

**Vice-Chair**  
Ochoa Bogh, Rosilicie

**Members**  
Cabaldon, Christopher  
Choi, Steven S.  
Cortese, Dave  
Gonzalez, Lena A.  
Reyes, Eloise Gómez

# California State Senate

## EDUCATION



**SASHA RENÉE PÉREZ**  
CHAIR

**Staff Director**  
Olgallia Ramirez

**Principal Consultant**  
Ian Johnson  
Michelle Nguyen

**Consultant**  
Theresa Austin

**Committee Assistant**  
Maria Velez  
Ima Kam

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

## AGENDA

Wednesday, April 15, 2026  
9 a.m. -- 1021 O Street, Room 2100

### SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. SB 998 Gonzalez Educational equity: discrimination prevention coordinators.

---

### MEASURES HEARD IN FILE ORDER

- \*2. SB 914 Ashby School accountability: audits: annual review.
- \*3. SB 961 Ashby CalFresh: student eligibility.
- \*4. SB 928 Cervantes California State University: faculty employees.
- \*5. SB 1381 Cervantes State special schools: information.
- \*6. SB 945 Weber Pierson School curriculum: physical education framework: cardiopulmonary resuscitation: automated external defibrillators.
7. SB 965 Blakespear Public libraries: library cards.
8. SB 1082 Niello Pupil attendance: interdistrict transfers: agreements: policies.
- \*9. SB 1133 Strickland Pupil instruction: preventative health instruction.
- \*10. SB 1412 Rubio Parental communication: teacher meetings.
11. SB 960 Cabaldon Public postsecondary education: community colleges: statewide baccalaureate degree program.
12. SB 1083 Pérez Noncertificated public school employees: private school employees: egregious misconduct: statewide data system.

### **\*Consent Items**

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

**Bill No:** SB 998 **Hearing Date:** April 15, 2026  
**Author:** Gonzalez and Weber Pierson  
**Version:** April 8, 2026  
**Urgency:** No **Fiscal:** Yes  
**Consultant:** Therresa Austin

**Subject:** Educational equity: discrimination prevention coordinators.

**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 establishes roles and responsibilities for the Religious Discrimination Prevention Coordinator, the Race and Ethnicity Discrimination Prevention Coordinator, the Gender Discrimination Prevention Coordinator, and the LGBTQ+ Discrimination Prevention Coordinator under the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) and additionally requires the OCR to employ a Disability Discrimination Prevention Coordinator to be appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate. This bill also requires the OCR to employ a Deputy Coordinator on Anti-Black Racism, a Deputy Coordinator on Anti-Asian American and Pacific Islander (Anti-AAPI) Discrimination, and a Deputy Coordinator on Anti-Latino Discrimination, and would require these deputy coordinators to report directly to the Race and Ethnicity Discrimination Prevention Coordinator.

## BACKGROUND

Existing federal law:

- 1) Provides that, in part, “no person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program of activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” Enforcement of compliance is initiated upon the filing of a complaint alleging a violation of Title IX. (Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 to the 1964 Civil Rights Act, United States Code (USC) § 1681 et seq.)
- 2) The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires that a free appropriate public education (FAPE) be made available to individuals with exceptional needs. (20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq.)
- 3) Authorizes a parent or a local educational agency (LEA) to file a due process complaint relating to the identification, evaluation or educational placement of a child with a disability, or the provision of FAPE. (20 USC § 1415)
- 4) Requires each school district and county office of education (COE), or a local public or private agency that receives funding from the state or federal government, to designate a person to serve as the Title IX compliance

coordinator to enforce compliance at the local level, including coordinating any complaints of non-compliance. (34 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 106.8(a))

Existing state law:

- 5) States that it is the policy of the State of California to afford all persons in public schools, regardless of their disability, gender, gender identity, gender expression, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or any other characteristic that is contained in the definition of hate crimes set forth in Section 422.55 of the Penal Code, including immigration status, equal rights, and opportunities in the educational institutions of the state. States that the purpose is to prohibit acts that are contrary to that policy and to provide remedies that will eliminate these discriminatory acts, including discrimination not just because of one protected trait, but also because of the combination of two or more protected bases. (Education Code (EC) § 200)
- 6) States that no person shall be subjected to discrimination on the basis of disability, gender, gender identity, gender expression, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or any other characteristic that is contained in the definition of hate crimes set forth in Section 422.55 of the Penal Code, including immigration status, in any program or activity conducted by an educational institution that receives, or benefits from, state financial assistance, or enrolls pupils who receive state student financial aid. (EC § 220)
- 7) Requires the California Department of Education (CDE) to monitor adherence to federal and state non-discrimination laws in any program or activity conducted by an educational institution as part of its regular monitoring and review of LEAs, commonly known as the Categorical Program Monitoring process. Existing law requires CDE to assess whether LEAs have taken specified actions relative to anti-discrimination policies, complaint and investigation processes, documentation, protection from retaliation, and identification of the responsible LEA officer for ensuring compliance. (EC § 234 et seq.)
- 8) Provides that the governing board of a school district has the primary responsibility for ensuring that school district programs and activities are free from discrimination based on age and characteristics protected pursuant to the Penal Code, and for monitoring compliance with any and all rules and regulations. (EC § 260)
- 9) Requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) to establish and implement a system of complaint processing, known as the Uniform Complaint Procedures (UCP), for specified educational programs. (EC § 33315)
- 10) Requires an LEA, if it finds merit in a complaint, or the SPI finds merit in an appeal, to take corrective actions consistent with the requirements of existing law that will provide a remedy to the affected pupil, or to all affected pupils, parents, and guardians. (EC § 33315)

- 11) Establishes the OCR under the administration of the Government Operations Agency (GovOps) to work directly with LEAs to prevent and address discrimination and bias, as specified. Requires the OCR to engage with and seek advice from coordinators within the OCR on actions implemented by the OCR. Establishes the position of the Director of the OCR and subjects it to appointment from the Governor and confirmation by the Senate. (EC § 33801)
- 12) Requires that a complaint alleging violations of the IDEA be investigated in an expeditious and effective manner in accordance with applicable federal law. (EC § 56500.2)
- 13) Requires that a written decision be issued to the complainant in accordance with the 60-day time limit. (EC § 56500.2)
- 14) Requires the party filing the complaint to forward a copy of the complaint to the LEA or public agency serving the child at the same time the party files the complaint with the CDE. (EC § 56500.2)
- 15) Requires the SPI to develop a model form to assist parents and public agencies in filing a state complaint under this section. (EC § 56500.2)
- 16) Requires the OCR, in consultation with the CDE, and under the supervision of GovOps, to carry out several tasks including providing education and educational resources to identify and prevent antisemitism and other forms of discrimination and bias, and sharing relevant laws and regulations with educational state agencies, LEAs, and community stakeholders; annually submitting a report to GovOps, the SPI, the executive director of the State Board of Education (SBE), and the Legislature on the state of discrimination and bias in all LEAs, as specified; recommending strategies to combat discrimination or bias to CDE and LEAs, including proactive strategies using a restorative justice approach with a focus on repairing harm, fostering empathy, and healing relationships; reviewing reports from the CDE that include summaries of all complaints of discrimination filed pursuant to the UCP and advise on subsequent actions; providing assistance to the office of the Attorney General and the CDE on proper protocols to respond to discrimination complaints filed pursuant to the UCP. (EC § 33802)
- 17) Establishes the position of the Antisemitism Prevention Coordinator, subject to appointment by the Governor and confirmation by the Senate. (EC § 33803.1)
- 18) Requires the Antisemitism Prevention Coordinator, in consultation with the CDE, and under the supervision of GovOps to carry out several tasks, including developing, consulting on, and providing antisemitism prevention education to teachers, staff, governing board or body members, administrators, and other LEA personnel to identify and proactively prevent antisemitism; make recommendations in coordination with the executive director of the SBE, to the Legislature on legislation necessary for the prevention of antisemitism in educational settings; engaging and advising on actions taken by the OCR on issues related to antisemitism and the Jewish community; tracking and reporting to the Legislature, the executive director of the SBE, and the SPI, complaints and resolutions or lack of resolutions on complaints made pursuant to the UCP, as

specified; and engaging with relevant community stakeholders in the execution of their duties. (EC § 33803.1)

- 19) Requires the CDE, by October 1 each year, to issue a management bulletin to all LEAs describing protections and responsibilities regarding prohibitions against unlawful discrimination, as specified. (EC § 280)
- 20) Requires the SPI, in consultation with the executive director of the SBE and the Antisemitism Prevention Coordinator, to develop and maintain a distinct internet web page containing resources and information specific to antisemitism on its internet website. (EC § 280)
- 21) Establishes the position of the Religious Discrimination Prevention Coordinator, the Race and Ethnicity Discrimination Prevention Coordinator, the Gender Discrimination Prevention Coordinator, and the LGBTQ Discrimination Prevention Coordinator under the OCR, and subjects each position to appointment by the Governor and confirmation by the Senate. (EC § 33803.2-33803.5.)

## ANALYSIS

This bill:

### *OCR*

- 1) Requires the OCR to provide resources and training on how to properly assist in cases of discrimination that involve the intersectionality of protected characteristics, as specified.
- 2) States that the roles and responsibilities of the discrimination prevention coordinators established pursuant to this bill shall not be limited to their specific title or discrimination subject to allow for flexibility in their roles.
- 3) Repeals placeholder language setting forth the intent of the Legislature to enact future legislation to establish the coordinator roles proposed by this bill.

### *Religious Discrimination Prevention Coordinator*

- 4) Requires the Religious Discrimination Prevention Coordinator, in consultation with the CDE and under the supervision of GovOps, to do the following:
  - a) Develop, consult on, and provide religious discrimination related education to teachers, staff, governing board and body members, administrators, and other LEA personnel to identify and proactively prevent religious discrimination.
  - b) Provide technical assistance to LEAs to access restorative justice resources, training, and practitioners by doing both of the following:

- i) Ensuring educators receive guidance and professional development recommendations to equip educators with the skills to navigate challenging conversations while fostering safe spaces for teaching and learning.
- ii) Creating a list of resources and identifying available training that LEAs may share with teachers, administrators, and LEA personnel in their educator preparation programs, including, but not limited to, the best practices for restorative justice made available by the CDE.
- c) Engage with LEAs, upon the request of the SPI, district superintendent, county superintendent of schools, or the governing board or body of an LEA, to ensure administrators are equipped to address conflicts at an early stage with the goal of proactively resolving incidents pertaining to religious discrimination.
- d) Provide information on training courses on cultural competency and positive school climate to teachers, administrators, and LEA personnel. Training courses may include, but not be limited to, any of the following topics:
  - i) Nondiscrimination laws.
  - ii) Trauma-informed restorative practices.
  - iii) Bullying prevention and response.
  - iv) Navigating politically charged environments.
  - v) Implementing inclusive curriculum.
- e) Beginning September 1, 2027, track and report to the Legislature, the executive director of the SBE, the SPI, complaints and resolutions or lack of resolutions of complaints made pursuant to the UCP relating to religious discrimination in all local LEAs serving pupils in transitional kindergarten (TK), kindergarten, or any of grades 1 to 12, inclusive.
- f) Engage with relevant community stakeholders to address high-priority issues in the prevention of unlawful religious discrimination.
- g) Make recommendations, in coordination with the executive director of the state board, to the Legislature on legislation necessary for the prevention of religious discrimination in educational settings.

*Race and Ethnicity Discrimination Prevention Coordinator*

- 5) Requires the Race and Ethnicity Discrimination Prevention Coordinator, in consultation with the CDE and under the supervision of GovOps, to do the following:

- a) Develop, consult on, and provide race and ethnicity discrimination related education to teachers, staff, governing board and body members, administrators, and other LEA personnel to identify and proactively prevent race and ethnicity discrimination.
- b) Provide technical assistance to LEAs to access restorative justice resources, training, and practitioners by doing both of the following:
  - i) Ensuring educators receive guidance and professional development recommendations to equip educators with the skills to navigate challenging conversations while fostering safe spaces for teaching and learning.
  - ii) Creating a list of resources and identifying available trainings that LEAs may share with teachers, administrators, and LEA personnel in their educator preparation programs, including, but not limited to, the best practices for restorative justice made available by the CDE.
- c) Engage with LEAs, upon the request of the SPI, district superintendent, county superintendent of schools, or the governing board or body of an LEA, to ensure administrators are equipped to address conflicts at an early stage with the goal of proactively resolving incidents pertaining to race and ethnicity discrimination.
- d) Provide information on training courses on cultural competency and positive school climate to teachers, administrators, and LEA personnel. Training courses may include, but not be limited to, any of the following topics:
  - i) Nondiscrimination laws.
  - ii) Trauma-informed restorative practices.
  - iii) Bullying prevention and response.
  - iv) Navigating politically charged environments.
  - v) Implementing inclusive curriculum.
- e) Beginning September 1, 2027, track and report to the Legislature, the executive director of the SBE, the SPI, complaints and resolutions or lack of resolutions of complaints made pursuant to the UCP relating to racial and ethnic discrimination in all LEAs serving pupils in TK, kindergarten, or any of grades 1 to 12, inclusive.
  - i) Track and report complaints and resolutions or lack of resolutions made pursuant to the UCP relating to anti-immigrant discrimination.

- f) Engage with relevant community stakeholders to address high-priority issues in the prevention of unlawful race and ethnicity discrimination.
- g) Make recommendations, in coordination with the executive director of the state board, to the Legislature on legislation necessary for the prevention of racial and ethnic discrimination in educational settings.

*Deputy Coordinator on Anti-Black Racism*

- 6) Requires the OCR to employ a Deputy Coordinator on Anti-Black Racism, who shall report directly to the Race and Ethnicity Discrimination Prevention Coordinator.
- 7) Requires the Deputy Coordinator on Anti-Black Racism, in addition to the requirements of #5 above, to do all of the following:
  - a) Make recommendations to the Legislature on legislation necessary for the prevention of anti-Blackness-related incidents or educational disparities.
  - b) Work with the leadership of the OCR to develop a dedicated internet web page with resources and information accessible to support Black pupils and LEA personnel.
  - c) Annually report statistics on anti-Black racism against pupils and LEA personnel with suggestions on how to prevent anti-Black racism at the root of the problem.
  - d) Provide information on available training courses that focus on the history and contemporary context of anti-Black racism within society and in educational settings.
  - e) Engage with Black education-specific organizations when receiving feedback to address anti-Black racism.

*Deputy Coordinator on Anti-AAPI Discrimination*

- 8) Requires the OCR to employ a Deputy Coordinator on Anti-AAPI Discrimination, who shall report directly to the Race and Ethnicity Discrimination Prevention Coordinator.
- 9) Requires the Deputy Coordinator on Anti-AAPI Discrimination, in addition to the requirements of #5 above, to do all of the following:
  - a) Make recommendations to the Legislature on legislation necessary for the prevention of anti-AAPI-related incidents or educational disparities.
  - b) Work with the leadership of the OCR to develop a dedicated internet web page with resources and information accessible to support AAPI pupils and LEA personnel.

- c) Annually report statistics on anti-AAPI discrimination against pupils and LEA personnel with suggestions on how to prevent anti-AAPI discrimination at the root of the problem.
- d) Provide information on available training courses that focus on the history and contemporary context of anti-AAPI discrimination within society and in educational settings.
- e) Engage with AAAP education-specific organizations when receiving feedback to address anti-AAPI discrimination.

*Deputy Coordinator on Anti-Latino Discrimination*

- 10) Requires the OCR to employ a Deputy Coordinator on Anti-Latino Discrimination, who shall report directly to the Race and Ethnicity Discrimination Prevention Coordinator.
- 11) Requires the Deputy Coordinator on Anti-Latino Discrimination, in addition to the requirements of #5 above, to do all of the following:
  - a) Make recommendations to the Legislature on legislation necessary for the prevention of anti-Latino-related incidents or educational disparities.
  - b) Work with the leadership of the OCR to develop a dedicated internet web page with resources and information accessible to support Latino pupils and LEA personnel.
  - c) Annually report statistics on anti-Latino discrimination against pupils and LEA personnel with suggestions on how to prevent anti-Latino discrimination at the root of the problem.
  - d) Provide information on available training courses that focus on the history and contemporary context of anti-Latino discrimination within society and in educational settings.
  - e) Engage with Latino education-specific organizations when receiving feedback to address anti-Latino discrimination.

