

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
Olgalilia Ramirez

Principal Consultant
Ian Johnson
Michelle Nguyen

Consultant
Therresa Austin

Committee Assistant
Maria Velez
Irma Kam

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

AGENDA

Wednesday, April 22, 2026
9 a.m. -- 1021 O Street, Room 2100

MEASURES HEARD IN FILE ORDER

1. SB 1067 Weber Pierson Pupil instruction: math screenings.
2. SB 1086 Dahle Microschools and micro-education entities.
3. SB 1110 Becker Early learning and care: rates.
4. SB 1128 Stern Pupils: technology-based materials: school-issued electronic devices.
5. SB 1181 Hurtado Central Valley School Safety Coordination Pilot Program.
6. SB 1321 Niello Public postsecondary education: remedial classes and supports: audit.
7. SB 1374 Niello Restraining orders: educational institutions.
8. SB 1328 Cervantes Public postsecondary education: Equity in Higher Education Act: campus contact.
- *9. SB 1126 Choi School districts, county offices of education, and local agencies: financial postings.
10. SB 1147 Ochoa Bogh Pupil instruction: high school graduation requirements: personal finance.
- *11. SB 1443 Education Elementary and secondary education: omnibus.

*Consent Items

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	SB 1067	Hearing Date:	April 22, 2026
Author:	Weber Pierson		
Version:	April 8, 2026		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Therresa Austin		

Subject: Pupil instruction: math screenings.

SUMMARY

This bill (1) requires the State Board of Education (SBE) to appoint a panel of experts to create an approved list of screening instruments to assess pupils for math difficulties; (2) requires the appointed panel to adopt screening instruments based on specified criteria; (3) requires the governing board or body of an local educational agency (LEA) serving kindergarteners or pupils in grade 1 or 2 to adopt one or more screening instruments from the appointed panel's approved list; (4) requires LEAs to assess each pupil in kindergarten and grades 1 and 2 for math difficulties using the adopted screening instrument or instruments; (5) requires LEAs to provide pupils who have been screened and identified as experiencing math difficulties with appropriate supports and services to address the specific challenges identified by the screening; and (6) requires LEAs to annually report data related to the number of students identified with math difficulties to the California Department of Education (CDE).

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Requires the Instructional Quality Commission (IQC) to adopt basic instructional materials for use in kindergarten and grades 1 through 8, inclusive, for the governing boards of school districts to subsequently adopt. (Education Code (EC) § 60200)
- 2) Requires the IQC, during the next revision of the mathematics curriculum framework, on or after January 1, 2025, to consider including that pupils in grade 8 be offered the opportunity to take Algebra I or Mathematics I course that is aligned to the content standards adopted by the SBE. (EC § 33547.5)
- 3) Requires the SBE, on or before January 31, 2024, to appoint an independent panel of experts for the purpose of creating an approved list of screening instruments for pupils in kindergarten and grades 1 and 2 to assess pupils for risk of reading difficulties, as specified. (EC § 53008)
- 4) Requires the above panel of experts to vote to approve a list of screening instruments that includes screening instruments that are developed both for English-speaking pupils and for non-English speaking pupils, in languages

reflecting the primary languages of pupils in the state, to the extent assessments in those languages are available. (EC § 53008)

- 5) Requires the governing board or body of an LEA serving pupils in kindergarten and grades 1 and 2 to adopt one or more screening instruments from the list approved by the panel of experts above to assess pupils for risk of reading difficulties, as specified. (EC § 53008)
- 6) Requires LEAs serving pupils in kindergarten, or grades 1 or 2, beginning no later than the 2025-26 school year, and annually thereafter, to assess each pupil in kindergarten and grades 1 and 2 for risk of reading difficulties using the screening instrument or instruments adopted by the governing board or body of the LEA, unless the pupil's parent or guardian opts out of the screening in writing. Specifies that, when determining when in the school year to administer each screening instrument, an LEA shall consider whether pupils have received sufficient instruction in foundational reading skills to support a valid assessment. (EC § 53008)
- 7) States that results from a screening instrument shall be used as part of a broader process that further evaluates pupil needs and progress, identifies supports for classroom instruction, enables targeted individual intervention as needed, and allows for further diagnosis if concerns do not resolve. (EC § 53008)
- 8) Requires an LEA to provide a student who has been screened and identified as being at risk of having reading difficulties with supports and services, appropriate to the specific challenges identified by the screening instrument and other pertinent information about the pupil. (EC § 53008)
- 9) Defines "Reading difficulties" to mean a barrier that impacts a pupil's ability to learn to read or improve reading abilities, including dyslexia. (EC § 53008)

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Establishes a series of findings and declarations related to the importance of universal screenings for math difficulties.
- 2) Requires, on or before April 30, 2027, the SBE to appoint a panel of experts for the purpose of creating an approved list of evidence-based, culturally, linguistically, and developmentally appropriate screening instruments for pupils in kindergarten and grades 1 and 2 to assess pupils for math difficulties, as specified.
 - a) Prohibits the SBE from appointing any person with a financial interest in the screening instruments under consideration.
 - b) States that the provisions of this bill do not prohibit the SBE from periodically reconstituting the expert panel or updating the review process.

- c) States that the provisions of this bill do not prohibit the expert panel from periodically amending the list of screening instruments at the request of the SBE.
 - d) Subjects the work of the panel of experts appointed by the SBE to the Bagley-Keene Open Meetings Act.
- 3) Requires the SBE to establish a review process, including how screening instruments will be evaluated against criteria, as specified, for the panel to use to evaluate and approve screening instruments.
- 4) Requires, on or before January 31, 2028, the appointed panel of experts to vote to approve a list of screening instruments, as specified, at a regularly scheduled public meeting.
- a) Requires that the list of approved screening instruments include screening instruments that are developed for English-speaking pupils and for non-English-speaking pupils, in languages reflecting the primary languages of pupils in the state, to the extent assessments in those languages are available.
 - b) Requires the panel of experts to consider the time required to conduct each screening with the goal of minimizing the impact on instructional time as well as the timeliness of each instrument in reporting results to teachers, administrators, and parents.
 - c) Requires the panel of experts to collect information about the appropriate administration of each screening instrument, including the appropriate grade or grades for administration of each screening instrument.
- 5) Requires the SBE to consider the extent to which a screening instrument addresses the following factors when adopting evaluation criteria:
- a) Use of direct measurement supplemented by other pupil data to determine if a pupil is experiencing math difficulties.
 - b) Measurement of foundational math skills appropriate to the respective grade level, including, but not limited to, organizing and counting with numbers, comparing and ordering numbers, and learning to add and subtract, using numbers flexibly.
 - c) Evidence that the tool is normed and validated using a contemporary multicultural and multilanguage sample of pupils, with outcome data for pupils whose home languages is a language other than English as well as those who are native English speakers.
 - d) Integration of relevant pupil demographic information, such as home language, English language fluency, and access to prekindergarten education, to more fully understand a pupil's performance.

- e) Guidance and resources for educators regarding how to administer screening instruments, interpret results, explain results to families, including in pupils' primary languages, and determine further educational strategies assessments, diagnostics, and interventions that should be considered and that are specific to each type of pupil result.
 - i) Specifies that guidance and resources provided shall be informed by the Mathematics Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve and the knowledge of effective interventions for the specific needs of individual pupils and shall reflect a tiered interventions model aligned with the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS).
- 6) Requires the governing board or body of an LEA serving pupils in kindergarten or grades 1 or 2, on or before June 30, 2028, to adopt one or more screening instruments from the list of approved pursuant to #4 above, at a public meeting.
 - a) Requires that the screening instrument or instruments adopted provide assessments for both English-speaking pupils and non-English-speaking pupils, in languages reflecting the primary languages of pupils in the LEA, to the extent assessments in those languages are available.
- 7) Requires, beginning no later than the 2028-29 school year, and annually thereafter, LEAs serving pupils in kindergarten, or grades 1 or 2, to assess each pupil in kindergarten and grades 1 and 2 for math difficulties using the screening instrument or instruments adopted by the governing board, unless the pupil's parent or guardian opts out of the screening in writing.
 - a) Requires the LEA to conduct screenings early in the year to allow time for pupils to receive appropriate intervention.
 - b) States that the provisions of this bill do not restrict LEAs from providing additional pupil screenings or diagnostic evaluations, as appropriate.
- 8) Requires an LEA, if a pupil enrolls for the first time in kindergarten or grades 1 or 2 after the screening instrument or instruments have been administered to all pupils in a given grade in that school year, to assess the pupil using the adopted screening instrument or instruments within 45 calendar days of enrollment. Provides an exception to this requirement under the following circumstances:
 - a) The pupil's parent or guardian opts out of the screening in writing;
 - b) The pupil's parent or guardian provides documentation that the pupil has had a similar screening in their prior school for their current grade, and the parent or guardian was made aware of the results; or
 - c) The LEA has documentation that the pupil has had a similar screening in their prior school for their current grade, and the parent or guardian was made aware of the results.

- 9) States that assessments administered pursuant to this bill shall not be considered an evaluation or diagnostic tool to establish eligibility for special education and related services pursuant to the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), or an evaluation to determine eligibility for a plan pursuant to Section 504 of the Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973.
 - a) States that assessments administered pursuant to this bill shall not be used to delay the child find process required under IDEA.
 - b) Authorizes LEAs to use the assessments administered pursuant to this bill to recommend that a pupil receive further assessment and evaluation to establish eligibility for special education and related services pursuant to IDEA, or to determine eligibility for a plan pursuant to Section 504 of the federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973.
- 10) States that pupils who do not speak sufficient English to be screened with an English language instrument shall be screened in their primary language if an approved screening instrument in their primary language is available.
 - a) States that if a screening instrument is not available in at least one language in which a pupil is proficient before the pupil can be screened, the pupil's foundational math skills shall be evaluated through an analysis of the pupil's developmental history, educational history, and math progress, taking into account the pupil's home background and evolving English language abilities.
 - b) States that when a pupil acquires sufficient English language knowledge and fluency to be able to be assessed using the approved screening instruments, or if a screening instrument in their primary language becomes available, the LEA shall assess that pupil using the appropriate screening instrument.
- 11) Authorizes an LEA to elect not to screen a pupil if the LEA receives written consent of the parent or guardian and any of the following criteria are satisfied.
 - a) The pupil has a current identification or diagnosis of dyscalculia or other disability.
 - b) The pupil is eligible for special education and related services pursuant to IDEA, or a plan pursuant to Section 504 of the federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973.
 - c) The pupil is in the process of being assessed for eligibility for special education and related services pursuant to IDEA, or a plan pursuant to Section 504 of the federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the pupil is being evaluated with diagnostic assessments that make the screening required by this bill redundant.
- 12) Requires an LEA to provide the parents and/or guardians of the pupil eligible for screening, information about the screening, including dates of the screening and

instructions for how parents or guardians can opt out of the screening on behalf of their child, no later than 15 calendar days before the administration of the screening instrument or instruments.

- a) Encourages the LEA to provide information about screenings with other back-to-school materials at the beginning of the school year.
- 13) States that pupil's results from assessments administered pursuant to this bill shall be made available to the pupil's parent or guardian in a timely manner, but no more than 30 calendar days from the date the assessment was administered.
 - 14) States that screening results shall be used to identify pupils experiencing math difficulties, not as a diagnosis of a disability. States that results from a screening instrument shall be used as part of a broader process that further evaluates pupil needs and progress, identifies supports for classroom instruction, enables targeted individual intervention as needed, and allows for further diagnosis if concerns do not resolve.
 - 15) Requires LEAs to provide a pupil who has been screened and identified as experiencing math difficulties with supports and services appropriate to address the specific challenges identified by the screening instrument and other pertinent information about the pupil. Those supports and services may include, among other supports and services, any of the following:
 - a) Evidence-based math instruction focused on the pupil's specific needs;
 - b) Progress monitoring;
 - c) Early intervention;
 - d) One-on-one or small group tutoring;
 - e) Further evaluation or diagnostic assessment, if needed.
 - 16) Prohibits the results of an assessment administered pursuant to this bill from being used for any high-stakes purpose, including but not limited to, teacher or other school staff evaluation, accountability, pupil grade promotion or retention, identification for gifted or talented education, or identification as an individual with exceptional needs.
 - 17) Requires LEAs, on or before July 15, 2029, and on or before July 15 each year thereafter, to report to the CDE the number and percentage of pupils in each grade who have been identified as experiencing math difficulties through the screening pursuant to this bill and disaggregated by pupil group.
 - 18) Requires that notifications to parents or guardians provided pursuant to this bill comply with existing translation requirements.
 - 19) Defines the following terms:

- a) States that “kindergarten” does not include transitional kindergarten, as specified.
- b) “Local educational agency” means a school district, county office of education, or charter school.
- c) “Math difficulties” means not demonstrating the foundational math skills at the respective grade level, including but not limited to, number sense in kindergarten and grades 1 and 2, as described in the Mathematics Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve, the ability to organize and count with numbers, compare and order numbers, and learning to add and subtract, using numbers flexibly.
- d) “Screening instrument” means a brief tool administered by an appropriately trained school employee, including, but not limited to, a certificated teacher of record, measuring discrete areas to identify pupils experiencing math difficulties.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “California is in the midst of a math achievement crisis that is limiting students’ long-term academic and career opportunities and widening equity gaps across our state. As a legislator, I believe it is our shared responsibility to ensure that future generations have the foundation they need to succeed and to contribute meaningfully to sustaining California’s leadership in innovation and growth. Math learning is cumulative, and when students fall behind in the early grades it becomes much harder to catch up—too often turning small gaps into lifelong barriers, with the greatest impacts on low-income students and students of color.

“SB 1067 takes a proactive, prevention-focused approach by ensuring young students are screened for early math challenges and receive timely, evidence-based support when it is most effective. At its core, this bill is about making sure every child builds a strong foundation in math, opening the door to lasting academic achievement, meaningful career pathways, and lifelong success in California’s innovation economy.”

- 2) ***What is a math screener?*** Math screening instruments, or math screeners, are a type of brief assessment tool used to evaluate whether a student is performing at grade level or experiencing difficulties with foundational math skills. Screeners can be administered at different intervals, ranging from three times a school year to once annually. They can be conducted in one-on-one or group settings, depending on the tool. Taken together, these screenings can help provide educators with insights to determine which students need early interventions and support services.
- 3) ***Recent investments and advancements in reading difficulties screenings.*** This bill establishes a process and timeline for adopting annual universal math screenings for students in kindergarten and grades 1 and 2—similar to what was established through the state budget process for universal reading difficulties

screenings. In the 2023-24 Budget, the Legislature began its universal reading difficulties screening rollout by first requiring an independent panel of experts appointed by the SBE to develop selection criteria and create an approved set of screening instruments for LEA use by December 31, 2024. LEAs were then required to adopt one or more of the four screening instruments that were approved by the panel by June 30, 2025, and begin annually screening students in kindergarten and grades 1 and 2 by the 2025–26 school year. Like the proposed universal math screening, if a student is screened and identified to be at risk for reading difficulties, the law requires LEAs to provide the student with supports and services to address the specific challenges.

Since the initial \$1 million appropriation for the expert panel appointment and screening instrument list development process, the Legislature has appropriated a total of \$65 million in one-time Proposition 98 General Funds to specifically support necessary implementation costs, including training for educators to administer literacy screenings.

Since August, initial implementation feedback has emphasized the need for continued investments in educator professional development to provide student reading supports. Without ongoing training, educators may feel underprepared to appropriately administer screenings, interpret screening results, communicate results and findings with families, and integrate the solutions into individualized evidence-based interventions or enhanced Tier 1 instruction.

The Governor’s 2026-27 Budget Proposal includes an additional \$40 million to support continued implementation of student reading difficulties screenings. It also proposes statutory changes to adjust the timeline of when the annual screenings should be administered.

- 4) ***The 2023 Mathematics Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (Mathematics Framework)***. In 2023, the SBE adopted a new Mathematics Framework after an extensive revision process. The Framework is important guidance designed to help educators align classroom teaching with California’s rigorous math learning standards. The purpose of the revised Mathematics Framework is to support excellence in math teaching and learning through curriculum and instructional approaches grounded in research and reflective of best practices across the globe. The revised Mathematics Framework provides guidance for mathematics learning for all students at all levels of math, including calculus, and ensures students have a wide variety of options, including pursuing science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) in college or seeking other careers that benefit from quantitative knowledge and reasoning. Notable highlights of the new Mathematics Framework include the following:
- Guidance to help educators structure the teaching of state math standards around “Big Ideas” that integrate math concepts across grade levels and through developmental progressions, and encourage students to connect with their learning through “real-world” examples and problem solving.

- Guidance to help educators make mathematics instruction culturally relevant and empowering, thus allowing students to see themselves in the curriculum and in math-related careers.
- Guidance on instruction for linguistically and culturally diverse English learners who are developing mathematical proficiency, informed by the California English Language Development Standards (CA ELD Standards) and the CDE's guidance for integrating the CA ELD Standards into mathematics teaching.
- Guidance to help educators incorporate data science into math instruction throughout grade levels and encourage students to become proficient at understanding and using data, with the goal of helping students identify misleading data and use data to make informed decisions.
- Guidance on strategies that support learning recovery for students, such as providing additional support and expanded learning time; providing personalized learning; and including one-on-one or small group tutoring.

In 2025, the IQC completed the process of adopting Mathematics Framework-aligned instructional materials for three types of programs: basic grade-level for kindergarten through grade 8, Algebra I, and Integrated Mathematics I.

This bill develops a timeline and process for what will ultimately be a universal math screening requirement for students in kindergarten and grades 1 and 2, to identify which of those students are experiencing math difficulties. In the context of this bill, a student experiencing math difficulties means a student who is not demonstrating the foundational math skills needed at the respective grade level as described in the Mathematics Framework. During the SBE adoption process, the screening instruments themselves are also evaluated based on how well they provide Mathematics Framework-informed implementation guidance and resources to educators.

- 5) **California's recent investments in math support and intervention.** California has made several investments in supporting math instruction and professional development in the years preceding and following the adoption of the new Mathematics Framework. These include:

2021-22 Budget:

- Provided \$50 million one-time Proposition 98 General Fund for the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE) to administer evidence-based professional development for educators that can support learning acceleration for California's diverse student population, particularly in mathematics, literacy, and language development.
- Provided \$37.7 million in one-time Proposition 98 General Fund, available over three years, for the Early Math Initiative at the Fresno County Office of Education to develop, identify, and distribute early math resources,

professional learning and coaching for educators, and mathematical learning opportunities for children.

