and reduce disruptions in school transportation services for California's students."

- 2) ***Balancing decarbonization goals with on-the-ground implementation realities.*** The 2035 zero-emission schoolbus (ZEV) mandate represents an ambitious and important step in the state's broader climate and public health agenda. However, this bill reflects an emerging consensus that the path to implementation is more complex for some communities than others. Many small and rural districts face unique challenges, including insufficient charging infrastructure, limited grid capacity, and long or topographically difficult routes that are not yet well served by current electric bus technology. By expanding the scope of allowable extensions and including infrastructure and maintenance availability as qualifying constraints, this bill aims to provide a more workable pathway for these districts to comply without sacrificing transportation access for students.
- 3) ***Implications of modifying the schoolbus scrapping requirement.*** Current law generally requires schoolbuses replaced through the state's HVIP program to be scrapped within 24 months to prevent continued use of older, polluting vehicles. This bill introduces a narrow exception allowing LEAs to transfer buses (under 25 years old) to another LEA that qualifies for an extension. While this change may help districts that are struggling to procure usable vehicles in the interim, it also prolongs the operational life of older buses—some of which may lack seatbelts or other modern safety features. CARB estimates that 726 buses could remain in circulation under this provision, with nearly 40% lacking seatbelts. Policymakers must weigh whether the potential transportation continuity benefits justify the associated safety trade-offs.
- 4) ***Unintended market disruptions in the zero-emission transition.*** One motivation behind this bill is the growing difficulty LEAs face in obtaining new diesel or compressed natural gas (CNG) buses, even where they remain temporarily authorized. As the market increasingly shifts toward ZEVs in anticipation of the 2035 deadline, manufacturers are reducing production of fossil-fuel models. This may disadvantage LEAs that qualify for extensions but cannot find compliant vehicles to use during the additional time. While this bill attempts to ease this bottleneck by preserving certain buses for continued use, the state may need to consider a broader strategy to ensure that the market for transitional vehicles remains functional during the ZEV ramp-up.

- 5) ***Preserving policy coherence in California’s climate strategy.*** Several environmental groups have expressed concern that the bill weakens the state’s climate leadership by extending the life of fossil-fueled vehicles and delaying full ZEV compliance for some districts until 2045. They argue that diesel buses pose well-documented risks to children’s health and that cleaner alternatives are increasingly available. Supporters counter that the bill merely refines—not repeals—the existing policy, by ensuring that districts with legitimate technical or logistical barriers are not penalized or left without viable transportation options. As with many clean-energy transitions, the challenge lies in maintaining a strong overall policy signal while allowing flexibility for edge cases.
- 6) ***ZEV bus deployment is accelerating—but disparities remain.*** Recent state and federal investments in schoolbus electrification have been substantial. California alone has committed more than \$1 billion in grant funding since 2022, prioritizing small and rural districts and those with the oldest diesel fleets. Yet the uptake of ZEV buses has been uneven. According to CARB, only about 3% of California’s schoolbuses are currently electric, and many of the districts with the highest needs also face the steepest implementation hurdles. This bill does not undermine the ZEV mandate but recognizes that achieving it equitably may require more than a one-size-fits-all timeline.

## **SUPPORT**

California School Boards Association (Sponsor)  
Association of California School Administrators  
California Association of School Business Officials  
San Bernardino County District Advocates for Better Schools  
Small School Districts Association

## **OPPOSITION**

California Electric Transportation Coalition

-- END --

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

**Bill No:** AB 1224 **Hearing Date:** July 2, 2025  
**Author:** Valencia  
**Version:** May 1, 2025  
**Urgency:** No **Fiscal:** Yes  
**Consultant:** Ian Johnson

**Subject:** Teacher credentialing: substitute teachers: days of service.

## SUMMARY

This bill permanently authorizes substitute teachers holding any credential or permit issued by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) to serve in a substitute teaching assignment aligned with their authorization for up to 60 cumulative days for any one assignment, provided certain recruitment conditions are met.

## BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Emergency 30-Day Substitute Teaching Permit, allowing holders to substitute for no more than 30 days per assignment (20 days for special education).
- 2) Allows holders of Emergency Career Substitute Permits to serve for up to 60 days per assignment.
- 3) Temporarily authorized (until July 1, 2024) any credentialed substitute to serve up to 60 cumulative days in one assignment due to pandemic-related teacher shortages.
- 4) Allows districts to request waivers from the CTC for credentialing requirements in special circumstances.
- 5) Establishes the Teaching Permit for Statutory Leave (TPSL), allowing temporary assignments covering statutory leaves (medical, parental, military) with required training and support.

## ANALYSIS

This bill indefinitely authorizes a holder of a substitute teaching permit or credential issued by the CTC to serve as a substitute teacher in a general, special education, or career technical education assignment aligned with their permit or credential authorization, including for staff vacancies, for up to 60 cumulative days for any one assignment, if the local educational agency (LEA):

- 1) Has entered into a collective bargaining agreement with the employee organization that includes a specific process for assigning substitute teachers, or
- 2) Has both:
  - a) Employed all available and suitable substitute teachers holding a TPSL if substituting for teachers on statutory leave; and
  - b) Made reasonable efforts to recruit a fully credentialed teacher.

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “AB 1224 seeks to provide better continuity for students by allowing substitute teachers to remain in the classroom for up to 60 days. The increased flexibility will reduce classroom instability and learning disruptions that affect students with disabilities the most. With greater stability in the classroom, students are able to establish rapport with their substitute teacher, leading to better educational outcomes. While in recent years the Legislature has made efforts to strengthen the teacher workforce, the persistent shortages exacerbate the demand for substitute teachers. In the face of an unprecedented educational workforce shortage, every tool should be utilized to help provide the best educational outcomes for California’s students.”
- 2) ***From Emergency Flexibility to Permanent Policy: Context Still Matters.*** During the COVID-19 pandemic, the Legislature temporarily authorized substitute teachers to serve in a single assignment for up to 60 cumulative days—double the usual 30-day cap, or 20 days in special education. That policy was a crisis response, justified by sudden, widespread absences and enacted with clear sunset provisions.

This bill proposes to make that emergency authority permanent. But unlike the earlier policy, this bill contains no sunset, no training requirement, no oversight trigger, and no quality assurance measures. As the CTC notes, if this is truly a response to temporary staffing challenges, why remove all temporal constraints and programmatic guardrails?

The reality is that some districts face persistent shortages and are cycling through substitutes every 30 days. For students, especially in high-need schools, this turnover is undeniably destabilizing. But continuity without instructional quality is not an adequate answer—particularly when many of the students served by long-term substitutes are those most reliant on consistent, skilled instruction: students with disabilities, English learners, low-income students, and students of color.

The key policy question, then, is not just whether 60-day coverage is better than frequent turnover—but what kind of 60-day coverage the state is willing to permit? Are we comfortable offering students a substitute with no training, no instructional oversight, and no subject-matter guidance for one-third of the school year? And if not, what amendments would make this bill a justifiable temporary fix rather than a quiet surrender to long-term staffing inequity?

- 3) ***Shortage Conditions Are Real—but the Root Problems Persist.*** California’s educator shortage is not hypothetical. The state has seen steep declines in teacher preparation program enrollment and an overreliance on emergency or alternative credentialing. According to the Learning Policy Institute, credentialed teacher preparation completions in California have dropped by more than 50% since 2004, and substandard credentials now comprise over half of all new teaching authorizations.