*Gender Discrimination Prevention Coordinator*

- 12) Requires the Gender Discrimination Prevention Coordinator, in consultation with the CDE and under the supervision of GovOps, to do the following:
  - a) Develop, consult on, and provide gender discrimination related education to teachers, staff, governing board and body members, administrators, and other LEA personnel to identify and proactively prevent gender discrimination.
  - b) Provide technical assistance to LEAs to access restorative justice resources, training, and practitioners by doing both of the following:

- i) Ensuring educators receive guidance and professional development recommendations to equip educators with the skills to navigate challenging conversations while fostering safe spaces for teaching and learning.
  - ii) Creating a list of resources and identifying available trainings that LEAs may share with teachers, administrators, and LEA personnel in their educator preparation programs, including, but not limited to, the best practices for restorative justice made available by the CDE.
- c) Engage with LEAs, upon the request of the SPI, district superintendent, county superintendent of schools, or the governing board or body of an LEA, to ensure administrators are equipped to address conflicts at an early stage with the goal of proactively resolving incidents pertaining to gender discrimination.
- d) Provide information on training courses on cultural competency and positive school climate to teachers, administrators, and LEA personnel. Training courses may include, but not be limited to, any of the following topics:
- i) Nondiscrimination laws.
  - ii) Trauma-informed restorative practices.
  - iii) Bullying prevention and response.
  - iv) Navigating politically charged environments.
  - v) Implementing inclusive curriculum.
- e) Beginning September 1, 2027, track and report to the Legislature, the executive director of the SBE, the SPI, complaints and resolutions or lack of resolutions of complaints made pursuant to the UCP relating to gender discrimination in all local LEAs serving pupils TK, kindergarten, or any of grades 1 to 12, inclusive.
- f) Engage with relevant community stakeholders to address high-priority issues in the prevention of unlawful gender discrimination.
- g) Make recommendations, in coordination with the executive director of the state board, to the Legislature on legislation necessary for the prevention of gender discrimination in educational settings.

*LGBTQ+ Discrimination Prevention Coordinator*

- 13) Renames the position of the LGBTQ Discrimination Prevention Coordinator to the *LGBTQ+ Discrimination Prevention Coordinator*.

- 14) Requires the LGBTQ+ Discrimination Prevention Coordinator, in consultation with the CDE and under the supervision of GovOps, to do the following:
- a) Develop, consult on, and provide LGBTQ+ related discrimination education to teachers, staff, governing board and body members, administrators, and other LEA personnel to identify and proactively prevent LGBTQ+ discrimination.
  - b) Provide technical assistance to LEAs to access restorative justice resources, training, and practitioners by doing both of the following:
    - i) Ensure educators receive guidance and professional development recommendations to equip educators with the skills to navigate challenging conversations while fostering safe spaces for teaching and learning.
    - ii) Creating a list of resources and identifying available trainings that LEAs may share with teachers, administrators, and LEA personnel in their educator preparation programs, including, but not limited to, the best practices for restorative justice made available by the CDE.
  - c) Engage with LEAs, upon the request of the SPI, district superintendent, county superintendent of schools, or the governing board or body of an LEA, to ensure administrators are equipped to address conflicts at an early stage with the goal of proactively resolving incidents pertaining to LGBTQ+ discrimination.
  - d) Provide information on training courses on cultural competency and positive school climate to teachers, administrators, and LEA personnel. Training courses may include, but not be limited to, any of the following topics:
    - i) Nondiscrimination laws.
    - ii) Trauma-informed restorative practices.
    - iii) Bullying prevention and response.
    - iv) Navigating politically charged environments.
    - v) Implementing inclusive curriculum.
  - e) Beginning September 1, 2027, track and report to the Legislature, the executive director of the SBE, the SPI, complaints and resolutions or lack of resolutions of complaints made pursuant to the UCP relating to LGBTQ+ discrimination in all local LEAs serving pupils TK, kindergarten, or any of grades 1 to 12, inclusive.

- f) Engage with relevant community stakeholders, including, but not limited to, organizations that support the LGBTQ+ community, organizations that support LGBTQ+ youth, LGBTQ+ parent groups, and organizations that support transgender, gender nonbinary, and intersex youth, to address high-priority issues in the prevention of unlawful LGBTQ+ discrimination.
- g) Make recommendations, in coordination with the executive director of the state board, to the Legislature on legislation necessary for the prevention of LGBTQ+ discrimination in educational settings.

*Disability Discrimination Prevention Coordinator*

- 15) Establishes the position of the Disability Discrimination Prevention Coordinator, subject to appointment by the Governor and confirmation by the Senate.
- 16) Requires the Disability Discrimination Prevention Coordinator, in consultation with the CDE and under the supervision of GovOps, to do the following:
  - a) Develop, consult on, and provide disability discrimination related education to teachers, staff, governing board and body members, administrators, and other LEA personnel to identify and proactively prevent disability discrimination.
  - b) Provide technical assistance to LEAs to access restorative justice resources, training, and practitioners by doing both of the following:
    - i) Ensuring educators receive guidance and professional development recommendations to equip educators with the skills to navigate challenging conversations while fostering safe spaces for teaching and learning.
    - ii) Creating a list of resources and identifying available trainings that LEAs may share with teachers, administrators, and LEA personnel in their educator preparation programs, including, but not limited to, the best practices for restorative justice made available by the CDE.
  - c) Engage with LEAs to ensure administrators are equipped to address conflicts at an early stage with the goal of proactively resolving incidents pertaining to disability discrimination.
  - d) Provide information on training courses on cultural competency and positive school climate to teachers, administrators, and LEA personnel. Training courses may include, but not be limited to, any of the following topics:
    - i) Nondiscrimination laws.
    - ii) Trauma-informed restorative practices.

- iii) Bullying prevention and response.
  - iv) Navigating politically charged environments.
  - v) Implementing inclusive curriculum.
- e) Beginning September 1, 2027, track and report to the Legislature, the executive director of the SBE, the SPI, complaints and resolutions or lack of resolutions of complaints made pursuant to the UCP relating to disability discrimination in all LEAs serving pupils TK, kindergarten, or any of grades 1 to 12, inclusive.
- f) Engage with relevant community stakeholders, including, but not limited to, organizations that support the disability community, organizations that support pupils and youth with disabilities, organizations that support parents and guardians of pupils with disabilities and their families, to address high-priority issues in the prevention of unlawful disability discrimination.
- g) Make recommendations, in coordination with the executive director of the state board, to the Legislature on legislation necessary for the prevention of disability discrimination in educational settings.

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “Last year, the Legislature passed SB 48 (Gonzalez/Weber/Fong/Ward), which created four discrimination prevention coordinators under the newly established Office of Civil Rights. My colleagues and I committed to working on subsequent legislation to clarify the role of each coordinator and create a Disability Discrimination Prevention coordinator based on stakeholder feedback. SB 998 builds on that commitment by establishing clear guidelines and expectations for the service coordinators to provide upon the request of the local educational agency to ensure that all student populations receive equal protection, proactive support services, and timely responses to discriminatory incidents. With the dismantling of the Federal Department of Education, the state must step up to foster a positive campus climate, deliver targeted support services for our student population, and address discrimination against any student in California schools.”
- 2) ***Complaint process.*** This bill requires the Religious Discrimination Prevention Coordinator, the Race and Ethnicity Discrimination Prevention Coordinator, the Gender Discrimination Prevention Coordinator, and the LGBTQ+ Discrimination Prevention Coordinator to track and annually report on complaints and resolutions, or lack of resolutions of complaints made pursuant to the UCP relating to the respective forms of discrimination in all local LEAs serving pupils TK, kindergarten, or any of grades 1 to 12.

As prescribed by statute and regulations, each LEA has the primary responsibility to ensure compliance with applicable state and federal laws and regulations. Each LEA is required to investigate complaints alleging failure to comply with

applicable state and federal laws and regulations and/or alleging discrimination, harassment, intimidation, or bullying, and seek to resolve those complaints.

A complaint through the UCP 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.

Federal laws also require the CDE to adopt written procedures for the investigation and resolution of any state complaint alleging that a school district or public agency has violated IDEA.

*This bill requires discrimination prevention coordinators within the OCR to annually track and report to the Legislature, the volume of complaints and resolutions, or lack of resolutions to complaints filed under the UCP. Importantly, while the OCR provides support on matters pertaining to discrimination-based complaints, the OCR itself, as well as the Antisemitism Prevention Coordinator and Coordinator roles established and specified in this bill, are not intended to receive, investigate, or adjudicate formal complaints. Instead, those functions shall continue to follow the existing channels pursuant to the UCP.*

- 3) **CDE Resources for Managing Conversations.** In 2023, the Legislature passed AB 1078 (Jackson, Chapter 229, Statutes of 2023), requiring CDE to provide guidance to support school districts, COEs, charter schools, and school personnel in their managing of conversations about race and gender, as well as guidance on how to review instructional materials to ensure that they represent diverse perspectives and are culturally relevant. The resulting guidance is culminated in the *AB 1078 Accurate and Inclusive Curriculum* webpage, outlining California's existing laws, policies, and resources related to creating safe and inclusive learning environments. Such resources include information on the following:

Asset-Based Pedagogies: Asset-based pedagogies view the diversity that students bring to the classroom, including culture, language, disability, socio-economic status, immigration status, and sexuality, as characteristics that add value and strength to classrooms and communities. Examples of such pedagogies include:

- a) Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy
- b) Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching
- c) Culturally Relevant Pedagogy

Creating Equitable Early Learning Environments for Young Boys of Color:

Disrupting Disproportionate Outcomes: This resource was developed in collaboration between the CDE Early Education Division and the WestEd Center for Child and Family Studies as a resource to support early childhood educators in improving race equity within their classrooms and programs and disrupting the exclusionary disciplinary practices like suspensions, expulsions, and pushouts that disproportionately impact California's youngest boys of color.

Transformative Social and Emotional Learning (T-SEL) Competencies: T-SEL Competencies describe the knowledge, skills, dispositions, and capacities that children and young people can develop when the conditions are supportive to their healthy, whole development. These guidance tools aim to build on and respond to the call from California’s diverse stakeholders to embed equity-focused T-SEL in every learning and teaching context across the education system.

- 4) ***Antibias Education Grant Program***. In the 2021–22 and 2022–23 State Budgets, the Legislature appropriated a total of \$20 million to the SPI to establish the Antibias Education Grant Program— funding training and resources to prevent and address bias or prejudice toward any group of people based on race, ethnicity, religion, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, disability, immigration status, language, or any actual or perceived characteristic listed in Section 422.55 of the Penal Code. The statute placed emphasis on preventing antisemitism and bias or prejudice toward groups, including, but not limited to, African Americans, Asian-Pacific Islanders, Latinos, and people who are LGBTQ youth.

Across the two cohorts, 104 LEA grantees received award amounts ranging from \$75,000 to \$392,235. Notable grantee proposals include:

Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) – proposing to address issues of racial bias against students, families, and staff and other prejudices within the school environment, with intended outcomes that include reducing instances of harassment on school sites; increasing positive school climate; increasing student access to culturally responsive and sustaining pedagogy practices and increase access to culturally relevant materials; launching lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex, and asexual plus (LGBTQIA+) inclusive clubs and campaigns for student leadership; drafting a comprehensive diversity plan; and improving organizational climate with a focus on increased experience of belonging among linguistically and religiously diverse Black/African American and LGBTQIA+ staff as measured by an annual equity survey and focus groups.

Nevada Joint Union High School District – proposing to adopt a systematic, long-term plan for regular professional development with a renowned agency, passionate about improving school culture. Simultaneously creating systems within classrooms to acknowledge individuality daily, as well as looking to more restorative practices for discipline.

Newark Unified School District – proposing to fund research-based Empathic Instruction modules for approximately 250 TK–12 staff, secondary restorative justice student leadership program development, and community outreach for ongoing district antibias, equity work.

Palm Springs Unified School District – proposing to accelerate its Conscious Education antibias training for all district staff, create a Diversity and Equity Steering Committee to develop a district Equity Plan and act as an advisory

group, and continue work with equity consultants to refine Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion related practices.

- 5) ***The Safe and Supportive Schools Act.*** In 2023, the Legislature passed AB 5 (Zbur, Chapter 220, Statutes of 2023), which (1) required CDE to complete the development of an online training curriculum and delivery platform to provide training on cultural competency in supporting LGBTQ students; and (2) requires, LEAs serving students in grades 7-12 to provide and require at least one hour of training annually to all certificated staff, beginning with the 2025-26 school year through the 2029-30 school year.

Using a budget allocation of \$770,000 for this purpose, CDE partnered with LACOE to develop the Providing Relevant Inclusive Support that Matters for LGBTQ+ Students (PRISM) program. PRISM is a free six-course online training program with content targeted to certificated educators to provide resources to bolster support for LGBTQ+ youth in California. The training curriculum includes information on 12 statutorily required topics, including the creation of safe and supportive learning environments for LGBTQ+ pupils; the importance of identifying local physical and mental health providers with experience in treating and supporting LGBTQ+ youth; requirements regarding school antibullying and harassment policies, and complaint procedures; and requirements regarding suicide prevention policies and related procedures.

PRISM is available to all teachers and other certificated staff serving pupils in grades 7-12 as of July 1, 2025.

- 6) ***California Teachers Collaborative for Holocaust and Genocide Education (Collaborative).*** California has made significant investments to support educators in their efforts to teach about the sensitive topics of the Holocaust and genocide. For instance, the Collaborative was established in 2021 as a statewide professional development program on genocide for school district, COE, and charter school teachers. The Collaborative was initially created by the Jewish Family and Children's Services (JFCS) Holocaust Center in San Francisco with support from the CDE, Marin COE, and the State of California, and was later codified with passage of SB 1277 (Stern, Chapter 890, Statutes of 2024). The Collaborative also works in close collaboration with the Governor's Council on Holocaust and Genocide Education. The Collaborative received a state budget allocation of \$1.9 million in its first year and, in subsequent years, has received additional allocations of \$1.5 million (2023-24 State Budget) and \$5 million (2024-25 State Budget). The Collaborative's goals include:
- a) Creating new, standards-aligned lessons on the Holocaust and genocide for all 6-12th grade students in California;
  - b) Empowering and unifying educators in teaching the lessons of history and about what happens when bias goes unchecked; and
  - c) Combatting rising antisemitism and hate by creating more respectful and empathetic next generations.

In 2024, the Collaborative launched a website to serve as a central location to connect educators with digital resources including best practices and curricular materials, and information about workshops, trainings, and conferences.

7) ***Slight differences between the newly articulated coordinator positions and the Antisemitism Prevention Coordinator.*** While most of the new roles and responsibilities for the respective Discrimination Prevention Coordinators outlined in this bill align cleanly with those of the Antisemitism Prevention Coordinator, there are a few areas that speak more to authorizations articulated for the OCR as a whole rather than a particular coordinator. These include:

- a) Explicit authorization for the newly outlined coordinators to provide technical assistance to LEAs to access restorative justice resources, training, and practitioners--upon the request of the SPI, a school district superintendent, a county superintendent of schools, or the governing board or body of an LEA.
- b) Explicit authorization for the newly outlined coordinators to provide information on training courses on cultural competency and positive school climate to teachers, administrators, and LEA personnel.

*Should the bill move forward, the authors may wish to consider if these changes would ultimately require a revisiting of the roles of the Antisemitism Prevention Coordinator, or if it would make more sense to centralize the responsibilities to the OCR as a whole.*

8) ***Prior and related legislation.***

AB 715 (Zbur, Chapter 428, Statutes of 2025) (1) establishes the OCR under the administration of GovOps and the position of Antisemitism Prevention Coordinator within OCR; (2) requires LEAs that know or have reason to know that instructional or professional development materials were used that violate existing anti-discrimination laws to investigate and remediate the action; (3) requires instruction and instructional materials to be factually accurate, align with the adopted curriculum and existing standards for instructional materials, and be consistent with accepted standards of professional responsibility; (4) authorizes the CDE to require specified corrective action be taken by LEAs; and, (5) requires specified corrective action be taken by organizations contracted to provide instructional or professional development materials if those materials are found to violate specified provisions of this bill.

SB 48 (Gonzalez, Chapter 429, Statutes of 2025) requires the OCR under GovOps to employ a Religious Discrimination Prevention Coordinator, a Race and Ethnicity Discrimination Prevention Coordinator, a Gender Discrimination Prevention Coordinator, and an LGBTQ Discrimination Prevention Coordinator. Requires that these positions all be appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate.

SB 1421 (Stern, 2024) would have required the CDE to establish the OCR within the CDE to receive and investigate complaints reported through the UCP that

allege unlawful discrimination, harassment, intimidation, or bullying; to assume the CDE's duties as it pertains to these complaints; and to develop procedures to optimize complaint reporting and response. *SB 1421 was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.*

AB 1078 (Jackson, Chapter 229, Statutes of 2023), among other things, requires the CDE to issue guidance related to how to help school districts, COEs, charter schools, and school personnel manage conversations about race and gender, and how to review instructional materials to ensure that they represent diverse perspectives and are culturally relevant.