2022-23 Budget:

- c) Provided \$85 million one-time Proposition 98 General Fund to create Pre-Kindergarten through 12th grade educator resources and professional learning to implement the California Math Framework, the California Computer Science Standards, the Next Generation Science Standards, and the math and science domains of the California Preschool Learning Foundations. These funds also support the alignment of other state STEM educator support initiatives (e.g., University of California (UC) Subject Matter Projects, Early Math Initiative, etc.) with this work, to create a cohesive statewide continuum of instructional supports for all STEM educators.
- d) Provided \$15 million appropriated to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing for the Mathematics Instructional Added Authorization and Reading and Literacy Supplementary Authorization Incentive Grant Program to support the preparation of credentialed teachers to earn an authorization in mathematics or reading and literacy.

2024-25 Budget:

- e) Provided \$20 million one-time Proposition 98 General Fund for a county office of education to work with the California Mathematics Projects, as well as other well-qualified governmental or non-profit providers, to develop and provide training aligned with the new California Mathematics Framework for mathematics coaches and leaders who, in turn, can provide training and support to mathematics teachers to deliver high-quality instruction.

2025-26 Budget:

- f) Provided \$7.5 million one-time Proposition 98 General Fund for the Statewide Mathematics Network, administered by the CCEE, to convene literacy and mathematics lead agencies to support the implementation of evidence-based practices aligned to the Mathematics Framework and the use of data to support effective instruction.
 - g) Provided \$30 million one-time Proposition 98 General Funds for the Mathematics Professional Learning Partnership, for the Kern County Superintendent of Schools to support educator training and mathematics coaching in LEAs, including expanding upon collaboration with the Rural Math Collaborative and training mathematics coaches who can be deployed in schools and LEAs with the highest need of support.
- 6) **Arguments in support.** In their letter of support submitted to this Committee, the bill sponsor, EdVoice, states, in part, the following:

“California is facing a math achievement crisis,¹ and it starts in early grades. Research tells us that children enter kindergarten with widely differing levels of exposure to foundational math skills, such as number recognition, counting, and quantity.² Because math learning is cumulative, students who fall behind early rarely catch up without targeted support.³ This is reflected in California’s own data: in 2025, 46% of third-grade students met math standards, compared with just 33% of eleventh-grade students. Studies show that students who don’t master foundational math skills early are far more likely to struggle later in school and far less likely to take advanced math coursework or attend college.

“SB 1067 focuses attention on the first years of school, when gaps emerge and targeted support can change learning trajectories.⁵ The bill requires annual early math screening for all students in kindergarten through grade 2, as well as targeted support for students who are identified as having math difficulties. Much as a vision screening identifies a child who may need glasses, a math screening identifies a student who may need additional instructional support. According to the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, math screeners are short, quick to administer, and cause minimal disruption to instruction.⁶ SB 1067 requires school districts to select state-approved screeners that are evidence-based and culturally, linguistically, and developmentally appropriate; it also prohibits results from being used to label students, assess teachers, or for any other high-stakes purpose.”

- 7) **Arguments in opposition.** In a joint letter in opposition submitted to this Committee, the Association of California Administrators (ACSA), California County Superintendents, Kern County Superintendent of Schools (KCSOS), and the Riverside County Office of Education (RCOE) highlight, in part, the following concerns:

“A screening mandate is only as effective as the systems that support it. Without dedicated funding for professional development, staffing, intervention materials, and data infrastructure, LEAs will struggle to translate results into meaningful action. Absent these supports, the requirement risks becoming a compliance exercise rather than a tool for improving student learning.

“California’s Mathematics Framework (adopted July 2023) emphasizes integrated, reasoning-based instruction across TK–12. With substantial state investment already underway, implementation is still in its early stages. Most math screeners focus narrowly on number sense and computation, which may conflict with the Framework’s broader goals and create competing priorities for districts.

“We urge the Legislature to prioritize full implementation of the Mathematics Framework and allow time for these investments to demonstrate results before introducing new mandates. The state has committed significant funding to math education through 2028, and those efforts should be given the runway needed to succeed.”

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

SB 1410 (Ochoa Bogh, Chapter 476, Statutes of 2024) requires the IQC, when the mathematics curriculum framework is next revised, to consider including that students in 8th grade be offered the opportunity to take an Algebra I or Mathematics I course that is aligned to the content standards adopted by the SBE.

SB 1115 (Limon, 2024) would have required the CDE, on or before January 1, 2026, to identify and recommend professional learning programs for certificated and classified staff that support pupil development in mathematics and literacy. *SB 1115 was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.*

SB 691 (Portantino, 2023) would have required LEAs serving students in kindergarten to grade 2 to annually screen all students for risk of dyslexia using state-approved instruments, unless objected to in writing by a student's parent or guardian, beginning in the 2024-25 school year. *SB 691 was amended into a different bill after being heard in the Senate Education Committee.*

SUPPORT

EdVoice (sponsor)

State Superintendent of Public Instruction Tony Thurmond

21st Century Alliance

Bell Resident Club

Black Parallel School Board

California State PTA

California-Hawaii State Conference of the NAACP

Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice

Charles Armstrong School

Decoding Dyslexia CA

Delta Kappa Gamma International - Chi State

Designated Exceptional Services for Independence

El Centro Del Pueblo

Elevate California

Ensemble Learning

Families in Schools

Gumball Foundation

Hawley Special Education Law Advocacy

Innovate Public Schools

KIPP Public Schools Northern California

La Comadre Network

Latinos in Action

Legislative Action Committee - Santa Clara County School Boards Association

Maywood Education Fair

Mi Escuelita Bilingue

National Center for Learning Disabilities

New Economics for Women

Ollin Law

Partnership for Los Angeles Schools
Proyecto Pastoral At Dolores Mission
San Mateo County School Boards Association
Scholarship Association for ESL Students
SpEducational
Teach for America
Teach Start
Walnut Park Civic Engagement Project
Watts of Power Foundation
Yo Soy Tu Voz

OPPOSITION

Association of California School Administrators
California County Superintendents
California Mathematics Council
California Teachers Association
Kern County Superintendent of Schools Office
Office of the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	SB 1086	Hearing Date:	April 22, 2026
Author:	Dahle		
Version:	April 7, 2026		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Ian Johnson		

Subject: Microschools and micro-education entities.

SUMMARY

This bill requires the state to develop model local ordinances governing the siting and operation of small private schools, defined as “microschools” and “micro-education entities,” including those operating in residential settings and those serving up to 100 students.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Requires any person or entity offering private school instruction at the elementary or high school level to annually file an affidavit with the Superintendent of Public Instruction containing specified information regarding the school’s operations, including enrollment, courses of study, and instructional staff, pursuant to California Private School Affidavit.
- 2) Specifies that filing a private school affidavit shall not be interpreted as state evaluation, recognition, approval, or endorsement of the school.
- 3) Permits a student to be exempt from compulsory public school attendance if the student is enrolled in a private full-time day school, including a private school established through the affidavit process.
- 4) Requires private schools to obtain criminal background clearances for employees who will have contact with pupils
- 5) Authorizes cities and counties to adopt and enforce local ordinances to protect the public health, safety, and welfare, including regulating land use.
- 6) Requires each city and county to adopt a comprehensive, long-term general plan that guides physical development within its jurisdiction, including land use designations and development standards.
- 7) Requires that zoning ordinances and development approvals be consistent with a jurisdiction’s adopted general plan, including applicable land use, housing, and safety elements.

- 8) Authorizes cities and counties to adopt zoning ordinances that regulate permitted land uses and impose development standards, including building intensity, parking requirements, setbacks, and other conditions to address community impacts.

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Defines a “micro-education entity” as a private school that:
 - a) Is organized as a business or nonprofit entity;
 - b) Provides Kindergarten (K)–12 instruction;
 - c) Serves more than 16 and fewer than 101 students at one time; and
 - d) Has filed a private school affidavit pursuant to the California Private School Affidavit.
- 2) Defines a “microschool” as a private school that:
 - a) Is organized as a business or nonprofit entity;
 - b) Provides K–12 instruction;
 - c) Serves 16 or fewer students at one time;
 - d) Operates from a residential dwelling, accessory dwelling unit, or residential property; and
 - e) Has filed a private school affidavit pursuant to the California Private School Affidavit.
- 3) Clarifies that microschools and micro-education entities are private schools and are not operated by a school district, county office of education, charter school, or state special school.
- 4) Defines “local agency” to include cities, counties, and charter jurisdictions.
- 5) Requires the Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation, in consultation with the California Department of Education, the Department of Housing and Community Development, and the Office of the State Fire Marshal, to develop and publish one or more model ordinances governing microschools and micro-education entities by January 1, 2028.
- 6) Requires that the model ordinances include, at a minimum:
 - a) Building and fire safety requirements;

- b) Parking and traffic management standards;
- c) Hours of operation;
- d) Signage; and
- e) Outdoor activity and noise considerations.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “Parents know their children best, which is why parents must have the freedom to educate their education in the way that best meets their unique needs. This bill reflects our commitment to empowering families and trusting them to do what is best for their children.

“This legislation is also about the future of education. It embraces the kind of innovation our students desperately need, like project/place-based and experiential learning. We ask so much of our public schools, but the reality is that many districts are lacking the agility to pivot and meet the demands of the modern workforce.

“In the wake of the pandemic, parents, educators, and community partners didn't wait for the system to catch up; they found new ways to support student growth. Microschools are leading this charge, fostering meaningful partnerships, and designing student-centered, and even trauma-informed environments.

“While conventional schools work to innovate, we must champion the models that are already doing it. We should not create unnecessary hurdles for legitimate, forward-thinking educational models.

“This bill ensures that local regulations don't stand in the way of microschools, giving parents and students the opportunity to take true ownership of their growth and learning.”

- 2) ***From land use preemption to model ordinance guidance.*** As introduced, this bill proposed a comprehensive statewide framework governing the siting and operation of microschools and micro-education entities. The bill would have required local agencies to treat these entities as permitted uses across multiple zoning categories, prohibited discretionary review, limited the application of local development standards, and required ministerial approval of permits. The bill also included provisions restricting the ability of local agencies to regulate various aspects of these entities and required local ordinances to conform to a state-developed model ordinance.

Amendments taken in the Senate Local Government Committee removed these provisions. As currently drafted, the bill no longer preempts local zoning authority, mandates ministerial approval, or requires local agencies to adopt ordinances consistent with a state model. Instead, the bill is limited to defining “microschools” and “micro-education entities” in statute and requiring the Office

of Land Use and Climate Innovation to develop model ordinances addressing their siting and operation.

While these amendments significantly narrow the bill's scope, they also shift its effect. The bill now primarily serves to establish new statutory categories of schools and to direct the state to develop guidance to facilitate their accommodation through local land use policies.

- 3) ***Limited information on microschoools and micro-education entities.*** The materials provided by the author and sponsor describe microschoools and micro-education entities in broad and flexible terms, often emphasizing that these models are evolving and may take a variety of forms. However, these materials do not provide the Committee with basic information regarding the scope and operation of these entities in California.

For example, the Committee has not been provided with information regarding the number of such entities currently operating in the state, the number of students served, the staffing structures employed (including whether instructors are credentialed), the instructional models utilized, or any available data regarding student outcomes.

In addition, the materials provided describe these entities in ways that are not always consistent with the bill's definitions. For instance, one summary characterizes "micro-education entities" as including activities such as coding classes and tutoring centers, which do not appear to fall within the bill's definition requiring operation as a private school that has filed a private school affidavit. This variation in how the concept is described makes it difficult to determine the intended scope of the bill and the types of entities that would ultimately be affected.

Given that this bill would create new statutory definitions and direct the development of model ordinances to guide their accommodation, the absence of clear, consistent, and data-informed information makes it difficult for the Committee to fully assess the scope of the proposal and its potential implications.

- 4) ***Statutory recognition of microschoools and micro-education entities.*** This bill establishes statutory definitions for "microschoools" and "micro-education entities," both of which are defined as forms of private schools operating under the private school affidavit framework. Under existing law, private schools operate with limited state oversight, and the filing of an affidavit does not constitute state evaluation, approval, or endorsement of a school.

By contrast, this bill would explicitly define a subset of these schools in statute and direct the state to develop model ordinances addressing their siting and operation. While the bill does not alter the underlying education law framework, the act of defining these entities in statute and directing state-level guidance may be viewed as a form of recognition and facilitation.

The Committee may wish to consider whether additional information regarding the nature, scope, and operation of these entities would be helpful prior to

establishing such definitions in statute and directing the development of statewide guidance.

- 5) ***State role in facilitating locally regulated land uses.*** Existing law provides cities and counties with broad authority to regulate land use through their police powers, including the adoption of zoning ordinances and development standards tailored to local conditions. As noted in the Senate Local Government Committee's analysis, local agencies are responsible for determining allowable land uses and associated standards through their general plans and zoning ordinances.

Consistent with that committee's jurisdiction, amendments taken in the Senate Local Government Committee removed provisions that would have required local agencies to permit these entities as a matter of right or limited their ability to apply discretionary review. As currently drafted, the bill no longer compels local governments to take specific actions, but instead directs a state agency to develop model ordinances addressing the siting and operation of microschoools and micro-education entities.

With local control concerns addressed, the central question for this Committee is not whether local governments should be required to accommodate these uses, but whether the state should define these entities in statute and direct the development of model ordinances to facilitate their accommodation. In this context, the Committee may wish to consider whether sufficient information has been provided regarding the nature, scope, and operation of these entities to support that policy choice.

- 6) ***Legislative approach to defining emerging education models.*** This bill would establish new statutory definitions for "microschools" and "micro-education entities," concepts that the author and sponsor describe as evolving and without a rigid definition. The Committee has, in other contexts, taken a measured approach to defining emerging or nontraditional educational models, recognizing that statutory definitions can have significant implications for oversight, funding, and future policy development.

For example, the Committee continues to grapple with distinctions among various instructional models, including independent study and nonclassroom-based charter schools, and has only recently established statutory clarity in areas such as charter management organizations. In these instances, definitions have often followed extended deliberation and the development of a clearer understanding of how such models operate in practice.

The Committee may wish to consider whether a similar level of clarity and understanding exists with respect to microschoools and micro-education entities before establishing new definitions in statute and directing the development of statewide guidance related to their operation.

SUPPORT

California Policy Center (sponsor)
All Families, All Schools
California Microschool Collective
Libertas Network
Seven Individuals

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	SB 1110	Hearing Date:	April 22, 2026
Author:	Becker		
Version:	April 13, 2026		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Michelle Nguyen		

Subject: Early learning and care: rates.

SUMMARY

This bill makes changes to the reimbursement formula for alternative payment programs (APPs) administered by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS). This bill adds definitions for indirect administrative costs and direct program and support costs for APPs and direct contract childcare programs administered by CDSS and the California State Preschool Program (CSPP), administered by the California Department of Education (CDE).

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

Preschool Programs

- 1) Establishes the Early Education Act to provide an inclusive and cost-effective preschool program that provides high quality learning experiences, coordinated services, and referrals for families to access health and social-emotional support services through full- and part-day programs. (Education Code (EC) § 8200 et seq.)
- 2) Defines “California State Preschool Program” as educational programs that offer part-day, full-day, or both, for eligible two-, three-, and four-year-old children, and commencing July 1, 2027, these programs will be for eligible three- and four-year-old children only and will no longer be available to two-year-old children. Provides that these programs may be offered by a public, private, or proprietary agency, and operated in childcare centers or family childcare homes operating through a family childcare home education network. Requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction to administer all CSPP programs. (EC § 8205 and EC § 8207)
- 3) Requires, commencing July 1, 2025, and through June 30, 2026, that if a CSPP is open and operating in accordance with its approved program calendar and remains open and providing services to certified children throughout the program year, contract reimbursement shall be based on the lesser of the following: a) the maximum reimbursable amount stated in the contract, or b) net reimbursable program costs. (EC § 8245.5)

- 4) Requires, commencing July 1, 2026, the contract reimbursement for the CSPP to be based on the lesser of the following: a) the maximum reimbursable amount stated in the contract, b) net reimbursable program costs, and c) the product of the adjusted child days of enrollment for certified children multiplied by the specified contract rate. (EC § 8245.5)
- 5) Requires, commencing January 1, 2023, and through July 1, 2028, that reimbursement for full-day and part-day CSPP family childcare home education network providers be based on the maximum certified hours of care for all families, regardless of attendance, less any allowable administrative expenses withheld by the contractor. (EC § 8245.5)

Child Care and Development Programs

- 6) Establishes the Child Care and Development Services Act to provide a comprehensive, coordinated, and cost-effective system of childcare and development services for children from infancy to 13 years of age and their parents, including a full range of supervision, health, and support services through full- and part-time programs. (Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) § 10207 et seq.)
- 7) Defines “alternative payment program” as a local government agency or nonprofit organization that has contracted with CDSS to provide alternative payments and to provide support services to parents and providers. (WIC § 10213.5)
- 8) Requires reimbursement for APPs to include the cost of childcare paid to childcare providers, plus the administrative and support services costs of the APP, and that the total cost for administration and support services shall not exceed 17.5% of the total contract amount. (WIC § 10229)
- 9) Requires, commencing July 1, 2025, and through June 30, 2026, that if direct contract childcare programs is open and operating in accordance with its approved program calendar and remains open and providing services to certified children throughout the program year, the contract reimbursement shall be based on the lesser of the following: a) the maximum reimbursable amount stated in the contract, or b) net reimbursable program costs. (WIC § 10280)
- 10) Requires, commencing July 1, 2026, reimbursement for direct contract childcare programs to be based on the lesser of the following: a) the maximum reimbursable amount stated in the contract; b) net reimbursable program costs; c) the product of the adjusted child days of enrollment for certified children times the specified contract rate. (WIC § 10280)
- 11) Requires, commencing July 1, 2025, and through June 30, 2026, that reimbursement for family childcare home education network providers funded through direct contract childcare programs, as specified, be 100% of reimbursement based on the family’s certified need for services at the maximum authorized hours of care, less any allowable administrative expenses withheld by the contractor. (WIC § 10280)

Preschool Programs and Child Care Programs

- 12) Provides that, unless specifically exempted by the Legislature, the administrative cost for all state-funded childcare and preschool programs and all federal programs administered by the state shall not exceed 15% of the funds provided for those programs. (EC § 8258 and WIC § 10302)
- 13) Defines “indirect de minimis” as an indirect cost rate of up to 15% for recipients and subrecipients that do not have a current federal negotiated indirect cost rate. (Code of Federal Regulations, Title 2, Subtitle A, Chapter II, Part 200, Subpart E, § 200.414)
- 14) Defines “administrative costs” as costs incurred for administrative activities where neither the family, the child, nor the service providers for APPs and family childcare homes directly benefit from the activity. (California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 5, §18013)
- 15) Defines “indirect cost” as an expense that benefits the operations of the entire organization but cannot be assigned to specific programs or activities. (CCR, Title 5, § 18013)
- 16) Defines “family childcare home education network” as an entity organized under law that contracts with CDE or CDSS to make payments to licensed family childcare home providers and to provide educational and support services to those providers and to children and families eligible for CSPP or state-subsidized childcare and development services. (EC § 8205 and WIC § 10213.5)

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Defines “indirect administrative costs” for both preschool programs and childcare and development programs as the general costs related to the day-to-day function of the program and the indirect de minimis expenses incurred by the agency in the administration of the program. These costs include, but are not limited to: a) staff payroll and benefits; b) conducting internal and external program audits; c) managing facilities, human resources, and information technology; d) communication with the state, providers, and the union; e) work relating to accounting and invoicing, grants and contract management, and required reporting; and f) researching and evaluating programs.
- 2) Defines “direct program and support costs” for both preschool programs and childcare and development programs as the costs of running the center-based program. These costs include, but are not limited to: a) outreach and enrollment of families; b) conducting family needs assessments and connecting families to community resources; c) providing ongoing individualized case management; d) monitoring and improving the quality of program delivery; e) collecting childcare attendance records and calculating and processing monthly payments; f) maintaining childcare documents; g) providing technical assistance to families and providers; and h) hearing parental appeals.