However, data from the CTC suggests this is not simply a supply problem. Over 150,000 individuals currently hold valid substitute teaching permits but are not working in classrooms, and another 10,000 permits were issued in the past year alone. While some of these permit holders may have retired, left the workforce, or opted out for personal reasons, the data suggest that recruitment, support, and compensation—not raw numbers—may be the driving factors behind classroom shortages.

This bill may alleviate symptoms, but without broader structural action, it risks becoming a policy crutch. The danger is that it relieves pressure to fix the systemic conditions that make teaching and substitute teaching unattractive—even to those already credentialed.

- 4) ***Instructional Quality and Equity Are at the Core.*** Research consistently shows that teacher quality—not just presence—is the most significant school-based factor affecting student achievement. As Linda Darling-Hammond and others have found, teacher preparation and pedagogical skills are especially critical for supporting the learning of students with disabilities, English learners, and low-income students.

Substitute teachers holding only emergency permits typically lack this preparation. Without safeguards like training, mentoring, or structured instructional support, extending their placements may offer superficial continuity while undermining deeper learning. As Public Advocates and CTA have pointed out, this creates particular concern for students who most need expert, consistent instruction—and risks contravening legal standards, including those articulated in *Williams v. California*.

- 5) ***Oversight and Incentives Must Be Aligned.*** A key policy inconsistency raised by the CTC is that credentialed teachers assigned outside of their authorized subject area for more than 30 days must be reported as misassignments and are subject to oversight, whereas substitute teachers serving for up to 60 days under this bill would not trigger any such reporting. This imbalance could unintentionally incentivize local educational agencies (LEAs) to place long-term substitutes in classrooms instead of pursuing credentialed placements, potentially weakening teacher quality and accountability frameworks.

This sends a conflicting message: that trained, credentialed teachers must be carefully monitored—while long-term substitute placements proceed without similar scrutiny.

- 6) ***The State Invests Hundreds of Millions on Teacher Recruitment and Retention.*** To be evaluated fairly, this bill should be viewed within the broader context of the state’s sustained and substantial investments in addressing California’s teacher shortage. This bill offers stopgap flexibility—but it does so alongside a range of programs that reflect the state’s long-term commitment to strengthening the educator pipeline.

Major state-funded initiatives include:

- a) *Golden State Teacher Grant Program* (\$101 million ongoing): Provides up to \$20,000 in scholarships to teacher preparation candidates who commit to teaching in priority schools for four years. This program is designed to attract and retain teachers in high-need subject areas and communities.
- b) *Paid Student Teaching Stipends* (\$25 million one-time in 2023–24): Offers financial support to student teachers completing required clinical practice, a known barrier to credential completion for many candidates, particularly those from underrepresented backgrounds.
- c) *Teacher Residency Grants* (\$250 million one-time since 2021): Funds intensive, year-long residencies that pair candidates with mentor teachers in high-need districts. These programs have been linked to stronger preparation and retention outcomes.
- d) *National Board Certification Incentives* (\$10 million ongoing): Supports experienced teachers pursuing advanced certification, with incentives shown to improve instructional quality and promote teacher retention.
- e) *“Grow Your Own” Teacher Pipeline Programs* (approximately \$20 million to date): Help LEAs build sustainable local pipelines by supporting paraeducators, classified staff, and students as they move into credential programs—often returning to serve the same communities.

These investments reflect a long-term commitment to raising instructional quality and equity. This bill must be understood as a limited tool—one that relieves short-term pressure without undermining long-term goals.

- 7) ***This Bill Adds a Tool—But What About the Tools They Already Have?*** If this bill is intended to give districts one more option to address staffing shortages, it’s worth asking: how does it relate to the tools districts already have? And if those existing tools are underutilized or perceived as burdensome, should the policy response be to lower standards—or to streamline and support high-quality options?

Today, LEAs already have multiple structured pathways for staffing classrooms when fully credentialed teachers are not available:

- a) *Short-Term Staff Permits (STSPs) and Provisional Intern Permits (PIPs)*, for candidates who are nearly credentialed and committed to completing requirements.



- b) *Variable Term Waivers*, which require governing board approval and documented evidence of unsuccessful recruitment.
- c) *Teaching Permits for Statutory Leave (TPSLs)*, which authorize longer-term substitute placements when the teacher of record is on statutory leave—and require that the substitute receive support, mentoring, and basic training in pedagogy, special education, and classroom management.
- d) *Emergency Career Substitute Permits*, which authorize extended substitute assignments for individuals with prior substitute experience and district sponsorship.
- e) *Internship programs*, often supported by state grants, that place teacher candidates in classrooms under supervision while they complete credentialing coursework.

These pathways involve documentation, recruitment, and training—requirements grounded in the principle that flexibility should not come at the expense of instructional quality.

- 8) ***Committee Amendments to Address Transparency, Oversight, and Legislative Intent.*** As currently drafted, this bill would provide ongoing authority for LEAs to assign substitute teachers to a single classroom for up to 60 cumulative days—double the current statutory limits of 30 days for general education and 20 days for special education—without using structured substitute permit pathways. While this may help districts respond to persistent vacancies, it raises concerns around transparency, oversight, and erosion of existing standards.

If the state is to authorize a lower-bar assignment option for substitute teachers, it should do so with careful guardrails and a clear articulation of legislative values. Specifically, the bill should reinforce the state’s long-standing preference for fully credentialed teachers and high-quality alternative permits, ensure that the public and oversight bodies are aware when the new flexibility is used, and make clear that existing pathways remain operative.

To that end, ***staff recommends amending the bill*** as follows:

- a) Add legislative findings affirming the state’s preference for fully credentialed teachers and clarifying that this bill is intended as a temporary stopgap when higher-quality options are unavailable.
- b) Include legislative intent language encouraging the CTC to review whether existing substitute permit options—such as the TPSL and Emergency Career Substitute Permit—could be made more responsive to LEA needs, while clarifying that the CTC already has full regulatory authority to make such changes.

- c) Require school districts and charter schools to seek governing board approval for assignments exceeding 20 days (for special education) or 30 days, or, in cases of urgent need, present an informational report at the next regular board meeting.
- d) Establish a parallel requirement for COEs to provide quarterly informational reports to county boards, recognizing their different governance structure.
- e) Clarify that the bill does not affect existing permit requirements for STSPs, PIPs, or TPSLs.
- f) Require LEAs to report usage of this authority via the California Statewide Assignment Accountability System (CalSAAS), to support public oversight and state-level monitoring.
- g) Add a sunset date of January 1, 2029, establishing this as a time-limited flexibility aligned with the CTC's planned review of emergency permits.

These amendments were initially developed with technical assistance from the CTC. While the Commission has since expressed a preference to step back from these provisions in favor of broader regulatory reforms, staff believes the proposed amendments remain responsive to the key issues raised, strike a reasonable balance between flexibility and accountability, and preserve essential legislative oversight.