AB 1327 (Weber, Chapter 366, Statutes of 2023) requires the California Interscholastic Federation (CIF) to report to the Legislature every three years on instances of racial discrimination or harassment, and requires the CIF to develop, in consultation with community organizations that represent the interests of ethnic groups and communities of color, a standardized incident form to track instances of racial discrimination or harassment that occur at high school sporting games or sporting events, and annually post those results on the CIF website.

SB 857 (Laird, Chapter 228, Statutes of 2023) requires the SPI, on or before July 1, 2024, to convene an advisory task force to identify the statewide needs of LGBTQ students and report its findings to the Legislature, the SPI, and the Governor by January 1, 2026.

AB 493 (Gloria, Chapter 775, Statutes of 2019) requires that, no later than July 1, 2021, the CDE develop resources or update existing resources for in-service training on schoolsite and community resources for the support of LGBTQ students, for use in LEAs, including charter schools serving students in grades 7-12. Requires the CDE to periodically provide online training on this topic that can be accessed on a statewide basis.

## **SUPPORT**

California Legislative LGBTQ Caucus  
Disability Rights California  
Equality California

## **OPPOSITION**

None received

**-- END --**

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

<b>Bill No:</b>	SB 914	<b>Hearing Date:</b>	April 15, 2026
<b>Author:</b>	Ashby		
<b>Version:</b>	April 6, 2026		
<b>Urgency:</b>	No	<b>Fiscal:</b>	Yes
<b>Consultant:</b>	Ian Johnson		

**Subject:** School accountability: audits: annual review.

## SUMMARY

This bill revises the timeline and procedures by which local educational agency (LEA) governing boards must review annual audit reports by replacing the existing fixed deadline with a rolling timeline tied to the issuance of the audit and requires LEA governing boards to formally accept or reject the audit report at a public meeting.

## BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Requires each LEA to obtain an annual independent audit of its books and accounts, including all funds under its control, to promote fiscal accountability and transparency.
- 2) Requires annual audits to be conducted in accordance with government auditing standards and the state-prescribed audit guide, and to include review of internal controls, attendance reporting, and compliance with state and federal funding requirements.
- 3) Requires LEAs to submit completed audit reports by December 15 of each year to the county superintendent of schools, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the Controller, unless an extension is granted.
- 4) Establishes a system of fiscal oversight and audit resolution, requiring county superintendents of schools to review audit findings, ensure corrections or corrective action plans are developed, and certify resolution of findings to the state.
- 5) Authorizes the county superintendent of schools or the Controller to intervene when audits are delayed or not completed, including granting extensions, arranging for completion of audits, or conducting the audit directly.
- 6) Requires auditors to report audit exceptions, management recommendations, and going concern risks, and requires LEAs to address findings through corrective actions.

- 7) Requires the governing board of each LEA, by January 31 of each year, to review the annual audit at a public meeting, including audit findings, recommendations, and corrective actions, and to place this review on a public meeting agenda.

## ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Replaces the existing requirement that LEAs review their annual audit by January 31 of each year with a requirement that the review occur within 45 days of the issuance of the audit report.
- 2) Requires the governing board or body of the LEA to formally accept or reject the audit report at the public meeting at which the audit is reviewed.
- 3) Defines LEA, for purposes of its provisions, as school districts, county offices of education, charter schools, and educational joint powers authorities.

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “Under current law, governing boards of local educational agencies (LEAs) must annually review audits of the LEAs finances and records by January 31st of each year, regardless of when the audit is submitted to the LEAs.

SB 914 extends the audit review deadline for governing boards to 45 days after the audit is formally issued, which allows governing boards the flexibility to carefully evaluate findings and develop financial plans. This extension also gives governing boards more time to effectively ensure LEAs are managing their budgets appropriately and ensure any corrective action plans are in place.”

- 2) ***Aligning audit timelines with local governance practices.*** Existing law requires LEA governing boards to review annual audit reports by a fixed date of January 31, regardless of when the audit is completed or whether an extension has been granted. In practice, audit timelines can vary, particularly in years when extensions are more common or when audit requirements change.

By tying the governing board review to the issuance of the audit report, this bill establishes a more flexible timeline that may better reflect the timing of audit completion. This approach could allow governing boards additional time to review audit findings, recommendations, and corrective actions in a more deliberate manner. At the same time, a rolling deadline may result in less uniformity when audits are reviewed across LEAs, which could have implications for statewide transparency and oversight.

- 3) ***Clarifying the role of governing boards in audit review.*** This bill requires governing boards to formally “accept or reject” the audit report. Under current practice, some governing boards have taken action to “approve” audit reports,

which may imply a level of authority over the audit that is inconsistent with professional auditing standards.

Clarifying that boards accept or reject the audit may better reflect their role in receiving and responding to audit findings rather than validating the audit itself. However, the bill does not specify the implications of a governing board rejecting an audit report. The Committee may wish to consider whether additional clarity is needed regarding the purpose and effect of a rejection, particularly in cases where concerns relate to the audit process rather than the underlying financial findings.

- 4) ***Technical alignment with broader audit policy discussions.*** This bill addresses a discrete component of the state's audit framework related to the timing and conduct of governing board review. Similar changes to audit timelines and practices have been considered in other policy contexts, including recent Administration proposals related to charter school and fiscal oversight.

As those discussions continue to evolve, the Committee may wish to consider how changes to audit timelines interact with the broader audit and oversight system, including audit submission deadlines, extension practices, and the roles of county offices of education and state agencies in reviewing and resolving audit findings.

## **SUPPORT**

Alameda County Office of Education

## **OPPOSITION**

None received

**-- END --**

---

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

<b>Bill No:</b>	SB 961	<b>Hearing Date:</b>	April 15, 2026
<b>Author:</b>	Ashby		
<b>Version:</b>	April 8, 2026		
<b>Urgency:</b>	No	<b>Fiscal:</b>	Yes
<b>Consultant:</b>	Olgalilia Ramirez		

**Subject:** CalFresh: student eligibility.

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

### SUMMARY

This bill (1) requires the California Student Aid Commission (CSAC) to amend its Grant Delivery System to ensure students who may be eligible for CalFresh benefits are identified; (2) requires CSAC and the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) to enter into a data-sharing agreement to ensure identified students are linked to basic needs resources on- and off -campus; (3) deems through CDSS guidance specific student support programs at a public institution of higher education as a state-approved local education program that increases employability and therefore qualifies for the student exemption for CalFresh eligibility as well as authorizes other campus-based programs to apply to CDSS for qualification.

### BACKGROUND

Existing law:

#### *CalFresh*

- 1) Establishes in 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. Federal regulations establish SNAP eligibility requirements, including adjusted net income that is at or below 100 percent of the federal poverty level and is determined to be a substantial limiting factor in permitting a recipient to obtain a more nutritious diet. (Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Title 7 § 271.1 and § 273.9)
- 2) Establishes the CalFresh program as the state’s program to administer the provisions of federal SNAP benefits to low-income families and individuals meeting specified criteria. (Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) § 18900 et seq.)

*College students ineligible for CalFresh without a waiver*

- 3) Federal law prohibits an individual who is enrolled at least half-time in an institution of higher education from eligibility for SNAP benefits, unless the student qualifies for an exemption. To be eligible for an exemption, a student must meet at least one of the following criteria:
  - a) Be age 17 or younger, or age 50 or older.
  - b) Be physically or mentally “unfit.”
  - c) Be receiving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) under Title IV of the federal Social Security Act (known as CalWORKs in California).
  - d) Be employed for a minimum of 20 hours per week.
  - e) Be participating in a state or federally financed work-study program during the regular school year, as specified.
  - f) Be participating in an on-the-job training program, as specified.
  - g) Be responsible for a child under 6.
  - h) Be responsible for the care of a child 6-11 years old when the State agency has determined that adequate child care is not available to enable the student to attend class and comply with the work requirements.
  - i) Be a single parent enrolled in an institution of higher education on a full-time basis (as determined by the institution) and be responsible for the care of a dependent child under age 12.
  - j) Be enrolled in an employment and training or another job-training program, as specified. (7 CFR § 273.5)

#### CSAC

- 4) Establishes the Cal Grant Program under the administration of CSAC. (Education Code (EC) § 69431 et seq.)
- 5) Requires CSAC to notify, in writing, a recipient of a Cal Grant award if that student’s grant includes any amount of funding that has been derived from the TANF block grant or state match, in order for the student to verify that the student qualifies for the exemption from the CalFresh program student eligibility rules. (EC § 69519.3)
- 6) Requires CSAC to notify students of their exemption from the CalFresh program student eligibility rules and their potential eligibility for CalFresh benefits, to the extent CSAC possesses the pertinent information and is permitted by federal law to use information to determine a student’s CalFresh eligibility. (EC § 69519.3)
- 7) Requires each campus of the California State University (CSU) and each community college district, and requests and each campus of the University of

California (UC), each independent institution of higher education, and each private postsecondary educational institution, to use the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) data to identify students who meet the income qualifications for CalFresh. (EC § 66023.6)

- 8) Requires each CSU campus and each community college district to send an email to the campus-based email account associated with a student identified pursuant to # 7, informing the student that they may qualify for CalFresh if the student can also meet one of the exemptions. The email must encourage the student to contact the local county welfare agency to apply for CalFresh and include the contact information for the local county welfare agency and the designated campus staff who can assist the student in applying for CalFresh. (EC § 66023.6)

## ANALYSIS

This bill:

### *CSAC and Grant Delivery System*

- 1) Requires CSAC to, upon entering into a data-sharing agreement, in compliance with state and federal law, amend the Grant Delivery System to ensure all of the following:
  - a) Students that might be eligible for the CalFresh program are identified.
  - b) Students that are identified have the ability to provide consent to have their contact information shared with the CDSS, and for CDSS to further share their contact information with the appropriate county human services agency and public postsecondary educational institutions in which the student is enrolled, for the sole purposes of identifying, supporting, and linking students to on-and off-campus basic needs services and resources, including conducting direct outreach about the CalFresh program.
  - c) Identified students are linked to on-and off-campus basic needs services and resources.
- 2) Requires CSAC, upon amending the Grant Delivery System, to provide CDSS with information for students who consent to have their contact information shared with CDSS under the terms of the data-sharing agreement.
- 3) States that contact information includes legal name, email address, ZIP code or county of residence, and phone number of the student.

### *CDSS Guidance and Eligible Programs*

- 4) Adds students identified by CSAC to the list of student applicants CDSS is required to issue guidance for verifying CalFresh student exemption eligibility to county agencies.

- 5) Requires, by May 31, 2027, CDSS to issue guidance to counties, the California Community College (CCC) Chancellor's Office, the CSU Chancellor's Office, and the UC President that informs them of the changes made by the bill and that does all of the following:
  - a) Clarifies the state and federal eligibility requirements for a campus-based program to be a state-approved local educational program that increases employability that has a component that is equivalent to a component specified in federal law and that qualifies for the student exemption for CalFresh eligibility as described in federal law.
  - b) Makes, to the extent permitted by federal law, a determination that all adult education, career technical education, certificate, and associate, bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs at a public institution of higher education be considered as a state-approved local educational program that increases employability.
  - c) Makes, to the extent permitted by federal law, a determination that the specified state-funded financial aid, academic support, and student support service programs are to be considered a state-approved local educational programs that increases employability, including the Cal Grant Program, Educational Opportunity Program, and Disabled Students Programs and Services.
  - d) Clarifies the application and approval process for CDSS approval as a state-approved local educational program that increases employability for programs not listed.
- 6) Authorizes a campus-based program at a CCC, CSU, or UC campus that is not listed to apply to CDSS for approval. CDSS is required to determine whether applicants meet the requirements to be considered a state-approved local educational program that increases employability.
- 7) CDSS is required to work with the Statewide Automated Welfare System to develop and implement the necessary changes to list the specified general categories of state-approved local education programs that increase employability.

#### *Reporting requirements*

- 8) Requires, by September 1, 2028, and annually thereafter until 2030, CDSS reports to the relevant Assembly and Senate Committees and posts on its website all of the following:
  - a) The number of state-approved campus-based local educational programs that increase employability that are approved, disaggregated by name and campus.
  - b) The number of pending applications, disaggregated by name and campus.

- c) The number of applications denied, disaggregated by name and campus, and the reason for the denials.
- 9) Requires CDSS to implement and administer the bill's provision on eligible campus-based programs through all-county letters or similar instructions as specified by May 30, 2027.

#### *Data-Sharing Agreement*

- 10) Requires CDSS and CSAC to develop a data-sharing agreement meeting the requirements of applicable state and federal law and regulations, under which CSAC is to share the student information with CDSS. The bill authorizes CDSS, as prescribed in the data agreement to share the student information with the appropriate county human services agency and the higher education institutions' systemwide office of the campus in which the student is enrolled for the sole purposes of identifying, supporting, and linking students on-and off-campus basic needs services and resources, including conducting direct outreach to students about the CalFresh program.
- 11) Requires each CCC and CSU and requests each UC campus (if a data-sharing agreement has been entered into), commencing with the 2028-29 academic year, to contact all students who opted in to have their contract information shared with CDSS for the purpose of informing students about on-and off-campus basic needs services and resources, including the CalFresh program.
- 12) Prohibits data shared pursuant to this bill from being shared with any other entity or used for any purpose other than for identifying, supporting, and linking students to on-and off-campus basic needs services and resources, including conducting direct outreach to students about the CalFresh program. The bill further specifies that the sharing of data for purposes of the bill be done in compliance with applicable federal and state privacy laws.

#### *Miscellaneous*

- 13) Strikes existing provisions requiring CDSS to issue a guidance letter to counties, the CCC Chancellor's Office, the CSU Chancellor's Office, and the Office of the President of UC relating to the submission of a certification application for programs that increase employability.
- 14) Defines the "public post-secondary education systemwide office" to mean the office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, the Office of the Chancellor of the California State University, or the Office of the President of the University of California.
- 15) States various findings and declarations related to promoting student access to public benefits such as CalFresh.

**STAFF COMMENTS**

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “Many college students, especially those from low income backgrounds are unable to access fresh meals. Half of California’s college students experience food insecurity. Students are eligible for CalFresh, but fewer than 25% actually receive benefits.

“SB 961 addresses food access by streamlining access to CalFresh benefits. This bill would require the California Student Aid Commission to notify students of their potential eligibility for CalFresh. SB 961 further addresses the issue of food insecurity for students by broadening the programs of study for an increase in eligibility, for access to food assistance for all levels of students.”

- 2) ***Student eligibility for CalFresh.*** CalFresh is California’s version of the federal SNAP program, which provides monthly food benefits to qualified low-income individuals and families. CalFresh is administered by CDSS at the state level, and California’s 58 counties are responsible for administering CalFresh at the local level. CalFresh benefits are 100 percent federally funded, and national income eligibility standards and benefit levels are established by the federal government.

Student eligibility for CalFresh is constrained based on a number of factors that essentially disqualify most full-time college students from benefits unless they qualify for one of several exemptions. These exemptions include being employed at least 20 hours per week, being approved and anticipating participating in a work-study program, being responsible for the care of a child, attending school as part of an employment and training program or participating in a program to improve employability, or receiving TANF funding. Committee staff notes that existing law directs CSAC to provide recipients of a TANF-funded Cal Grant A or B written notification regarding their potential eligibility for CalFresh. It does not guarantee receipt of CalFresh benefits—it solely notifies the student that they may be eligible.

According to a 2024 report by the California Policy Lab, among students who were estimated to be eligible for CalFresh, 26 percent of community college students received CalFresh benefits in the Fall of 2019, as compared to 22 percent of UC undergraduate students. “This means about 100,600 students received CalFresh benefits, but also that an estimated 297,400 eligible students missed out on benefits that could have paid for their food.”

- 3) ***Sharing of student data.*** This bill requires CSAC to identify and provide a way for students who may be eligible for CalFresh to give permission or opt-in to have their contact information shared with CDSS. This approach appears to be generally modeled on a data-sharing agreement between Compton Community College and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services. Students enrolled in Compton College who have submitted a FAFSA are asked if they are interested in being evaluated for county services. Consent forms are provided to students who answer in the affirmative. Compton College then provides the county with student data to be matched with county caseload

records to identify CalFresh participation among those students. Compton College uses the results to initiate targeted CalFresh outreach to students. According to the Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services, of the 1,136 students who signed the consent form from the inception of this project, only 156 students were already receiving CalFresh (980 students were not). Of the 980 students who were not already receiving CalFresh, 470 students have since been connected to CalFresh through this partnership. This bill requires CDSS and CSAC to establish a data-sharing agreement allowing student information to be shared with county human services agencies and higher education institutions solely to connect students with basic needs services and CalFresh outreach. Starting in 2028-29 academic year, CCC, CSU campuses and UC campuses (if participating) must contact opted-in students about these resources. Data use is strictly limited to this purpose and must comply with all applicable privacy laws.