- 3) Revises the reimbursement formula for APPs by doing the following:
 - a) Adds direct program and support costs of the APPs as eligible for reimbursement, and renames “administrative and support services costs” to “indirect administrative costs”.
 - b) Strikes the provision prohibiting the total cost for administration and support services from exceeding 17.5% of the total contract amount and instead provides that the indirect administrative costs shall not exceed 15% of the maximum reimbursable amount.
 - c) Provides that the combined costs of indirect administrative costs and direct program and support costs shall not exceed 25% of the maximum reimbursable amount of the contract.
 - d) Provides that, if 25% of the maximum reimbursable amount of the contract falls below \$300,000, the minimum reimbursement for the combined total costs of indirect administrative costs and direct program and support costs shall be \$300,000, which would be adjusted annually for inflation using the California Consumer Price Index.
 - e) Removes a reference to administrative costs, including costs associated with the dissemination of information on developmental screenings.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for this bill.*** According to the author, “recent changes and new requirements in the last decade have significantly increased the operational burden of contractors and centers—reducing their ability to focus on the children and families they serve. When the state provided one-time stipends and pandemic relief funding, contractors were often reimbursed below statutory rates, even as they took on expanded responsibilities. ... Contractors must now implement five new payments, with all but one being one-time in nature, and with a variety of separate reimbursement amounts for contractors—ranging from no reimbursement to 10% rate on the care cost plus stipends along with a flat \$70 million administrative fee for Child Care Providers United (CCPU) union services. ... SB 1110 will build a more stable and robust childcare subsidy system.”
- 2) ***Adds definitions for cost categories for preschool programs and childcare and development programs.*** This bill was double referred to the Senate Human Services Committee and the Senate Education Committee. This bill adds definitions for two types of costs incurred by preschool programs and childcare and development programs:
 - a) “Indirect administrative costs” means general costs related to the day-to-day function and indirect costs incurred in the administration of the program. These costs include, but are not limited to: staff payroll and benefits; managing facilities, human resources, and information technology; and

conducting accounts payable and receivable, grants and contract management, invoicing, and required reporting.

- b) “Direct program and support costs” as costs of running the center-based program that are not considered indirect administrative costs. These costs include, but are not limited to: outreach, recruitment, and enrollment of families; providing individualized, ongoing case management; and collecting childcare attendance records and calculating and processing monthly payments.

This bill intends to clearly categorize expenses as business-related (“indirect administrative costs”) or program-related (“direct program and support costs”) for purposes of revising reimbursement for APP agencies (described below in #3). This bill does not utilize these definitions to make changes to providers who directly contract with the state, including CSPP providers. *This committee may wish to consider the following regarding these definitions:*

- a) *The definition for “direct program and support costs” for preschool programs uses the phrase “center-based program” when describing preschool programs. However, CSPP may be operated in either childcare centers or family childcare homes operating through a family childcare home educational network, so including the phrase “center-based program” for preschool providers creates confusion. For future amendments, staff recommends striking this phrase from the definition for “direct program and support costs” for preschool programs.*
- b) *This bill inserts the definitions for “indirect administrative costs” and “direct program and support costs” in the Education Code for preschool providers, but this bill does not make amendments that reference indirect administrative costs or direct program and support costs for preschool providers, nor did it do so in prior versions of this bill. If future amendments do not include these definitions to make substantive changes to CSPP, staff recommends removing these definitions from the Education Code.*
- 3) **Bill increases reimbursement for APP agencies.** Current law provides that reimbursement for APP agencies includes the cost of childcare paid to providers, plus the administrative and support services costs of the APP agencies. For administrative and support services costs specifically, current law requires that reimbursement for these costs of the APP not exceed 17.5% of the total contract. Since 2006, the percentage reimbursement for administrative and support services has decreased over time. Prior to 2006, the limit for administrative and support services costs was 23.4567% of the contract amount; this dropped to 20% in 2006, 19% in 2008, and then 17.5% in 2010.

This bill revises the reimbursement for APP agencies to include the cost of childcare paid to providers, plus the *indirect administrative costs and direct program and support costs* for the APP agencies. This bill requires that indirect administrative costs not exceed 15% of the maximum reimbursable contract amount, and that the combined costs of indirect administrative costs and direct program and support costs not exceed 25% of the maximum reimbursable contract

amount. Because current law already requires indirect administrative costs to be 15% or less, this bill does not effectively increase allowable funding on administrative costs. However, this bill does increase allowable funding on direct program support costs from effectively at least 2.5% to at least 10%. According to the Senate Human Services Committee analysis on this bill, “while the rate APPs receive has remained stagnant since 2010, the dollar amount APP agencies receive has increased due to recent investments in APP voucher slots, funding to issue additional provider stipends, and funding to perform administrative support for the CCPU.”

This bill also makes changes to the minimum reimbursement for APP agencies. If reimbursement for APP agencies (i.e., the reimbursement received for indirect administrative costs and direct program and support costs) is below \$300,000, this bill requires the minimum reimbursement for APP agencies to be \$300,000, and for this amount to be adjusted annually for inflation using the California Consumer Price Index. In effect, this bill increases the reimbursement amount available to APP agencies by providing a minimum of \$300,000 for APP agencies. This guaranteed funding is intended to provide stability for APP agencies and be particularly valuable for small APP agencies experiencing fluctuations in reimbursement. According to CDSS, there would be approximately 20 APP agencies that would be entitled to a \$300,000 minimum reimbursement, though they acknowledged that number may vary every year.

4) ***Recent author’s amendments removed sections related to the 2025 Budget Act agreement.*** The 2025 Budget Act made changes to hold harmless provisions for both CSPP and direct contract-based childcare programs. Specifically:

- a) Commencing July 1, 2025, and through June 30, 2026, if a program is open and operating in accordance with its approved calendar and remains open and providing services to certified children throughout the program year, the contract reimbursement for these programs shall be the lesser of a) the maximum reimbursable amount stated in the contract, and b) net reimbursable program costs. (The most recent hold harmless provision for these programs preceding the 2025 Budget Act was not exactly the same but very similar.)
- b) Commencing July 1, 2026, the contract reimbursement for these programs shall be the lesser of a) the maximum reimbursable amount stated in the contract, b) net reimbursable program costs, and c) the product of adjusted child days of enrollment for certified children times the specified contract rate.

Prior versions of this bill made changes that deviated from the 2025 budget agreement. Prior versions primarily made changes to the hold harmless provisions commencing July 1, 2026, to establish that CSPP and direct contract-based childcare programs maintaining at least 85% of its enrollment would receive their maximum reimbursable amount, and programs not maintaining 85% of programs would receive the lesser of a) net reimbursable program costs or b) the product of the adjusted child days of enrollment for certified children times the specific

contract rate. The author's recent amendments remove these changes to the 2025 Budget Act.

5) ***Prior and Related Legislation.***

SB 151 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 108, Statutes of 2025), a budget trailer bill, ratifies the agreement reached between the State of California and CCPU on August 7, 2025, and includes parity provisions for unrepresented center-based providers. The bill extends payment based on maximum hours of care, regardless of attendance, for voucher-based childcare and preschool programs through July 1, 2028; extends monthly per-child cost of care plus rate supplements for all subsidized providers; requires CDSS and CDE to provide all subsidized childcare providers with a one-time, per-child stabilization payment; and requires CDSS and CDE to provide childcare contractors with a 5% administrative fee for processing both the one-time cost of care plus payments and the one-time, per-child stabilization payments.

SB 120 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 13, Statutes of 2025), a budget trailer bill, authorizes the continuation of Cost of Care Plus rate payments to childcare centers. SB 120 also extends the hold harmless policy for direct contract programs for one final year, and requires, commencing July 1, 2026, direct contract programs to be reimbursed based on enrollment.

SB 140 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 193, Statutes of 2023), a budget trailer bill, ratifies the agreement reached between the State of California and CCPU on June 30, 2023, and includes parity provisions for unrepresented center-based providers. The bill allocates funding to CDSS and CDE to provide a monthly Cost of Care Plus rate per child to all subsidized childcare providers and provides for administrative funding to APP agencies to process monthly cost of care rates.

AB 131 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 116, Statutes of 2021), a budget trailer bill, transfers childcare program and authority from CDE to CDSS.

AB 378 (Limón, Chapter 385, Statutes of 2019) authorizes family childcare providers, defined as licensed family childcare home operators or license-exempt providers who participate in a state-funded early care and education program, to form, join, and participate in the activities of a labor organization that represents them for the purpose of bargaining on matters related to the terms and conditions of their employment.

SB 98 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 24, Statutes of 2020) establishes the Early Childhood Development Act of 2020 to authorize the transfer of childcare and development programs administered by CDE to CDSS, effective July 1, 2021. SB 98 also establishes the first "hold harmless" policy to reimburse direct contract preschool and childcare programs to be reimbursed at 100% of the contract maximum reimbursable amount or net reimbursable program costs, whichever is less, from July 1, 2020, to June 30, 2021, based on a program's operating status, as specified.

AB 540 (Mullin, 2017) would have increased the total cost for administration and support services to 17.6% of the total APP contract amount. *AB 540 died in the Assembly Human Services Committee.*

AB 188 (Cristina Garcia, 2015) would have reimbursed APP agencies for making eligibility determinations at a rate of 3% of the total contract amount, in addition to the 17.5% for administration and support services. *AB 188 died on the Assembly Appropriations Committee suspense file.*

AB 1610 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 724, Statutes of 2010), a budget trailer bill, reduces the total cost for administration and support services to 17.5% of the total APP contract amount.

AB 1279 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 759, Statutes of 2008), a budget trailer bill, reduces the total cost for administration and support services to 19% of the total APP contract amount. Prior to this change, statute set the administration and support services rate at 23.4567% of the direct cost-of-care payments to childcare providers. However, both the 2006 and 2007 Budget Acts capped the rate at 20%.

SUPPORT

Child Action (co-sponsor)
 Child Care Alliance of Los Angeles (co-sponsor)
 Child Care Resource Center (co-sponsor)
 Crystal Stairs, Inc. (co-sponsor)
 Every Child California (co-sponsor)
 Mexican American Opportunity Foundation (co-sponsor)
 Thriving Families California (co-sponsor)
 Alameda County Office of Education
 California Association for the Education of Young Children
 California Child Care Resource and Referral Network
 Children Now
 Children's Paradise
 Community Bridges
 Fresno County Office of Education
 Kern County Superintendent of Schools Office
 Kidango
 Los Angeles Unified School District
 Mendocino County Office of Education
 Options for Learning
 San Francisco Child Care Planning & Advisory Council
 Silicon Valley Community Foundation
 Thermalito Union Elementary Preschool
 YMCA of San Diego County
 One Individual

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	SB 1128	Hearing Date:	April 22, 2026
Author:	Stern		
Version:	April 14, 2026		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Therresa Austin		

Subject: Pupils: technology-based materials: school-issued electronic devices.

SUMMARY

This bill prohibits local educational agencies (LEA) from requiring a pupil in kindergarten to take home a school issued electronic device. The bill also requires the Department of Education (CDE) to develop and post on its internet website, model policies for the age-appropriate use of school-issued electronic devices in schools, as specified.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Authorizes the governing board of a school district, a county board of education, or the governing body of a charter school to adopt a policy to limit or prohibit pupil use of social media while pupils are at a schoolsite or while the pupils are under the supervision and control of an employee or employees of that school district, county office of education (COE), or charter school. Specifies that the above authorization does not authorize the monitoring, collection, or otherwise accessing of information related to a pupil's online activities. (Education Code (EC) § 48901.8)
- 2) Requires the governing body of a school district, COE, or charter school to develop and adopt a policy by July 1, 2026, to limit or prohibit the use of smartphones by students while they are at school or under the supervision of a school employee, and to update the policy every five years. (EC § 48901.7(a))
- 3) Prohibits an LEA's adopted smartphone use policy from restricting a student's use of a smartphone under any of the following circumstances:
 - a) In the case of an emergency, or in response to a perceived threat of danger, unless explicitly addressed in a comprehensive school safety plan;
 - b) When a teacher or administrator grants permission to a student to possess or use a smartphone, subject to any reasonable limitation imposed by that teacher or administrator;

- c) When a licensed physician and surgeon determines that the possession or use of a smartphone is necessary for the health or well-being of the student; or
 - d) When the possession or use of a smartphone is required in a student's individualized education program (IEP). (EC § 48901.7(b))
- 4) Defines "distance learning" to mean instruction in which the pupil and instructor are in different locations and interact through the use of computer and communications technology. States that distance learning may include video or audio instruction in which the primary mode of communication between pupil and instructor is instructional television, video, telecourses, or any other instruction that relies on computer or communications technology. (EC § 51865)
- 5) States the following state education goals for which distance learning should be utilized:
- a) Equity in education, which requires that every pupil in California's public schools, and every adult in the state, have equal access to educational opportunities, regardless of where he or she lives or how small a school the pupil attends.
 - b) Quality in education, which would be enhanced through the creative application of telecommunications, as pupils are given the opportunity to interact with pupils from other cultures and geographical locations, and with outstanding educators from other educational institutions.
 - c) Diversity among educational institutions, which has been recognized in California through the support of various types of public educational institutions as well as of independent and private colleges and universities.
 - d) Efficiency and accountability, which receive increasing emphasis as state budget resources become increasingly restricted. (EC § 51865)

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Prohibits an LEA from requiring a pupil in kindergarten to take home a school-issued electronic device.
- 2) Requires the CDE, on or before July 1, 2027, to develop and post on its internet website, model policies for the age-appropriate use of school issued electronic devices in schools.
- 3) Requires the CDE, in the development of the model policies, to consider all of the following:
 - a) Developmentally appropriate screen exposure time.

- b) Balancing pupils' use of school-issued electronic devices with direct teacher interaction.
 - c) The impact of school-issued electronic devices on early literacy, arithmetic, and fine motor skill development.
- 4) Defines the following terms:
- a) "Electronic device" means a desktop or laptop computer, handheld device, tablet, smartphone, or other electronic product or device that has a platform on which to download, install, or run any software program, code, script, or other content.
 - b) "Kindergarten" includes transitional kindergarten (TK), defined as the first year of a two-year kindergarten program that uses a modified kindergarten curriculum that is age and developmentally appropriate.
 - c) "Local educational agency" means a school district, COE, or charter school.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, "Innovation is our state's greatest strength, but it should never come at the cost of our children's fundamental development. Today, we see five-year-olds coming home with school-issued laptops before they have even mastered the grip of a pencil. Senate Bill 1128 is a common-sense step to bring balance back to our homes and classrooms

"When we mandate that TK and kindergarten students must take a device home, we risk replacing direct teacher interaction with a digital interface. We are seeing a real threat to the development of early literacy, arithmetic, and those essential fine motor skills that every child needs to succeed. Senate Bill 1128 provides a common-sense solution. Commencing with the 2027–28 school year, local educational agencies shall not require these young pupils to take home electronic devices. This returns the power to parents, ensuring that a child's first "homework" isn't navigating a screen.

"Furthermore, this bill ensures our schools lead with facts. By July 1, 2027, the Department of Education will develop model policies focused on developmentally appropriate screen exposure. These guidelines will focus on direct teacher interaction and the impact of screens on early literacy, arithmetic, and fine motor skills. We are grounding our educational technology in facts, not just trends.

"We are not anti-technology; we are pro-childhood. SB 1128 helps to ensure that parents are in the drivers seat when it comes to their kids technology use, helping to ensure that the Golden State remains a place where our children's futures are defined by their potential, not their screen time."

- 2) ***Distance learning and one-to-one computing programs.*** Prior to the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, several schools began adopting and implementing

“one-to-one” computing programs, providing each student with one laptop, tablet, or mobile device, with variations across school districts and grade levels as to whether the student was able to bring the device home. When the pandemic necessitated transitions to distance learning, the prevalence of one-to-one computing programs rose significantly with the goal of ensuring that students were able to continue learning through virtual classrooms.

To this effect, in 2020 and 2021, the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) and the CDE issued several press releases announcing partnerships with companies like ASUS, CDW, Dell, HP, Lenovo, Samsung, Staples, Office Depot, Apple, and T-Mobile to help schools provide discounted devices to their students, as well as initiatives aimed at closing the digital divide.

In addition to these efforts, LEAs received \$5.3 billion in one-time Learning Loss Mitigation Funding (LLMF) in the 2020-2021 State Budget to support pupil academic achievement and mitigate learning loss related to COVID-19 school closures. Among the approved uses for this funding was the purchase of devices or connectivity tools for the provision of in-classroom and distance learning.

While not universal, these efforts proved effective. According to data reported by the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC), in Spring 2020, as COVID-19 related distance learning shift began, 67.5% of California households with students reported reliable device access. This percentage rose significantly to 81.6% and 81.8% in Fall 2020 and Spring 2021, respectively, as LEAs used available funds and partnerships to invest in student technology.