**SUPPORT**

Association of California School Administrators (Co-Sponsor)  
California Association of School Business Officials (Co-Sponsor)  
California County Superintendents (Co-Sponsor)  
California School Boards Association (Co-Sponsor)  
Alameda County Office of Education  
Alameda Unified School District  
Berkeley Unified School District  
California Association of Suburban School Districts  
California Charter Schools Association  
California State PTA  
Castro Valley Unified School District  
Central Valley Education Coalition  
Clovis Unified School District  
Coalition for Adequate Funding for Special Education  
Contra Costa County Office of Education  
Corona-Norco Unified School District  
Dublin Unified School District  
Eden Area Regional Occupational Program  
Eden Area ROP  
Fremont Unified School District  
Los Angeles County Office of Education  
Los Angeles Unified School District

New Haven Unified School District  
Oakland Unified School District  
Office of the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools  
Orange County Board of Education  
Orange County Department of Education  
Orange County District Superintendents Organization  
Pleasanton Unified School District  
Riverside County Public K-12 School District Superintendents  
San Bernardino County District Advocates for Better Schools  
San Diego Unified School District  
San Francisco Unified School District  
San Joaquin County Office of Education  
School Employers Association of California  
SELPA Administrators of California  
Small School Districts Association  
Sunol Glen Unified School District  
United Administrators of Southern California  
Vallejo City Unified School District

**OPPOSITION**

California Teachers Association  
Public Advocates

**-- END --**

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

<b>Bill No:</b>	AB 1230	<b>Hearing Date:</b>	July 2, 2025
<b>Author:</b>	Bonta		
<b>Version:</b>	April 21, 2025		
<b>Urgency:</b>	No	<b>Fiscal:</b>	Yes
<b>Consultant:</b>	Therresa Austin		

**Subject:** Pupil discipline: expulsions: procedures.

## SUMMARY

This bill makes several changes to the components and procedures for the development and review of a rehabilitation plan for a student who is subject to an expulsion order. The bill also specifies data collection and reporting requirements related to expulsions for school districts and county offices of education (COEs).

## BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Prohibits a student from being suspended from school or recommended for expulsion, unless the superintendent of the school district or the principal of the school determines that the student has committed any of the following offenses while on school grounds, while going to or coming from school, or during the lunch period whether on or off campus, or during or while going to or coming from a school-sponsored activity:
  - a) Causing, attempting to cause, or threatening to cause physical injury to another person, or willfully using force or violence upon another person, except in self-defense;
  - b) Possessing, selling, or otherwise furnishing a firearm, knife, explosive, or other dangerous object, unless the student had obtained prior written permission to possess the item;
  - c) Unlawfully possessing, using, selling, or otherwise furnishing a controlled substance;
  - d) Unlawfully offering, arranging, or negotiating to sell a controlled substance, an alcoholic beverage, or an intoxicant of any kind;
  - e) Committing or attempting to commit robbery or extortion;
  - f) Causing or attempting to cause damage to school property or private property;
  - g) Stealing or attempting to steal school property or private property;

- h) Possessing or using tobacco or products containing tobacco or nicotine products;
  - i) Committing an obscene act or engaging in habitual profanity or vulgarity;
  - j) Unlawfully possessing or unlawfully offering, arranging, or negotiating to sell drug paraphernalia;
  - k) Knowingly receiving stolen school property or private property;
  - l) Possessing an imitation firearm;
  - m) Committing or attempting to commit a sexual assault or sexual battery;
  - n) Harassing, threatening, or intimidating a student who is a complaining witness or a witness in a school disciplinary proceeding in order to prevent the student from being a witness or retaliating against that student for being a witness, or both;
  - o) Unlawfully offering, arranging to sell, or negotiating to sell the prescription drug Soma;
  - p) Engaging in or attempting to engage in hazing;
  - q) Engaging in the act of bullying, including bullying committed by means of an electronic act;
  - r) Committing sexual harassment;
  - s) Causing, attempting to cause, threatening to cause, or participating in an act of hate violence;
  - t) Intentionally engaging in harassment, threats, or intimidation directed against school personnel or students that is sufficiently severe or pervasive to have the actual and reasonably expected effect of materially disrupting classwork, creating substantial disorder, and invading the rights of school personnel or students by creating an intimidating or hostile educational environment; or
  - u) Making terroristic threats against school officials or school property or both. (Education Code (EC) §§ 48900, 48900.2, 48900.3, 48900.4, 48900.7)
- 2) Requires the principal or superintendent of schools to recommend the expulsion of a student for any of the following acts committed at school or at a school activity off school grounds, unless it is determined that the expulsion should not be recommended under the circumstances or that an alternative means of correction would address the conduct:
- a) Causing serious physical injury to another person, except in self-defense;

- b) Possession of any knife or other dangerous object of no reasonable use to the student;
  - c) Unlawful possession of any controlled substance, as specified;
  - d) Robbery or extortion; and
  - e) Assault or battery, as defined, upon any school employee. (EC § 48915)
- 3) Requires that a decision to expel a student, based on any of the grounds in (2) be based on a finding that other means of correction are not feasible or have repeatedly failed to bring about proper conduct; and/or due to the nature of the act, the presence of the student causes a continuing danger to the physical safety of the student or others. (EC § 48915)
- 4) Requires the principal or superintendent of schools to immediately suspend and recommend expulsion of a student who has committed any of the following acts at school, or at a school activity off school grounds:
- a) Possessing, selling, or otherwise furnishing a firearm;
  - b) Brandishing a knife at another person.
  - c) Unlawfully selling a controlled substance, as specified;
  - d) Committing or attempting to commit a sexual assault; or
  - e) Possession of an explosive. (EC § 48915)
- 5) Requires the governing board of a school district to establish rules and regulations governing procedures for the expulsion of students, which must include, among other items, all of the following:
- a) The student's right to a closed session hearing within 30 schooldays to determine whether they should be expelled conducted by the governing board of the school district or under contract with a county hearing officer or the Office of Administrative Hearings;
  - b) Within 10 schooldays of the hearing, the school district must decide whether to expel the student unless the student requests a postponement, or within 40 days under specified conditions;
  - c) The provision of written notice of the hearing to be provided to the student at least 10 calendar days prior and must include the date and place of the hearing; the specific facts and charges; the school district's disciplinary rules; parent/guardian/student's obligations; the right to be represented by legal counsel, to inspect and obtain copies of all documents to be used at the hearing, to confront and question all witnesses who testify at the hearing, to question all other evidence presented, and to present oral and documentary evidence on the pupil's behalf, including witnesses;

- d) Final action to expel a student must be taken by the governing board of the school district in a public session, and written notice must be provided to the student or the student's parent or guardian and be accompanied by all of the following: a notice of the right to appeal the expulsion to the county board of education; notice of the education alternative placement to be provided to the student during the period of the expulsion; and the obligation of the parent, guardian, or the student to inform the new school district of the student's expulsion.
  - e) The maintenance of records of each expulsion, including the cause for expulsion, which must be recorded in the student's interim record and forwarded to any school in which the student subsequently enrolls upon request. (EC § 48918)
- 6) Requires the governing board to ensure that an educational program is provided to a student who is subject to an expulsion order for the period of the expulsion; authorizes any educational program provided to expelled students to be operated by the school district, the county superintendent of schools, or a consortium of districts, or in joint agreement with the county; prohibits the educational program being provided to be situated on the grounds of the school from which the student was expelled; and prohibits the program offered to a student expelled from kindergarten to grade 6 to be combined with a program offered to students in grades 7 to 12. (EC § 48916.1)
- 7) Requires that an expulsion order remains in effect until the governing board orders the readmission of the student; requires the board to set a date not later the last day of the semester following the semester in which the expulsion occurred, when the student is to be reviewed for readmission to a school maintained by the district; requires the governing board to recommend a plan of rehabilitation for the student at the time of the expulsion order, which may include recommendations for improved academic performance, tutoring, special education assessments, job training, counseling, employment, community service, or other rehabilitative programs; requires, upon completion of the readmission process, the board to readmit the student unless they find that the student has not met the conditions of the rehabilitation plan or continues to pose a danger to campus safety or to other students or employees of the school district; requires if the board denies readmission of an expelled student, they must continue the placement of the student in the alternative educational program originally selected, or place the student in another program serving expelled students, including a county community school. (EC § 48916)
- 8) Requires each school district to maintain the following data and to report this data as a part of the coordinated compliance review, if requested by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI):
- a) The number of pupils recommended for expulsion;
  - b) The grounds for each recommended expulsion;