- 4) ***Programs to increase employability.*** One of the criteria for students to be eligible for CalFresh is placement in an employment and training program, including state or local programs for low-income individuals that are equivalent to SNAP Employment and Training components. Federal regulations require an employment and training program to include specified components, including educational programs or activities to improve basic skills, build work readiness, or otherwise improve employability. This includes educational programs determined by a state agency, such as CDSS, to expand the job search abilities or employability of those subject to the program.

According to the federal regulations, allowable educational programs or activities may include, but are not limited to, courses or programs of study that are part of a program of career and technical education, adult basic skills, work readiness training, and instructional programs in English as a second language. The regulations further prescribe that only educational components that directly enhance the employability of the participants are allowable. To gain approval, a component must establish a direct link between education and job readiness.

Currently, campus-based programs that meet these requirements must submit an application to CDSS, which maintains a list of approved programs on its website. Staff notes the list predominantly includes certificate and degree programs. Any newly qualifying programs that meet the eligibility requirements after September 1, 2022, must be identified within six months of the program's formation. After September 1, 2022, the list will be updated monthly to identify new programs, newly qualifying programs, and previously approved programs that no longer meet the criteria. Based on the list of approved programs posted on the CDSS website, there were over 14,000 programs in California institutions of higher education that have been approved by CDSS as containing at least one employment and training component, making students who participate in these programs exempt from the CalFresh student eligibility rule.

<https://www.cdss.ca.gov/inforesources/calfresh-resource-center/policy>

This bill directs CDSS to consider *all* adult education, career technical education, certificate, and degree programs, as well as the listed student support programs that have a component equivalent to an employment and training component

(pursuant to federal regulations), as a state-approved local education program that increases employability (to the extent permitted by federal law). In listing and describing specific programs, this change limits CDSS' role in reviewing individual programs to determine which programs have a component equivalent to an employment and training component. Other campus-based programs must seek CDSS approval.

5) ***Prior legislation.***

SB 761 (Ashby, 2025), similar to this bill, would have required the CSAC to amend its Grant Delivery System to ensure students who may be eligible for CalFresh are identified; (2) required CSAC and CDSS to enter into data-sharing agreement; and (3) deemed campus-based programs of study at a public institution of higher education, as specified, as a state-approved local education program that increases employability and therefore qualify for the student exemption for CalFresh eligibility. SB 761 was vetoed by the Governor whose message read, in part:

***“I strongly support the author’s goal of expanding eligible college student participation in the CalFresh program and applaud the author for her commitment to this issue. However, as drafted, this bill contains significant policy and implementation challenges with respect to the required data-sharing agreements. I encourage the author to work with CDSS on a more implementable solution that reduces both privacy risks and the complexity of creating new data-sharing systems across multiple agencies.”***

AB 1514 (Reyes, 2023) would have required CDSS to convene a workgroup of various stakeholders to develop recommendations to allow data from the FAFSA to be released to county welfare departments in order to authorize students to apply to receive public social services based on data collected from their FAFSA application. AB 1514 was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

AB 1393 (Calderon, 2023) would have authorized CSAC to establish a food benefit pilot program for the purpose of providing students, who receive financial aid through the California Dream Act, with funding for food. AB 1393 was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

## **SUPPORT**

University of California Office of the President (Co-Sponsor)  
 Advanced Consulting, LLC  
 Alliance for a Better Community  
 California Association of Food Banks  
 California Community Colleges, Chancellor’s Office  
 California Competes: Higher Education for a Strong Economy  
 California Dental Association  
 California State Student Association  
 Center for Healthy Communities at California State University, Chico

Coalition of California Welfare Rights Organizations  
College Access Plan  
Communities in Schools of Los Angeles  
DIY Girls  
Expanded Learning Alliance  
First Gen Empower  
Fulfillment Fund  
Future Leaders of America  
Heart of Los Angeles  
Journey House  
Junior Leagues of California State Public Affairs Committee  
Kid City Hope Place  
Los Angeles Urban Foundation  
Michelson Center for Public Policy  
Motivating Our Students Through Experience  
New Ways to Work  
NextGen California  
Operation Jump Start  
Parent Engagement Academy  
Project Soar  
Puente Learning Center  
Second Harvest Food Bank of Orange County  
Somos Familia Valle  
Southern California College Attainment Network  
Student Homes Coalition  
Swipe Out Hunger  
uAspire  
University of California Student Association  
Young Invincibles

**OPPOSITION**

None received

**-- END --**

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

<b>Bill No:</b>	SB 928	<b>Hearing Date:</b>	April 15, 2026
<b>Author:</b>	Cervantes		
<b>Version:</b>	March 24, 2026		
<b>Urgency:</b>	No	<b>Fiscal:</b>	No
<b>Consultant:</b>	Olgalilia Ramirez		

**Subject:** California State University: faculty employees.

## SUMMARY

This bill requires that the instructor of record for a California State University (CSU) course be a person who is qualified to serve as a faculty employee and explicitly requires that a CSU faculty employee be a person.

## BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the CSU system, made of 22 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. (Education Code (EC) §§ 66606 and 89030 et seq.)
- 2) Requires the CSU Trustees to provide by rule for the government of their appointees and employees, including, among other things, rules related to appointment, classification, and duties. (EC § 89500)
- 3) Requires that a California Community College (CCC) instructor, librarian, counselor, student personnel worker, supervisor, administrator, chief administrative officer, extended opportunity programs and services worker, disabled students programs and services worker, apprenticeship instructor, or health supervisor be a *person* who meets the minimum qualifications to serve in that position established in current law. (EC § 87359.2(a))
- 4) Requires that the instructor of record for a community college course be a *person* who meets minimum qualifications to serve as a faculty member teaching noncredit or credit instruction. (EC § 87359.2(b))

## ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Requires that the instructor of record for a CSU course of instruction be a person who meets the rule to serve as a faculty employee teaching credit or noncredit instruction.

- 2) Requires that a CSU faculty employee be a person who meets the rule to serve in that position.
- 3) States the bill's provisions do not prohibit CSU employees from using artificial intelligence (AI) tools to assist in the operations of the CSU or in providing services to CSU students.
- 4) States that "faculty employee" includes, but is not limited to, an employee of the CSU who is a professor, lecturer, librarian, counselor, or coach. These positions include instructional and non-instructional positions as well as full-time, part-time, probationary, tenured, temporary, and extension for-credit positions.

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) **Need for the bill.** According to the author, "In February 2025, the California State University (CSU) announced a \$17 million contract with OpenAI to provide ChatGPT Edu to all faculty, staff, and students on its 22 campuses as part of a larger "AI Powered University" initiative. The contract between the CSU and OpenAI is the largest contract ever established between a university system and an artificial intelligence (AI) company, and was ratified without faculty consent. While there is room for technology tools like AI to contribute in CSU, human faculty are still necessary and best suited to teach human students. Senate Bill 928 would erect guardrails to prevent instructional and non-instructional faculty employees at the CSU from being replaced by AI. The bill would require that faculty positions—which includes professors, lecturers, librarians, counselors, and coaches—must be held by an individual who meets all the minimum qualifications as determined by the Trustees of the California State University. This bill would also require that the instructor of record for a course of instruction shall be a person who meets the rule to serve as a faculty employee teaching credit or noncredit instruction. SB 928 builds upon the work I did in Assembly Bill 2370 (2024) and Senate Bill 241 (2025) to provide similar faculty protections within the California Community Colleges."
- 2) **What's the problem?** AI has been described as the quality of any computer program to sense, reason, act, and adapt like humans. As such, it performs with near-humanlike abilities. Fear that the technology could potentially replace human jobs is a growing concern across many sectors. At the same time, the rapid development of AI has opened opportunities that have enhanced human capabilities. This dynamic is also felt in education, as these technologies provide useful tools for enhancing instructional practices and student learning, but also bring about the need to defend the role of human faculty and other educator positions. It also brings about the need to protect instructional quality for students that ensures they are adequately prepared for careers in their field of study. Current law, enacted by SB 241 (Cervantes, Chapter 214, Statutes of 2025) and AB 2370 (Cervantes, Chapter 66, Statutes of 2024), explicitly required community college instructors and certain employees to be a *person* and required that the instructor of record for a community college course be a *person* that is qualified for the position, respectively. This bill attempts to build on that policy by enacting similar requirements for CSU faculty and faculty employee positions.

- 3) ***COVID pandemic accelerated virtual instruction.*** The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated the expansion of virtual instruction within the CSU, as campuses shifted to distance learning. Prior to the pandemic, CSU had already incorporated online instruction as a means of expanding access, with the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) reporting (*An Evaluation of CSU's Cross Campus Online Education Program in 2018*) that 19 percent of CSU undergraduates took at least one fully online class as early as 2015. The LAO recently reported, in its trends in higher education series, that online instruction increased significantly during the COVID-19 pandemic and remains above the pre-pandemic levels. CSU continues to offer online courses systemwide, including cross-campus enrollment in fully online courses, reflecting the ongoing role of virtual instruction within the system. Online courses can be a popular option for students who want greater flexibility in how they access their education, particularly for those who are place-bound or have work and family obligations. Arguably, the rapid growth of online instruction has also contributed to increased use of AI to support teaching and learning, particularly in virtual settings, clarifying that course instruction remains the responsibility of qualified faculty is timely.
  
- 4) ***AI integration in higher education.*** AI can provide numerous benefits in augmenting traditional methods of learning and instruction. Examples of this capability include offering interactive simulations, virtual reality experiences, and intelligent tutoring systems, as well as improving accessibility for students with disabilities with text-to-speech and speech-to-text technology. CSU, in particular, recently declared itself an AI-empowered higher education system, integrating AI learning and teaching tools across the system, which further demonstrates AI's growing influence in educational settings. CSU is partnering with tech companies, including OpenAI, to create its AI-powered higher education system with the goal of enacting a systemwide AI strategy to equip students, faculty, and institutions to be positioned to lead the state in leveraging emerging AI technologies. For faculty, this includes access to AI technologies, training, and transformative research capabilities. Students are to be equipped with personalized learning tools and access to apprenticeship programs within the industry. Seemingly, the intent of the initiative is to foster greater innovation in an educational environment to support successful outcomes.

At the same time, ensuring student success in educational programs involves a personal element to effectively educate and foster personal growth among individuals. Faculty have the ability to simulate critical and creative thinking, inspire them, cultivate empathy and moral conviction, and respond to unexpected situations. It has been stated that when establishing policies regarding the integration of AI, the Legislature should strive to strike a balance that fosters innovation while minimizing adverse consequences in other aspects of civic life. The same principle applies in the educational setting. This bill attempts to preserve the role of faculty in course instruction while allowing for the use of AI in the classroom to enhance instructional practices.

**SUPPORT**

California Faculty Association (sponsor)

**OPPOSITION**

None received

**-- END --**

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

**Bill No:** SB 1381 **Hearing Date:** April 15, 2026  
**Author:** Cervantes  
**Version:** March 25, 2026  
**Urgency:** No **Fiscal:** Yes  
**Consultant:** Ian Johnson

**Subject:** State special schools: information.

## SUMMARY

This bill requires local educational agencies (LEAs) to provide parents and guardians of specified students with disabilities with information about state special schools, including the California Schools for the Deaf and the California School for the Blind, through annual parent notifications and during the individualized education program (IEP) process.

## BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Requires school districts, at the beginning of each school year, to notify parents or guardians of specified rights, responsibilities, and school policies, including attendance options, available programs, and other required disclosures.
- 2) Requires the annual notification to include information on topics such as enrollment options, career technical education pathways, apprenticeship opportunities, dual enrollment, public health guidance, and student safety topics, with the California Department of Education (CDE) responsible for developing certain standardized components of the notice.
- 3) Authorizes school districts to provide annual notifications by mail, electronically, or other written communication methods, requires acknowledgment of receipt, and mandates translation of notices when a threshold of non-English-speaking pupils is met.
- 4) Requires that all individuals with exceptional needs receive special education instruction and related services at no cost, consistent with federal law.
- 5) Requires that pupils with disabilities be educated with nondisabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate and that more restrictive placements occur only when necessary.
- 6) Requires IEP teams, for pupils who are deaf, hard of hearing, deaf-blind, or visually impaired, to consider language and communication needs, access to peers and professionals, and appropriate instructional modalities, including braille where appropriate.

- 7) Requires IEP teams, when determining placement and least restrictive environment for pupils who are deaf, hard of hearing, or deaf-blind, to consider a range of placement options, including those provided by school districts, county offices of education, nonpublic schools, and the California Schools for the Deaf.
- 8) Requires IEPs to be developed within specified timelines, reviewed at least annually, and implemented promptly, with procedural safeguards ensuring parent participation in meetings and decision making.

## ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Requires an LEA, as part of its existing annual parent notification, to provide parents or guardians of a pupil who is deaf, hard of hearing, blind, visually impaired, or deaf-blind with information regarding the option to attend a state special school, including the California Schools for the Deaf and the California School for the Blind.
- 2) Commencing with the 2027-28 school year, requires an LEA, when developing, reviewing, or revising an IEP for a pupil who is deaf, hard of hearing, or deaf-blind, to provide the pupil's parent, guardian, or educational rights holder with information about the California Schools for the Deaf.
- 3) Requires the CDE, on or before July 1, 2027, to develop and provide standardized informational materials to LEAs for purposes of these notifications.

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, "My district proudly hosts the California School for the Deaf in Riverside. In alignment with Senate Bill 1381, we are committed to ensuring that parents or guardians of students who are deaf, hard of hearing, blind, visually impaired, or deaf blind receive comprehensive notification regarding the option for their child to attend a state special school. While interdistrict transfers may sometimes be met with reservations, it is essential that we consider the individual needs of each child and prioritize their best interests.

"The California School for the Deaf Riverside (CSDR) provides specialized resources, tools, and expertise designed to support the unique needs of deaf students. We have seen firsthand how students in such dedicated environments can achieve not only academic success but also personal growth, with some even reaching remarkable milestones such as winning CIF championships. This is the motivation behind my introduction of this bill: to make sure families are informed about available opportunities and can access the most fitting educational environments for their children.

"By expanding access to these specialized schools, we are not diminishing the resources of local districts; rather, we are fostering a collaborative environment

where all can thrive. This alignment allows districts to utilize their resources more effectively while placing students in settings that cater specifically to their needs. Ultimately, our shared goal is to do what is right for our students. We all understand that education is a critical pathway to social mobility, and it is our duty to advocate for equitable access for every child.”

- 2) ***The role of state special schools within the special education system.*** State law establishes a continuum of special education placements, with the majority of pupils with disabilities served by their LEA and a smaller share served in more specialized settings, including nonpublic schools and state special schools. California operates three state special schools, including the California Schools for the Deaf (Northern and Southern California) and the California School for the Blind, which are intended to serve pupils whose needs cannot be met in traditional local settings.

Consistent with federal law, IEP teams are responsible for determining placement based on a pupil’s unique needs, with a strong preference for the least restrictive environment and meaningful parent participation in decision making. Existing law also requires IEP teams, in the case of pupils who are deaf, hard of hearing, or deaf-blind, to consider a range of placement options, including the California Schools for the Deaf.

- 3) ***This bill adds a targeted information requirement within the IEP process.*** This bill builds on the existing IEP framework by requiring LEAs, beginning in the 2027-28 school year, to provide parents of pupils who are deaf, hard of hearing, or deaf-blind with information about the California Schools for the Deaf when an IEP is developed, reviewed, or revised. This requirement is distinct from existing law, which focuses on ensuring that IEP teams consider appropriate placement options, but does not explicitly require that parents be provided with standardized information about specific state-operated schools during the IEP process.

The bill also separately requires LEAs to include information about both the California Schools for the Deaf and the California School for the Blind in annual parent notifications, suggesting an intent to increase awareness of state special school options more broadly.

- 4) ***Committee amendments to ensure consistent treatment of state special schools.*** As currently drafted, this bill requires LEAs to provide parents of pupils who are deaf, hard of hearing, or deaf-blind with information about the California Schools for the Deaf during the IEP process, but does not include a parallel requirement for pupils who are blind or visually impaired to receive information about the California School for the Blind. This results in inconsistent treatment of the state’s special schools within the same IEP policy framework.

According to the author’s office, this difference was not intentional. To address this issue, ***staff recommends amendments*** to align the IEP-related notification requirements with the bill’s annual parent notification provisions by also requiring LEAs to provide information about the California School for the Blind, as appropriate.

These amendments will ensure that families of pupils with sensory disabilities are provided with consistent information about state special school options at key decision points, while maintaining the individualized nature of IEP team placement decisions.