It does not appear to the committee staff that CDE collects uniform metrics on how many schools currently employ a school-issued device program, or on how device issuance varies across grade levels.

- 3) ***Recent efforts to reduce classroom screen time.*** LEAs have the authority to determine whether and how to utilize technology, such as laptops, tablets, and computers, as instructional tools. Further, teachers retain the discretion to design their instruction and curriculum in ways that utilize technology to support student learning. As students advance through grade levels, the use of technology in and outside of the classroom may increase as school issued devices are used to complete assessments and homework assignments.

In response to parent concerns about the increasing ubiquity of school device use and the impacts of prolonged screen time on students, some California school districts have introduced and adopted resolutions aimed at creating stronger guidance on technology use in classrooms.

In March, the Beverly Hills Unified School District (BHUSD) passed a resolution titled, “Using Technology with Intention: Establishing Guidelines for Student Screen Time,” stating BHUSD’s intention to adopt a Screen Time Policy that, among other things, would:

- a) Provide expected and maximum daily and weekly screen time limits for students delineated by grade level;

- b) Reduce the use of digital devices—including one-to-one tablets—for early education through second grade, except for district-mandated formative assessments;
- c) Operationalize how parents and guardians can annually consent/opt-in for each Google application on a to-be-created Consent to Use Digital Tools form rather than submit a blanket opt-in for all applications listed, particularly for students in grades TK-8;
- d) Provide recommendations and strategies to safely prepare students to utilize and/or create digital tools; and
- e) Develop and share schoolwide guidance outlining best practices for reducing and monitoring student screen time—including systematic coordination among teachers—to prevent excessive cumulative screentime.

The resolution also requires BHUSD to conduct a review of all its current systems and processes, both internal and external, to determine how to regularly track and report students' time spent on devices districtwide, disaggregated by grade level, and specific online applications.

A substantively similar resolution has been agendized for an upcoming vote by the Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles, the governing board of the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD).

This bill would prohibit an LEA from requiring a TK or kindergarten student to take home a school-issued electronic device—thus creating an opt-out option for parents who do not wish to have their students take home a device. Notably, it does not prohibit an LEA from issuing a device for classroom use. The bill also requires the CDE to adopt a model policy on age-appropriate use of school-issued electronic devices in schools, with particular consideration of the following:

- a) *Developmentally appropriate screen exposure time.*
 - b) *Balancing pupils' use of school-issued electronic devices with direct teacher interaction.*
 - c) *The impact of school-issued electronic devices on early literacy, arithmetic, and fine motor skill development.*
- 4) ***Prior and related legislation.***

AB 2071 (Hoover, 2026) would require the CDE to develop a plan to expand digital wellness instruction in California public schools. *AB 2071 is currently in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.*

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

SB 1283 (Stern, Chapter 891, Statutes of 2024) authorizes a school district, a county board of education, or a charter school to adopt a policy to limit or prohibit students from using social media while at a schoolsite or under the supervision and control of an employee of the school district, COE, or charter school.

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

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

SUPPORT

None received

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	SB 1181	Hearing Date:	April 22, 2026
Author:	Hurtado		
Version:	March 25, 2026		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Therresa Austin		

Subject: Central Valley School Safety Coordination Pilot Program.

SUMMARY

This bill requires California Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES), in consultation with the Department of Education (CDE), to establish the Central Valley School Safety Coordination Pilot Program, for the purposes of studying and evaluating improved communication pathways between local educational agencies and regional fusion centers regarding credible safety threats affecting school communities, as specified.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Authorizes the governing board of a school district to establish a school police department under the supervision of a school chief of police, and employ peace officers to ensure the safety of school district personnel and pupils, and the security of the real and personal property of the school district. (Education Code (EC) § 38001)
- 2) Requires a school official who is alerted to or observes any threat or perceived threat to immediately report the threat or perceived threat to law enforcement. Requires the report to include copies of any documentary or other evidence associated with the threat or perceived threat. Requires law enforcement to keep a record of any report received pursuant to this section. (EC § 49393)
- 3) Requires the local law enforcement agency or the schoolsite police, upon notification of a report referenced in #2 above, to immediately conduct an investigation and assessment of any threat or perceived threat, with the support of the respective local educational agency (LEA). (EC § 49394)
- 4) Defines “threat or perceived threat” to mean any writing or action of a pupil that creates a reasonable suspicion that the pupil is preparing to commit a homicidal act related to school or a school activity. This may include possession, use, or depictions of firearms, ammunition, shootings, or targets in association with infliction of physical harm, destruction, or death in a social media post, journal, class note, or other media associated with the pupil. It may also include a warning by a parent, pupil, or other individual. (EC § 49390)
- 5) Defines “reasonable suspicion” to mean articulable facts, together with rational inferences from those facts, warranting an objective suspicion. (EC § 49390)

- 6) Requires each school district or COE to be responsible for the overall development of all CSSPs for its schools operating kindergarten or any of grades 1 through 12. (EC § 32281)
- 7) Requires the schoolsite council or a school safety planning committee to be responsible for developing the CSSP in consultation with representatives from law enforcement agencies, fire departments, and other first responder entities, and requires that the CSSP be shared with law enforcement, the fire department, and other first responder entities. (EC § 32281)
- 8) Requires each school to adopt its school safety plan by March 1 and review and update its plan annually by March 1. Requires each school to annually report, in July, on the status of its school safety plan, including a description of key elements of the plan, in the annual school accountability report card (SARC). (EC § 32286)
- 9) Specifies that the CSSP must include:
 - a) An assessment of the current status of school crime committed on school campuses and at school-related functions;
 - b) Identification of appropriate strategies and programs to provide or maintain a high level of school safety;
 - c) Child abuse reporting procedures;
 - d) Disaster procedures, including adaptations for pupils with disabilities;
 - e) An earthquake emergency procedure system;
 - f) Accommodations related to relevant federal disability laws; a requirement that the annual evaluation of plans ensure appropriate adaptations; and allow parents and others to bring a concern about a student's safety to the principal;
 - g) Policies regarding pupils who commit specified acts that would lead to suspension or expulsion;
 - h) Procedures to notify teachers of dangerous pupils;
 - i) A discrimination and harassment policy;
 - j) Any schoolwide dress code;
 - k) Procedures for safe ingress and egress of pupils, parents, and school employees to and from school;
 - l) A safe and orderly environment conducive to learning;

- m) Rules and procedures on school discipline;
- n) Procedures for conducting tactical responses to criminal incidents, including procedures related to individuals with guns on school campuses and at school-related functions;
- o) Procedures to assess and respond to reports of any dangerous, violent, or unlawful activity that is being conducted or threatened to be conducted at the school, at an activity sponsored by the school, or on a school bus serving the school;
- p) Accommodations for students with special needs in case of emergency;
- q) Procedures related to severe fires, including a communication, refuge, and evacuation plan;
- r) Procedures to respond to incidents involving an individual experiencing a sudden cardiac arrest or a similar life-threatening medical emergency while on school grounds;
- s) A protocol for responding to a student suffering from an opioid overdose;
- t) An instructional continuity plan to establish communication with pupils and their families and provide instruction to pupils when in-person instruction is disrupted due to an emergency, including procedures for pupil engagement and a plan to provide access to in-person instruction or remote instruction, as soon as practicable; and
- u) Commencing with the 2026–27 fiscal year, a procedure to identify appropriate refuge shelter for all pupils and staff to be used in the event of an evacuation order in the event of a fire. Also requires each public school serving more than 50 pupils that is in a high or very high fire hazard severity zone to coordinate the procedure with the operational area having jurisdiction within the school’s boundaries. (EC § 32282)

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Requires the Cal OES, in consultation with the CDE to establish the Central Valley School Safety Coordination Pilot Program (pilot program), with the stated purpose of studying and evaluating improved communication pathways between LEAs and regional fusion centers regarding credible safety threats affecting school communities, with a focus on addressing chronic absenteeism, youth mental health, and emerging digital or hybrid threats in Senate District 16 and similar regions.
- 2) Requires that the pilot program be implemented in selected counties within the Central Valley, including, but not limited to, the Counties of Fresno, Kern, Kings,

Tulare, Madera, Merced, San Joaquin, and Stanislaus, prioritizing areas with high chronic absenteeism and mental health challenges as identified in district-specific data.

- 3) Authorizes the pilot program to include, but not be limited to, the following:
 - a) Designation of school safety liaisons within participating county offices of education, in coordination with existing school resource officers where applicable.
 - b) Development of voluntary coordination protocols between participating local educational agencies and regional fusion centers regarding credible school safety threats, including online radicalization and cyber threats, while leveraging Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST)-certified programs for school resource officers and school personnel.
 - c) Training opportunities for school personnel related to threat awareness, responsible reporting practices, and emerging digital safety trends affecting youth, including AI-driven disinformation and its links to mental health issues, aligned with POST standards and existing school resource officer frameworks.
 - d) Development of information sharing practices between participating educational entities and regional threat assessment centers, emphasizing support for chronic absenteeism reduction through mental health resources.
 - e) Identification and analysis of emerging threat trends affecting school communities, including digital and hybrid threats, such as disinformation campaigns targeting youth mental health, family stability, or resource-related tensions in rural areas, in coordination with school resource officer and fusion center protocols.
- 4) Prohibits the pilot program from authorizing bulk monitoring of students or the collection of student information unrelated to a credible safety threat.
- 5) Limits the information sharing conducted pursuant to this bill to information permitted to be disclosed under existing law.
- 6) Requires Cal OES, by January 1, 2029, in consultation with the CDE, to submit a report to the Legislature evaluating the pilot program. The report shall include, but not be limited to, the following:
 - a) The number of *participating local educational agencies*.
 - b) A description of communication practices developed through the pilot.
 - c) Emerging threat trends affecting schools identified through the pilot program, with specific data on Senate District 16 challenges, including

- chronic absenteeism reductions via threat mitigation, youth mental health improvements, and impacts from digital or hybrid threats.
- d) Privacy and civil liberties safeguards implemented.
 - e) Recommendations regarding whether the pilot program should be expanded statewide.
 - f) Recommendations for pursuing federal grants, including those from the Homeland Security Grant Program or Targeted Violence and Terrorism Prevention grants, to support program expansion and address identified threats.
- 7) Defines “local educational agencies” as a school district, a county office of education, a nonprofit charter school participating as a member of a special education local plan area, or a special education local plan area.
- 8) Makes a series of findings and declarations related to the Central Valley’s unique challenges with youth safety, mental health, chronic absenteeism, and digital threats, and the need for improved coordination and privacy-protected information sharing to address those challenges.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “California’s schools are increasingly confronted with safety threats that are more complex, interconnected, and often originate outside of school campuses. From online threats that escalate quickly to real-world emergencies, our educators are being asked to act as first responders, but they are not always equipped with the communication systems and partnerships needed to respond effectively.

“This challenge is especially pronounced in the Central Valley, where rural school districts face persistent gaps in infrastructure, staffing, and access to coordinated emergency response systems. At the same time, schools are uniquely positioned to identify early warning signs. This may be in the form of chronic absenteeism, behavioral health concerns, or digital indicators of potential harm. Without a clear and coordinated framework to share information responsibly, these warning signs can be missed.

“SB 1181 builds upon existing state-operated Fusion Centers to establish the Central Valley School Safety Coordination Pilot Program to help bridge this gap. By strengthening collaboration between local educational agencies, regional intelligence-sharing partners, and the Governor’s Office of Emergency Services, this bill ensures that schools are not operating in isolation when responding to credible threats.”

- 2) ***What is a fusion center?*** The Senate Emergency Management Committee’s analysis of this bill notes the following:

“According to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), fusion centers are state-owned and locally operated entities that serve as focal points in states and major urban areas for the receipt, analysis, gathering and sharing of threat-related information between state, local, tribal, other federal, and private sector partners as it relates to law enforcement, homeland security, public safety, and terrorism. DHS states that each fusion center is a vital resource for integrating information from national and local sources to prevent and respond to all threats and hazards and National Network of Fusion Centers brings critical context and value to homeland security and law enforcement by providing partners with a unique perspective on threats to their state or locality and being the primary contact between frontline personnel, state and local leadership and DHS.”

The State Threat Assessment System (STAS) is California’s network of fusion centers. According to its website:

“At the state level, CalOES, in partnership with the California Highway Patrol (CHP) provide[s] daily strategic analysis and tactical support, while state agency partners such as California’s Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR), Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), Department of Justice (CalDOJ), and Department of Public Health (CDPH) also contribute personnel or resources to advance the anti-terrorism objectives of the STAS. At the local level, County Sheriff’s Offices as well as City Police, Fire and Emergency Management Departments contribute personnel and resources to the STAS.”

The network of the STAS consists of the State Threat Assessment Center (STAC); four regional threat assessment centers (RTACs)—the Central California Intelligence Center; the Joint Regional Intelligence Center, serving the counties of Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Ventura; the Northern California Regional Intelligence Center; the Orange County Intelligence Assessment Center; and the San Diego Law Enforcement Coordination Center, an RTAC subordinate major urban area fusion center. Cal OES indicates that the STAC serves as “California’s information sharing clearinghouse of strategic threat analysis and situational awareness reporting to statewide leadership and the public safety community in support of efforts to prevent, prepare for, mitigate and respond to all crimes and all hazards impacting California citizens and critical infrastructure, while preserving civil liberties, individual privacy, and constitutional rights.”

- 3) ***Currently known interactions between fusion centers and California schools.*** According to the Senate Emergency Management Committee, the Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) Unit within Cal OES coordinates with the regional fusion centers to enhance the availability of POST certified training related to school security. The program is supported through the U.S. Department of Justice and is designed to provide students and teachers with the tools to recognize, respond quickly to, and prevent acts of violence. The CIP Unit works to educate state, county, and local entities about the STAS, provide guidance for the adoption of security-related measures, inform schools of

identified threats trends, and facilitate engagement with the regional fusion centers. Examples of these trainings course titles include School Threat - Active Assailant investigations, Basic Vulnerability Assessments for School Facilities, and Advanced Threat Assessment: K-12 School Safety.

Regional fusion centers also maintain Suspicious Activity Report (SAR) systems on their respective websites, with some additionally providing specific reporting systems for school related threats.

This bill would require Cal OES to study and evaluate improved communication pathways between local educational agencies and regional fusion centers regarding credible safety threats affecting school communities, with a focus on addressing chronic absenteeism, youth mental health, and emerging digital or hybrid threats in Senate District 16 and similar regions. The bill provides significant discretion to Cal OES, in consultation with the CDE, to determine the pilot program elements, listing examples elements such as the following:

- a) Training opportunities for school personnel related to threat awareness, responsible reporting practices, and emerging digital safety trends affecting youth, including AI-driven disinformation and its links to mental health issues, aligned with POST standards and existing school resource officer frameworks.
- b) Development of information sharing practices between participating LEAs and regional threat assessment centers, emphasizing support for chronic absenteeism reduction through mental health resources.
- c) Identification and analysis of emerging threat trends affecting school communities, including digital and hybrid threats, such as disinformation campaigns targeting youth mental health, family stability, or resource-related tensions in rural areas, in coordination with school resource officer and fusion center protocols.

Importantly, the bill language indicates that the pilot program *may* include these elements, but does not limit the scope of the pilot program to what is listed. Thus, it is plausible that the pilot program may ultimately take the form of an approach entirely outside of the example set provided. Further, the bill, as currently in print, does not specify a sunset date by which the pilot program will come to an end. Each of the potential outcomes of the examples provided in the bill have varying levels of privacy and security implications.

In their letter submitted to this committee in opposition to this bill, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) California Action argues the following:

“Explicitly increasing coordination between schools and fusion centers will lead to sensitive student information entering systems frequently used by federal law enforcement and immigration authorities. While SB 1181 contains certain limits on information sharing, the black-box nature of fusion centers makes it difficult to know which laws they comply with and which laws the constantly violate. The students most likely to be harmed

by this approach are the very students the bill seeks to support: students of color, immigrant students, and LGBTQ students. Embedding school safety within fusion centers is likely to exacerbate distrust and disengagement rather than improve attendance or wellbeing of students.

Should this bill move forward, the author may wish to consider ways to more specifically tailor the scope of the pilot program to ensure that the practices resulting from the program can be meaningfully evaluated.

- 4) ***Existing school-based initiatives to support campus climate and student mental health.*** California has made significant efforts to develop the best practices and strategies for addressing student mental health, behavior, and school climate. These include:
- a) Restorative justice practices contribute to the development of a positive school climate and discipline policies that are humanistic and inclusive, while increasing student voice and engagement.
 - b) Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) encourages local educational agencies (LEAs) to establish and align school-wide, data-driven systems of academic and behavioral supports to more effectively meet the needs of California's diverse learners in the most inclusive environment.
 - c) Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS) is a school-wide approach to discipline that is intended to create safe, predictable, and positive school environments.

The state has also made coordinated investments through the Children and Youth Behavioral Health Initiative (CYBHI), which seeks to overhaul California's mental health system and enhance the pathways connecting families with the needed services. Specific school-based workstreams include the following:

- a) *Safe Spaces Trauma Informed Training* – A free, online training designed to help individuals working with children and youth recognize and respond to signs of trauma and stress.
- b) *CalHOPE Mindfulness, Resilience, and Well-being Supports* – Providing no-cost mental health and wellness resources to schools across the state. The website contains resources that focus on creating trusted spaces, building resilience, and recognizing the signs of mental stress and duress in colleagues, students, and family members.
- c) *Student Behavioral Health Incentive Program* – Addressing behavioral health access barriers for Medi-Cal students through targeted interventions that increase access to preventive, early intervention, or other behavioral health services provided by school-affiliated behavioral health providers for TK-12 children in public schools.
- d) *School-Linked Partnership and Capacity Grants* - Providing COEs and LEAs, as well as institutions of higher education (IHEs), with critical

resources to build infrastructure and partnerships and achieve a long-term and sustainable funding model for student behavioral health services. These one-time grants aim to increase operational readiness to engage in the CYBHI Fee Schedule program through supporting Medi-Cal enrollment, building service delivery and billing infrastructure, establishing data collection and documentation processes, and supporting collective impact efforts.