- c) Whether the pupil was subsequently expelled;
  - d) Whether the expulsion order was suspended;
  - e) The type of referral made after the expulsion; and
  - f) The disposition of the pupil after the end of the period of expulsion. (EC § 48916.1)
- 9) Defines “expulsion” as the removal of a student from the immediate supervision and control, or the general supervision, of school personnel. (EC § 48925)
- 10) Requires each county superintendent of schools in counties that operate community schools to develop a plan for providing education services to all expelled students in that county, identify existing educational alternatives for expelled students, identify gaps in services, and identify strategies for filling those gaps. Also requires the plan to identify alternative placements for students who fail to meet the rehabilitation plan or who pose a danger to other district students. Requires these plans be submitted to the SPI no later than June 30, 1997, and be updated and submitted every three years thereafter. (EC § 48926)

## ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Requires the governing board of a school district to recommend a plan of rehabilitation for a student at the time of the expulsion order that includes an assessment for readmission at least 45 days before the end of the expulsion term.
- 2) Requires the rehabilitation plan to be developed in consultation with school personnel who have knowledge or special expertise regarding the pupil and is tailored to the student’s individual needs, and addresses the student’s behavior that led to the expulsion.
- 3) Requires the governing board of a school district to assist the student in locating opportunities accessible to the student that are necessary to complete the requirements of the rehabilitation plan, including but not limited to, opportunities for counseling and community services.
- 4) Prohibits the governing board of the school district from requiring the student or their parent or guardian, to pay for any costs necessary to complete a plan for rehabilitation.
- 5) Requires the governing board of the school district to adopt rules and regulations establishing a procedure for the transition process for readmitted pupils.



- 6) Requires the governing board, in the rehabilitation review procedure to include an indication of whether or not the student had access to the necessary resources to complete their rehabilitation plan.
- 7) Prohibits the denial of a student's request for readmission on the basis of a rehabilitation plan not being completed due to financial or transportation barriers or a lack of viable opportunities to complete the plan.
- 8) Removes as a condition to deny readmission that the student continues to pose a danger to campus safety or to other pupils or employees of the school district.
- 9) Requires the governing board to readmit a student upon the completion of the readmission review process, unless the governing board makes a finding that a student:
  - a) Has not substantially met the conditions of the rehabilitation plan despite having access to the necessary resources to complete their rehabilitation plan; or
  - b) Continues to exhibit documented behaviors that led to the expulsion or is documented to have committed one or more new acts during the expulsion term that would make the student eligible for another expulsion.
- 10) Authorizes the expulsion term of a student to be extended for one semester at a time, if the student is not readmitted pursuant to #9 above. If the student has not been readmitted, the student shall be reassessed for readmission, pursuant to the procedures developed by the governing board.
- 11) Requires the governing board to review educational options for expelled students with the student and their family before the expulsion order is finalized, and requires that the initial referral of the student for enrollment in an educational program be completed within two days after the expulsion.
- 12) Adds to the outcome data that a school district must maintain pertaining to expulsions, all of the following:
  - a) The disposition of the pupil after the end of the period of expulsion, including the completion of a rehabilitation plan or the successful readmission of the pupil, or both; and
  - b) The average length of expulsions ordered each school year.
- 13) Removes reference to a penalty for non-reporting as the relevant cross-section has been repealed.
- 14) Requires the COE to notify the school district if they are unable to serve the expelled students, and requires, upon such notification, the school district to ensure that another educational program is provided to the student, and requires

that the school district review the educational options available with the student and their parent or guardian.

- 15) Expands the requirements of the triennial plan update that each county superintendent of schools that operates community schools must develop, to include the provision of services that may be required in an expelled student's individualized education program (IEP) or 504 plan. Also requires the plan to additionally do the following:
  - a) Identify multiple educational programs and services;
  - b) Outline a timely readmission process after the expulsion term is complete; and
  - c) Describe the steps to be taken by the school district, in collaboration with the COE, to support the successful transition of a student upon readmission.

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, "AB 1230 strengthens expulsion rehabilitation plans to ensure that California's most vulnerable students receive the support they need to return to their home schools. In 2023-24, over 4,000 students were expelled. These students are some of our most underserved and at highest risk for poor academic outcomes. Without meaningful rehabilitation, these students risk falling into the school-to-prison pipeline, leading to lower academic achievement and higher incarceration rates. This bill ensures that rehabilitation plans are tailored to students' needs, removes financial and transportation barriers, and limits prolonged expulsion terms. It also mandates clear readmission pathways, transition support, and the use of expulsion data to improve district policies. AB 1230 prioritizes education over exclusion, providing expelled students with the resources necessary to succeed."
- 2) ***When is a student recommended for expulsion?*** Expulsion is the most serious disciplinary action a school administrator may recommend and a school district may impose on a student. Expulsion can only occur through the action of the school district governing board, but administrators have an important role in recommending expulsion. Due process procedures for student expulsion are outlined in EC § 48915, which categorizes the types of offenses that require an expulsion recommendation and those that do not. If an administrator does recommend expulsion for a specified offense, a student is entitled to a hearing within 30 school days after that determination unless the student or their parents or guardians request in writing that the hearing be postponed.
- 3) ***Expulsion Rehabilitation Plans.*** The body of law governing expulsion rehabilitation plans, EC § 48916, is objectively sparse when recognizing how consequential the design and completion of the plan may be in an expelled student's educational journey. At the time that an expulsion is ordered against a student, existing law requires the governing board of the student's home school to set a date upon which the student shall be reviewed for readmission and

recommend a plan of rehabilitation for the student. Upon completion of the readmission process, the governing board must readmit the student unless the board makes a finding that the student has not met the conditions of their rehabilitation plan or they continue to pose a danger to campus safety or other students or employees of the school district. The law authorizes the rehabilitation plan to include a periodic review, an assessment at the time of review for readmission, and recommendations for improved academic performance, tutoring, special education assessments, job training, counseling, employment, community service, or other rehabilitative programs. Beyond these authorizations, existing law provides no structure for creating a student-centered rehabilitation plan.

According to the bill's co-sponsor, the Alameda County Office of Education:

*“Current law offers very limited guidance to school districts regarding the development of rehabilitation plans to support the successful return of expelled students to their home district school or appropriate alternative. At present, plans may fail to address specific behaviors that led to the expulsion or may not be tailored to the needs of the student. Currently, plans may require services the student must complete at the family’s expense or include community service requirements without access to transportation.*

*“AB 1230 will support improved outcomes for expelled students by requiring that rehabilitation plans address the behavior leading to the expulsion and are responsive to the student’s needs, and that districts provide students and their families with vital information regarding program enrollment and readmission following expulsion...”*

- 4) **California’s efforts to reduce expulsion and disproportionate discipline in schools.** Notably, EC § 48916, which governs rehabilitation plans, has not been substantively amended since 1995 and, therefore, has not benefited from the best practices and strategies for addressing student behavior that have emerged over the last 30 years. These include:
  - 5)
    - a) Restorative justice practices contribute to the development of a positive school climate and discipline policies that are humanistic and inclusive, while increasing student voice and engagement.
    - b) Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) encourages local educational agencies (LEAs) to establish and align school-wide, data-driven systems of academic and behavioral supports to more effectively meet the needs of California’s diverse learners in the most inclusive environment.
    - c) Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS) is a school-wide approach to discipline that is intended to create safe, predictable, and positive school environments.
- 6) **Countywide Plans for Provision of Educational Services to Expelled Students.** Existing law requires each county superintendent of schools, in

conjunction with superintendents of the school districts within the county, to develop a plan for providing educational services to all expelled students in that county and to submit the plan to the SPI. These plans must be updated every three years (triennially).