**SUPPORT**

None received

**OPPOSITION**

None received

**-- END --**

---

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

<b>Bill No:</b>	SB 945	<b>Hearing Date:</b>	April 15, 2026
<b>Author:</b>	Weber Pierson		
<b>Version:</b>	April 6, 2026		
<b>Urgency:</b>	No	<b>Fiscal:</b>	Yes
<b>Consultant:</b>	Therresa Austin		

**Subject:** School curriculum: physical education framework: cardiopulmonary resuscitation: automated external defibrillators.

### SUMMARY

This bill requires the Instructional Quality Commission (IQC) to consider including content on the importance of compression-only cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and automated external defibrillators (AED), as specified, during the next regularly scheduled revision of the Physical Education (PE) Curriculum Framework.

### BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Requires the governing board of a school district or the governing body of a charter school to include instruction in performing compression-only CPR within a health course, as specified, if the governing board or body requires a health course for graduation from high school. (Education Code (EC) § 51225.6)
- 2) Requires the California Department of Education (CDE) to provide guidance on how to implement such instruction, including, but not limited to, who may provide instruction. (EC § 51225.6)
- 3) Encourages school districts and charter schools to provide pupils general information on the use and importance of an AED. Specifies that the physical presence of an AED in the classroom is not required. (EC § 51225.6)
- 4) Establishes high school graduation requirements, including three years in English, two years in math, and two years of PE, and permits school districts to establish graduation requirements which exceed those required by the state. (EC § 51225.3)
- 5) Requires the state board and the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission (now known as the IQC), during its first revision of the PE Curriculum Framework, to include self-defense instruction and safety instruction for pupils in grades 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12. (EC § 51223.3)

### ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) This bill requires the IQC to consider including content on the importance of CPR and AEDs, as specified, during the next regularly scheduled revision of the PE Curriculum Framework.
- 2) Makes a series of findings and declarations related to the importance of expanding access to CPR and AED instruction.

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “Every minute after cardiac arrest, survival drops by 7 to 10 percent. More than 350,000 people suffer cardiac arrest outside a hospital each year in the United States, and nearly 90 percent don’t survive. Cardiac arrest isn’t rare and it doesn’t just affect older adults. About 23,000 children experience cardiac arrest outside of a hospital. Emergency responders typically arrive in 6 to 12 minutes, but irreversible brain damage can begin in just 3 to 5 minutes. That gap is where bystanders can save lives. Schools are the most effective place to train the next generation of lifesavers. Even a single 20-minute CPR training dramatically increases a student’s willingness to act in an emergency. While CPR and AED usage is already being taught, a vulnerable segment of the population is NOT receiving this education in high school. By requiring this education as part of a graduation requirement, we can ensure parity and safety in California high schools.”
- 2) ***The IQC and the State Board of Education (SBE).*** The Legislature has vested the IQC and the SBE with the authority to develop and adopt state curriculum and instructional materials. The IQC develops curriculum frameworks through a process involving practitioners and experts who have an in-depth understanding of curriculum and instruction, including the full scope and sequence of the curriculum in each subject and at each grade level, constraints on instructional time and resources, and the relationship of curriculum to state assessments and other measures of student progress. Changes are frequently made in response to public comment. The frameworks are then adopted by the SBE in a public meeting.

The resulting curriculum framework is intended to serve as a guidance document for educators and administrators on how to plan for and provide quality, skills-based, standards-aligned instruction on the various content areas.

The SBE also adopts, in a public process, instructional materials aligned to those frameworks for grades K-8. School district governing boards and charter schools then adopt instructional materials aligned to these standards and frameworks.

The respective revision and adoption processes have traditionally occurred on a regular schedule, giving schools a predictable timetable to plan and budget for changes to the curriculum. Local adoption of new curricula also involves significant local cost and investment of resources for professional development.

- 3) ***CPR and AED related content in the 2019 Health Education Framework.*** In 2016, the Legislature passed AB 1719 (Rodriguez, Chapter 556, Statutes of

2016), requiring local educational agencies (LEAs) that have a health course graduation requirement for high school to provide instruction on performing compression-only CPR. While this instructional requirement only speaks to applicable high school settings, the *2019 Health Education Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten through Grade Twelve (Framework)* identifies several grade bands where educators are encouraged to weave age-appropriate CPR and AED instruction within their curriculum. For instance:

- a) Transitional kindergarten (TK) through third grade: the Framework provides sample learning activities to help students understand heart emergencies, how to call for help, and how CPR can help keep a heart beating until medical personnel arrive.
- b) Fourth through sixth grade: the Framework encourages educators to partner with their school and local guest speakers to host a “Responding-to-Emergencies Day,” complete with drills and demonstrations of life-threatening situations, 9-1-1 calls, CPR performance, and direction on how to find the closest AED.
- c) Seventh through eighth grade: the Framework encourages educators to teach students about the warning signs of cardiac arrest as a way to connect students’ interest in sports and recreational activities to health education. The Framework also notes that compression-only CPR training can be provided to students in grade levels seven and eight in partnership with local chapters of organizations like the American Red Cross, the American Heart Association, local emergency medical service providers, or credentialed school nurses.
- d) Ninth through twelfth grade: In addition to outlining the CPR instruction required by AB 1719, the Framework also provides examples of injury prevention and safety learning activities that help students practice health literacy by reviewing warning signs and risk factors of a potential heart condition and encouraging students to advocate for themselves.

Health education content is required for students in all grade levels; however, *how* the content is delivered is the decision of LEAs. LEAs decide whether or not to provide a health education course, the length of that course, and whether or not it is a graduation requirement.

This bill seeks to address the inequity that may present itself when an LEA does not offer a dedicated high school health education course through which the CPR and AED instruction may be provided. While LEAs are not universally required to offer high school health education courses, they *are* required to provide PE courses in order to meet the two-course statewide graduation requirement.

Following this logic, this bill requires the IQC, during the next revision of the PE Framework, to consider including content on the importance, performance, and use of CPR and AEDs. Again, curricular frameworks are intended to serve as a guidance document for educators on how to provide standards aligned instruction. Educators are not required to follow frameworks exactly. However,

including CPR and AED content within the PE Framework may provide educators with the support they need to ensure that such instruction can be better integrated into their individual curriculum and course plans.

- 4) ***The Curriculum Guidance Study and future of curriculum development and adoption.*** The 2025-26 budget, through AB 121 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 8, Statutes of 2025), included \$1 million for a Curriculum Guidance Study to evaluate the processes by which other states develop curriculum guidance, and to make recommendations about how to improve and streamline California's processes across all content areas. The report is required to include, among other topics:
- a) The roles and responsibilities of the CDE, the IQC, the SBE, the Legislature, LEAs, educators, parents and guardians, and the public; and
  - b) The processes and cycles for developing, revising, and adopting content standards, curriculum frameworks, and other instructional guidance, and how available instructional time in elementary and secondary schools is considered.

This report is to be completed by January 1, 2027.

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

AB 1719 (Rodriguez, Chapter 556, Statutes of 2016) requires school districts and charter schools serving students in grades 9 through 12, commencing with the 2018-19 school year, to include instruction in CPR if they require a course in health education for graduation from high school.

SB 1290 (Kehoe, Chapter 703, Statutes of 2010) requires the SBE and the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission to include self-defense instruction, as defined, and safety instruction, as defined, in the next revision of the PE Framework for pupils in grades 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12.

## **SUPPORT**

American Heart Association (co-sponsor)  
 Eric Paredes Save a Life Foundation (co-sponsor)  
 California Association of School Police Chiefs  
 California Coalition of School Safety Professionals  
 California Society for Respiratory Care  
 California Teachers Association  
 Capital City CPR  
 CFT – A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO  
 Emergency Medical Services Administrators' Association of California  
 Habematolel Pomo of Upper Lake  
 Heartshield Project  
 Kyle J. Taylor Foundation  
 Los Angeles School Police Management Association  
 Los Angeles School Police Officers Association

McMahon Steel Company, Inc.  
National Association of EMS Physicians  
Orange County Fire Authority  
Riverside Police Officers Association  
Riverside Sheriffs' Association  
Safeplay CPR & AED Training  
Sudden Arrhythmia Death Syndromes Foundation  
Via Heart Project  
One Individual

**OPPOSITION**

None received

**-- END --**

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

<b>Bill No:</b>	SB 965	<b>Hearing Date:</b>	April 15, 2026
<b>Author:</b>	Blakespear		
<b>Version:</b>	March 25, 2026		
<b>Urgency:</b>	No	<b>Fiscal:</b>	Yes
<b>Consultant:</b>	Michelle Nguyen		

**Subject:** Public libraries: library cards.

## SUMMARY

This bill prohibits a public library from requiring that a parent or guardian be present for the issuance of a public library card to a California resident who is 16 or 17 years old.

## BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the California Library Services Act for the purpose of ensuring that all people have free and convenient access to all library resources and services, regardless of where they live or of the tax base of their local government. (Education Code (EC) § 18700 and 18701)
- 2) Defines a jurisdiction as a county, city and county, city, or any district that is authorized by law to provide public library services and that operates a public library. (EC § 18710)
- 3) Defines a public library as a library, or two or more libraries, that serves its residents free of charge and that is operated by a single public jurisdiction. (EC § 18710)
- 4) Defines a school library as an organized collection of printed and audiovisual materials that makes these materials as well as necessary equipment and services of a staff accessible to elementary and secondary school pupils and teachers. (EC § 18710)
- 5) Defines a cooperative library system means a public library system that consists of two or more jurisdictions entering into a written agreement to implement a regional program under the Public Library Services Act and was designated a library system under the Public Library Services Act of 1963 or a successor to that library system. (EC § 18710)

## ANALYSIS

This bill prohibits a public library from requiring that a parent or guardian be present for the issuance of a public library card to a California resident who is 16 or 17 years old.

This bill also includes intent language to resolve issues related to liability in the case of lost, stolen, or missing books.

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “there are nearly 1 million residents who are 16 and 17 years old who may be subject to in-person parental consent requirements to get a library card. ... Library card policies for minors vary widely by jurisdiction across the state. ... These different requirements, particularly those requiring a parent or guardian to be physically present, create inconsistent access to a public resource for older teens across the state. ... Parental consent in-person requirements create practical barriers for teens whose parents or guardians may not have the time, availability, or flexibility to accompany them to a library. As a result, an otherwise responsible teenager may be prevented from accessing books, study materials, and employment resources.

This bill would establish a clear statewide standard in California allowing 16- and 17-year-olds to independently obtain and use a public library card. ... [This bill] clarifies eligibility under existing systems while preserving local control over library operations and accountability for materials. Policies regarding lost or damaged items can be addressed through existing library policies. The bill maintains the requirement for a parent or guardian signature on the application while removing the need for in-person presence to get a library card.”

- 2) ***Public libraries are run and funded primarily by local governments.*** As defined in statute, a public library (also known as a local public library or a local library) is a library, or two or more libraries, that serves its residents free of charge and that is operated by a single public jurisdiction, such as a county, city, special district, or a joint powers authority. Typically, the jurisdiction of the public library designates a central library to coordinate activities among all the library branches within a jurisdiction. Preliminary 2023-24 data from the Public Libraries Survey show that 187 jurisdictions, with 1,127 sites (including central libraries and their branches), are operating in California. With regard to funding, around 94% of local library funding comes from local governments, and the remaining 6% comes from the state and federal governments.
- 3) ***Other initiatives provided library cards for students, but they had limited statewide impact.*** Multiple national, regional, and local initiatives have sought to provide library cards for students. One notable prior initiative was called the Student Success Initiative, which was developed by the Pacific Library Partnership and NorthNet Library System in 2016 to create collaborative partnerships between public libraries and schools that provided library cards for students in California. By 2018-19, this project included 70 public libraries with partnerships with schools. Some of these partnerships focused on elementary school students, and others focused on high schools. Though library card policies vary based on the memorandum of understanding between the school district and the library, most of the partnerships included provisions where library cards would be automatically provided to students without the parents’ signature, but an opt-out provision would be available for parents who did not want their child to participate. This program

has since been folded into the Local Public Library Partnership Program created by SB 321 (Ashby, Chapter 598, Statutes of 2023).

- 4) ***Age-old debate on statewide uniformity and consistency vs. reducing local flexibility.*** Current law is silent on how 16- and 17-year-olds obtain public library cards, which provides flexibility and discretion for public libraries to determine what is needed for youths under 18 to obtain a library card. Though some public libraries require that parents or guardians be present in person for a child's library card application, some public libraries simply require a signature from a parent or guardian, and some do not require a signature at all, so long as the applicant has proof of identification and residency. Public libraries also do not have a uniform requirement for the age threshold for which an in-person parent is needed, or if a signature is needed. These decisions are currently made locally.

For example, the Los Angeles County Library requires that children under 18 must have a parent or guardian sign their library card application, but doesn't need them to be in person; however, the Los Angeles County Library does require a parent or guardian to be present to fill out a form for a child under 18 to access the internet at the library. Within the same county is the South Pasadena Public Library, which requires a parent or legal guardian to be in person to sign a library card application for children under 18, with the adult needing to show valid identification with verification of current address.

This bill prohibits public libraries from requiring that parents or guardians be present for the issuance of a public library card to a California resident who is 16- or 17-years old, which would provide for a uniform law on this policy. Opponents of this bill may object to removing the ability for public libraries to make local decisions on a parent's or guardian's in-person presence for the issuance of a library card. This bill does not make other changes to how a 16- or 17-year-old would obtain a public library card.

- 5) ***Author's amendments to be taken as committee amendments.*** This bill includes intent language to resolve issues related to liability in the case of lost, stolen, or missing books, which may arise from prohibiting public libraries from requiring that parents or guardians be in-person for a 16- or 17-year-old California resident to obtain a public library card. However, as mentioned in comments above, because this bill does not make changes to parent or guardian signature policies at the local level, *the author suggests amending the bill, and committee staff concurs, to strike intent language to resolve issues related to liability in the case of lost, stolen, or missing books.*

- 6) ***Prior and Related Legislation.***

SB 321 (Ashby, Chapter 598, Statutes of 2024) established the Local Public Library Partnership Program, under the administration of the State Librarian, to promote collaboration between public libraries and local educational agencies (LEAs) and to ensure that all pupils have access to a local public library by third grade. The bill reflects legislative intent to expand equitable access to library resources for students statewide and reduce barriers to library use through school-library partnerships.

SB 34 (Umberg, Chapter 297, Statutes of 2022) requires the California Department of Education—in an earlier version of this legislation—to administer a competitive grant program to award one-time grant funding to LEAs, library districts, and public libraries for the purpose of providing every public school student with a student success card. SB 34 was subsequently amended to relate to public contracts.

**SUPPORT**

Alliance for Children’s Rights  
CFT – A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO  
Children Now  
End Child Poverty California  
The Grauer School

**OPPOSITION**

California Library Association

**-- END --**

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

**Bill No:** SB 1082 **Hearing Date:** April 15, 2026  
**Author:** Niello  
**Version:** March 19, 2026  
**Urgency:** No **Fiscal:** No  
**Consultant:** Michelle Nguyen

**Subject:** Pupil attendance: interdistrict transfers: agreements: policies.

**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 clarifies timelines and procedures for school districts reviewing interdistrict transfer requests by 1) requiring that a school district of residence’s response to an interdistrict transfer request be deemed approved if the district does not issue a final decision on a request within 30 days and 2) requiring a school district of proposed enrollment to begin review of an interdistrict transfer request upon receipt, if a parent or guardian of a student submits an interdistrict transfer request concurrently to a school district of proposed enrollment and a school district of residence.

## BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Authorizes the governing boards of two or more school districts to enter into an agreement, for a term of up to five school years, for the interdistrict attendance of students who are residents of the school districts. (Education Code (EC) § 46600)
- 2) Authorizes the agreement to provide for the admission to a school district other than the school district of residence of a student who requests a permit to attend a school district of proposed enrollment (that is a party to the agreement). (EC § 46600)
- 3) Requires the agreement to stipulate the terms and conditions under which interdistrict attendance shall be permitted or denied, and authorizes the agreement to stipulate terms and conditions established by the school district of residence and the school district of enrollment under which the permit may be revoked. (EC § 46600)
- 4) Requires a school district of proposed enrollment to ensure that students who are admitted are selected through an unbiased process that prohibits an inquiry into or evaluation or consideration of whether or not a student should be enrolled based on academic or athletic performance, physical condition, proficiency in English, family income, or any of protected characteristics (race or ethnicity, gender, gender identity, gender expression, and immigration status). (EC § 46600)

- 5) Requires that a student who has been determined by personnel of either the school district of residence or the school district of proposed enrollment to have been the victim of an act of bullying committed by a student of the school district of residence to be given priority for interdistrict attendance. (EC § 46600)
- 6) Requires each school district of residence and school district of proposed enrollment to post on its website the procedures and timelines regarding a request for an interdistrict transfer permit in a manner that is accessible to the public, including a link to the policy of the governing board of the school district. (EC § 46600.2)
- 7) Requires that a school district of residence and a school district of proposed enrollment to notify a parent submitting a current year request of its final decision within 30 calendar days from the date the request was received. (EC § 46600.2)
- 8) Requires a school district that denies a request for an interdistrict transfer to advise the parent, in writing, of the right to appeal to the county board of education within 30 calendar days from the date of the final denial. (EC § 46600.2)
- 9) Provides for a process to appeal a request for an interdistrict transfer, including a) requiring a parent to appeal to a county board of education within 30 calendar days should they choose to file an appeal, and b) requiring the county board of education to determine whether the student should be permitted to attend the school district of proposed enrollment and the applicable period of attendance within 30 calendar days after the appeal is filed. (EC § 46601)

## ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Requires that a school district of residence's response to an interdistrict transfer request be deemed approved if the school district of residence does not issue a final decision on a request within the existing statutory timeline of 30 calendar days.
- 2) Requires a school district of proposed enrollment to begin review of an interdistrict transfer request upon receipt, irrespective of the status of the school district of residence's response, if a parent or guardian of a student submits an interdistrict transfer request concurrently to a school district of proposed enrollment and a school district of residence.
- 3) Requires the governing board of a school district entering into an interdistrict attendance agreement to adopt a policy regarding the relevant procedures and timelines relating to a request for an interdistrict transfer, and to require all agreements entered on or after January 1, 2027 to include the provisions of these policies. The policy shall include, but not be limited to, the following provisions:

- a) The date that the school district will begin accepting and processing interdistrict transfer requests for the subsequent school year and any other applicable timelines for submitting a request.
- b) The criteria the school district will use to approve or deny a request, and any information or documents that must be submitted as supporting evidence.
- c) The process and timelines for which a denial of a request may be appealed within the school district before the school district renders a final decision, and any other relevant information regarding the appeals process.
- d) That failure of the parent to meet any timelines established by the school district shall be deemed an abandonment of that request.
- e) Applicable timelines for processing a request, including:
  - i) Notifying a parent submitting a current year request of its final decision within 30 calendar days of the date the request was received, and that if a response is not issued by the school district of residence within 30 calendar days, the request shall be deemed approved for the school district of residence.
  - ii) Notifying a parent submitting a future year request of its final decision as soon as possible, but no later than 14 calendar days after the commencement of instruction in the school year for which interdistrict transfer is sought.
- f) The conditions under which an existing interdistrict transfer permit may be revoked or rescinded.

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for this bill.*** According to the author, “families requesting interdistrict transfers “often experience lengthy delays—sometimes 60 to 90 days or longer—from the district of residence. During this time, districts of desired attendance frequently wait to begin their own review until a release decision is issued. These delays are rarely intentional and often reflect administrative workload and capacity constraints. However, the impact of families can be significant, leaving them unable to make timely educational decisions and increasing the likelihood of appeals to county boards of education.

SB 1082 builds on existing law by clarifying expectations and ensuring that inaction does not function as an unintended denial. ... [This bill] streamlines the interdistrict transfer process by clarifying review timelines ... The bill enables districts of residence to waive review and approve an exit request when no response is issued within 30 days ... Together, these changes ensure families receive timely decisions while reducing the administrative burden for school districts and county boards of education.”

- 2) ***Process and timelines for interdistrict transfers.*** The state has several options that allow students to transfer to other school districts, and interdistrict transfers are a longstanding state policy that allows a student to transfer from one district to another when both districts consent to the transfer. A student may wish to transfer for multiple reasons, including seeking certain educational programming not available in their district of residence. For a district of residence, many districts evaluating a request have a limited set of reasons for which they will release a student, and examples may include the availability of child care in the other district or the attendance of a sibling already enrolled in the other district. For a district of proposed enrollment, they may be evaluating impacted enrollment at the school and within the grade, as well as capacity constraints for the student's expected courses if they are in middle or high school.

Regarding timelines, for a parent submitting a current year request for an interdistrict transfer, the school district is currently required to notify a parent of its decision within 30 calendar days from when the request was received. For students denied a release, parents may appeal the decision to their county board of education within 30 calendar days from the date of final denial, and the county board of education has another 30 calendar days after the appeal is filed to determine whether the student should be permitted to attend the school district of proposed enrollment, as well as the applicable period of attendance.

A parent should theoretically be waiting 30 days to learn if their request was approved. If denied and then appealed to a county board of education, this process could take another 30 to 60 days, depending on when the parent files an appeal. In total, according to existing timelines, this means that a parent should be waiting between 1 to 3 months for a final decision on an interdistrict transfer permit.

- 3) ***Lack of data makes it difficult to verify to what extent this is a statewide problem.*** The author indicates that families requesting an interdistrict permit often experience significant delays far exceeding statutory timelines, which can create unnecessarily burdensome timelines for parents and students. Unfortunately, the state generally does not publish statewide or district-level data for the interdistrict permit system that can verify these claims. A Legislative Analyst's Office report from February 2021 on the District of Choice Program stated that in 2018-19, 146,109 students used an interdistrict permit and that 635 districts accepted students through interdistrict permits; however, this data relies upon a special data extraction prepared by the California Department of Education (CDE). *Without publicly available data on interdistrict transfers—including how many requests are approved or denied every year, how long requests take to be resolved, how often and when appeals are filed, and which districts or county boards of education are seeing longer than expected delays—it is difficult to know to what extent this is a statewide problem without a more in-depth survey of the individual county offices of education.*
- 4) ***Could concurrent review expedite the overall process while also creating unnecessary workload for school districts of proposed enrollment?*** School districts of proposed enrollment often do not begin reviewing interdistrict transfer requests until school districts of residence have approved them. The typical rationale for this is that if the school district of residence denies the request, the

request is considered denied regardless of the school district of proposed enrollment's response, so it is wise to wait for the school district of residence's decision to avoid unnecessary workload. However, if a parent decides to appeal a denied request, a county board of education would ideally review an appeal with responses from both the school district of residence and the school district of proposed attendance, in order for a more timely resolution and to avoid the possibility of needing a *second* appeal if the county board of education is receiving information from the two school districts on separate timelines.

*Without information about how often denials of interdistrict transfer requests lead to appeals, this committee could consider how this bill's requirement for concurrent review may expedite the overall process, and if it also potentially creates unnecessary and additional workload for school districts of proposed enrollment.*

- 5) ***Automatic approval for school district of residence's response is meant to put pressure on districts, but the school district of enrollment's response is still needed to approve transfer.*** According to the author, it is common for parents to wait much longer than 30 days for a final decision, and in response, this bill requires that a school district of residence's response to an interdistrict transfer request be deemed approved if that district does not respond to the request within 30 days. This provision puts pressure on school districts of residence, but this provision does not provide an alternative if a district is actively evaluating the request but may need longer than 30 days.

Notably, this bill does not deem a request as automatically approved from the school district of proposed enrollment if that district takes longer than 30 days. This is presumably because the school district of proposed enrollment's evaluation is typically more complicated, because the district may be assessing not only potentially impacted enrollment at the school and the grade, but also evaluating enrollment capacity for the student's expected coursework if they are in middle or high school. Therefore, even if the school district of residence's response to an interdistrict transfer request is deemed approved, the request ultimately needs to be approved by both districts in order for interdistrict transfer to proceed.

- 6) ***Committee amendments.*** This bill requires a school district of residence's response to an interdistrict transfer request be deemed approved if the school district of residence does not issue a final decision on a request within the existing statutory timeline of 30 calendar days. However, given the lack of statewide information about how widespread of an issue this may be, ***staff recommends amendments as follows:***

- a) *Removes the provision that the school district of residence's response to an interdistrict transfer request be deemed approved if the school district of residence does not issue a final decision within 30 days.*
- b) *Adds that if either the school district of residence or school district of proposed enrollment determines that more time is needed to gather required information, the school district may extend the review period by up to an additional 30 calendar days if written notice is provided to the student and parent within 30 days of receiving the request.*

- c) *Adds that if either the school district of residence or school district of proposed enrollment determines that a request for an interdistrict transfer is incomplete with regard to the application and materials required by the policies of the school districts, they shall notify the parent within 30 calendar days of receipt of the application and identify missing information or documentation required to process the request.*

7) ***Prior and Related Legislation.***

SB 399 (Niello, 2025) would have (1) required school districts to keep a record of all requests for interdistrict transfer and records of the disposition of those requests, including specified information; (2) required school districts to submit annually, by June 30, the information for the current school year to the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI); and (3) required the SPI to post annually, by August 1, the information on the CDE's website. SB 399 was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

AB 1127 (Luz Rivas & Robert Rivas, Chapter 781, Statutes of 2019) requires a school district of residence to approve an intradistrict transfer request for a victim of an act of bullying, and requires a school district of proposed enrollment that elects to accept an interdistrict transfer to accept all students to apply pursuant to this bill, as specified.

**SUPPORT**

Association of California County Boards of Education (co-sponsor)  
 Just Advocates (co-sponsor)  
 California Policy Center  
 Lighthouse Charter School  
 Monterey County Office of Education  
 Orange County Board of Education  
 Placer County Office of Education  
 Seneca Family of Agencies  
 One Individual

**OPPOSITION**

None received

-- END --

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

<b>Bill No:</b>	SB 1133	<b>Hearing Date:</b>	April 15, 2026
<b>Author:</b>	Strickland		
<b>Version:</b>	March 23, 2026		
<b>Urgency:</b>	No	<b>Fiscal:</b>	Yes
<b>Consultant:</b>	Therresa Austin		

**Subject:** Pupil instruction: preventative health instruction.

## SUMMARY

This bill requires the Instructional Quality Commission (IQC) to consider including information on evidence-based preventative health instruction, as specified, at the next regularly scheduled revision of the Health Education Framework.

## BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Requires the IQC, during its next revision of the Health Education Framework, on or after January 1, 2025, to consider including content on sextortion, as defined. (Education Code (EC) § 33546.2)
- 2) Requires the IQC, during its next revision of the Health Education Framework, on or after January 1, 2025, to consider including information on evidence-based schoolwide programs to support pupils in developing skills in mindfulness, distress tolerance, interpersonal effectiveness, and emotional regulation. (EC § 33546.4)
- 3) Requires the IQC, during the next revision of the publication Health Education Framework, to consider developing, and recommending for adoption by the State Board of Education (SBE), a distinct category on mental health instruction to educate students about all aspects of mental health. (EC § 51900.5 (a))
- 4) Requires each school district, county office of education, state special school, and charter school that offers one or more courses in health education to pupils in middle or high school to include instruction in mental health, as specified. (EC § 51925)

## ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Requires the IQC, during its next revision of the Health Education Framework, on or after January 1, 2027, to consider including information on evidence-based preventative health instruction, including information on nutrition, food literacy,

sleep, movement, stress management, and digital balance in an integrated manner that discusses these key health factors and the interrelationship and balance between them.

- 2) Specifies that the information considered for inclusion shall include, but not be limited to, the following:
  - a) How nutrition affects metabolism, inflammation, and long-term disease risk.
  - b) The role of exercise and physical activity in physical and mental health.
  - c) How stress and sleep influence hormones, weight, immunity, and cognition.
  - d) The impacts and responsible use of social media, artificial intelligence, and digital platforms.
  - e) How environmental factors such as air quality, water quality, and food environments impact health.
  - f) How daily choices influence the body and mental health.

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** “Healthy students are better prepared to learn. The Ready to Learn, Ready for Health Act encourages the inclusion of evidence-based preventative health education in California’s Health Education Framework. By helping students understand the importance of nutrition, sleep, physical activity, stress management, and healthy technology habits, we can support both academic success and lifelong health.

“SB 1133, the “Ready to Learn, Ready for Health” Act, simply requires that these preventative health topics be considered for inclusion in our public school health framework the next time it is revised.”

- 2) ***The IQC and the SBE.*** The Legislature has vested the IQC and the SBE with the authority to develop and adopt state curriculum and instructional materials. The IQC develops curriculum frameworks through a process involving practitioners and experts who have an in-depth understanding of curriculum and instruction, including the full scope and sequence of the curriculum in each subject and at each grade level, constraints on instructional time and resources, and the relationship of curriculum to state assessments and other measures of student progress. Changes are frequently made in response to public comment. The frameworks are then adopted by the SBE in a public meeting.

The resulting curriculum framework is intended to serve as a guidance document for educators and administrators on how to plan for and provide quality, skills-based, standards-aligned instruction on the various content areas.

The SBE also adopts, in a public process, instructional materials aligned to those frameworks for grades K-8. School district governing boards and charter schools then adopt instructional materials aligned to these standards and frameworks.

The respective revision and adoption processes have traditionally occurred on a regular schedule, giving schools a predictable timetable to plan and budget for changes to the curriculum. Local adoption of new curricula also involves significant local cost and investment of resources for professional development.

- 3) ***Health Education Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve.*** In May 2019, the SBE adopted the Health Education Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (the Framework) to provide instructional guidance and support to California teachers, administrators, curriculum specialists, other educators, and school boards for implementation of the health education content standards. According to the California Department of Education (CDE), the Framework was designed to “help students build strong and healthy relationships with their families, friends, and communities while strengthening their resiliency and personal decision-making skills for healthy living.” The Framework covers six content areas of health education:
- a) Nutrition and Physical Activity;
  - b) Growth and Development;
  - c) Injury Prevention and Safety;
  - d) Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drugs;
  - e) Mental, Emotional, and Social Health; and
  - f) Personal and Community Health.

The six content areas are woven throughout the grade spans and build upon each other to ensure students gain a holistic understanding of health.

- 4) ***What’s missing?*** This bill requires the IQC, during its next revision of the Health Education Framework, to consider including information on evidence-based preventative health instruction, including information on nutrition, food literacy, sleep, movement, stress management, and digital balance in an integrated manner that discusses these key health factors and the interrelationship and balance between them. However, it is worth noting that most, if not all, of these topics and connections can already be found throughout the existing Health Education Framework. Such examples include, but are not limited to:
- *Nutrition, food literacy, and disease risk:* TK and Kindergarten students learn that vitamin D from the sun and calcium from chickpeas, tofu, white beans, leafy greens, and dairy products make the bones that support their bodies stronger, and the vitamins in carrots are good for their eyes. Instruction for first graders builds on kindergarten foundations, allowing

them to learn that nutritious food that is high in vitamins and minerals can keep their immune system strong. Seventh and eighth grade students learn about the long-term health benefits associated with proper nutrition, such as a decreased risk of heart disease, stroke, certain types of cancers, and obesity.

- *Sleep, mental health, and cognition:* In kindergarten, students learn through storytelling and discussion how adequate sleep helps them perform better in school, sports, and activities, and makes them feel good mentally. In fifth grade, teachers can lead students in activities to study classroom sleep patterns and better understand the best practices for healthy sleep habits. In grades seven and eight, students learn how their individual decisions may have subsequent positive or negative health outcomes. For instance, staying up late to watch videos or study for a test leads to poor sleep and feeling tired the next day—the outcome may be poor performance in school, sports, or activities.
- *Digital balance and social media impacts on health:* In fourth grade, teachers may facilitate conversations with students about “netiquette,” safe internet use, and the importance of seeking the help of a trusted adult when feeling personally threatened or unsafe on the internet, or elsewhere. In grades seven and eight, students analyze the influences of culture, media, social media, and technology on their health decisions and the consequences of their decisions.
- *Environmental impacts on health:* In fourth grade, students build on the foundations of their science education to discover the direct connections between their health, the movement of potentially harmful materials from human activities like cleaning, and the safety of the water they drink, the air they breathe, and the food they eat. In seventh and eighth grade, students learn about local environmental challenges that affect their community’s health, like air, water, and noise pollution, or pesticide use, and are encouraged to develop information campaigns to raise awareness.

As discussed in Comment #3, curriculum frameworks are intended to provide educators and administrators with guidance on how to plan for and provide standards aligned instruction to students. Educators are not required to follow the Framework exactly and are encouraged to design their lesson plans to meet the needs of their students and communities, so long as they maintain alignment with standards. This also means they retain the flexibility to draw greater connections between the foundational concepts and topics taught in previous grade levels.

*The committee may wish to consider whether the topics identified by this bill are already sufficiently addressed in the Framework.*

- 5) ***The Curriculum Guidance Study and future of curriculum development and adoption.*** The 2025-26 budget, through AB 121 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 8, Statutes of 2025), included \$1 million for a Curriculum Guidance Study to evaluate the processes by which other states develop curriculum guidance, and

to make recommendations about how to improve and streamline California's processes across all content areas. The report is required to include, among other topics:

- a) The roles and responsibilities of the CDE, the IQC, the SBE, the Legislature, LEAs, educators, parents and guardians, and the public; and
- b) The processes and cycles for developing, revising, and adopting content standards, curriculum frameworks, and other instructional guidance, and how available instructional time in elementary and secondary schools is considered.