- e) *CYBHI Fee Schedule Program* - Increases access to school-linked behavioral health services. The program establishes a sustainable reimbursement source from Managed Care Plans, commercial health insurance, and disability insurers. Covered services include outpatient mental health or substance use disorder services for students under 26 years of age. The Fee Schedule creates a more approachable billing model for LEAs and public IHEs, easing burdens related to contracting, rate negotiation, and navigation across delivery systems, and reducing uncertainty around students' health insurance coverage.
 - f) *Transforming Together* - Supported by the San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools, Transforming Together (T2) brings together a cross-sector Collaborative Leadership Working Group to align and integrate systems efforts for a re-imagined, youth-centered behavioral health ecosystem. Work is conducted in close partnership with CDE's California Community Schools Partnership Program and piloted in four demonstration counties.
- 5) ***Forthcoming audit.*** In March of this year, the Joint Legislative Audit Committee (JLAC) approved an audit of the STAC and two selected local fusion centers focusing on compliance with laws, rules, and regulations governing the fusion centers and access to and use of sensitive personally identifiable information by participating agencies. The listed objectives of the audit include the following:
- a) Identifying policies related to who determines which agencies (local, state, or federal) are allowed to participate in fusion center activities.
 - b) Identifying the policies for how other states and local law enforcement agencies obtain intelligence, data, or assistance from the fusion center.
 - c) Identifying local, state, and federal entities that have staff assigned to the STAC and local fusion centers, including national guard members, and the processes for determining which entities and staff are assigned, under what authority and supervision, and who is responsible for ensuring their compliance with restrictions on accessing law enforcement information.
 - d) Determining whether the law authorizes STAC's and local fusion centers' information collection and sharing practices and whether such collection and sharing practices comply with applicable requirements. To the extent possible, evaluate data sharing practices specifically related to state and local agencies sharing information with the federal government, including

for purposes of immigration enforcement, and whether those practices comply with all applicable laws, regulations, and policies.

- e) To the extent possible, determining whether STAC and the local fusion centers have defined missions and have established metrics that they use to assess their performance. If so, assess the validity of these metrics. Review the performance of the STAC and local fusion centers against these or other applicable measures of performance to determine whether they are effective in their mission and purpose. Identifying performance trends based on any internal evaluation reports over the past 10 years.

In the petition letter submitted to JLAC requesting the audit, the requestor, Senator Sabrina Cervantes, noted the following:

“No single piece of federal or state legislation established this national network of fusion centers, defined its mission, or authorized it to operate as a decentralized domestic intelligence collection mechanism feeding the federal intelligence community with information gathered from every part of American life. The network operates in secret and under ambiguous lines of authority. It includes not only federal, state, and local law enforcement, but also other public and private entities that have no legal or statutory authority to collect or disseminate intelligence about Americans. The public has little access to information regarding what their local fusion centers do in their communities or even the individuals who work there. Fusion centers were originally created with the laudable goal of preventing terrorism. However, over the nearly three decades since their establishment and with limited formal oversight, these centers have seen a significant expansion in their surveillance and targeting activities to include broad domestic activities. The infrastructure established at fusion centers is designed to gather considerable information about individuals’ identities, movements, activities, and relationships from various aspects of their lives, and to collect and collate this data to multiple levels of government and private entities for analysis and decision-making.”

An expected completion date for the audit has not yet been released.

- 6) **Pilot program reporting.** This bill would require Cal OES, in consultation with CDE, to submit a report to the Legislature that evaluates the pilot program. The report shall include, but not be limited to, the following information:
 - a) The number of participating LEAs.
 - b) A description of communication practices developed through the pilot.
 - c) Emerging threat trends affecting schools identified through the pilot program, with specific data on Senate District 16 challenges, including chronic absenteeism reductions via threat mitigation, youth mental health improvements, and impacts from digital or hybrid threats.
 - d) Privacy and civil liberties safeguards implemented.

- e) Recommendations regarding whether the pilot program should be expanded statewide.
- f) Recommendations for pursuing federal grants, including those from the Homeland Security Grant Program or Targeted Violence and Terrorism Prevention grants, to support program expansion and address identified threats.

As noted in Comment 3, regional fusion centers already have some level of existing interaction with LEAs. However, information on the scope of interactions beyond those noted publicly is limited— at very least until the forthcoming audit (see Comment 5) is completed. This bill encourages further partnership between regional fusion centers and LEAs who serve students in some of California's most vulnerable communities.

In the effort to balance the interest in coordinated partnerships to protect schools from safety threats, with the need for increased scrutiny when involving student privacy and civil liberties, the committee recommends the following amendments:

- a) *Require the evaluation report to additionally include the following:*
 - i) *Information on the supportive resources provided to participating schools or students in response to emerging threat trends. These may include, but are not limited to, resources for mental health, restorative justice, and hate and bullying prevention*
 - ii) *Information on how the regional fusion centers identify threats and determine what constitutes a credible safety threat in the school environment.*
 - iii) *A description of the types of information shared between participating LEAs, regional fusion centers, and Cal OES when a credible safety threat has been identified.*
 - iv) *A description of specific privacy and civil liberties safeguards implemented by Cal OES, regional fusion centers, and participating LEAs.*
- b) *Specify a sunset date for the pilot program consistent with the required evaluation report.*
- c) *Amend the definition of local educational agencies to maintain continuity with existing definitions.*
- d) *Ensure continuity in the use of the term, "regional fusion centers" by replacing a reference to a "regional threat assessment center."*

7) ***Prior and related legislation.***

SB 1095 (Perez, 2026) regulates the information sharing activities of California-based fusion centers and imposes related reporting requirements. *SB 1095 is pending a hearing in the Senate Public Safety Committee.*

AB 474 (Rodriguez, 2023) would have required the STAC and Cal OES to prioritize, to the greatest extent possible, cooperation with state and local efforts to disrupt and dismantle criminal drug trafficking networks that pose a threat to California. *AB 474 was vetoed by the Governor.*

SUPPORT

None received

OPPOSITION

ACLU California Action
All of US or None
Legal Services for Prisoners with Children
Oakland Privacy

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No: SB 1321
Author: Niello
Version: March 23, 2026
Urgency: No
Consultant: Olgalilia Ramirez

Hearing Date: April 22, 2026
Fiscal: Yes

Subject: Public postsecondary education: remedial classes and supports: audit

SUMMARY

This bill requires the California State Auditor, by September 1, 2027, to report the results of an audit of the California State University (CSU) and the University of California (UC) that evaluates the use of remedial instruction and supports. It further requires a review of admission reviewer proficiency and training, bias, fairness, and proper assessment of student preparedness.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Declares that it is the Legislature's intent that the governing boards of the CSU and UC, in determining the standards and criteria for undergraduate and graduate admissions to their respective systems do all of the following:
 - a) Develop processes which strive to be fair and are easily understandable.
 - b) Consider the use of criteria and procedures that allow students to enroll who are otherwise fully and admissible but have course deficiencies due to circumstances beyond their control, and, when appropriate, provide that the admission requires the student to make up the deficiency.
 - c) Consult broadly with California's diverse ethnic and cultural communities. (Education Code (EC) § 66205 (a) (1-3))
- 2) Declares that it is the Legislature's intent that UC and CSU seek to enroll a student body that meets high academic standards and reflects the cultural, racial, geographic, economic, and social diversity of California. (EC § 66205 (b))
- 3) Prohibits a CSU and UC campus from granting admission by exception to a student unless the student's admission has been approved by a minimum of three senior campus administrators. Current law defines "admission by exception" to mean the process by which a campus admits applicants who do not meet the eligibility requirements for admission to the segment, or guaranteed admission to a campus of the segment, but who demonstrate high potential for

success and leadership in an academic or special talent program at the campus. (EC § 66022.5 et al.)

- 4) Requires the CSU to provide certain information regarding the academic progress and placement levels of freshmen at each CSU campus with a focus on general education courses in mathematics/quantitative reasoning and written communication and annually report that information to the Legislature. (EC § 66015.12)

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Requires, by September 1, 2027, the California State Auditor to report on the results of the prescribed audit of the CSU and the UC regarding the use of remedial instruction and supports. This bill requires that the audit do all of the following:
 - a) Evaluate the number of students that enrolled in remedial English or mathematics courses or received support in nonremedial English or mathematics courses.
 - b) Evaluate the efforts of the segment pertaining to students needing remedial instruction or support.
 - c) Evaluate three of the high-demand campuses of the CSU and three of the high-demand campuses of the UC on all of the following:
 - i) Any increase in the use of remedial courses or support in nonremedial courses since the 2019-20 academic year and the factors contributing to that increase.
 - ii) Potential improvements to the admissions process to ensure that student preparedness is properly assessed.
 - iii) How the admission process ensures the use of fair and unbiased admissions practices.
 - iv) The level of proficiency and training of those evaluating applications.
 - d) Review and assess any other issues that are significant to the audit, including, but not limited to, identifying any changes that might result in improvements in the ability of CSU and the UC to address the number of students who need remedial courses or support in nonremedial courses.
- 2) Requires the California State Auditor to report the findings of each audit conducted pursuant to this bill to the chairs of the Assembly Committee on Higher Education, the Senate Committee on Education, and the Joint Legislative Audit Committee, consistent with the requirements.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) **Need for the bill.** The author cites a UC, San Diego (UCSD) report examining academic preparation of its entering first-year students as the rationale for the bill. The report showed UCSD has experienced a significant decline in the academic preparation of entering first-year students over the past five years, with the most severe deterioration occurring in mathematics preparation and notable challenges also present in writing and language skills. Between 2020 and 2025, the number of entering students at UCSD whose mathematics skills fell below high school standards increased nearly thirtyfold, with more than seventy percent of those students performing below middle school standards, representing approximately one in twelve members of the entering cohort. A substantial portion of underprepared students also require remedial instruction in writing, and recent data indicates an increasing overlap between deficiencies in mathematics and deficiencies in writing and literacy. The author further notes, “While expanding access to students from under-resourced backgrounds is consistent with the UC’s mission as a public institution and engine of social mobility, admitting large numbers of students who are profoundly underprepared risks undermining student success, increasing course failure rates, lengthening time to degree, and placing unsustainable strain on faculty and instructional resources.”
- 2) **Admissions.** The proposed audit calls for a review of the admission process of three high-demand campuses within the CSU and UC systems, respectively. Expectations and guidance on enrollment targets and eligibility standards for admission for the state’s public universities are outlined by state statute and in the Master Plan for Higher Education. CSU and UC internal policies govern and establish admission eligibility criteria and evaluation procedures for undergraduate admissions, which are described below:
 - a) *UC Admissions:* UC Regent policy specifies that admission requirements established by the University follow the guidelines set by the California Master Plan for Higher Education, which requires that the top one-eighth (12.5 percent) of the state’s high school graduates, as well as those transfer students who have successfully completed specific college work, be eligible for admission to the UC. Accordingly, UC’s admission policy deems a student eligible for admission to the system (guaranteed placement, though not necessarily to the first-choice campus) for all California applicants who are in the top 9 percent of California high school graduates (eligibility in the statewide context) or in the top 9 percent of their respective high school class (eligibility in the local context). Eligibility in the local and statewide context is based on a combination of GPA and completed A-G high school coursework. Applicants who are not in the top 9 percent must also meet eligibility requirements—completion of A-G high school courses with a weighted GPA of at least 3.0 for residents (3.4 for nonresidents)—and are considered through a comprehensive review process that evaluates 13 factors on academic and personal achievements.

The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) is a committee of the UC Academic Senate that oversees all matters relating to UC admissions of undergraduates. BOARS regulates the policies and practices used in the admissions process that directly relate to the educational mission of the University. It also recommends and directs efforts to improve the admissions process. The setting of eligibility standards as well as defining A-G requirements are among its duties.

- b) *CSU admissions.* Whereas the UC is to admit the top one-eighth of high school graduates, the CSU is to include the top one-third of each year's graduates. For California residents, eligibility is determined based on high school graduation and completion of A-G high school coursework with a GPA of 2.5 or greater. CSU programs that are impacted may require use of a higher A-G GPA threshold as well as identify other supplemental criteria. Many CSU campuses use local admission policies for students who graduate or transfer from high schools and community colleges within the CSU's local admission area. CSU policy also allows for admission by exception for a "disadvantaged applicant," defined as an individual from a low-income family and who has the potential to perform satisfactorily on the college level but who has been unable to realize that potential without special assistance because of economic or educational background. The number of students admitted by exception is very limited. The CSU Admission Advisory Council provides recommendations related to admission for consideration by the CSU Board of Trustees.
- 3) **A-G course requirements.** High school students must complete at least 15 courses across seven subject areas to be eligible for admission directly from high school to either the UC or CSU. CSU has adopted the UC's A-G course pattern as the foundation for determining eligibility for its first-time freshmen. A CSU applicant must receive a grade of "C" or better in each course for that course to count toward the requirement. A-G course requirements are as follows:
- Two years of history/social science, including one year of world history, cultures, and historical geography and one year of U.S. history, or one-half year of U.S. history and one-half year of American government or civics.
 - Four years of college preparatory English that integrates reading of classic and modern literature, frequent and regular writing, and practice in listening and speaking.
 - Three years of college-preparatory math, including or integrating the topics covered in elementary and advanced algebra and two- and three-dimensional geometry.
 - Two years of laboratory science providing fundamental knowledge in at least two of the three disciplines of biology, chemistry, and physics.
 - Two years of the same language other than English or equivalent to the second level of high school instruction.

- One year of visual and performing arts chosen from dance, music, theater, or the visual arts.
 - One year of a college-preparatory elective beyond those used to satisfy the requirements above, or courses that have been approved solely in the elective area.
- 4) **Remediation.** This bill calls for an audit to evaluate how many students need remediation, questions why they need it, and probes whether admissions practices are aligned with student readiness. In general, remedial education is intended to help students who are assessed as underprepared in English or math to succeed in college-level coursework after being admitted. In recent years practices for delivering remedial education instruction have changed from the offering noncredit stand-alone courses toward more integrated co-requisite support. Under CSU's current policy, students who need additional preparation are placed into credit-bearing college-level math/quantitative reasoning courses with support, which may include co-requisite support (students enroll directly in college-level courses with support), supplemental instruction, or stretch formats (the course material is extended over two terms instead of one). The CSU policy allows students to take a maximum of two units or pre-baccalaureate coursework offered concurrently with a college-level, baccalaureate credit-bearing course in the summer prior to their first term through the campus supportive *Pathways for First-Year Student* program. Campuses also offer this content in a student's freshman year. It's important to note that existing law already requires CSU to annually report on the effectiveness of their remedial education policy and student outcomes for students needing additional preparation. *The committee may wish to consider whether the bill's provisions related to remediation are duplicative of existing CSU reporting.*

There seems to be some variation across the UC in how they approach remediation. According to the UCSD report, the campus enrolls students in prerequisite sequences commencing with Math 2 (Algebra I-II and Geometry), which is a departure from successful integrated support practices. No other UC campus offers a course equivalent to Math 2, which remediates elementary and middle school math. It's unclear if credit is awarded for Math 2. Two other UC campuses (UC Riverside and UC Davis) now offer partial remediation for high school math, and a third (UC Irvine) offers a self-study, partial high school remediation course. It's not clear to committee staff whether these or any UC campuses have adopted co-requisite support similar to CSU over standalone noncredit courses. Research from the Public Policy Institute of California has found that co-requisite support models to be effective for delivering remedial education, over traditional remediation education courses. Staff also notes that UCSD is unique as it is the only campus within the system that requires all majors (even those not math related) to take calculus, and as such, it may not serve as the most instructive example for shaping policy.

- 5) **Things to consider.** This bill is informed by concerns raised in the UCSD admissions review about student preparedness and admissions. The report examines students enrolled between 2020 and 2025, and it notes that the

number of students deemed to need remedial math courses before taking calculus rose from 32 in 2020 to more than 900 in the fall of 2025. It points to several contributing factors consisting of learning loss associated with the COVID-19 pandemic, including disruptions to in-person instruction, reduced opportunities to complete advanced coursework, and uneven access to academic support. The report also notes that the elimination of standardized testing, grade inflation, and the expansion of admissions from under-resourced high schools are coinciding factors. Committee staff notes that in an effort to increase enrollment of students in under-resourced schools (LCFF+ schools), the Budget Act of 2016 appropriated one-time funds for academic and other support services for these students, and again through the 2019 Budget Act.

This bill directs the auditor to evaluate whether the admission processes are fair and unbiased, the training and proficiency of those evaluating applications, and improvements to the admission process to ensure that student preparedness is properly assessed. The issue of remediation as framed in the bill seems solely focused on admission practices, which may raise concerns with how student preparedness and access are treated within the scope of the audit. Seemingly, there is a broad range of circumstances that impact student readiness, including many experienced within K-12 education rather than admissions decisions alone.

- *The committee may wish to consider, to the extent that student preparedness reflects broader K-12 disruptions and the need for institutional support, whether focusing on admissions practices related to remediation overlooks the fundamental causes of student preparedness, particularly for COVID-impacted cohorts.*
- *The committee may wish to also consider, given that the state's public universities are called upon to provide access and support student success, as well as prior state investments to serve students from under-resourced schools and legislative intent recognizing the admission of students with course deficiencies beyond their control, whether focusing on admissions practices could undermine the UC and CSU's charge in preparing and supporting these students once enrolled.*
- *The committee may further wish to consider whether focusing on admissions practices raises concerns about potential unintended consequences for students who are otherwise able to gain admission and succeed with appropriate support.*
- *The committee may wish to consider whether broader research evaluating college preparedness within the K-12 pipeline and institutional support, particularly for COVID-impacted students, is merited.*

6) **Bypasses JLAC.** The Joint Legislative Audit Committee (JLAC) is charged with evaluating and approving which audits the California State Auditor will do each year. Its members are tasked with weighing each proposal and deciding which ones are the highest priority. This bill instead directs the California State Auditor in statute and bypasses JLAC, which raises questions about audit prioritization

and use of limited audit resources. *The committee may wish to consider whether it is appropriate for audit requests to be considered through the legislative process or whether they are more appropriately vetted through JLAC process.*

7) **Related and prior legislation.**

AB 500 (Quirk-Silva, 2025) would have requested the UC to undertake certain actions before a proposal to change the conditions for undergraduate admissions is adopted by the UC Regents, including providing the proposal to the official UC student organization, the State Board of Education (SBE), the CSU Trustees and each UC Regent. It further would have required, upon receiving the proposal from UC, the SBE and the CSU Trustees, to identify as an item for discussion and discuss the proposal at an open meeting of each of these boards, respectively. AB 500 died in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

AB 684 (Patel, 2025) would expand the definition of “Regent of the University of California” to also include the Academic Senate of the University of California, Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools for purposes of the Bagley-Keene Open Meetings Act. AB 684 was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

AB 1217 (Fong, 2025) would request the UC to align the admission criteria used in the review and certification of high school courses with the content standards, frameworks, and model curriculum adopted by the SBE for the applicable subject area. AB 1217 further updates the existing local educational agency course certification process for CSU and UC admissions, including a requirement that the approving entity provide a reason for a denial and suggest ways for the local educational agency to obtain future approval. AB 1217 was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

SB 309 (Leyva, 2023) would have established the A-G Completion Improvement Grant Program, contingent upon an appropriation, for the purpose of providing additional supports to LEAs to help increase the number of California high school pupils, particularly unduplicated pupils, who graduate from high school eligible to attend a UC or CSU; (2) increases notification requirements regarding high school graduation requirements and UC/CSU admission requirements; and (3) commencing with the 2026-27 school year, would have required charter schools and county offices of education to meet the same requirement as school districts to offer to all otherwise qualified pupils a course of study fulfilling the requirements and prerequisites for admission to the UC/CSU in a timely manner. SB 309 died in the Assembly Education Committee its contents were subsequently included in the 2021 Budget.