The plan must enumerate existing educational alternatives for expelled students, identify gaps in educational services for expelled students, and outline strategies for filling those service gaps. The plan shall also identify alternative placements for students who are expelled and placed in district community day school programs but who fail to meet the terms and conditions of their rehabilitation plan or who pose a danger to other district pupils, as determined by the governing board.

On December 2023, the California Department of Education (CDE) issued a letter to county and district superintendents and charter school administrators offering further recommendations on what the countywide plans should address in the most recent 2024 plan:

- a) As part of the required list of educational alternatives available for expelled students, schools were also encouraged to describe strategies for improvement during the next three years, including:
  - i) Any behavioral intervention practices at the site and district levels, and options used to:
    - 1) Minimize the number of suspensions leading to expulsions;
    - 2) Minimize the number of expulsions being ordered; and
    - 3) Support students returning from expulsions.
  - ii) Specific explanation of how those practices relate to any disproportionate representation of minority students in such interventions.
- b) As part of the required list of gaps in educational services and strategies for filling them, schools are encouraged to include the following information regarding the implementation of strategies outlined for filling those service gaps:
  - i) Were the strategies successful or not? Please explain why and how they were or were not successful.
  - ii) Were any additional strategies implemented? If so, explain why and how they were or were not successful.
  - iii) For strategies that were not successful, describe any additional measure(s) or approach(es) taken, and the outcome(s).

*This bill would additionally require the countywide plans to do the following:*

- i) *Outline a timely readmission process after the expulsion term is complete; and*
- ii) *Describe the steps to be taken by the school district, in collaboration with the COE, to support the successful transition of a student upon readmission.*

7) **Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) State Priority: Pupil Engagement.**

One of the eight state priorities required to be addressed in the LCAP is school climate, measured by suspension rates, expulsion rates, and other local measures, including surveys of students, parents, and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness. In their LCAPs, school districts, county offices of education and charter schools must explain their actions to achieve their goals for each state priority, including goals for reducing suspension rates.

8) **Author amendments to be taken as committee amendments.** Based on stakeholder feedback, the author wishes, and the committee agrees that the bill be amended as follows:

- a) Clarify that the assessment required to be included within the plan of rehabilitation is a *preliminary* assessment for readmission.
- b) Authorize the rehabilitation plan to be developed in consultation with school personnel who have knowledge or special expertise regarding the student, rather than requiring their consultation.
- c) Clarify that the governing board shall not require the student or their parent or guardian to pay for any costs or services the governing board determines to be necessary for the student to complete a plan of rehabilitation.
- d) Specify that a description of the readmission procedure shall be made available to the student and their parent or guardian at the *same time* that they are notified of the expulsion order.
- e) Clarify that the governing board shall readmit the student, unless the board makes a finding that the student (A) has not substantially met the conditions of the rehabilitation plan despite having access to the necessary resources and viable opportunities to complete their rehabilitation plan or continues to exhibit documented behaviors that the student was expelled for or is documented to have committed one or more new acts during the expulsion term that would make the student eligible for another expulsion. *This brings the standard in alignment with the indication that governing boards must make as part of the review of the rehabilitation plan.*
- f) Specify that before an expulsion order is finalized, the governing board shall **notify the student and their family of the available** educational options for expelled students, rather than simply requiring the governing board to review such options.

- g) Extend the timeline within which a governing board shall complete the initial referral of the student for enrollment in an educational program, from 2 days to 3 days.
- h) Adjust one of the outcome data points that a school district must collect, from “the average length of expulsions ordered each year,” to “the average length of *expulsion terms, including any extensions.*”

9) ***Prior and related legislation.***

AB 772 (Lowenthal, 2025) would require the CDE by June 30, 2026, to develop, post on its website, and distribute to LEAs, a model policy appropriate for schools serving grades 4 to 12 on how to address reported acts of cyberbullying occurring outside of school hours. Also requires LEAs to adopt the model policy by July 1, 2027, and to provide copies to staff, students, and parents. *AB 772 is pending in Senate Appropriations Committee.*

AB 2351 (Lowenthal, 2024) would have authorized a student to be suspended from school or recommended for expulsion on the basis of specified acts taking place outside of school hours, if specified conditions are met. *AB 2351 was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.*

AB 2711 (Ramos, Chapter 840, Statutes of 2024) prohibits the suspension of students enrolled in grades 1 to 12 who voluntarily disclose their use of a controlled substance, alcohol, an intoxicant of any kind, or tobacco, in order to seek help through services or supports. Applies this prohibition for students enrolled in charter schools.

AB 1984 (Weber, Chapter 368, Statutes of 2024) requires, commencing with the 2026-27 school year, LEAs to provide to the CDE data on student transfers due to disciplinary reasons, and the CDE to publish the information on their website. Requires the CDE, when providing guidance on its website about reducing disproportionate discipline of pupil subgroups in schools, to advise LEAs against the use of transfers to avoid reporting suspensions and expulsions.

SB 1445 (Cortese, Chapter 327, Statutes of 2024) authorizes a school district governing board, a charter school governing body, or an entity managing multiple charter schools, to allow student board members to make restorative justice recommendations that may be considered by the board or body in closed session expulsion hearings; and requires the board or body to provide limited case information to the student board member, subject to the approval of the student being considered for expulsion and their parent or guardian, and to relevant state and federal privacy protections.

SB 274 (Skinner, Chapter 597, Statutes of 2023) prohibits the suspension or expulsion of a student enrolled in grades 6 to 12 in a public school on the basis of willful defiance until July 1, 2029, authorizes employees to refer students to school administrators for in-school interventions or supports, and requires that

administrators document the actions taken in the student's record and inform the referring employee of those actions.

AB 599 (Ward, 2023) would have prohibited a pupil from being suspended or expelled from school for possessing or using tobacco or nicotine products beginning July 1, 2025. This bill would also have required the CDE to develop and make available a model policy for a public health approach to addressing student possession and use of drugs on school property by July 1, 2025. *AB 599 was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.*

AB 2598 (Weber, Chapter 914, Statutes of 2022) requires the CDE to develop and post on its website by June 1, 2024, evidence-based best practices for restorative justice practices for LEAs to implement to improve campus culture and climate.

AB 740 (McCarty, Chapter 400, Statutes of 2022) extends the parental notification requirements currently in place for a student's involuntary transfer to a continuation school, suspension, or expulsion, in the case of a foster child, to the foster child's attorney and social worker, and, in the case of an Indian child, the child's tribal social worker and county social worker.

SB 419 (Skinner, Chapter 279, Statutes of 2019) commencing July 1, 2020, extends the permanent prohibition against suspending a pupil enrolled in kindergarten or any of grades 1 to 3 for disrupting school activities or otherwise willfully defied the valid authority of school staff to include grades 4 and 5 permanently; and to include grades 6 to 8, inclusive, until July 1, 2025; and applies these prohibitions to charter schools.