This report is to be completed by January 1, 2027.

6) ***Prior and related legislation.***

AB 1792 (M. Rodriguez, 2026) would require the IQC, during the next revision of the Health Education Framework, to include specific content related to sexual health instruction to educate pupils about dating abuse and digital violence. *AB 1792 is currently in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.*

AB 1766 (Krell, 2026) would require the IQC, the next time it revises the Health Framework, to consider including specified content on human trafficking and sexual exploitation. *AB 1766 is currently in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.*

SB 330 (Padilla, Chapter 481, Statutes of 2013) requires the IQC, during the next revision of the Health Framework, to consider developing a distinct category on mental health instruction to educate pupils about all aspects of mental health.

## **SUPPORT**

End Chronic Disease (sponsor)

## **OPPOSITION**

None received

-- END --

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

<b>Bill No:</b>	SB 1412	<b>Hearing Date:</b>	April 15, 2026
<b>Author:</b>	Rubio		
<b>Version:</b>	March 25, 2026		
<b>Urgency:</b>	No	<b>Fiscal:</b>	Yes
<b>Consultant:</b>	Michelle Nguyen		

**Subject:** Parental communication: teacher meetings.

## SUMMARY

This bill provides that a parent or guardian of a student has the right to communicate with their child’s teacher using a two-way telephonic service or a two-way audiovisual platform if the parent or guardian is unable to attend a meeting in person with a teacher.

## BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Provides that parents and guardians of students enrolled in public schools have the right and should have the opportunity to be informed by the school and to participate in the education of their children, as specified, including meeting with their child’s teacher or teachers and the principal of the school in which their child is enrolled, within a reasonable time of their request. (Education Code (EC) § 51101)
- 2) Provides that parents and guardians of students enrolled in public schools are mutually supportive and respectful partners in the education of their children within the public schools. (EC § 51101)

## ANALYSIS

This bill provides that a parent or guardian of a student has the right to communicate with their child’s teacher using a two-way telephonic service or a two-way audiovisual platform if the parent or guardian is unable to attend a meeting in person with a teacher. This bill also deletes an obsolete reference to a program that has since been repealed.

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) **Need for the bill.** According to the author, “existing law does not require schools to provide remote or virtual options for parent-teacher conferences outside of the special education context, leaving such decisions to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs). ... As a result, parents and guardians who are unable to attend conferences in person due to work schedules, transportation barriers, or other constraints may face challenges in engaging with educators. ... SB 1412 ensures that schools provide remote participation options, helping families who may struggle with transportation or are navigating the complexities of immigration to

actively participate in their child's education. ... By expanding access in this way, the bill supports equity, strengthens school-family communication, and helps ensure every student has the support needed to reach their full potential."

- 2) ***Parents and guardians of children enrolled in public schools have the right to participate in the education of their children.*** State law provides that parents and guardians of children enrolled in public schools have the right, and should have the opportunity, to participate in the education of their children in specified ways, including observing the classrooms in which their child is enrolled, being notified on a timely basis if their child is absent from school without permission, and being informed of their child's progress in school and the appropriate school personnel to be contacted if problems arise with their child.

One of these rights includes meeting with their child's teacher and the principal of the school in which their child is enrolled, within a reasonable time of their request. This statute was last amended in 2004, and with the widespread adoption of smartphones and remote audiovisual platforms such as Zoom, this bill provides an additional right for a parent or guardian of a student to communicate and meet with their child's teacher with a phone call or audiovisual system if the parent or guardian of a student is unable to attend an in-person meeting with a teacher, allowing for greater flexibility for the parent or guardian.

#### **SUPPORT**

None received

#### **OPPOSITION**

None received

**-- END --**

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

<b>Bill No:</b>	SB 960	<b>Hearing Date:</b>	April 15, 2026
<b>Author:</b>	Cabaldon		
<b>Version:</b>	February 3, 2026		
<b>Urgency:</b>	No	<b>Fiscal:</b>	Yes
<b>Consultant:</b>	Olgalilia Ramirez		

**Subject:** Public postsecondary education: community colleges: statewide baccalaureate degree program.

## SUMMARY

This bill limits the prohibition on California community college (CCC) duplication of California State University (CSU) baccalaureate degree programs to instances where a CSU's campus's local admission area includes or overlaps with the CCC district's territory, except when the CSU program has been impacted for at least three consecutive years. In so doing, this bill allows a CCC district to duplicate a CSU program where a CSU campus's local admission area *does not* include or overlap with the CCC district's territory. Lastly, this bill retains the prohibition on CCC baccalaureate degree program duplication of University of California (UC) programs statewide.

## BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Differentiates the missions and functions of public and independent institutions of higher education. Under these provisions:
  - a) The primary mission of the CSU is to offer undergraduate and graduate instruction through the master's degree in the liberal arts and sciences and professional education, including teacher education. The CSU is authorized to establish two-year programs only when mutually agreed upon by the Trustees and the CCC Board of Governors. The CSU is also authorized to jointly award the doctoral degree with the UC and with one or more independent institutions of higher education.
  - b) The UC provides undergraduate and graduate instruction and has exclusive jurisdiction in public higher education over graduate instruction in the professions of law, medicine, dentistry, and veterinary medicine. The UC is also the primary state-supported academic agency for research.
  - c) The independent institution of higher education requires undergraduate and graduate instruction and research in accordance with their respective missions.

- d) The mission and function of the CCC are to offer academic and vocational instruction at the lower division level, and the CCC is authorized to grant the associate degrees. The CCCs are also required to offer learning supports to close learning gaps, English as a Second Language instruction, and adult noncredit instruction, and support services which help students succeed at the postsecondary level. (Education Code (EC) § 66010.4)
- 2) Authorizes the CCC Board of Governors, in consultation with the CSU and the UC, to establish baccalaureate degree programs that do not duplicate a baccalaureate degree program offered by the CSU or UC. Allows for the approval of 30 CCC baccalaureate degree programs per academic year. Current law further requires the CCC Chancellor to consult with and seek feedback from the CSU Chancellor, the UC President, and the President of the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities on proposed baccalaureate degree programs, as specified, and establishes a mechanism for the assessment, consultation, and approval of programs where duplication is identified, as specified. (EC § 78040 et seq.)
- 3) Requires the CSU Trustees to ensure that any changes in the admission criteria for campus admission comply with specified consultation, public meeting, notification and disclosure requirements, and prohibits any change from becoming effective until one year has elapsed, or six months, if the change is based upon the resources of the local service area of the affected campus. Applies these requirements to all changes in the admission criteria that affect eligibility of local service area applicants, including changes to transfer requirements and determinations regarding impact of majors. (EC § 89030.5)

## ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Limits the prohibition on CCC duplication of CSU baccalaureate degree programs to instances where a CSU campus's local admission area includes or overlaps with the CCC district's territory, except when the CSU program has been impacted for at least three consecutive years prior to the date the program is approved.
- 2) Allows a CCC district to duplicate a CSU program where a CSU campus's local admission area *does not* include or overlap with the CCC district's territory.
- 3) Retains the prohibition on CCC baccalaureate degree program duplication of UC programs *statewide*.

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) **Need for the bill.** According to the author, "SB 960 is a student centered policy that allows a California Community College to offer a bachelor's degree in a high demand field when the regional California State University (CSU) has been

impacted in that same program for three consecutive years or if the program is not offered by the regional CSU.

“When CSU programs are consistently over enrolled and turning qualified students away, California cannot afford to let workforce pipelines stall. SB 960 provides a student and workforce focused approach to allowing some community colleges to offer a bachelor's degree. This bill removes an outdated barrier that prioritizes institutional boundaries over students' futures. By expanding affordable, local access to bachelor's degrees in critical technical fields, SB 960 strengthens California's workforce, fuels economic growth, and ensures students are not denied opportunity simply because a program is full.”

- 2) **Mission shift.** The state has four segments of higher education: three public and one private. Each plays a vital and unique role for the state and its students. Their mission statements are outlined in state statute. The CCCs are to have an open admission policy and bear the most extensive responsibility for lower-division undergraduate instruction. Its primary area of mission includes academic and vocational instruction leading to associate degrees and university transfer, career technical education, and remedial education. The primary mission of the CSU is undergraduate and graduate instruction through the master's degree. The UC was granted the sole authority to offer doctoral degrees and is the state's primary research institution. Despite the differentiation of mission, the Legislature has authorized the CSU and CCCs to go beyond their original mission to offer doctoral degrees and baccalaureate degree programs, respectively, so long as programs do not duplicate those offered by the other segments with primary jurisdiction. *Further expansion of CCC baccalaureate degree authority, as proposed in this bill, would signal the Legislature's willingness to allow CCCs to potentially deviate further from their core mission and duplicate programs offered by a segment with primary jurisdiction.*
- 3) **Existing CCC Bachelor's program.** SB 850 (Block, Chapter 747, Statutes of 2014) authorized the Board of Governors, in consultation with the CSU and the UC, to establish a CCC baccalaureate degree pilot program. The pilot program included 15 participating CCC districts to offer one baccalaureate degree program each to meet local workforce needs, as long as it did not duplicate a baccalaureate degree program already offered by the CSU or the UC. The original pilot led to the statewide authorization established by AB 927 (Medina, Chapter 565, Statutes of 2021), which allows the CCC Board of Governors to approve qualifying programs bi-annually. Today, as reported on the CCC Chancellor's website, there are more than 50 approved CCC baccalaureate programs statewide, primarily in applied and workforce-related fields such as health care, industrial technology, and public safety. Specific degree offerings include respiratory care, mortuary science, industrial automation, and public safety management. These programs are intended to address unmet regional workforce needs rather than broad expansion into traditional academic fields of study. Since 2017, approximately 1,893 students have attained a CCC bachelor's degree, with 293 completed in the 2023-2024 academic year. This bill aims to broaden the types of programs a CCC may offer beyond their current authority.

- 4) **Program duplication.** Under this measure, a CCC district would have greater flexibility to offer a baccalaureate degree program when a CSU campus offers that same program. This change represents a significant policy shift from a statewide prohibition to a local one (under certain circumstances). Duplication of CSU programs at a campus outside the local service area would no longer be restricted. The prohibition on CSU program duplication would apply only where a CSU campus whose local admission area includes or overlaps with the CCC district's territory. However, the bill establishes an exception to the local restriction based on CSU program impaction thereby focusing local expansion to high demand fields of study. Additionally, the UC duplication prohibition remains statewide, so a CCC district cannot offer a program already offered by a UC campus, no matter the location. Notably, the bill does not change the overall program cap or approval requirements for CCC baccalaureate degrees established in existing law. *Given that this bill would allow duplication of CSU programs, the committee may wish to consider whether additional institutional performance standards or student success benchmarks are warranted.*
- 5) **Impaction.** As mentioned, this bill provides an exception to the local restriction, allowing a CCC district to offer the same baccalaureate degree program only if that CSU program has been impacted for three consecutive years. An undergraduate major, program, or campus is designated as "impacted" (subject to approval by the Chancellor) when it receives more eligible applicants during the initial filing period than it can accommodate given its instructional resources and physical capacity. Impaction may be defined by a specific program or by the entering class level (i.e., freshmen or upper division), or some combination of these. Programs or campuses are then authorized (subject to approval) to include supplemental admission criteria to screen applicants within a specific enrollment category. CSU campuses are required to provide first priority to local admission area applicants for each impacted program.

The CSU reports that across the system dozens of academic programs are impacted, including nursing, business administration, electrical engineering, psychology and social work. Additionally, five campuses, Fullerton, Long Beach, San Diego, San Jose, and San Luis Obispo, are impacted for all undergraduate degree programs. Of the 193,000 undergraduate enrolled in the CSU's impacted programs for the fall 2025 semester, approximately 36 percent of these students, nearly 70,000 in total, transferred from a CCC. The committee may wish to consider whether additional support should be provided to CSU with primary jurisdiction for granting baccalaureate degrees to increase enrollment in high-demand areas prior to expanding CCC bachelor's degree authority.

Campuses may discontinue impaction upon approval by presenting evidence of sufficient, long-term capacity as part of their request. This bill is silent on what happens to a program approved if the CSU program is later discontinued from impaction. Additionally, this bill relies on CSU program impaction as a trigger for local duplication but does not provide an opportunity to address capacity issues prior to its implementation. Lastly, impaction is currently not described in the bill, which could raise questions and generate debate during implementation. For these reasons, ***staff recommends that the bill be amended as follows:***

- Define program impaction: *“Impacted program” means a specific baccalaureate degree program offered by a campus of the CSU that has been designated as impacted by the CSU in accordance with its established policies and procedures, and for which the number of eligible applications received in the initial filing period is greater than the number that can be accommodated by the program.*
  - *Delay CSU program impaction trigger by four years. During this time CSU campus wishing to discontinue impaction in accordance with the established policies and procedures for a baccalaureate degree program shall develop a plan describing how it will address enrollment demand and maintain student access for that program. The campus shall make the plan publicly available on its website.*
  - *Clarify that a community college baccalaureate degree program approved under the impaction-based duplication exception may continue to be offered regardless of any subsequent change in impaction status of the corresponding CSU program.*
- 6) **Local Admission Area.** This measure imposes geographic limits specifically around a CSU campus’ local admission area and CCC district territory. Current law establishes how CCC district territories are defined, organized, and governed within the state. However, local admission areas are not as clearly delineated in statute. This bill is silent on how the local admission area is to be determined, which may also prompt discussion and raise questions during implementation. For this reason, **staff recommends that the bill be amended** so that CSU’s local admission area is determined as follows:
- *For purposes of this article, a CSU campus’s local admission area or local service area shall be as identified by the CSU consistent with Section 89030.5 (c).*
- 7) **Impact on CCCs core mission.** In previous discussions around authorizing the offering of CCC baccalaureate degrees, concerns were raised that broadening the CCC mission would diminish attention to transfer, associate degree completion, remedial education goals, and career technical education. In an effort to address this concern and limit any potential impact on the current mission of the CCC, as well as on existing associate degree programs at local campuses. Existing law established by AB 927 limits the number of programs a CCC may offer to no more than 25 percent of the number of associated degree programs offered at the college. To the extent this bill facilitates additional growth in CCC baccalaureate programs, the existing cap may not serve as a reasonable limit. For this reason, **staff recommends that the bill be amended** to reduce the statutory cap from 25 percent to 15 percent.
- 8) **Alternative solutions to expand access.** This bill expands CCC’s ability to establish programs independent from CSU or UC. If it is the desire of the Legislature to expand access to baccalaureate degree programs, arguably, more effective and efficient alternatives do not require a departure from the CCC’s

mission to expand and streamline bachelor's degree pathways between CCCs and public or nonprofit universities. There are numerous examples of successful CCC/CSU pathway partnerships across the state, including Sonoma State University's (SSU) liberal studies bachelor's degree completion program, which provides upper-division instruction to transfer students taught by SSU faculty on the Mendocino Community College campus. This model brings the university to CCC students, building on the strength of each segment. Further, in its recommendation for alternatives to the original CCC baccalaureate degree pilot program, the LAO's analysis notes that improving alignment between CCC and the universities could increase the number of CCC students who ultimately obtain a bachelor's degree and reduce the amount of time students take to obtain their degree. The LAO report asserts that CCC and university pathways could not only be more cost-effective but also benefit more students (including place-bound students), thereby having a more widespread impact. *The committee may wish to consider all of the following:*

- *Could this bill undermine any incentive for CCC/CSU collaboration among the segments to streamline pathways? What is the expectation for collaboration among the segments?*
- *Can the process for developing CCC/CSU collaborative efforts to address access issues be modified to facilitate greater proliferation of these programs?*
- *Should a CCC be required to demonstrate that existing avenues for partnership with CSU are not possible or viable before seeking an expanded authorization to offer an independent baccalaureate degree?*

- 9) **Arguments in support.** In their letter of support submitted to this Committee, the Association of California Community College Administrators states, in part: "The California Community Colleges Baccalaureate Degree Program has proven to be a vital tool in expanding access to higher education for students across the state. Since its inception, ACCCA has supported this program because it provides students with an affordable and accessible pathway to earning a bachelor's degree. Many students, particularly working adults, first-generation college students, and those in underserved communities—benefit from the ability to complete their education locally and at a lower cost.

"SB 960 builds on the success of this program by addressing persistent capacity challenges in impacted CSU programs. By allowing CCCs to offer similar baccalaureate degrees in fields where demand exceeds available CSU enrollment, this bill will help reduce bottlenecks, accelerate time to degree completion, and better align educational opportunities with workforce needs."

- 10) **Arguments in opposition.** The CSU argues, in part, in their opposition letter, "Impaction is the result of a lack of equitable state investment in the CSU. While the community colleges benefit from Proposition 98's guaranteed funding, local tax revenue and access to bond authority for facility needs, the state's investment to the CSU is lagging, unpredictable and constrains our ability to fully meet student demand. For some programs, such as our pre-licensure Bachelor

of Science in nursing programs, impactation is driven almost entirely by factors outside of the CSU's control, including the limited capacity for clinical placements.