AB 233 (Boerner Horvath, 2021) would have requested the UC Regents to adopt a policy directing the UC Office of the President implement other various California State Auditor recommendations related to the general student admission process to be effective for the UC’s 2023 admissions cycle. AB 233 died in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

AB 1215 (Boerner Horvath, 2021) would have requested the UC Board of Regents to adopt policies directing the UC Office of the President to establish various systemwide protocols pertaining to undergraduate admissions. AB 1215 was vetoed by Governor Newsom whose veto message read in part:

***“I am committed to ensuring the fairness of admissions processes at all California colleges and universities, which is why I signed previous legislation with that goal in mind. However, I believe that the system-wide requirements stipulated in this bill could constrain the UC’s ability to effectively use its holistic admissions process in admitting diverse cohorts of new students.*”**

***“Moreover, I believe that the UC has addressed the majority of issues identified by the State Auditor with the seriousness they deserve and has already implemented many of the safeguards required by this bill. In light of the UC’s ongoing implementation of audit recommendations, this bill is premature.*”**

“I will continue to monitor this issue and expect that the UC follows through on these new procedures.”

SUPPORT

California Community College Independents
One individual

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	SB 1374	Hearing Date:	April 22, 2026
Author:	Niello		
Version:	April 13, 2026		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Olgalilia Ramirez		

Subject: Restraining orders: educational institutions.

SUMMARY

This bill authorizes a chief administrative officer of a postsecondary educational institution or their designee to seek a temporary restraining order or an order after hearing on behalf of the institution when the officer becomes aware of unlawful violence or a credible threat of violence directed at the campus, as specified.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

1) Defines the following relevant terms:

- a) "Chief administrative officer" means the principal, president, or highest-ranking official of a postsecondary educational institution.
- b) "Course of conduct" means a pattern of conduct composed of a series of acts over a period of time, however short, evidencing a continuity of purpose, including (1) following or stalking to or from school; (2) entering the school campus or facility; (3) following a student during school hours; (4) making telephone calls to a student; and (5) sending correspondence to a student by any means.
- c) "Credible threat of violence" means a knowing and willful statement or course of conduct that would place a reasonable person in fear for their safety, or the safety of their immediate family, and that serves no legitimate purpose.
- d) "Petitioner" means the chief administrative officer, or their designee, who files a petition under #2) below.
- e) "Postsecondary educational institution" means an institution of vocational, professional, or postsecondary education.
- f) "Respondent" means the person against whom the temporary restraining order and order after hearing are sought and, if the petition is granted, the restrained person.

- g) "Student" means an adult currently enrolled in or applying for admission to a postsecondary educational institution.
 - h) "Temporary restraining order" and "order after hearing" mean orders that include any of the following restraining orders, whether issued ex parte, or after notice and hearing:
 - i) An order enjoining a party from harassing, intimidating, molesting, attacking, striking, stalking, threatening, sexually assaulting, battering, abusing, telephoning, including making annoying telephone calls as defined, destroying personal property, contacting (directly or indirectly), or coming within a specified distance of, or disturbing the peace of, the student.
 - ii) An order enjoining a party from specified behavior that the court determines is necessary to effectuate orders described in (g)(i).
 - i) "Unlawful violence" means any assault or battery, or stalking as defined, but does not include lawful acts of self-defense or defense of others. (Code Civ. Proc., § 527.85(b).)
- 2) Permits a chief executive officer of a postsecondary educational institution, or an officer or employee designated by the chief executive officer, to seek a temporary restraining order and an order after hearing on behalf of the student, as follows:
- a) The student must have suffered a credible threat of violence made off the school campus or facility from any individual which can reasonably be construed to be carried out or to have been carried out at the school campus or facility.
 - b) The chief executive officer or their designee must obtain the written consent of the student.
 - c) The chief executive officer or their designee may, at the discretion of the court, seek a temporary order or order after hearing on behalf of any other students at the campus or facility who are similarly situated.
 - d) The court may not issue a temporary restraining order or order after hearing prohibiting speech or other activities that are constitutionally protected.
 - e) In the discretion of the court, for good cause shown, a temporary restraining order or order after hearing may include other named family or household members of the student, or other students at the campus or facility. (Code Civ. Proc., § 527.85(a), (c), (d).)
- 3) Establishes procedures and timelines for obtaining a temporary restraining order or order after hearing under #2) below, as follows:

- a) After filing a petition, a petitioner may obtain a temporary restraining order if they file a declaration that, to the satisfaction of the court, shows reasonable proof that a student has suffered a credible threat of violence made by the respondent, and that great or irreparable harm would result to the student.
 - b) A request for the issuance of a temporary restraining order without notice shall be granted or denied the same day the petition is submitted, unless the petition is filed too late in the day to permit effective review, in which case the order shall be granted or denied on the next day of judicial business.
 - c) A temporary restraining order shall remain in effect, at the court's discretion, for a period not to exceed 21 days, or for 25 days upon a showing of good cause, unless otherwise modified or terminated by the court.
 - d) The respondent must be personally served with a copy of the petition, temporary restraining order (if any), and notice of the hearing; service must be made at least five days before the hearing, unless the court shortens the notice period for good cause.
 - e) Within 21 (or 25) days from the date that the temporary order is granted or denied, the court shall hold a hearing on the petition; if no temporary order was requested, the court shall hold the hearing 21 (or 25) days from when the petition was filed.
 - f) The respondent may file a response that explains, excuses, justifies, or denies the alleged credible threats of violence.
 - g) The respondent is entitled to one continuance for a reasonable period to respond to the petition, and the court may grant a continuance upon the request of either party, or on its own motion, for good cause. If the hearing is continued, a temporary restraining order that has been granted shall remain in effect until the hearing unless the court provides otherwise.
 - h) At the hearing, the judge shall receive any relevant testimony and may make an independent inquiry.
 - i) If the judge finds, by clear and convincing evidence, that the respondent made a credible threat of violence off the school campus or facility, the order shall issue prohibiting further threats of violence.
 - j) An order may have a duration of not more than three years, subject to termination or modification by further order or stipulation of the parties, and may be renewed, upon the request of a party, for a duration of not more than three years. (Code Civ. Proc., § 527.85(e)-(k), (m), (o), (p))
- 4) Provides that a person who is subject to a protective order issued under 3) cannot own, possess, receive, purchase, receive, or attempt to purchase or receive a firearm or ammunition while the protective order is in effect. (Code Civ. Proc., § 527.9)

- a) The court shall order a person subject to a protective order to relinquish any firearms or ammunition they own or possess pursuant to the provisions set forth in Code of Civil Procedure Section 527.9.
- b) Any person who owns, possesses, purchases, or receives, or attempts to purchase or receive, a firearm or ammunition while the protective order is in effect is punishable as a crime. (Pen. Code § 29825.)

ANALYSIS

This bill authorizes a postsecondary educational institution to seek a temporary restraining order and an order after hearing on behalf of the institution. Specifically, it:

- 1) Authorizes a chief administrative officer of a postsecondary educational institution or their designee in order to maintain order on the school campus or facility to seek a temporary restraining order and an order after hearing on behalf of the institution and, at the discretion of the court, its property when the officer becomes aware of unlawful violence or a credible threat of violence towards a *campus*.
- 2) Expands the types of conduct that may support issuance of a restraining order, including communications such as making telephone calls or email correspondence directed to the *campus or its employees* as well as sending correspondence to the *chief administrative officer*.
- 3) Clarifies the definition of “credible threat of violence” to include a statement or course of conduct that would place a reasonable person, *including a person at a school campus or facility*, in fear for their safety or the safety of their immediate family and that serves no legitimate purpose.
- 4) Authorizes a court to issue an order enjoining a party from harassing, intimidating, attacking, stalking, threatening, telephoning, emailing, destroying property, contacting, or coming within a specified distance of a *school campus or facility*.
- 5) Modifies the temporary restraining order provision governing relief upon filing a petition by requiring a declaration showing reasonable proof that a student or *other person at a school campus or facility* has suffered unlawful violence or a credible threat of violence and that great or irreparable harm would result to that student or other person at the school campus or facility.
- 6) Makes other clarifying and conforming changes.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) **Need for the bill.** According to the author, “SB 1374 empowers higher education institutions to provide safer communities by providing an additional preemptive measure to deter threats by permitting restraining orders on behalf of the institution itself when threats are made towards a campus. This bill will

provide a crucial tool to ensure institutions are able to maintain safe learning environments.

“When institutions are targeted with threats, the resulting lockdowns, disruptions, and fear undermine students’ ability to learn and faculty’s ability to teach. SB 1374 will help campuses maintain a safe, stable environment by allowing them to seek timely court orders that can deter or restrict dangerous conduct before it reaches the classroom, residence hall, or campus event.

“Campus leaders are responsible for safeguarding thousands of students, faculty, and staff, yet under existing law they lack clear standing to obtain civil protective orders when the institution itself is the target. SB 1374 provides a clear, court supervised mechanism to intervene early, before threats escalate into acts of violence on campus.”

- 2) **Related incident.** The CSU, the sponsors of this measure, cite a recent incident at San Diego State University (SDSU) as the motive for the bill. In March 2024, a student began posting on SDSU-restricted online platforms. These posts contained violent, sexual, and concerning content and were forwarded to the University Police Department (UPD) by a student. UPD’s Threat Management Team (TMT) was notified, and monitoring began. Additionally, coordination with local law enforcement for monitoring began. In 2025, SDSU worked with the FBI on the case, as the student was serving in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve.

In this case the campus conducted a student conduct investigation and found the student responsible for misconduct. Following that determination using internal processes and procedures, campus leadership, including student affairs and legal counsel, imposed expulsion. As a result, the student is barred from enrolling at any CSU campus. This action was based solely on CSU’s internal disciplinary process and was not tied to any restraining order or court intervention. Once expelled, the individual is no longer subject to university authority. While enrolled, campuses may issue administrative directives, such as no-contact orders that restrict access to campus property. However, these directives are enforceable only through the student disciplinary process and do not carry legal or criminal penalties if violated.

Since the threats were not specifically directed at an individual student or employee at SDSU, CSU did not have the ability to have a long-term restraining order issued against the student. The student was suspended from SDSU, and the suspension was upheld.

- 3) **Remedies currently available.** Existing law establishes an avenue by which a campus (public and private) may seek a temporary restraining order on behalf of a student who has received a threat of violence in order to protect the student. This bill permits an institution to seek a temporary restraining order on behalf of the institution when a credible threat is directed towards the campus, not just to an individual. Existing law specifies that a court may not issue a temporary restraining order or order after hearing for prohibiting free speech or other activities that are constitutionally protected.

- 4) **Heard by the Senate Judiciary Committee.** This bill was heard by the Senate Judiciary Committee on March 24, 2026, where it passed on consent. The committee analysis notes the following with regard to First Amendment protections:

The First Amendment of the United States Constitution and the corresponding provision of the California Constitution generally guarantee the freedoms of speech and expression. “The hallmark of the protection of free speech is to allow ‘free trade in ideas’—even ideas that the overwhelming majority of people might find distasteful or discomforting.”

But “the right of free speech is not absolute at all times and under all circumstances.” Restrictions on the content of speech are permissible “in a few limited areas, which are ‘of such slight social value as a step to truth that any benefit that may be derived from them is clearly outweighed by the social interest in order and morality.’”

One such category of unprotected speech is true threats. True threats are “statements where the speaker means to communicate a serious expression of an intent to commit an act of unlawful violence to a particular individual or group of individuals.” The “prohibition on true threats ‘protect[s] individuals from the fear of violence’ and ‘from the disruption that fear engenders,’ in addition to protecting people ‘from the possibility that the threatened violence will occur.’” Because the bill is expressly targeted at credible threats of violence, the bill does not facially proscribe any protected speech. The bill also appears to be consistent with judicially created tests for when a restriction on speech is permissible. The existing law also specifically provides that it does not permit a court to “issue a temporary restraining order or order after hearing prohibiting speech or other activities that are constitutionally protected, or otherwise protected by Section 527.3 or any other law.”

- 5) **Other campus safety requirements.** Existing federal law requires, under Title IX and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Act), colleges and universities, as a condition of participating in federal student aid programs, to do the following:
- a) Publish annual campus security reports, maintain crime logs, provide timely warnings of crimes that present a public safety risk, and maintain ongoing crime statistics.
 - b) Establish certain rights for victims of sexual assault, including notification to victims of legal rights, availability of counseling, the results of disciplinary proceedings, safety options for victims, and offering prevention and awareness programs.

Under state law, Cal Grant qualifying higher education institutions are required to adopt and implement written policies and procedures to ensure that any report of a Part 1 violent crime (i.e., includes willful homicide, forcible rape, robbery, or

sexual assault) or hate crime, committed on or off campus, received by a campus security authority, and made by the victim for purposes of notifying the institution or law enforcement, is forwarded to the appropriate law enforcement agency.

6) ***Prior legislation.***

AB 2096 (Petrie-Norris, Chapter 947, Statutes of 2024) is a related bill which permitted public postsecondary institutions to request a restraining order to seek a temporary restraining order and an injunction on behalf of a student who has been victim of harassment.

SUPPORT

California State University, Office of the Chancellor (sponsor)
Association of Independent California Colleges & Universities
San Diego County District Attorney's Office
San Diego State University
University of California

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	SB 1328	Hearing Date:	April 22, 2026
Author:	Cervantes		
Version:	April 13, 2026		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Michelle Nguyen		

Subject: Public postsecondary education: Equity in Higher Education Act: campus contact.

SUMMARY

This bill requires the California State University (CSU) Trustees and each governing board of a community college district (CCD), and requests of the University of California (UC) Regents, to designate an employee as a point of contact for the needs of lesbian, gay, bisexual, asexual, pansexual, transgender, gender-nonconforming, intersex, and two-spirit faculty, staff, and students at a branch campus, satellite location, or site other than the main campus.

BACKGROUND

Existing federal law:

- 1) Establishes Title IX, providing 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 or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” (United States Code (USC) Title 20, Chapter 38, § 1681 (colloquially known as Title IX))
- 2) Provides for various exemptions from these provisions, including for fraternities and sororities, military institutions, institutions that are traditionally male or female, and institutions controlled by religious organizations. (USC Title 20, Chapter 38, § 1681)
- 3) Outlines the required response, pursuant to Title IX, of a postsecondary higher education institution when the institution is made aware of an alleged sexual harassment incident on campus, which include a requirement for a formal complaint, a grievance procedure for an investigation into whether the incident based on a standard of evidence occurred, a hearing by which advisors are provided an opportunity to cross-examine, and a method of appealing the outcome of the grievance process. (Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 34, Subtitle B, Chapter 1, Part 106, Subpart D, § 106.45)
- 4) Defines sexual harassment as a form of sex discrimination and as conduct on the basis of sex that satisfies at least one of the following:

- a) *Quid pro quo harassment.* An employee of the postsecondary education institution conditions aid, benefit, or services to a postsecondary education institution's education program or activity on the individual's participation in unwelcome sexual conduct.
- b) *Hostile environment harassment.* Unwelcome conduct determined by a reasonable person to be so severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive that it effectively denies a person equal access to the recipient's education program or activity.
- c) *Specific offenses.* Sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking, as defined in the USC. (CFR, Title 34, Subtitle B, Chapter 1, Part 106, Subpart A, § 106.2)

Existing state law:

- 5) Establishes the Equity in Higher Education Act (Act) to prohibit a person from being 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 statutory definition of hate crimes, in any program or activity conducted by a postsecondary educational institution that receives, or benefits from, state financial assistance or enrolls pupils who receive state student financial aid. (Education Code (EC) § 66270)
- 6) Requires the CSU Trustees and the governing board of a CCD, and would request of the UC Regents, to designate an employee at each of their respective campuses as a point of contact for the needs of lesbian, gay, bisexual, asexual, pansexual, transgender, gender-nonconforming, intersex, and two-spirit faculty, staff, and students. (EC § 66271.2)
- 7) Prohibits an employee designated as a campus point of contact pursuant to #6 above from being considered a responsible employee, which means the employee does not have the duty to report sexual harassment to an appropriate school official who has that authority. (EC § 66271.2)
- 8) Prohibits an employee designated as a campus point of contact pursuant to #6 above shall not disclose confidential information provided to them by faculty, staff, or students about any alleged act of sexual harassment, sexual violence, or discrimination without the prior written consent of the person who provided the information to the designated point of contact. (EC § 66271.2)
- 9) Excludes notice to or the providing of services by the designated point of contact from being considered "actual or constructive notice" to the California community colleges (CCC), CSU, or UC alleging acts of sexual harassment, sexual violence, or discrimination, for purposes of investigations under Title IX. (EC § 66271.2)
- 10) Defines sexual harassment and sexual violence as the following:
 - a) "Sexual harassment" as unwelcomed sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal, visual, or physical conduct of a sexual nature made

by someone from or in the work or educational setting in which specific conditions are met. "Sexual harassment" also includes sexual battery, sexual violence, and sexual exploitation.