AB 1808 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 32, Statutes of 2018) removed the sunset on the prohibition on suspending a student in kindergarten through grade 3, or recommending a student in kindergarten through grade 12 for expulsion, on the basis of willful defiance, making these prohibitions permanent.

AB 420 (Dickinson, Chapter 660, Statutes of 2014) eliminated the authority to suspend a pupil enrolled in kindergarten through grade 3, and the authority to recommend for expulsion a pupil enrolled in kindergarten through grade 12, for disrupting school activities or otherwise willfully defying the valid authority of school personnel engaged in the performance of their duties. These requirements sunset on July 1, 2018.

SB 1111 (Lara, Chapter 837, Statutes of 2014) requires parental consent for referrals to a county community school by a school attendance review board, school district, or probation department, except for situations where a student is expelled or pursuant to a court order. This bill also establishes the right of a student to reenroll in his/her former school or another school upon completion of the term of involuntary transfer to a county community school.

AB 1729 (Ammiano, Chapter 425, Statutes of 2012) reaffirmed that superintendents and school principals have the discretion to implement alternatives to suspension and expulsion and expanded the list of other means of

correction that must be implemented prior to suspension or expulsion to address most student misbehavior.

**SUPPORT**

Alameda County Office of Education (co-sponsor)  
National Center for Youth Law (co-sponsor)  
ACLU California Action  
Alameda County Board of Education  
California Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry  
California Alliance for Youth and Community Justice  
California Alliance of Child and Family Services  
California Faculty Association  
California School Employees Association  
California Youth Empowerment Network  
California-Hawaii State Conference of the NAACP  
East Bay Community Law Center  
EdVoice  
Los Angeles County Office of Education  
Oakland Unified School District  
Office of the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools  
Santa Clara County Office of Education  
Seneca Family of Agencies  
United Administrators of Southern California  
Youth Alliance

**OPPOSITION**

None received

**-- END --**



---

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

**Bill No:** AB 1264 **Hearing Date:** July 2, 2025  
**Author:** Gabriel  
**Version:** June 23, 2025  
**Urgency:** No **Fiscal:** Yes  
**Consultant:** Lynn Lorber

**Subject:** Pupil nutrition: particularly harmful ultraprocessed food: prohibition.

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

### SUMMARY

This bill (1) prohibits local educational agencies (LEAs) from selling “particularly harmful ultra-processed food” (UPF) or beverages, beginning July 1, 2035; (2) prohibits a vendor from offering particularly harmful UPF to a school, beginning January 1, 2032; and, (3) requires the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment to adopt, by July 1, 2026, regulations to define particularly harmful UPF.

### BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Requires LEAs, beginning with the 2022–23 school year, to make available a nutritionally adequate breakfast *and* a nutritionally adequate lunch free of charge and with adequate time to eat, during each schoolday to any student who requests a meal without consideration of the student’s eligibility for a federally funded free or reduced-price meal. (Education Code (EC) § 49501.5)
- 2) Requires meals to be nutritionally adequate meals that qualify for federal reimbursement (which means each meal must contain specific food components and meet specified nutritional standards). LEAs that participate in meal programs comply with federal regulations for the National School Lunch Program and School Breakfast Program and comply with state requirements for school meals. (EC § 49501.5)
- 3) Prohibits meals that do not meet federal requirements from being eligible for federal or state meal reimbursement, and prohibits meals that do not meet state requirements from being eligible for state meal reimbursement. (EC § 49501.5)
- 4) Defines “nutritionally adequate breakfast” and “nutritionally adequate lunch” as meals that qualify for reimbursement under the most current meal pattern for the federal School Breakfast Program or National School Lunch Program, and beginning December 31, 2027, does not contain any of the following substances (excluding food provided by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA))

Foods in Schools program:

- a) Blue 1 (CAS 3844-45-9);
  - b) Blue 2 (CAS 860-22-0);
  - c) Green 3 (CAS 2353-45-9);
  - d) Red 40 (CAS 25956-17-6);
  - e) Yellow 5 (CAS 1934-21-0); and,
  - f) Yellow 6 (CAS 2783-94-0). (EC § 49501.5)
- 5) Restricts the sale of “competitive food” (anything outside of the breakfast or lunch meal programs) in elementary schools and the sale of “competitive snack” in middle and high schools to fruit, vegetable, dairy, protein, or whole grain rich food items; foods with a fruit, vegetable, dairy, protein, or whole grain item as its first ingredient; or combination foods containing at least one-quarter cup of fruit or vegetable that meets the following standards:
- a) Not more than 35% of its total calories shall be from fat, excluding individually sold portions of nuts, nut butters, seeds, seed butters, reduced-fat cheese or part skim mozzarella cheese packaged for individual sale, eggs, fruits, vegetables that have not been deep fried, seafood, or a dried fruit and nut and seed combination;
  - b) Less than 10% of its total calories shall be from saturated fat, excluding reduced-fat cheese or part skim mozzarella cheese packaged for individual sale, eggs, nuts, nut butters, seeds, seed butters, or a dried fruit and nut and seed combination;
  - c) Not more than 35% of its total weight shall be composed of sugar, including naturally occurring and added sugar, excluding fruits, vegetables that have not been deep fried, or a dried fruit and nut and seed combination.
  - d) Contains less than 0.5 grams of trans fat per serving.
  - e) Contains not more than 200 milligrams of sodium per item, package, or container sold to a student.
  - f) Contains not more than 200 calories per individual food item. (EC § 49431)
- 6) Prohibits, beginning December 31, 2027, the sale of “competitive food” that contains any of the following substances:
- a) Blue 1 (CAS 3844-45-9);
  - b) Blue 2 (CAS 860-22-0);

- c) Green 3 (CAS 2353-45-9);
  - d) Red 40 (CAS 25956-17-6);
  - e) Yellow 5 (CAS 1934-21-0); and,
  - f) Yellow 6 (CAS 2783-94-0). (EC § 49431)
- 7) Similarly restricts the sale of a “competitive entrée” in middle or high schools, with the same prohibition on specified food dyes beginning December 31, 2027. (EC § 49431)
  - 8) Prohibits food sold outside of the federal meal programs from containing artificial trans fat. (EC § 49431.7)
  - 9) Defines “food additive” as any substance, the intended use of which results or may reasonably be expected to result, directly or indirectly, in the substance becoming a component of the food or otherwise affecting characteristics of the food. This includes any substance or radiation source intended for use in producing, manufacturing, packing, treating, packaging, transporting, or holding any food. (Health and Safety Code § 109940)

## ANALYSIS

This bill:

### *Schools*

- 1) Requires a school to begin to phase out particularly harmful UPF by January 1, 2028.
- 2) Prohibits schools, beginning July 1, 2035, from selling food and beverages that include particularly harmful UPF, as follows:
  - a) Prohibits elementary schools from selling entrées served as part of the federal National School Lunch Program and federal School Breakfast Program, and competitive entrees sold by any entity, that contain particularly UPF (excluding USDA commodities).
  - b) Prohibits middle schools and high schools from selling entrées served as part of the federal National School Lunch Program and federal School Breakfast Program, competitive entrées sold by any entity, and competitive snacks that contain particularly UPF (excluding USDA commodities).
  - c) Prohibits elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools from selling competitive beverages that contain particularly harmful UPF.
  - d) Prohibits food containing particularly harmful UPF (excluding USDA commodities) from being considered part of a “nutritionally adequate breakfast” or “nutritionally adequate lunch,” for purposes of meeting the

existing requirement to make available a nutritionally adequate breakfast and a nutritionally adequate lunch free of charge during each schoolday to any pupil who requests a meal.

- e) Expressly prohibits a nutritionally adequate breakfast or lunch (excluding USDA commodities) from including particularly harmful UPF.

*Regulations to define particularly harmful UPF*

- 3) Requires the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment to adopt regulations, by July 1, 2026, to define particularly harmful UPF that consider all of the following factors:
  - a) Whether the substance or group of substances are banned or restricted in other local, state, federal, or international jurisdictions due to concerns about adverse health consequences.
  - b) Whether the products include or require a warning label in other local, state, federal, or international jurisdictions due to concerns about adverse health consequences.
  - c) Whether, based on reputable peer-reviewed scientific evidence, a substance or group of substances are linked to health harms or adverse health consequences, including, but not limited to, any of the following:
    - i) Cancer.
    - ii) Cardiovascular disease.
    - iii) Metabolic disease.
    - iv) Developmental or behavioral issues.
    - v) Reproductive harm.
    - vi) Obesity.
    - vii) Type 2 diabetes.
    - viii) Other health harms associated with UPF consumption.
  - d) Whether, based on reputable peer-reviewed scientific evidence, a substance or group of substances may be hyperpalatable, or may contribute to food addiction.
  - e) Whether the food has been modified to be high in fat, sugar, or salt.
- 4) Requires the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment to adopt regulations to update the definition of a particularly harmful UPF every two years to accommodate any relevant advances in scientific knowledge, the development

of better agricultural or manufacturing practices, or other changes that require revision of the definition.

- 5) Requires the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment to adopt these regulations in consultation with the State Department of Public Health, the California Department of Education (CDE), the University of California, and all appropriate state agencies, after providing an opportunity for all interested parties to comment.
- 6) Authorizes the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment to seek information from other states, the federal government, and other nations to inform development of regulations.

### *Definitions*

- 7) Defines UPF as any food or beverage that contains one or more of the following substances:
  - a) Substances not available in the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Substances Added to Food database but having any of the following FDA-defined technical effects (as defined in specified sections of Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations):
    - i) Surface-active agents.
    - ii) Stabilizers and thickeners.
    - iii) Propellants, aerating agents, and gases.
    - iv) Colors and coloring adjuncts.
    - v) Emulsifiers and emulsifier salts.
    - vi) Flavoring agents and adjuvants, excluding spices and other natural seasonings and flavorings.
    - vii) Flavor enhancers, excluding spices and other natural seasonings and flavorings.
    - viii) Surface-finishing agents.
    - ix) Non-nutritive sweeteners.
  - b) Substances available in the FDA Substances Added to Food database that are designated as having any of the FDA-defined technical effects listed above, excluding spices and other natural seasonings and flavorings.
- 8) Defines “particularly harmful UPF” as an ultra-processed food product that is particularly harmful, as determined by regulations adopted by the Office of

## Environmental Health Hazard Assessment.

- 9) Defines “category of food” as the following food groups: fruits; vegetables; grains; cereals; beans, peas, and lentils; nuts, seeds, and soy products; beverages; dairy; seafood; poultry; meat; eggs; condiments; fats and oils; and, herbs and spices.
- 10) Defines “food product” as a finished product of food with a unique universal product code, other than food products reimbursed under the National School Lunch or Child Nutrition Act, and USDA commodities.

*Vendors*

- 11) Prohibits a vendor from offering particularly harmful UPF to a school, beginning January 1, 2032.
- 12) Requires any vendor of food or food products to a school to annually report the following information to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, by February 1, 2027, through February 1, 2032, annually thereafter, for each food product sold to a school in the past calendar year, to the extent it is known to the vendor:
  - a) The total quantity of that food product sold to schools.
  - b) The name of the food product.
  - c) Whether the food product is a UPF.
  - d) Whether the food product is a particularly harmful UPF.
  - e) The Global Trade Item Number (GTIN) of the food product, if applicable.
  - f) The category or categories of food to which the food product belongs.
  - g) The average total calories in each food product sold to schools that year.
  - h) The average price charged for each food product sold to schools that year.
  - i) The ingredient list of the food product.
  - j) The nutritional facts of the food product.
  - k) Estimates of the amount of UPF items sold or served to students on campus during the schoolday.
  - l) Estimates of the amount of competitive UPF sold to students on campus during the schoolday in elementary, middle, and high schools.

- 13) Exempts the following from reporting requirements:
- a) A cottage food operation that is registered or has a permit pursuant to existing Health and Safety Code statutes.
  - b) A microenterprise home kitchen, as defined in existing Health and Safety Code statutes.
  - c) A small business, as defined in existing Government Code statutes.

*Report to the Legislature*

- 14) Requires the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, in consultation with CDE and using information reported by vendors pursuant to #10 above, to annually submit to the Legislature, by July 1, 2027 through July 1, 2032, a written report containing all of the following information:
- a) A summary and analysis of information reported by vendors for the prior year.
  - b) A summary and analysis of the progress of the UPF phase-out required by this bill.
  - c) Estimates of the amount of foods that are not UPF items and are sold or served to students on campus during the schoolday in elementary, middle, and high schools.
  - d) Estimates of the portion of the average elementary school, middle school, and high school student's school food intake, in calories, that is composed of UPF.
  - e) A strategy for reducing the consumption of UPF and particularly harmful UPF in schools.
  - f) Analysis of the feasibility of reducing the sale or service of UPF and particularly harmful UPF in schools.
  - g) Any actions the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment or CDE plans to take regarding UPF and particularly harmful UPF.
  - h) Recommendations for state and local legislative actions that could reduce the consumption of UPF and particularly harmful UPF in schools.
- 15) Requires the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment to also submit this report to the Governor and post the report on its website.

*General provisions*

- 16) Provides that this bill does not prohibit a public entity from voluntarily enacting more stringent restrictions on UPF or particularly harmful UPF.
- 17) States legislative intent to reduce the consumption of UPF by the children of California, and to encourage schools and school districts to promote and provide healthier options in school meals in advance of the compliance dates specified in this bill. This bill further states legislative intent to prioritize California-grown products in school meals, which are among the healthiest and most nutritious available, meeting the highest standards for quality, safety, and sustainability.

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for this bill.*** According to the author, “AB 1264 is a first-in-the-nation measure that would extend California’s national leadership in food safety and school nutrition by phasing out “particularly harmful” ultra-processed foods (UPF) from school meals in California by 2032. AB 1264 would task state scientists – working in cooperation with leading experts from the University of California – with identifying ‘particularly harmful’ UPF based on scientific research linking them to cancer, cardiovascular disease, metabolic disorders, neurological or behavioral issues, and other health harms.

“Our public schools should not be serving students ultra-processed food products filled with chemical additives that can harm their physical and mental health and interfere with their ability to learn. In California, Democrats and Republicans are joining forces to prioritize the health and safety of our children and we are proud to be leading the nation with a bipartisan, science-based approach. California schools are projected to provide over 1 billion meals this school year and this new legislation will ensure that schools are serving our students the healthy, nutritious meals they need and deserve.”

- 2) ***Practical effect for LEAs.*** Existing law prohibits schools from selling food that contains more than 0.5 grams of trans fat per serving, soda, beverages that contain caffeine, and beginning December 31, 2027, any food or beverage containing specified dyes. This bill further prohibits schools from selling, beginning July 1, 2035, any food or beverage that contains particularly harmful UPF (but does not prohibit the sale of UPF that are not “particularly harmful”).

Schools generally purchase the bulk of their food from the USDA Foods in Schools program, also known as commodities. Schools supplement USDA commodities with food purchased from school meal vendors, who prepare food products for schools in accordance with federal and state nutrition standards. Many schools also supplement USDA commodities with fresh fruit and vegetables purchased from local farmers. The food served by schools is typically not the same as the food found in grocery stores, as it must meet specific nutrition standards for schools.

While this bill prohibits schools from selling particularly harmful UPF, the bill places the greatest responsibility on vendors to offer food and beverage products that do not contain particularly harmful UPF, as defined by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. Food and beverage vendors will



need to adapt their products offered to schools, schools will have to rely solely on cooking from scratch using ingredients that are not particularly harmful UPF, or schools may need to change their menus to ensure no particularly harmful UPF are used. Until the regulations are developed to define particularly harmful UPF, it is unknown exactly which products currently sold, or ingredients used, by schools will be affected.

- 3) ***Processed, ultra-processed, or particularly harmful ultra-processed.*** According to the University of California, Davis, Office of Research, the “ultra-processed” category was developed in 2009 by a group of Brazilian public health researchers, as part of the NOVA classification system that groups foods by extent and purpose of processing. This categorization does not include a breakdown of the nutrients in the foods, nor was it designed to classify individual foods. The goal of the NOVA classification system is to provide a tool researchers can use to understand the health impacts of dietary patterns that include high percentages of UPF.

According to NOVA, food processing refers to the physical, biological, and chemical procedures that take place following the separation of food from its natural state and prior to its consumption or usage in the making of dishes and meals. NOVA does not account for culinary techniques used in home or restaurant kitchens to prepare food, such as fractioning, cooking, seasoning, and blending different foods or eliminating non-edible components. The four NOVA categories are:

- a) Group 1 - Unprocessed (or natural) foods are edible parts of plants (seeds, fruits, leaves, stems, roots) or of animals (muscle, eggs, milk), and also fungi, algae and water, after separation from nature. Minimally processed foods are natural foods altered by processes that include removal of inedible or unwanted parts, and drying, crushing, grinding, fractioning, filtering, roasting, boiling, non-alcoholic fermentation, pasteurization, refrigeration, chilling, freezing, placing in containers and vacuum-packaging.
- b) Group 2 - Processed culinary ingredients, such as oils, butter, sugar and salt, are substances derived from Group 1 foods or from nature by processes that include pressing, refining, grinding, milling and drying.
- c) Group 3 - Processed foods, such as bottled vegetables, canned fish, fruits in syrup, cheeses and freshly made breads, are made essentially by adding salt, oil, sugar or other substances from Group 2 to Group 1 foods.
- d) Group 4 - UPF, such as soft drinks, sweet or savory packaged snacks, reconstituted meat products and pre-prepared frozen dishes, are not modified foods but formulations made mostly or entirely from substances derived from foods and additives, with little if any intact Group 1 food.

There are numerous studies on UPF, many of which are cited in the Assembly Education and Assembly Environmental Safety and Toxic Materials Committee analyses. The USDA’s *2025-2030 Dietary Guidelines for Americans* are

currently under development, and are expected to be finalized in late 2025. While the *Scientific Report of the 2025 Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committee*, which is used as a resource for the development of the guidelines, does not include recommendations on UPF, other than it be further studied due to inconsistent definitions, it does concede that despite the inconsistency, “most of the foods categorized as ultra-processed were higher in saturated fat, sodium, and added sugars, as well as other food additives and preservatives.”

This bill defines UPF as any food or beverage that contains one or more specified substance, and defines “particularly harmful” UPF as an UPF product that is particularly harmful as determined by regulations adopted by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. *This bill’s definition of UPF essentially categorizes food based on added substances; it is not meant to consider any natural nutrients that may be present. This bill’s definition of UPF could capture food items that may contain nutritious elements, but the bill does not prohibit schools from selling such food. This bill tasks the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment with determining which added substances are particularly harmful.*

*This bill is double-referred to the Senate Environmental Quality Committee, where the appropriate categorizations may be considered. As noted in comment #2, until the regulations are developed to define particularly harmful UPF, it is unknown exactly which products currently sold, or ingredients used, by schools will be affected.*

- 4) **Governor Newsom’s Executive Order.** On January 3, 2025, the Governor issued Executive Order N-1-25, directing state agencies to recommend potential actions to limit the harms associated with UPF and food ingredients that pose a health risk to individuals. In particular, the Governor’s Executive Order directs the executive director of the State Board of Education to identify, and requests CDE to identify, areas where California may adopt higher standards for healthy school meals than the standards contained in the USDA’s “Child Nutrition Programs: Meal Patterns Consistent With the 2020-2025 Dietary Guidelines for Americans,” beyond those areas where California already have stricter standards, and provide recommendations to the Governor’s Office for implementing any higher standards deemed appropriate, taking into account costs, logistical considerations, and any other factors deemed relevant. This Executive Order also requires the California Department of Food and Agriculture and its Office of Farm to Fork Program, by October 1, 2025, to explore developing new standards and partnerships to further ensure our universal school food programs have fresh ingredients and options grown in California.
- 5) **Related budget activity.** AB 121 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 8, Statutes of 2025) includes a \$10 million competitive grant program to support the retention and recruitment of food service workers. One of the criteria the CDE is to use to determine eligibility for these grants is the extent to which the applicant’s plan attempts to reduce or eliminate the use of particularly harmful UPF. This language also encourages applicants’ plans to demonstrate how improved recruitment and retention could increase access to fresh, healthy meals for students and address local priorities, and may include offering and cooking

nutritionally delicious breakfast or lunch without particularly harmful UPF, as defined in the Health and Safety Code established in AB 1264.

AB 121 also includes \$5 million for CDE to contract with the Marin County Office of Education for a study of particularly harmful UPF, as defined in the Health and Safety Code established in AB 1264. It is unclear to committee staff how the work on the Marin County Office of Education will correlate to the work of the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment as proposed by this bill.

**SUPPORT**

Environmental Working Group (Co-Sponsor)  
A Voice for Choice Advocacy  
American Academy of Pediatrics, California  
American Diabetes Association  
Breast Cancer Prevention Partners  
California Health Coalition Advocacy  
California Medical Association  
California Podiatric Medical Association  
California Public Interest Research Group  
California School Employees Association  
Capistrano Unified School District  
Center for Environmental Health  
Center for Science in the Public Interest  
CFT - A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO  
Chef Ann Foundation  
Children Now  
Conscious Kitchen  
Crohns and Colitis Foundation  
Dos Pisano's, Inc.  
Eat Real  
Facts Families Advocating for Chemical and Toxics Safety  
Indivisible Marin  
Kern County Superintendent of Schools Office  
Morgan Hill Unified School District  
NextGen California  
Office of Kat Taylor  
Resource Renewal Institute  
San Luis Coastal Unified School District  
San Ramon Valley Unified School District  
Stanford Medicine Children's Health  
United Nurses Associations of California/Union of Health Care Professionals

**OPPOSITION**

American Beverage Association  
American Chemistry Council  
Association of California Egg Farmers  
California Association of Wheat Growers

California Bean Shippers Association  
California Chamber of Commerce  
California Farm Bureau  
California Grain & Feed Association  
California Grocers Association  
California League of Food Producers  
California Manufacturers & Technology Association  
California Pear Growers Association  
Civil Justice Association of California  
Consumer Brands Association  
Pacific Egg & Poultry Association

**-- END --**