"Expanding access to baccalaureate programs at community colleges may seem like a practical way to increase access to a bachelor's degree, but it could unintentionally worsen the enrollment challenges already facing some CSU universities. While the CSU continues to address this dynamic issue through efforts such as our direct admissions program, enhanced recruitment in rural communities, and leveraging our online and hybrid program offerings, the shift proposed by this legislation could further erode CSU's transfer pipeline and cause additional pressure on universities already contending with budget and staff reductions."

11) ***Prior and related legislation.***

Recent legislative efforts have sought individual program or district specific exemptions from duplication restrictions, including the following:

AB 2694 (Alvarez, 2026) would narrow the prohibition on CCC baccalaureate degree programs duplication of CSU and UC programs based on geographic region. AB 2694 is pending hearing in the Assembly Higher Education Committee.

AB 664 (Alvarez, 2026) would establish an alternative pathway for baccalaureate degree approval for Southwestern Community College District by statutorily authorizing the CCC Chancellor to authorize the Southwestern Community College District to offer no more than 4 workforce-aligned baccalaureate degree programs. AB 664 is pending assignment in the Senate Rules Committee.

AB 2053 (Ta, 2026) would establish an alternative pathway for baccalaureate degree approval for Coast Community College District by statutorily authorizing the CCC Chancellor to authorize the Coast Community College District to offer a workforce-aligned cybersecurity baccalaureate degree program at Coastline College, as provided. AB 2053 is pending hearing in the Assembly Higher Education Committee.

AB 2136 (Pacheco, 2026) would establish an alternative pathway for baccalaureate degree approval for Cerritos Community College District by authorizing the CCC Board of Governors to authorize the Cerritos Community College District to offer up to three applied baccalaureate degree programs in the fields of public safety management, paralegal studies, and automotive technology, as provided. AB 2136 is pending hearing in the Assembly Higher Education Committee.

AB 1400 (Soria, 2025), nearly identical to AB 2104, would have required the Chancellor of the CCC to develop a Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN) Pilot Program that authorizes select CCC districts to offer a BSN degree. AB 2104 was vetoed by Governor Newsom, whose veto message read in part:

***“Last year, I vetoed a nearly identical bill, citing two primary reasons that continue to persist.***

***“First, the 2024 Budget Agreement included \$60 million per year, from 2025-26 to 2028-29, for the Rebuilding Nursing Infrastructure Grant Program, which may be used to develop or expand BSN partnerships with UC, CSU, and independent nonprofit higher education institutions. These partnerships have proven successful in expanding BSN access for community college students and increasing the number of BSN degree recipients. All segments of higher education must continue to collaborate on building these programs, and returning this bill will ensure those collaborative efforts are not undermined.***

***“Second, in recent years, both the CCC and the CSU have been authorized to offer independent programs outside of their traditional roles, provided they do not duplicate degree offerings of other public segments. I encourage the CCC system to focus on implementing this expanded authority and to ensure that it can continue to make progress on the unique and vital role the CCC plays in serving its students and the state. Given these significant changes, a pause should be maintained to understand their full impact before additional authorities are granted.”***

AB 2104 (Soria, 2024) would have required the Chancellor of the CCC to develop a BSN Pilot Program that authorizes select CCC districts to offer a BSN degree. AB 2104 was vetoed by Governor Newsom, whose veto message read in part:

***“I support the author's intent to expand access to baccalaureate nursing degree programs in underserved communities. The 2024 Budget Agreement included \$60 million per year, from 2025-26 to 2028-29, for the Rebuilding Nursing Infrastructure Grant Program, which may be used to develop or expand Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN) partnerships with higher education institutions. These types of partnerships have proven successful in expanding BSN access for community college students and increasing the number of BSN degree recipients. All segments of higher education should continue to focus on building these programs together, and I am concerned this bill could inadvertently undermine that collaboration.***

***“Additionally, in recent years, both the CCC and the CSU have been provided with expanded authority to offer independent programs. Given these major changes, a pause should be taken to understand their full impact before additional authorities are granted.”***

SB 895 (Roth, 2024) would have required the CCC Chancellor's Office to establish a Community College BSN Pilot Program that would authorize 10 CCC districts to offer a BSN degree. SB 895 was vetoed by Governor Newsom, whose veto message read, in part:

***“I appreciate the author’s commitment to expanding access to baccalaureate nursing degree programs for community college students. The 2024 Budget Agreement included \$60 million per year, from 2025-26 to 2028-29, for the Rebuilding Nursing Infrastructure Grant Program, which may be used to develop or expand Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN) partnerships with higher education institutions. These types of partnerships have proven successful in expanding BSN access for community college students and increasing the number of BSN degree recipients. All segments of higher education should continue to focus on building these programs together, and I am concerned this bill could inadvertently undermine that collaboration.***

***“Additionally, in recent years, both the CCC and the CSU have been provided with expanded authority to offer independent programs. Given these major changes, a pause should be taken to understand their full impact before additional authorities are granted.”***

AB 927 (Medina, Chapter 565, Statutes of 2021) permanently authorized the offering of baccalaureate degree programs at CCCs for degree programs that are not already offered by CSU or UC.

SB 769 (Hill, 2017) when heard in this committee, would have authorized the CCC Chancellor’s Office in consultation with the CSU and UC to expand the total number of CCC baccalaureate degree pilot programs from 15 to 25 and extended the January 1, 2024, repeal of the statewide pilot program by five years. The contents of SB 769 were subsequently amended to extend the pilot for an additional five years. Ultimately, SB 769 was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

SB 850 (Block, Chapter 747, Statutes of 2014) authorizes the Board of Governors of the CCC, in consultation with the CSU and the UC, to establish baccalaureate degree pilot programs, at up to 15 CCC districts, with one baccalaureate degree program each, as specified, to be determined by the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges.

AB 661 (Block, 2011) would have authorized Grossmont-Cuyamaca and the San Mateo Community College districts to offer one baccalaureate degree pilot program per campus. AB 661 was not heard on the Assembly Floor.

AB 2400 (Block, 2010) would have authorized the San Diego, Grossmont-Cuyamaca, and San Mateo Community College districts to establish baccalaureate degree pilot programs. No vote was taken, and AB 2400 was held in the Assembly Higher Education Committee.

## **SUPPORT**

Association of California Community College Administrators  
California School Employees Association

Campaign for College Opportunity  
Chief Executive Officers of the California Community Colleges Board  
Faculty Association of California Community Colleges  
PowerCA Action  
Student Senate for California Community Colleges

**OPPOSITION**

California Faculty Association  
California State University, Office of the Chancellor

**-- END --**



- b) Requiring hiring entities to contact prior employers regarding credible complaints, substantiated investigations, or discipline for egregious misconduct; and
  - c) Requiring prior employers to disclose reports made to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and provide supporting information. (EC §§ 44051, 44939.5)
- 6) Requires the CTC, contingent on appropriation, to develop a statewide data system tracking investigations and substantiated reports of egregious misconduct, including employee identifiers, employment history, and investigation data. (EC § 44052)
  - 7) Requires LEAs and private schools to report hiring, position changes, separations, initiation of investigations, investigation outcomes, and mid-investigation separations within specified timelines. (EC § 44052)
  - 8) Requires that only substantiated reports of egregious misconduct be recorded and prohibits retention of records for unfounded or inconclusive investigations. (EC § 44052)
  - 9) Requires LEAs and private schools to review the statewide data system prior to hiring to determine whether an applicant has a substantiated report of egregious misconduct. (EC § 44052)
  - 10) Authorizes the CTC's Committee of Credentials to initiate a review based on records in the statewide data system, including substantiated reports and cases involving separation during an investigation. (EC § 44242.5)

## ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Requires prior employers, when responding to hiring inquiries, to disclose whether an applicant was the subject of a substantiated report of egregious misconduct, rather than a substantiated investigation, and to continue providing all relevant information previously reported to the CTC.
- 2) Requires LEAs and private schools, upon receiving a credible complaint or other reason to believe egregious misconduct occurred, to conduct an investigation and provide the employee with written notice before commencing the investigation.
- 3) Requires LEAs and private schools to complete an investigation regardless of whether the employee separates from employment, and requires LEAs, within 10 calendar days of concluding the investigation, to provide the employee with written notice of the findings (substantiated, unsubstantiated, or inconclusive).

- 4) Authorizes LEA noncertificated employees to request a hearing on a substantiated report of egregious misconduct with an administrative law judge (ALJ), and requires the LEA to report the outcome of the ALJ's decision to the CTC within 10 calendar days for inclusion in the statewide data system.
- 5) Deletes the requirement that all investigations be reflected as "pending" in the statewide data system upon initiation.
- 6) Requires LEAs and private schools, only when an employee leaves employment before an investigation is completed, to:
  - a) Report the employee's change in employment status to the statewide data system;
  - b) Submit a preliminary notice that an investigation was initiated based on a credible complaint;
  - c) Complete the investigation and determine whether the report is substantiated, unsubstantiated, or inconclusive; and
  - d) Submit final notice of the investigation outcome to the statewide data system.
- 7) Requires the statewide data system, for employees who separate before the completion of an investigation, to notify the employee's current employer immediately upon receipt of the preliminary notice and every 30 days thereafter until a final report is submitted.
- 8) Restricts access to the statewide data system to employees of LEAs and private schools who are responsible for hiring, employment decisions, or employee investigations.
- 9) Requires individuals with access to the statewide data system to maintain the confidentiality of information contained in the system.
- 10) Expresses the intent of the Legislature to ensure that independent contractors who interact with pupils are vetted through appropriate measures to protect student safety, with specific requirements to be developed in subsequent provisions to be included in this act.

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, "SB 1083 builds on the Safe Learning Environments Act (SB 848), which was enacted into law last year and established a statewide data system to track egregious misconduct by school employees. That law was an important step forward in improving transparency, strengthening accountability, and helping ensure that individuals with serious allegations cannot quietly move between school sites without scrutiny.

But as implementation has moved forward, additional refinements are needed to ensure the system operates with consistency, fairness, and fully protects students. First, classified employees do not currently have a clearly defined, impartial review process comparable to what is provided to certificated employees. Existing law ensures that teachers receive due process, including a hearing and the ability to appeal to an Administrative Law Judge through the Office of Administrative Hearings. Without equivalent due process protections, investigations against them involving egregious misconduct can result in professional and personal consequences. SB 1083 addresses this by requiring an Administrative Law Judge to determine whether a classified employee should be added to the statewide data system. The bill also requires the statewide system to immediately notify a current employer when an employee leaves a local educational agency or private school before or during an investigation. This notice would inform the employer that a preliminary report has been filed, and an investigation is pending, to ensure that future employers are aware of any unresolved concerns.

Second, while the existing framework established accountability for permanent employees, gaps remain for independent contractors and non-permanent individuals who interact directly with students. These individuals may have regular, unsupervised access to children, yet are not always subject to the same standards. SB 1083 ensures that appropriate vetting measures apply to them as well. Together, these improvements strengthen the system, promote fairness, and ensure that all individuals working with students are held to consistent standards, because student safety remains our highest priority.”

- 2) ***From system creation to system calibration.*** Recent legislation from this author, SB 848 (Perez, Chapter 460, Statutes of 2025), established a new statewide framework for identifying, reporting, and preventing egregious misconduct by school employees, particularly those in noncertificated positions. This bill represents a second phase of that work, focused less on creating new requirements and more on refining how the system operates in practice. In particular, the bill revisits key implementation questions related to (1) when and how employees are reported to the statewide data system, (2) what procedural protections are afforded during local investigations, and (3) how hiring entities interpret and act on available information. As such, the bill centers on calibrating the balance between timely information-sharing and fairness to employees.
- 3) ***Shift from universal “pending” status to conditional notification.*** Under existing law, the initiation of any investigation results in a “pending” status in the statewide data system until the investigation is resolved. This bill eliminates that universal approach and instead requires reporting and employer notification only in cases where an employee separates from employment before an investigation is completed.

This represents a meaningful policy shift. On one hand, it reduces the likelihood that employees are flagged in the system based solely on unproven allegations. On the other hand, it narrows the set of circumstances in which hiring entities are alerted to ongoing investigations. This change focuses the system on higher-risk

scenarios, such as mid-investigation departures, but may also limit visibility into unresolved cases where an employee remains employed.

- 4) ***Codifying local investigation procedures and due process protections.*** This bill establishes more explicit procedural requirements for how LEAs and private schools conduct investigations of egregious misconduct, including advance written notice to the employee, required completion of investigations regardless of employment status, and written notice of findings. The bill also provides noncertificated employees the right to request a hearing before an ALJ to challenge a substantiated report.

These provisions appear responsive to concerns raised by stakeholders regarding consistency, transparency, and due process in local investigations. At the same time, they introduce new administrative expectations, including adherence to timelines, coordination of hearings, and potential legal costs, which may be more challenging for smaller LEAs with limited capacity.

- 5) ***Tension between due process and real-time hiring information.*** A central policy tension reflected in this bill is the balance between protecting students and ensuring fair treatment of employees. The statewide data system is intended to prevent individuals with substantiated misconduct histories from moving undetected between employers. At the same time, premature or overly broad reporting, particularly at the allegation stage, may raise concerns about reputational harm and employment consequences absent a completed investigation.

By limiting notifications primarily to cases where an employee separates during an investigation and by providing a hearing process for substantiated reports, this bill shifts the framework toward additional due process protections. This approach may better align reporting with verified findings, but it also places greater weight on local investigation timelines and outcomes in determining what information is available to hiring entities.

- 6) ***Requirement to complete investigations after employee separation.*** This bill requires LEAs and private schools to complete investigations even if the employee resigns or otherwise leaves employment. This provision directly addresses a well-documented gap in prior practice, where investigations were sometimes discontinued upon separation, limiting accountability and reducing the availability of information for future employers.

While this requirement strengthens the integrity of the reporting system, it may also present practical challenges, including access to witnesses or evidence after separation and questions regarding the scope of employer authority over former employees. Consistent implementation may depend on additional guidance and local capacity.

- 7) ***Ongoing notification to current employers.*** In cases where an employee leaves during an investigation, this bill requires the statewide data system to notify the employee's current employer immediately and every 30 days thereafter

until the investigation is resolved. This creates a mechanism for ongoing awareness of unresolved investigations.

While this approach increases transparency in higher-risk scenarios, it also raises questions about how employers should interpret and act on preliminary information that has not yet resulted in a substantiated finding. The absence of a final determination may complicate employment decisions and risk management practices.

- 8) ***Confidentiality and access to sensitive information.*** This bill limits access to the statewide data system to individuals responsible for hiring, investigations, or employment decisions and requires that information be kept confidential. These provisions are intended to safeguard sensitive personnel information while still allowing appropriate access for decision-making.

Given the nature of the information involved, effective implementation will depend on clear protocols, training, and oversight to ensure that access is appropriately limited and that information is not misused or improperly disclosed.

- 9) ***Independent contractors: intent language signals an unresolved policy question.*** This bill expresses the intent of the Legislature to ensure that independent contractors who interact with pupils are subject to appropriate vetting to protect student safety, but does not yet establish specific requirements or mechanisms to implement that intent.

This reflects a recognized gap in existing law. While employees are subject to background checks, reporting requirements, and inclusion in the statewide data system, independent contractors, such as coaches, vendors, and service providers, may operate under less consistent standards depending on the nature of their engagement with schools. How this intent is ultimately operationalized will shape the scope of the state's student safety framework and the responsibilities placed on LEAs.

- 10) ***Implementation status and capacity at the CTC.*** This bill builds on a newly established statewide framework that places significant administrative responsibility on the CTC as the operator of the statewide data system. The Governor's proposed 2026-27 budget includes \$1.4 million General Fund and 10 positions for CTC to implement these responsibilities.

However, CTC has indicated that its total workload and staffing needs remain uncertain and are closely tied to the final scope of statutory requirements. In communications with the author's office and committee staff, CTC has proposed statutory amendments to clarify definitions, reporting timelines, data elements, and alignment with existing educator discipline processes, as well as to address data privacy and evidentiary considerations.

CTC has also signaled to the Senate Budget Subcommittee on Education that additional legal staff, including attorney positions, may be necessary, particularly given the anticipated increase in investigatory workload and the integration of data system records into credential discipline proceedings. As the bill continues

to refine reporting triggers and procedural requirements, these changes may further affect both the volume and complexity of cases processed by the CTC.

**SUPPORT**

AFSCME (co-sponsor)

California Federation of Teachers (co-sponsor)

California School Employees Association (co-sponsor)

**OPPOSITION**

None received

**-- END --**