- b) "Sexual violence" as physical sexual acts perpetrated against a person without the affirmed consent of the person, and these acts include rape and sexual battery. (EC § 66262.5).
- 11) Provides 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, sex, color, ancestry, age, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, or any specified characteristic contained in the prohibition of hate crimes in any program or activity conducted by any postsecondary educational institution that receives, or benefits from, state financial assistance or enrolls students who receive state student financial aid. (EC § 66270)
- 12) Provides that statutes related to UC (and most other aspects of the governance and operation of UC) are applicable only to the extent that the Regents of UC make such provisions applicable. (EC § 67400)

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Requires the CSU Trustees and each governing board of a CCD, and requests of the UC Regents, to designate an employee as a point of contact for the needs of lesbian, gay, bisexual, asexual, pansexual, transgender, gender-nonconforming, intersex, and two-spirit faculty, staff, and students of a branch campus, satellite location, or site other than the main campus by complying with either of the following:
 - a) Designating an additional employee for the branch campus, satellite location, or site other than the main campus.
 - b) Requiring the designated point of contact for the main campus to hold virtual or in-person office hours every week, every month, or regularly as determined by the employee, at a branch campus, satellite location, or site other than the main campus.
- 2) Requires that the CSU Trustees and each governing board of a CCD publish the name and contact information of the designated point of contact on the internet website for the branch campus, satellite location, or site other than the main campus, and that this information be included in any printed and online directories for the branch campus, satellite location, or site other than the main campus.
- 3) Clarifies that the existing requirement for the CSU Trustees and each governing board of a CCD, and would request of the UC Regents, to designate an employee as a point of contact for the needs of lesbian, gay, bisexual, asexual, pansexual, transgender, gender-nonconforming, intersex, and two-spirit faculty, staff, and

students at each of their respective *main campuses*. Also clarifies that the existing requirement for the name and contact information of that designated employee shall be published on the internet website for the respective *main campus*, and shall be included in any of the *main campus'* printed and online campus directories.

- 4) Defines the following terms for a subdivision of this bill:
 - a) "Branch campus" as a site other than the main campus or satellite location.
 - b) "Main campus" as the campus's sole or primary teaching location.
 - c) "Satellite location" as an auxiliary classroom or teaching site within 50 miles of the main campus or a branch campus.
 - d) "Site" as a main campus, branch campus, or satellite location.
- 5) Requires that the employee designated as the point of contact for a main campus, branch campus, satellite location, or site other than the main campus shall not be the campus's Title IX coordinator.
- 6) Clarifies that the definition of those not considered responsible employees should align with Title IX (in addition to state law).
- 7) Removes language that excludes notice to or the providing of services by the designated employee from being considered "actual or constructive notice" to the CCC, CSU, or UC alleging acts of sexual harassment, sexual violence, or discrimination, for purposes of investigations under Title IX.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for this bill.*** According to the author, "LGBTQ+ students, especially LGBTQ+ women, face disproportionate amounts of sexual harassment and violence on college campuses. Without access to culturally competent support, this issue will continue to worsen. ... This bill will expand upon the work done by the LGBTQ Caucus through Senate Bill 1491 (Eggman, 2024) and further ensure that there is a point of contact for our LGBTQ+ students, faculty, and staff at satellite or branch campuses of the University of California, California State University, and community colleges. ... Geography should not determine whether our students have a safe and supportive learning environment at our public institutions of higher education. Whether they are on the main campus or a satellite site, our students deserve the right to further your education without fear of discrimination, harassment, or violence."

"One gap in SB 1491 was that it did not cover satellite campuses. ... This forces students at these sites to travel to the main campus of their institution to access confidential culturally competent care. ... This can require several hours-long journeys for students depending on the location of their site. This creates serious barriers to care and support, especially for students in rural areas. ... Every satellite campus is different. Some are down the street from the main campus, and

some are in other counties entirely. ... All LGBTQ+ students in California should be able to access support no matter if they take classes at a main campus or a satellite campus.”

- 2) **Implementation update on SB 1491.** Prior to the enactment of SB 1491 (Eggman, Chapter 490, Statutes of 2024), state law requested of the UC Regents, the CSU Trustees, and the governing boards of CCDs to designate an employee at each of their campuses as a point of contact for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender faculty, staff, and students. In 2024, roughly 25% of CCC campuses and 17% of CSU campuses had these designated employees, according to the author.

With the enactment of SB 1491, these designated employees are now also the point of contact for the needs of asexual, pansexual, transgender, gender non-conforming, intersex, and two-spirit faculty, staff, and students (in addition to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender faculty, staff, and students). As of April 2026, all UC campuses, all CSU campuses, and 93% of CCC campuses have a designated point of contact for this specified purpose. The CCCs also provided the following breakdown of the types of staff serving as a designated point of contact pursuant to SB 1491 (not counting non-respondents): 59% are administrators, 19% are faculty, 8% are classified, and 14% are part of multiple staff categories.

- 3) **Point of contact is prohibited from being a responsible employee or from disclosing confidential information without prior written consent.** Though current law does not define the specific duties and responsibilities of these designated employees, statute does indicate that these points of contact: a) serve the needs of the students specified in this bill, b) shall not be considered responsible employees, and c) shall not disclose confidential information provided to them about an alleged act of sexual harassment, sexual violence, or discrimination without the prior written consent of the person providing that information to the designated employee. Current law defines a “responsible employee” as an employee who has the authority to take action to redress sexual harassment or provide supportive measures to students, or who has the duty to report sexual harassment to an appropriate school authority who has that authority.

According to the author, these designated points of contact are intended to provide students with control over if, how, and when to start an investigation—as well as discretion over their personal stories—which is why SB 1491 prohibits these designated employees from being considered responsible employees and disclosing confidential information without an individual’s prior written consent. This bill specifically clarifies that these designated employees are prohibited from being Title IX coordinators because most Title IX coordinators are required to immediately report incidents of sexual harassment, sexual violence, or discrimination, and this may put an individual in a position to recount the harm perpetrated onto them before they may be ready to do so.

- 4) **Recent changes to Title IX regulations.** On January 9, 2025, a federal judge issued a nationwide order invalidating the Biden Administration’s 2024 Title IX regulations. According to the National Women’s Law Center, these 2024 Title IX regulations “had strengthened regulatory protections for students against sex-

based harassment, anti-LGBTQI+ discrimination, and discrimination based on pregnancy or related conditions.” This order put the 2020 Title IX regulations back into effect.

In response to this change, this bill removes language that excludes notice to or the providing of services by the designated point of contact from being considered “actual or constructive notice” to the CCC, CSU, or UC alleging acts of sexual harassment, sexual violence, or discrimination, for purposes of investigations under Title IX. Because the 2024 Title IX regulations have been invalidated, the authority to determine who is confidential is re-relegated to the institutions, and the removal of this language is intended to clarify confusion regarding which employees are considered confidential.

- 5) ***This bill requires a point of contact to be accessible to sites other than the main campus, but questions remain over the definition of those other sites.*** This bill requires the CSU Trustees and each governing board of a CCD provide a designated employee as a point of contact for the needs of the specified faculty, staff, and students at a branch campus, satellite location, or site other than the main campus for these specified faculty, staff, and students. There are 20 and 83 of these locations for the CSU and CCC systems, respectively, according to their system offices. There is diversity among branch campuses, satellite locations, and sites other than the main campus within the CSU and CCC systems, as relates to size, available educational programming, distance from the main campus, and how students use these locations.

For a few examples of that diversity, CSU Bakersfield Antelope Valley is tailored to local students transferring from a community college by offering only upper-division major courses, and the Fresno State South Valley Campus is a partnership between Fresno State and College of the Sequoias, serving transfer students from Tulare, Kings, and North Kern who cannot commute or relocate to the main campus. Some students primarily obtain their education through these sites, and they provide more comprehensive instruction and services. Other sites are relatively closer to the main campus and are not designed to be comprehensive, but a student may access libraries and student services at these locations and may use a site as a place to study away from the main campus and be closer to home.

This bill defines the terms “branch campus”, “satellite location”, and “site”, but each of the CCC, CSU, and UC system offices use terminology to describe their sites that is different from the definitions referenced in this bill. For example, the CCC Chancellor’s Office indicates that the CCC system uses the terms “college” and “educational center” (which are approved by the Board of Governors for the CCCs), which are both defined in the California Code of Regulations, and they do not use the terms defined in this bill, which are “branch campus”, “satellite location”, or “site other than main campus”. Moreover, many CSU campuses and CCDs offer dual enrollment at schools and provide education to currently incarcerated individuals in jails and prisons, and though it does not seem the intent of this bill to require compliance in these settings, it may be worth clarifying.

This bill provides flexibility for CSU campuses and CCDs to comply with this provision at their branch campus, satellite location, or site other than the main

campus by either: (1) designating an additional employee for these additional sites, or (2) requiring the designated point of contact of the main campus to hold virtual or in-person office hours at a regular interval determined by the employee. It is likely that most CSU campuses and CCDs would comply with this bill by requiring the point of contact of the main campus to offer virtual office hours. This bill also requires the name and contact information of the designated point of contact to be published on the website for the branch campus, satellite location, or site other than the main campus.

The committee may wish to consider the following regarding the reach of this bill to sites other than a college's main campus:

- a) *For the requirements of this bill relating to a branch campus, satellite location, or site other than the main campus, these terms may mean something different for each segment. Moreover, many colleges may have a presence in school districts, prisons and jails, medical centers, or other locations, and the author may wish to clarify if there are specific settings not intended to be included in this bill's scope and/or more narrowly define these locations. Though this bill's definitions are general and intended to be broad to apply to all three segments, it may create confusion with implementation unless these terms are further refined.*
- b) *Currently, the definitions of "branch campus" and "site" appear to have overlapping definitions, which may create confusion. Whereas a site is defined as a main campus, branch campus, or satellite location, a branch campus is defined as a site other than the main campus or satellite location, and this may be viewed as a circular definition.*
- c) *Depending on how broadly this bill is defining the locations for which a designated point of contact is required, this bill's notification requirements may be difficult to administer if some locations do not have their own dedicated website to publish the name and contact information of the designated point of contact.*

6) *Prior and Related Legislation.*

SB 1491 (Eggman, Chapter 490, Statutes of 2024) makes the following changes: (1) requires the CSU Trustees and the governing board of each CCD to designate an employee at each of their respective campuses as a point of contact for the needs of lesbian, gay, bisexual, asexual, pansexual, transgender, gender-nonconforming, intersex and two-spirit faculty, staff, and students at the respective campus; (2) requires the point of contact to be a confidential employee, as specified; (3) requires the CSU Trustees and the governing board of each CCD to adopt and publish policies on harassment, intimidation, and bullying and include these policies within the rules and regulations governing student behavior; and (4) requires California Student Aid Commission (CSAC), beginning with the 2026-27 school year, to provide written notice to students who receive state financial aid whether their college or university has a religious school exemption from Title IX.

SB 1146 (Lara, Chapter 888, Statutes of 2016) requires a postsecondary educational institution that claims a religious exemption from federal Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 or the California Equity in Higher Education Act to be accompanied by specified disclosures. SB 1146 also requires that related materials be submitted to, and posted by, CSAC on its website, as specified.

AB 620 (Block, Chapter 637, Statutes of 2011) establishes the Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Equity in Higher Education Act which (1) adds the attributes of sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression to existing nondiscrimination laws affecting postsecondary educational institutions, programs, and requirements; (2) requires the CSU Trustees and requests the UC Regents and the governing board of each CCD to take specified actions related to data collection, campus services and policies; and (3) encourages the Legislative Analyst's Office to undertake specified related activities.

AB 2987 (Ortega, Chapter 205, Statutes of 2024) requires each campus of the CSU and the CCCs, and requests each campus of the UC to provide (1) status updates on complaints of sex discrimination, including, but not limited to, complaints of sexual harassment, to complainants and respondents; and (2) a notification of the disciplinary action to the respondent and complainant, within five business days of a decision of disciplinary action being made against a respondent in response to a complaint of sex discrimination.

AB 810 (Friedman, Chapter 673, Statutes of 2024) (1) requests the governing board or body of an independent institution of higher education that receives state financial assistance, as part of the hiring process for specified positions, to require an applicant to disclose any final administrative decision or final judicial decision issued within the last seven years determining that the applicant committed sexual harassment; (2) requires the governing board of CCDs and the CSU Trustees (and requests of the UC Regents), to require an applicant for an specified position to sign a release form that authorizes the release of information by the previous employer concerning any substantiated allegations of misconduct and, (3) requires the UC, CSU, CCCs, independent institutions of higher education, and private postsecondary educational institutions, during the process to authorize a volunteer in an athletic department, to contact the current or former employer to determine if the applicant violated any employment policies.

AB 1575 (Irwin, Chapter 808, Statutes of 2024) authorizes students who receive a disciplinary notification the right to have an adviser of their choosing and requires postsecondary education institutions to provide training for the aforementioned adviser.

AB 1790 (Connolly, Chapter 86, Statutes of 2024) requires the CSU to implement the recommendations provided in a 2023 California State Auditor (CSA) report related to the CSU's handling of allegations of sexual harassment.

AB 1905 (Addis, Chapter 813, Statutes of 2024) requires the CCCs, CSU, and the UC, as a condition of receiving state financial assistance, to each adopt a written policy that prohibits an employee from being eligible for retreat rights and from receiving a letter of recommendation if the employee is the respondent in a sexual

harassment complaint where a final determination has been made, the employee resigned, or the employee enters into a settlement with the institution.

AB 2047 (Mike Fong, Chapter 693, Statutes of 2024) requires the CSU and the UC to establish a systemwide Title IX office, a systemwide Office of Civil Rights (OCR), a position of civil rights officer, and establishes duties for the systemwide OCR, the civil rights coordinator, and Title IX coordinator.

AB 2048 (Mike Fong, Chapter 694, Statutes of 2024) requires the CCC Chancellor, in consultation with stakeholders, to submit a report to the Legislature by December 1, 2025, with recommendations for establishing systemic campus reforms that effectively prevent, detect, and address sexual harassment on CCC campuses.

AB 2326 (Alvarez, Chapter 827, Statutes of 2024) recasts and modifies statutes that specify which individual or office within each public higher education segment is responsible for ensuring campus programs are free from discrimination, and who has the authority to oversee and monitor compliance with state and federal laws related to anti-discrimination, specifically including sexual harassment.

AB 2407 (Hart, Chapter 830, Statutes of 2024) requires the CSA to report (1) by September 1, 2026, and every three years thereafter, the results of an audit of the ability of the CSU, and the UC to address and prevent sexual harassment on campus; and, (2) by September 1, 2028, and every five years thereafter, the results of an audit of a sample of no less than three CCDs.

AB 2608 (Gabriel, Chapter 110, Statutes of 2024) expands currently required annual training for students on sexual violence and sexual harassment to also include topics related to alcohol- and drug-facilitated sexual assault and confidential support and care resources for situations that arise as a result of an act of sexual violence and/or sexual harassment.

SB 1166 (Dodd, Chapter 883, Statutes of 2024) (1) expands the scope of a currently-required CSU report containing a summation of the activities undertaken by each campus and by the systemwide Title IX office to also include outcomes of appeals, a list of personnel who are exempt from being a “responsible employee”; and, (2) requests the UC and requires each CCD to submit a similar report.

SUPPORT

Equality California (sponsor)
Alliance for TransYouth Liberation
California Legislative LGBTQ Caucus
CFT – A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO
Courage California
EI/La Para TransLatinas
Gender Affirming Professionals
LGBTQ+ Inclusivity, Visibility, and Empowerment
Lyon-Martin Community Health Services
PFLAG Sacramento

Public Counsel
Rainbow Families Action Bay Area
San Diego Pride
The Source LGBT+ Center
The TransLatin@ Coalition

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	SB 1126	Hearing Date:	April 22, 2026
Author:	Choi		
Version:	April 8, 2026		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Ian Johnson		

Subject: School districts, county offices of education, and local agencies: financial postings.

SUMMARY

This bill requires school districts, county offices of education, and specified local agencies to post their annual audit reports or audited financial statements on their internet websites, as specified.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Requires each local educational agency (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 California State Controller (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) Requires the governing board of each school district and each county superintendent of schools to post the annual audit report required pursuant to existing law on its internet website.
- 2) Requires that audit reports be posted in a prominent location on the agency's website and accessible to the public without a password or fee.
- 3) Requires audit reports to be posted within 30 days of being filed with the county superintendent of schools or formally received by the governing board, whichever occurs first.
- 4) Requires school districts and county offices of education to maintain audit reports on their websites for at least three years.
- 5) Requires cities, counties, cities and counties, and independent special districts that maintain a website to post their audited financial statements, or their annual comprehensive financial report.
- 6) Requires that local agency financial documents be posted in a prominent and publicly accessible location without a password or fee within 30 days of completion.
- 7) Requires local agencies to maintain posted financial documents on their websites for at least three years.
- 8) Provides that the local agency posting requirements become operative on January 1, 2028.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, "SB 1126 ensures that the audited financial statements of local agencies and school districts are easily accessible to the public by requiring completed reports to be posted online in a prominent location within 30 days of approval and maintained for at least three years. By standardizing disclosure and establishing enforceable deadlines, the bill strengthens accountability, promotes fiscal responsibility, and allows Californians to better monitor how their tax dollars are managed. Making this information easily accessible online reduces the need for formal records requests and makes oversight more efficient. Ultimately, SB 1126 holds local governments to the same transparency standards, ensuring the taxpayers they serve have timely access to information detailing how their tax dollars are spent."

- 2) ***Increasing public access to financial information.*** This bill seeks to improve public access to financial information by requiring school districts, county offices of education, and local agencies to post audit reports or audited financial statements on their internet websites. While these documents are already prepared and submitted pursuant to existing law, they are not always easily accessible to the public. Requiring proactive posting in a prominent and accessible location may help parents, taxpayers, and other stakeholders more readily understand how public funds are being managed.

At a high level, the bill reflects a broader legislative trend toward transparency and accessibility of public financial data, particularly in the wake of high-profile instances of fiscal mismanagement. To the extent that audit reports are intended to promote accountability, their usefulness is arguably limited if they are not readily available to the public.

- 3) ***Builds on, but does not duplicate, existing transparency efforts.*** Existing law requires LEAs to complete annual independent audits and submit them to oversight entities, including county offices of education and the state. In addition, the Controller's Office maintains public transparency portals that include financial data for local governments, and some LEAs already post audit reports voluntarily.

This bill does not change the substance of audit requirements or oversight processes, but instead focuses on public-facing access. In that sense, it represents a relatively modest but potentially meaningful step toward improving transparency, particularly for members of the public who may not know how to navigate existing state-level data systems.

- 4) ***Implementation considerations for smaller agencies.*** While most school districts, county offices of education, and local agencies maintain websites, the bill imposes new requirements related to the timing, prominence, and retention of posted documents. For smaller agencies with limited administrative capacity, ensuring compliance with these requirements may require additional administrative attention.

However, because the bill relies on documents that are already prepared in the normal course of business, the associated workload is likely to be limited. The delayed operative date for local agencies (January 1, 2028) may also provide additional time for those entities to prepare for implementation.

- 5) ***Consistency with prior legislative efforts.*** This bill is similar in concept to prior legislation related to charter school oversight, which also sought to improve public access to LEA financial information. As with that measure, the core policy question is not whether these documents should exist, but whether the state should require a baseline level of accessibility to ensure that the public can meaningfully review them.

In that context, this bill reflects an incremental approach, focusing on standardizing access rather than expanding oversight or audit requirements.

- 6) **Committee amendment to address the scope of educational entities covered by the bill.** As currently drafted, the audit posting requirements for educational entities apply to school districts and county offices of education, but do not explicitly apply to charter schools or educational joint powers authorities (JPAs), both of which are also LEAs that receive and expend public funds and are subject to audit requirements under existing law.

Excluding these entities may result in an incomplete picture of public education finances, particularly given the significant role that charter schools and JPAs play in delivering educational services and managing public resources in some regions of the state.

To ensure consistency and completeness in the application of the bill's transparency requirements, **staff recommends amending the bill** to extend the audit posting requirements to charter schools and educational JPAs.

SUPPORT

California Policy Center (sponsor)
Teach Plus - California

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	SB 1147	Hearing Date:	April 22, 2026
Author:	Ochoa Bogh		
Version:	March 24, 2026		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	No
Consultant:	Therresa Austin		

Subject: Pupil instruction: high school graduation requirements: personal finance.

SUMMARY

This bill authorizes a local educational agency (LEA) to meet the existing personal finance course provision requirement, if it elects to offer an integrated, year-long course that is equivalent in quality and rigor to a stand-alone one-semester course, and has a course scope that includes, at minimum, a specified set of topics related to personal finance.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

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

- i) Other coursework requirements adopted by the governing board of the school district. (Education Code (EC) § 51225.3)
- 2) With respect to (i) above, authorizes the governing board of a school district to, at its discretion, adopt a policy to exempt students from any additional coursework requirements it adopts. Establishes that it is the intent of the Legislature that the policy include a consultation with the student and the educational rights holder for the student regarding any impact of not fulfilling locally required coursework on the student's ability to gain admission to an institution of higher education. (EC § 51225.3(a)(2)(B))
 - 3) Requires the Instructional Quality Commission (IQC) to consider when the History-Social Science framework is revised after January 1, 2017, to consider including age appropriate information on financial literacy, including, but not limited to, the following:
 - a) Fundamentals of banking for personal use, including, but not limited to, savings and checking, and managing to minimize fees.
 - b) Principles of budgeting for independent living.
 - c) Employment and understanding factors that affect net income, including the topics covered during Workplace Readiness Week.
 - d) Uses and effects of credit, including managing credit scores and the relation of debt and interest to credit.
 - e) Uses and costs of loans, including student loans, as well as policies that provide student loan forgiveness.
 - f) Types and costs of insurance, including home, auto, health, and life insurance.
 - g) Impacts of the tax system, including its impact on personal income, the process to file taxes, and how to read tax forms and pay stubs.
 - h) Principles of investing and building wealth, including investment alternatives to build financial security, including tax-advantaged investments such as pensions and 401(k) plans, individual retirement accounts (IRAs), stocks, bonds, mutual funds, and index funds.
 - i) Enhancing consumer protection skills by raising awareness of common scams and frauds and preventing identity theft.
 - j) Identifying means to finance college, workforce education, low-cost community college options, and other career technical educational pathways or apprenticeships, as specified.
 - k) Understanding how psychology can impact one's financial well-being.

- l) Charitable giving.
 - m) Other topics that are directly and specifically relevant to personal finance. (EC § 51284.5)
- 4) Requires, on or before May 31, 2026, the State Board of Education (SBE) to adopt a curriculum guide and resources for a separate, stand-alone one-semester course in personal finance course based on the IQC recommendation that include content specified in #3 above. (EC § 51226.8)
 - 5) Authorizes an LEA to exempt a pupil who completes a separate, stand-alone one-semester course in personal finance, that is not combined with any other course, from the graduation requirement to complete a one-semester course in economics. (EC § 51225.3 (a)(1)(H))
 - 6) Authorizes an LEA to elect to eliminate one or more locally required courses, as specified, in order to accommodate the stand-alone one-semester personal finance course requirement. States that this is declarative of existing law. (EC § 51225.3 (a)(1)(H))
 - 7) Requires an LEA, including a charter school, with pupils in grades 9 to 12, to offer a separate, stand-alone one-semester course in personal finance that meet the requirements specified in 1), that cannot be combined with any other course beginning 2027-28 school year and with pupils graduating the 2030-31 school year. (EC § 51225.3 (a)(1)(H))

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) States that if an LEA that elects to offer a personal finance course as part of an integrated, year-long course that is equivalent in quality and rigor to a stand-alone one-semester course in personal finance and has a course scope that, at minimum, meets the course scope of a one-semester course, as specified, then the course shall satisfy any of the following:
 - a) The personal finance course graduation requirement, as specified.
 - b) The authorization to exempt a pupil from the graduation requirement of completing a one-semester course in economics.
 - c) The one semester personal finance course offering requirement.
- 2) Authorizes an LEA that elects to offer a one-year course pursuant to #1 above to also award credit for coursework in that year-long course in the subject that the course is offered, including, if applicable, credit towards satisfying a course required for a diploma of graduation.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “SB 1147 will allow California’s LEAs to build on their commitment to financial literacy by allowing high school students to take a more comprehensive, yearlong personal finance course that can be integrated with subjects such as economics, business, or mathematics to meet the graduation requirement. While the state has taken an important first step by requiring a one semester stand-alone course in financial literacy, SB 1147 will allow students to have true financial preparedness with deeper instruction in the classroom. This will ensure students can better understand critical concepts and career planning which are skills that are essential for long-term stability and success in college and into adulthood. At a time when many young adults report feeling unprepared to manage their finances, SB 1147 will help close gaps by allowing LEAs to expand and offer greater learning opportunities in financial literacy.”

- 2) ***The Personal Finance graduation requirement.*** In 2024, the Legislature passed AB 2927 (McCarty, Chapter 37, Statutes of 2024), establishing a new high school graduation requirement mandating all students, beginning with the graduating class of 2030-2031, to complete a one-semester, stand-alone course in personal finance. In turn, by 2027–28, all districts that serve high school students are required to offer at least one semester-long, stand-alone course in personal finance that is not combined with any other course, and that is designed to include all of, *and only*, the 13 topics outlined in EC Section 51284.5 (see #3 in the *Existing Law* section above).

Importantly, AB 2927 was the result of extensive conversations between the Legislature, education stakeholders, and an organization called Next Gen Personal Finance, which initially considered moving a ballot initiative to advance what ultimately became the provisions of this bill. Among the closely debated provisions was the particular focus on the personal finance course as a *stand-alone, semester-long course*. As the veto message of a previous personal finance graduation requirement bill (AB 858 (Dababneh, 2017)) noted, personal finance and financial literacy were historically included in the History-Social Science Framework (Framework). Proponents of the proposed ballot measure argued that simply including personal finance instruction in the Framework was insufficient, as it would have to contend with all the other topics the Framework covers. By moving forward with language that requires the course to stand alone and include all of, and only, the 13 personal finance topics identified in statute, the proponents’ concerns about the crowding out or dilution of personal finance instruction were generally addressed.

This bill seeks to provide flexibility to LEAs that elect to offer a year-long personal finance course that exceeds the statutory minimum in both length and scope. While Topic 13 (*or m* within #3 of the *Existing Law* section) authorizes the coverage of other topics that are directly and specifically relevant to personal finance, concerns have been raised by entities like the College Board that this language is too restrictive if an LEA elects to provide a year-long course in personal finance.

- 3) ***California's recently adopted Personal Finance Curriculum Guide.*** On March 11, 2026, the SBE adopted the Personal Finance Curriculum Guide to support educators, administrators, curriculum specialists, and district leaders as they implement California's new high school graduation requirement: a stand-alone, one-semester course in personal finance.

The curriculum guide contains several helpful tools for implementation, including but not limited to:

- a) An overview and rationale for the 13 essential content areas required in every California high school personal finance course;
- b) LEA tools for planning, staffing, A–G course submission, phased rollout, and local adaptation, including decision guides, vignettes, and sample structures;
- c) Guidance on selecting and customizing instructional materials; and
- d) Information on professional learning opportunities, from foundational onboarding to advanced content certification.

The adopted curriculum guide also provides educators with guidance on additional content permitted by Topic 13's flexibility. These include digital finance (e.g., online banking and digital wallets), cryptocurrency, renting an apartment, California-specific salary information, purchasing versus leasing a vehicle, predatory lending, buying a home, and other California-specific financial programs such as the CA Dream Act and Cal Grant.

This bill would authorize an LEA to offer a personal finance course as part of an integrated, year-long course that is equivalent in quality and rigor to a semester-long course and that has a course scope that covers, at a minimum, the 13 topics required in statute.

- 4) ***Awarding additional credit.*** AB 2927 requires all LEAs serving high school students to offer at least one semester-long, stand-alone personal finance course *that is not combined with any other course*. This bill seeks to authorize LEAs that offer a year-long personal finance course to also award students with credit toward satisfying a separate graduation requirement, if the course covers applicable content.

At present, the only other course required for graduation that can explicitly be awarded credit towards a separate graduation requirement is the ethnic studies graduation requirement. This is in recognition of course offerings such as Advanced Placement (AP) African American Studies, which, hypothetically, a student could complete to satisfy their ethnic studies graduation requirement while simultaneously receiving credit for a social studies graduation requirement. When the ethnic studies graduation requirement was established in the Education Code, it was specified that its operability, as well as the accompanying flexibilities, would be contingent upon an appropriation by the Legislature. As of

today, that appropriation has not been made. This ultimately means that the authorization for LEAs to award additional credit toward satisfying graduation requirements contained in this bill would be the first *operative* instance in which that flexibility is authorized.

Notably, this bill largely restates existing law, which allows LEAs to offer a year-long course in personal finance and waive the one-semester economics graduation requirement for students who complete a stand-alone course in personal finance, beginning with the graduating class of 2030-31. In recognition of the concerns discussed in Comment 2 regarding a dilution or crowding out of personal finance instruction if the standalone nature of the course was not maintained, the *committee recommends, and the author agrees to amend the bill as follows:*

- *Strike the provision authorizing LEAs to award credit for an additional course required for graduation.*

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

AB 2927 (McCarty, Chapter 37, Statutes of 2024) requires students, as an urgency measure, including those enrolled in charter schools, commencing with students graduating in the 2030–31 school year, to complete a one-semester course in personal finance, and requires all high schools, commencing with the 2027–28 school year, to offer a one-semester course in personal finance.

AB 2546 (Ian Calderon, Chapter 616, Statutes of 2016) requires that, when the History-Social Science Framework is revised after January 1, 2017, the IQC consider including specified content on financial literacy.

SUPPORT

College Board (sponsor)
 Alameda County Office of Education
 Alpaugh Unified School District
 Aromas-San Juan Unified School District
 Brea Chamber of Commerce
 Butte Valley Unified School District
 Calaveras Unified School District
 Calexico Unified School District
 California County Superintendents
 Campbell Union High School District
 Centinela Valley Union High School District
 Ceres Unified School District
 Charter Oak Unified School District
 Chawanakee Unified School District
 Chowchilla Union High School District
 Corona Chamber of Commerce
 Council on Economic Education
 Cuyama Joint Unified School District
 Denair Unified School District

Dos Palos - Oro Loma Joint Unified School District
Downey Unified School District
Dublin Unified School District
El Rancho Unified School District
Esparto Unified School District
Fall River Joint Unified School District
Fresno Unified School District
Garden Grove Unified School District
Gridley Unified School District
Grossmont Union High School District
Kern County Superintendent of Schools Office
Lodi Unified School District
Lompoc Unified School District
Los Banos Unified School District
Lynwood Unified School District
Maricopa Unified School District
Monrovia Unified School District
Murrieta Valley Unified School District
Napa Valley Unified School District
Nevada Joint Union High School District
Northern Humboldt Union High School District
Novato Unified School District
Palo Verde Unified School District
Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District
Pasadena Unified School District
Piedmont Unified School District
Pierce Joint Unified School District
Point Arena Joint Union High School District
River Delta Unified School District
Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce
San Benito High School District
San Diego Unified School District
San Juan Unified School District
Santa Barbara South Coast Chamber of Commerce
Scott Valley Unified School District
Sierra Unified School District
Simi Valley Unified School District
Snowline Joint Unified School District
Southwest California Legislative Council
Tehachapi Unified School District
Temple City Unified School District
Wheatland Union High School District
Woodland Joint Unified School District

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No: SB 1443 **Hearing Date:** April 22, 2026
Author: Committee on Education
Version: April 16, 2026
Urgency: No **Fiscal:** Yes
Consultant: Therresa Austin

Subject: Elementary and secondary education: omnibus.

SUMMARY

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

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

Uniform Complaint Procedures (UCP)

- 1) Requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) to establish and implement a system of complaint processing, known as the UCP, for specified educational programs. (Education Code (EC) § 33315)

Nonnutritious foods and beverages

- 2) Defines “nonnutritious beverages” to mean any beverage that is not any of the following: drinking water; milk, including, but not limited to, chocolate milk, soy milk, rice milk, almond milk, and other similar dairy or nondairy milk; an electrolyte replacement beverage that contains 42 grams or less of added sweetener per 20 ounce serving; or a 100% fruit juice, or fruit-based drink that is composed of 50% or more fruit juice and that has no added sweeteners. (EC § 35182.5)
- 3) Defines “nonnutritious food” to mean food that is not sold as part of the school breakfast or lunch program as a full meal, and that meets any of the following standards: more than 35% of its total calories are from fat; more than 10% of its total calories are from saturated fat; more than 35% of its total weight is composed of sugar. (EC § 35182.5)

California Teacher Commission (CTC)

- 4) Establishes the CTC in state government, consisting of 15 voting members, 14 of whom are to be appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. (EC § 44210)

- 5) Requires the CTC to, among other things, establish professional standards for entry and advancement in the education profession, and establish standards for the issuance and renewal of credentials. (EC § 44225)
- 6) Requires the CTC to issue district intern credentials authorizing persons employed by a school district that maintains kindergarten and grades 1 to 12, inclusive, or that maintains classes in bilingual education to provide classroom instruction to pupils in those grades and classes, as specified. (EC § 44325)
- 7) Authorizes persons holding district intern credentials issued by the CTC to teach in grades 9 to 12, inclusive, or in grades 6 to 8, inclusive, in a departmentalized program, or in departmentalized bilingual classes, to teach in the subject area in which they have met the subject matter requirement. (EC § 44326)
- 8) Authorizes persons holding district intern credentials issued by the CTC to teach in kindergarten and grades 1 to 8, inclusive, in a self-contained program or in self-contained bilingual classes and who have met the subject matter requirement to teach in those grades or classes. (EC § 44326)

California State Preschool Program (CSPP) and child care at Higher Education Institutions

- 9) Authorizes higher education institutions to establish and maintain child development programs on or near their respective campuses. Subjects these higher education institutions under contract with the California Department of Education (CDE) for child care and development services, as specified, to the rules and regulations adopted by the SPI. (EC § 66060)
- 10) Requires the SPI, in cooperation with higher educational institutions, to establish rules and regulations governing child care and development programs. (EC § 66060)
- 11) Defines “CSPP” to mean those programs that offer part-day and/or full-day educational programs for eligible two-, three-, and four-year-old children and those enrolled in kindergarten. These programs may be offered by a public, private, or proprietary agency, and operated in childcare centers or family childcare homes operating through a family childcare home education network. (EC § 8205)

Construction Contract Change Orders

- 12) Requires the governing board of the district that orders any change or alteration to specified contracts to specify the change or alteration, as well as the cost agreed upon between the governing board and the contractor, in writing. Authorizes the contractor to proceed with the performance of the change or alteration, without the formality of securing bids if the cost agreed upon does not exceed the greater of two specified thresholds. (Public Contracts Code (PCC) § 20118.4)

- 13) Authorizes the governing board of any school district, or of two or more school districts government by governing boards of identical personnel, having an average daily attendance (ADA) of 400,000 or more as shown by the report of the county superintendent of schools for the preceding year, to authorize any change or alteration of a contract for reconstruction or rehabilitation work, other than for the construction of new buildings or other new structures, if the cost of the change is or alteration in excess of specified limitations but does not exceed 25% of the original contract price, without the formality of securing bids, and the change or alteration is a necessary and an integral part of the work under the contract and the taking of bids would delay the completion of the contract. (PCC § 20118.4)

ANALYSIS

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

UCP

- 1) Strikes references to childcare and developments that are now under the purview of the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) and instead references preschool programs that are under the CDE's purview.

Nonnutritious foods and beverages

- 2) Updates and recasts the definitions of "nonnutritious beverages" and "nonnutritious foods" to align with federal requirements for competitive foods and beverages.

CTC

- 3) Removes obsolete references to the state basic skills proficiency test relative to multiple subject, single subject, and education specialist credentials.
- 4) Aligns the minimum requirements for the special education specialist with that of the multiple and single subject teaching credentials.
- 5) Clarifies eligibility criteria for early program completion within a district intern program.
- 6) Aligns the authorizations between district intern programs to ensure consistent assignment flexibility for interns regardless of program type.

CSPP and childcare at Higher Education Institutions

- 7) Updates references to the CSPP and childcare programs at postsecondary education institutions to reflect the distinction between programs administered by the CDE and CDSS.

Construction Contract Change Orders

- 8) Revises the ADA threshold for school districts to issue change orders for construction contracts from 400,000 to 250,000 to reflect declining enrollment.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Purpose of the elementary and secondary education omnibus bill.*** Each year, there is typically a K-12 education omnibus bill that makes various technical, conforming, clarifying, and non-controversial revisions to the Education Code and other areas of statute related to education. Typically, staff with the Senate and Assembly education policy, fiscal and budget committees (and their minority consultants), the Department of Finance, the CDE, the Legislative Analyst's Office, and other similarly situated state government offices, identify statutes in existing law which need updating or correcting and propose corrections. Custom and practice provide that if offices or entities object to a proposed provision in the omnibus bill, that particular provision is prohibited from inclusion.

SUPPORT

None received

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --