

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
Olga Iliia 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, June 3, 2026
9 a.m. -- 1021 O Street, Room 2100

MEASURES HEARD IN FILE ORDER

1. SCA 5 Cortese Education finance: Education Equalization Act: Equalization Reserve Account.
2. AB 402 Patel Student financial aid: Cal Grant Program and the California Community College Expanded Entitlement Program.
3. AB 2067 Patel School facilities: leasing real property.
4. AB 1204 Alvarez Local control funding formula: school districts and charter schools: pupils experiencing homelessness: supplemental and concentration grants: regional adjustment factors: grade-span adequacy adjustments.
- *5. AB 2056 Alvarez Teachers: exchange programs: local educational agencies.
6. AB 1235 Rogers California State University: skilled and trained workforce requirement.
- *7. AB 1346 DeMaio Public postsecondary education: residency: dependents of members of the Armed Forces: reenrollments.
- *8. AB 1486 Soria Climate resiliency: research farms: grant program.
9. AB 1555 Hadwick Community colleges: exemption from nonresident tuition fee: College of the Siskiyous.

10.	AB 1641	Jackson	Postsecondary education: segments: tribal colleges and universities.
11.	ACA 7	Jackson	Government preferences.
12.	AB 1659	Ransom	Juvenile court school pupils: joint transition planning policy: courses of study.
13.	AB 1713	Ransom	Public postsecondary education: students with disabilities: verification: academic accommodations.
14.	AB 1829	Fong	Community colleges: CalWORKs Recipients Education Program: services.
*15.	AB 2726	Fong	School facilities: disposal of surplus technology property.
16.	AB 1860	McKinnor	School facilities: design-build: alternative design-build: county superintendents of schools.
*17.	AB 1920	Mark González	Community colleges: California College Promise: fee waiver eligibility.
18.	AB 1943	Gipson	Pupil safety: notifications: firearms.
19.	AB 2107	Pellerin	Expanded Learning Opportunities Program: offering access: unduplicated pupils.
*20.	AB 2148	Muratsuchi	Elementary and secondary education: public school employees: contractors: natural persons.
*21.	AB 2178	Quirk-Silva	Community colleges: county probation departments: instructional service agreements.
22.	AB 2248	Hoover	Pupil services: educational counseling: California College Guidance Initiative.
*23.	AB 2455	Haney	Bruce Lee Day.
24.	ACA 18	Caloza	University of California: regents: student members.

*Consent Items

- 5) Defines a “basic aid school district” or “excess tax entity” as a district whose local property tax revenues exceed its LCFF entitlement, resulting in no regular LCFF state aid apportionment. (EC § 42238.02)
- 6) Imposes annual state and local appropriations limits under Article XIII B of the California Constitution (commonly referred to as the Gann Limit), restricting growth in government spending based on population growth and inflation.

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Establishes the ERA in the General Fund.
- 2) Requires the Controller, in any fiscal year in which Proposition 98 funding increases over the prior fiscal year, to transfer from the General Fund into the ERA an amount equal to the total amount transferred into the PSSSA for that fiscal year.
- 3) Requires the transfer calculation to include all reductions, suspensions, and adjustments applicable to the PSSSA.
- 4) Requires that if the constitutional provisions governing the PSSSA are amended after January 1, 2026, ERA transfers instead be calculated based on what the PSSSA transfer would have been under the January 1, 2026 version of the Constitution.
- 5) Specifies that only interest earned on funds in the ERA may be appropriated.
- 6) Prohibits expenditure of principal deposited into the ERA.
- 7) Requires that appropriated interest earnings be used solely to increase per-pupil funding for non-basic aid school districts.
- 8) Requires the Legislature to allocate at least 80% of ERA interest earnings annually to increase per-pupil funding in non-basic aid school districts.
- 9) Defines “basic aid school district” as a district that did not receive LCFF state aid in any of the preceding three fiscal years.
- 10) Defines “non-basic aid school district” as a district that received LCFF state aid in any of the preceding three fiscal years.
- 11) Authorizes the Legislature to suspend required ERA transfers in years when average per-pupil funding in non-basic aid school districts equals or exceeds average per-pupil funding in basic aid school districts.
- 12) Excludes ERA transfers and allocations from Proposition 98 minimum funding calculations.

- 13) Excludes ERA transfers and allocations from state appropriations subject to limitation under Article XIII B of the California Constitution (Gann Limit).

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “SCA 5, the Education Equalization Act, is intended to help California move toward statewide equalization of per-pupil funding so that every student has a fair opportunity to succeed, thrive, and access the school resources they need. California has attempted to make progress toward school funding equity through the Local Control Funding Formula, but that progress remains incomplete, while students in different districts continue to experience growing differences in per-pupil support. Over the last 40-plus years, California’s school finance structure has allowed these per-pupil funding disparities to persist and grow, even as the state has adopted reforms intended to make school funding more equitable. A student’s access to opportunity should not depend on where they live.

“SCA 5 establishes the Equalization Reserve Account in the General Fund to provide supplemental funding to non-basic-aid school districts over time to narrow per-pupil funding gaps statewide. The measure does not reduce, redirect, or alter existing Proposition 98 funding. The goal is to build a constitutionally guaranteed, stable, and protected structure that helps bring California closer to equalized per-pupil funding while preserving existing school funding guarantees.”

- 2) ***The LCFF represented a major advancement in educational equity, though funding disparities remain.*** Before the enactment of the LCFF in 2013, California’s education finance system relied heavily on revenue limits and numerous categorical programs that created substantial funding disparities among school districts while limiting local flexibility. The LCFF represented a significant restructuring of California school finance by simplifying funding streams, increasing transparency, and directing additional resources toward districts serving higher concentrations of low-income students, English learners, and foster youth.

Research on the LCFF has generally found positive impacts on student outcomes. Recent analyses by the Learning Policy Institute (LPI) found that LCFF-related increases in per-pupil spending improved student achievement, graduation rates, college readiness, and other educational outcomes, particularly for students exposed to increased funding over longer periods of time.

At the same time, discussions regarding how to improve California’s school finance system remain ongoing. Recent policy conversations have focused largely on issues such as base grant adequacy, concentration grant targeting, and transitioning from attendance-based funding to enrollment-based funding. Comparatively little recent research has focused specifically on funding disparities between basic aid and non-basic aid districts, despite the significant local property tax variations that exist across California.

- 3) ***SCA 5 would create a constitutionally protected education equalization endowment.*** While this measure characterizes the ERA as a reserve account, its structure more closely resembles a constitutionally protected endowment. Unlike traditional reserve structures intended to be expended during fiscal downturns or emergencies, this measure permanently prohibits expenditure of ERA principal. Only interest earned on the account may be appropriated, and only for equalization funding for non-basic aid districts.

As a result, the measure would continuously transfer General Fund dollars into an account whose principal balance could grow indefinitely over time. The Legislature would retain no authority to spend those deposited funds for any other purpose, absent another constitutional amendment approved by the voters.

The Committee may wish to consider the long-term fiscal implications of permanently dedicating potentially significant General Fund resources in this manner, particularly given the state's existing obligations and competing non-Proposition 98 priorities.

- 4) ***The measure effectively creates a second PSSSA-style funding obligation outside Proposition 98.*** This measure creates what is effectively a parallel education reserve structure outside the Proposition 98 guarantee. Under existing law, qualifying fiscal conditions trigger mandatory deposits into the PSSSA using Proposition 98 resources. Under this measure, those same conditions would simultaneously trigger matching deposits from the non-Proposition 98 side of the General Fund into the ERA.

As a result, during strong economic years, the state could be required to make two substantial education-related reserve deposits: one within Proposition 98 through the PSSSA and one outside Proposition 98 through the ERA.

This "double payment" structure could significantly increase pressure on the non-Proposition 98 side of the state budget, which funds numerous other major state responsibilities, including health and human services, higher education, developmental services, corrections, and climate-related programs.

- 5) ***Immediate fiscal obligations may significantly exceed near-term equalization benefits.*** Because only interest earnings may be appropriated, there may be a substantial mismatch between the state's immediate fiscal obligations and the amount of near-term equalization funding generated by the ERA.

For example, a multi-billion-dollar ERA balance could initially generate comparatively modest annual investment earnings relative to the size of the required General Fund deposits needed to capitalize the account. While the long-term compounding effect of investment growth could eventually generate substantial equalization funding, the measure requires the state to permanently commit large sums of General Fund resources long before those long-term benefits fully materialize.

The Committee may wish to consider whether permanently locking away substantial General Fund resources is the most effective mechanism for addressing school funding disparities.

- 6) ***The measure relies heavily on constitutional exemptions from both Proposition 98 and the Gann Limit.*** The measure excludes ERA transfers and allocations from both: (1) Proposition 98 minimum funding calculations; and (2) the Gann Limit.

These exclusions are central to the operation of the proposal. Without them, ERA deposits could increase Proposition 98 obligations or consume appropriations limit capacity, potentially creating unintended fiscal consequences and undermining the measure's intended structure.

The breadth of these constitutional exemptions reflects both the complexity and fiscal scale of the proposal. The Committee may wish to consider the long-term implications of creating a constitutionally protected funding structure operating largely outside the state's traditional budgetary constraints.

- 7) ***The author has taken steps to better account for marginal basic aid districts, though the proposal still paints basic aid districts with a broad brush.*** SB 743 (Cortese, 2025), the companion measure to this constitutional amendment, was amended to better account for districts near the basic aid threshold by defining non-basic aid districts as districts that received LCFF state aid in any of the preceding three fiscal years. This change addresses concerns regarding "basic aid flippers"—districts that move in and out of basic aid status due to relatively small changes in enrollment or local property tax revenues.

According to 2023-24 state funding data, 139 school districts were classified as basic aid. Of these, 16 exceeded their LCFF entitlement by less than 5%, and 32 exceeded it by less than 10%, indicating that a meaningful number of districts are only marginally above the basic aid threshold. Conversely, 20 non-basic aid districts received less than 5% of their LCFF entitlement from the state, and 40 received less than 10%, indicating similarly narrow margins on the non-basic aid side.

At the same time, substantial variation exists among basic aid districts themselves. While some districts generate local property tax revenues only modestly above their LCFF entitlement, others receive per-pupil funding levels many times greater than what they would otherwise receive under the LCFF. Recent statewide funding data show basic aid districts ranging from roughly \$11,000 per pupil to nearly \$100,000 per pupil in total funding.

As a result, while the author's most recent amendments reflect a more nuanced approach than earlier versions of the proposal, the measure still generally categorizes districts using a binary basic aid/non-basic aid framework despite the wide fiscal variation that exists among basic aid districts. The Committee may wish to consider whether additional differentiation among basic aid districts may be warranted if the goal of the measure is to address funding inequities in a more targeted and proportional manner.

- 8) ***Relationship between SCA 5, companion measure SB 743, and future implementing legislation.*** This measure and SB 743 (Cortese, 2025) operate together as companion measures. SCA 5 establishes the constitutional authority for the ERA, including the required General Fund transfers, the exclusion of ERA funds from Proposition 98 and Gann Limit calculations, and the restriction that only interest earnings may be appropriated for equalization purposes. SB 743 establishes the initial statutory framework implementing the ERA and conditions its operation on voter approval of this measure.

Together, these measures establish the constitutional and statutory foundation for a new education equalization funding structure. However, substantial future legislation would still be required to determine how the ERA would function in practice. Significant unresolved issues include how equalization funding would be distributed among eligible districts, how per-pupil funding disparities would be measured, what percentage of annual interest earnings would be appropriated, and how the state would determine when funding disparities between basic aid and non-basic aid districts have sufficiently narrowed to justify suspending future ERA deposits.

SUPPORT

Silicon Valley Education Foundation (sponsor)
Bay Area Tutoring Association
California School Employees Association
DJM Capital
East Side Education Foundation
East Side Union High School District
Hispanic Foundation of Silicon Valley
Latino Education Advancement Foundation
Legislative Action Committee - Santa Clara County School Boards Association
SOMOS Mayfair
Two Individuals

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 402	Hearing Date:	June 3, 2026
Author:	Patel		
Version:	May 23, 2025		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Olgalilia Ramirez		

Subject: Student financial aid: Cal Grant Program and the California Community College Expanded Entitlement Program.

SUMMARY

This bill, subject to an appropriation and commencing the 2026-27 year, increases the Cal Grant award for students attending a California independent institution of higher education (ICCU) from \$9,358 to \$9,708 when associate degree for transfer (ADT) goals are achieved. It further expands eligibility for the California Community College (CCC) Expanded Entitlement Program to award recipients who subsequently transfer to an ICCU.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Defines “independent institutions of higher education” as those nonpublic higher education institutions that grant undergraduate degrees, graduate degrees, or both, and that are formed as nonprofit corporations in this state and are accredited by an agency recognized by the United States Department of Education. (Education Code (EC) § 66010, et seq.)
- 2) Establishes the California Student Aid Commission (CSAC) for the purpose of administering specified student financial aid programs. (EC § 69510, et seq.)
- 3) Establishes the Cal Grant program, administered by the CSAC, to provide grants to financially needy students to attend a college or university. The Cal Grant programs include both the entitlement and the competitive Cal Grant awards. The program consists of the Cal Grant A, Cal Grant B, and Cal Grant C programs, and eligibility is based upon financial need, grade point average (GPA), California residency, and other criteria. Maximum award amounts for the California State University (CSU) and the University of California (UC) are established in the annual Budget Act and have traditionally covered all systemwide tuition and fees. Supplemental Cal Grant awards programs are available to students with dependent child(ren) and former and current foster youth attending CSU, UC, or a CCC to assist with non-tuition costs, such as living expenses. Sets the maximum Cal Grant A and B tuition award amount for new recipients in the 2023-24 award year, who attend an ICCU, at \$9,358. (EC §§ 69430–69433 and §§ 69465-69470)

- 4) Establishes the CCC Expanded Entitlement Program, which eliminates the age and time out of high school Cal Grant eligibility requirements for eligible CCC students. Specifies that CCC Expanded Entitlement Awards may retain their Cal Grant Award when they transfer to a UC or CSU. (EC § 69435.5)

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Increases, subject to an appropriation and commencing the 2026-27 year, the Cal Grant award for students attending ICCUs from \$9,358 to \$9,708 when ADT goals are achieved, as specified.
- 2) Authorizes a student who receives a CCC Expanded Entitlement Award and who subsequently transfers to an ICCU to remain eligible to receive the award, thereby making students transferring to an ICCU newly eligible.
- 3) Makes technical and clarifying changes.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) **Need for the bill.** According to the author, “A higher education degree remains the most effective way to achieve upward mobility, and Cal Grant serves to increase access for low and middle-income students to the education that can transform their futures and careers. Since 2001, Cal Grant awards for students attending non-profit private schools have decreased by 4%, while awards for UCs and CSUs have increased by 274% and 224%, respectively. At the same time, inflation has significantly increased the cost to attend a private non-profit college. AB 402 supports access and student agency by increasing the award amounts of Cal Grant and allowing Community College Expanded Entitlement recipients to maintain their awards at a private non-profit institution.”
- 2) **Why increase the Cal Grant award for ICCUs?** This bill seeks to increase the Cal Grant award amount to students attending Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) accredited non-public independent California colleges and universities (ICCU). Below is a summary of information about the sector and the Cal Grant recipients they serve.
 - a) **WASC-accredited non-public institutions.** The institutions that would benefit from the provisions of this bill are generally members of the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU), which represents about 85 private, nonprofit, WASC-accredited colleges and universities headquartered in California. These institutions include research universities, liberal arts colleges, religiously affiliated institutions, and specialized colleges and universities that focus on the arts, theater, and music.

The AICCU reports that their member institutions enroll over 346,000 students, comprised of 184,200 undergraduate students and 148,676 graduate students. ICCU institutions award over 55 percent of all graduate

degrees in California and approximately 19 percent of the baccalaureate degrees. The sector produces 43 percent of the teaching credentials, 27 percent of computer and information science degrees, 53 percent of nursing degrees, and 91 percent of clinical, counseling, and applied psychology degrees in the state. California residents comprise approximately 61 percent of the undergraduate population of ICCUs.

- b) *Who is served?* According to AICCU, over half of Cal Grant students at their member institutions are the first in their families to go to college and from historically underrepresented groups in higher education. AICCU reports that data collected over the years has consistently demonstrated that Cal Grant students graduate at a higher level than the general student population in the sector, even with the barriers they confront.

According to the AICCU's 2021 survey of their member institutions, 65 percent of their Cal Grant students graduate in 4 years, and 47 percent are first-generation college students. Approximately 50 percent of the Cal Grant population at AICCU institutions is Latino, 20 percent Caucasian, 14 percent Asian and Pacific Islander, and 6 percent African American. The sector educates about 40,500 nontraditional learners and over 24,000 California students through the Cal Grant program. The average institutional aid award to a Cal Grant student is approximately \$32,000.

- 3) ***Determining Cal Grant award amounts for ICCU students.*** In an effort to encourage participation and align ICCUs with state objectives around transfer, the 2018 budget trailer bill, AB 1809 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 33, Statutes of 2018), conditioned the amount of a Cal Grant tuition award for ICCUs on reaching annual goals for accepting CCC transfer students with ADT commitments. The award amount is maintained at current levels unless target goals are not achieved. To date, ICCUs collectively have struggled to meet statutory targets. Despite this, an award reduction for new recipients did not occur rather recent budget actions delayed implementation of annual goals in order to preserve the award for students.

AICCU reports in their annual ADT report that a total of 2,345 ADT students were admitted to 32 AICCU participating institutions for the 2025-26 academic year, concluding that the number indicates relative stability in ADT admits compared to the prior year. By comparison, in the 2024-25 academic year, 33 institutions admitted 2,367. The two year graduation rate for ADT students has generally remained near the 40-60 percent range. The report notes that this figure is comparable with their peers on similar transfer pathways. Seemingly, adjustments proposed in this bill could make transfer targets more attainable year after year and allow for growth in acceptance rates. This bill proposes to adjust the Cal Grant award at ICCUs from \$9,358 to \$9,708 when ADT goals are met.

- 4) **CCC Expanded Entitlement Program.** The 2021-22 State Budget Act included an expansion to the Cal Grant Program by establishing the CCC Expanded Entitlement Program. This program created a new pathway for CCC students to receive Cal Grant A and B entitlement awards even if they were no longer eligible

under the traditional entitlement programs (high school and transfer entitlement). Prior to this expansion, students generally qualified for a Cal Grant Entitlement award if they were recent high school graduates or were within one year of high school graduation. These students could use their awards at the CCC, CSU, UC, or qualifying private institutions, including ICCUs. Students who had been out of high school for more than one year and were under age 28 could later qualify for a Transfer Entitlement award upon transferring from a CCC to a CSU, UC, or qualifying private institutions, including ICCUs. Students age 28 or older generally were not eligible for entitlement awards and instead competed for a limited number of competitive awards.

The CCC Expanded Entitlement program broadened eligibility by allowing CCC students to receive a Cal Grant entitlement award regardless of the number of years since high school graduation. The program also allows recipients to retain their entitlement award when transferring from a CCC to a CSU or UC, regardless of age. Under current law, however, students who transfer to a private institution, including ICCUs, are not eligible to use the remainder of their expanded entitlement award. This bill would extend eligibility to students who transfer to qualifying ICCUs.

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

SB 851 (Portantino, 2022) would have modified the formula for determining the amount of a Cal Grant award for a student who attends an ICCU. SB 851 would have expanded eligibility for supplemental Cal Grant programs and the CCC Entitlement Program to students attending ICCUs. This bill was heard and passed by this Committee and was subsequently amended to relate to personal income tax.

AB 2030 (Blanca Rubio, 2020), similar to AB 1307 below, would have established a formula to determine the amount of Cal Grant awards for students attending ICCUs. AB 2030 was not heard by the Senate Education Committee due to the shortened 2020 Legislative calendar.

AB 1307 (Blanca Rubio, 2019), similar to this bill, would have created a new Cal Grant for ICCUs. The formula was to be set and maintained at 80 percent of the sum of the General Fund share of the CSU marginal cost of instruction and maximum Cal Grant award for tuition at the CSU. Unlike this bill, AB 1307 did expand eligibility to other programs. AB 1307 was vetoed by the Governor, whose message read, in part:

“...While this is a worthy measure, it creates ongoing General Fund costs in the tens of millions of dollars annually, and should be considered in the annual budget process.”

AB 1166 (Burke, 2017), which was held in this Committee by the request of the author, was similar in nature to this measure.

AB 831 (Bonilla, 2015), which was held on the Assembly Appropriations Suspense File, was similar in nature to this measure.

AB 1318 (Bonilla 2014), which was held by the author on the Senate Floor, was similar to this measure except that under AB 1318, students attending for-profit WASC-accredited institutions would also have been eligible for the increased award amount.

SUPPORT

Association of Independent California Colleges & Universities (sponsor)
Azusa Pacific University
California Association of Christian Colleges and Universities
California Baptist University
California Institute of the Arts
Chapman University
EDvance College
Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities
John Paul the Great Catholic University
Mount Saint Mary's University
National University
Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce
Samuel Merritt University
San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
Santa Clara University
University of La Verne
University of Southern California

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No: AB 2067 **Hearing Date:** June 3, 2026
Author: Patel
Version: February 18, 2026
Urgency: No **Fiscal:** No
Consultant: Ian Johnson

Subject: School facilities: leasing real property.

SUMMARY

This bill extends, by five years, the existing authorization for school districts to use the lease-leaseback project delivery method through a competitive best value solicitation process for school construction projects. Specifically, the bill extends the operative date of these provisions from July 1, 2027, to July 1, 2032.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Authorizes a school district governing board, notwithstanding specified competitive bidding provisions, to lease district property for a minimum of \$1 per year to a person, firm, or corporation if the lease requires the lessee to construct school facilities for district use and requires title to vest in the district at the conclusion of the lease term. Requires the instrument to be awarded through a competitive solicitation process using a best value methodology.
- 2) Provides that the current authorization for school districts to use the lease-leaseback project delivery method through a competitive best value process becomes inoperative on July 1, 2027.
- 3) Authorizes school districts to enter into agreements under which a private entity constructs school facilities and leases the facilities back to the district, with title ultimately vesting in the district, and requires agreements entered into pursuant to specified provisions to be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder.
- 4) Prohibits a school district from entering into a lease-leaseback agreement unless the entity and its subcontractors agree to use a skilled and trained workforce for all apprenticeable occupations on the project.
- 5) Defines “best value” for purposes of lease-leaseback procurement as a competitive procurement process that evaluates proposers based on objective criteria representing the best combination of price and qualifications.

ANALYSIS

This bill extends, by five years, the existing authorization for school districts to use the lease-leaseback project delivery method through a competitive best value solicitation process for school construction projects. Specifically, the bill extends the operative date of these provisions from July 1, 2027, to July 1, 2032.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “AB 2067 affords the continued use of an existing tool to improve transparency and bring certainty to school districts, contractors, and architects engaged in delivering school construction projects. Most importantly, this authority helps to control project costs and deliver facility projects on time, which directly benefits students and taxpayers.”
- 2) ***Extends a project delivery method that was substantially reformed following litigation and longstanding concerns regarding transparency and competitive bidding.*** Lease-leaseback has long been used by school districts as an alternative project delivery method for school construction projects. Historically, however, the process generated controversy because prior law authorized districts to enter into lease-leaseback agreements “without advertising for bids,” leading to concerns that some projects were effectively awarded without meaningful competition. These concerns culminated in the *Davis v. Fresno Unified School District* litigation, which challenged whether certain lease-leaseback arrangements improperly circumvented California’s public contracting laws.

In response, the Legislature enacted AB 2316 (O’Donnell, Chapter 521, Statutes of 2016), which substantially revised the lease-leaseback process by eliminating the authority to proceed without competitive bidding and replacing it with a competitive best value procurement process that included additional transparency, disclosure, workforce, and subcontractor protections.

This bill does not expand the scope of lease-leaseback authority or materially alter the procurement process established in 2016. Instead, it extends the sunset date for the current competitive best value framework for an additional five years.

- 3) ***Reflects a legislative preference for preserving procurement flexibility while maintaining guardrails adopted in 2016.*** Supporters of this bill argue that lease-leaseback provides districts with additional flexibility compared to traditional design-bid-build procurement methods, including the ability to incorporate preconstruction services, utilize guaranteed maximum pricing structures, and consider qualifications and project approach in addition to cost. They further contend that continuation of the current framework is particularly important for smaller districts that may benefit from early contractor involvement and integrated project delivery approaches.

At the same time, the current statutory framework preserves significant guardrails adopted following the Fresno litigation, including competitive solicitation requirements, public disclosure requirements, skilled and trained workforce

provisions, and protections for subcontractors. As a result, the bill can largely be viewed as an extension of the Legislature's existing policy balance between procurement flexibility and public accountability rather than a reopening of the broader policy debate regarding lease-leaseback authority itself.

- 4) ***Allowing the sunset to occur could create uncertainty regarding continued use of lease-leaseback procurement.*** If the competitive best value provisions sunset, the statute would revert to a prior version of the Education Code that no longer expressly references the competitive selection process established in 2016.

Supporters argue that allowing the sunset to occur could create uncertainty for districts, architects, and contractors regarding the continued viability and structure of lease-leaseback procurement. While some procurement-related protections adopted in subsequent legislation would remain in effect, the expiration of the current framework could create ambiguity regarding procedural expectations and procurement standards moving forward.

- 5) ***This bill continues a broader legislative trend toward authorizing alternative project delivery methods for school construction.*** Over the past two decades, the Legislature has increasingly authorized alternative project delivery methods for public infrastructure projects, including lease-leaseback, design-build, progressive design-build, and construction manager/general contractor models. These approaches are generally intended to provide public entities with greater flexibility in addressing project complexity, cost control, scheduling, and risk allocation.

This bill continues that broader trend by preserving an existing alternative delivery authority rather than reverting school districts exclusively to more traditional low-bid procurement structures. However, unlike some newer alternative delivery models, lease-leaseback already represents a mature and heavily litigated procurement framework with significant existing statutory guidance and operational experience among school districts.

SUPPORT

Associated General Contractors, California Chapters (co-sponsor)
 Coalition for Adequate School Housing (co-sponsor)
 Alameda County Office of Education
 Blach Construction Company
 California Association of School Business Officials
 California School Boards Association
 County School Facilities Consortium
 Del Mar Union School District
 Harris Construction Co., Inc.
 Hemet Unified School District
 Jurupa Unified School District
 Los Angeles Unified School District
 Manteca Unified School District
 Oakland Unified School District

Poway Unified School District
San Benito High School District

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No: AB 1204 **Hearing Date:** June 3, 2026
Author: Alvarez
Version: May 5, 2025
Urgency: No **Fiscal:** Yes
Consultant: Ian Johnson

Subject: Local control funding formula: school districts and charter schools: pupils experiencing homelessness: supplemental and concentration grants: regional adjustment factors: grade-span adequacy adjustments.

SUMMARY

This bill makes significant changes to the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) for school districts and charter schools by: (1) expanding targeted funding for high-needs pupils, including pupils experiencing homelessness; (2) increasing supplemental grant funding and expanding concentration grant eligibility; (3) establishing a minimum annual LCFF cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) and future regional cost adjustments; and (4) creating a phased transition toward a revised LCFF funding structure beginning in the 2025-26 fiscal year and intended for full implementation by 2030-31.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the LCFF as the primary funding formula for school districts, charter schools, and county offices of education.
- 2) Provides school districts and charter schools with grade span base grants for grades K-3, grades 4-6, grades 7-8, and grades 9-12, and requires those grants to receive an annual statutory COLA. Existing law also provides grade span adjustments for class size reduction in grades K-3 and college and career readiness in grades 9-12.
- 3) Provides a supplemental grant equal to 20% of the adjusted base grant for each “unduplicated pupil,” defined as a pupil who is eligible for free or reduced-price meals, an English learner, or a foster youth. Existing law requires pupils who qualify in more than one category to be counted only once for purposes of the LCFF.
- 4) Provides a concentration grant equal to 65% of the adjusted base grant for each unduplicated pupil above 55% of a school district’s or charter school’s enrollment.
- 5) Requires school districts and charter schools to annually report unduplicated pupil enrollment data to the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) and requires county superintendents of schools to review and validate that data.

- 6) Requires the State Board of Education to adopt regulations governing the expenditure of supplemental and concentration grant funding.
- 7) Requires, upon full implementation of the LCFF, school districts to maintain an average class enrollment of not more than 24 pupils in grades K-3, unless an alternative ratio is collectively bargained.
- 8) Requires the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO), on or before January 1, 2026, to submit a report to the Legislature examining the effects of changing the LCFF funding calculations from average daily attendance (ADA) to enrollment-based funding.

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Adds pupils experiencing homelessness, as defined under the federal McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, to the definition of "unduplicated pupils" for purposes of generating LCFF supplemental and concentration grant funding.
- 2) Beginning in the 2030-31 fiscal year, increases the supplemental grant add-on from 20% to 35% of the adjusted base grant for each unduplicated pupil.
- 3) Beginning in the 2030-31 fiscal year, lowers the concentration grant threshold from 55% to 45% unduplicated pupil enrollment while maintaining the 65% concentration grant add-on rate.
- 4) Removes the current limitation on charter school concentration grant calculations tied to the unduplicated pupil percentage of the surrounding school district.
- 5) Requires the annual LCFF base grant COLA to be no less than 4% in any fiscal year.
- 6) Requires the California Department of Education (CDE), on or before January 1, 2030, to:
 - a) Establish regional cost adjustment factors to address regional housing and labor cost differences; and
 - b) Publish those factors on its internet website.
- 7) Requires, beginning in the 2030-31 fiscal year, LCFF base grant adjustments to also be multiplied by applicable regional cost adjustment factors.
- 8) Requires the CDE, on or before January 1, 2028, to develop recommendations for "adequacy adjustments" to the LCFF grade span base grants to account for:
 - a) Differing educational costs across grade spans; and

- b) Revisions made by the bill to supplemental and concentration grants.
- 9) Requires the CDE to submit those adequacy adjustment recommendations to the Legislature.
- 10) Establishes a phased LCFF transition adjustment from the 2025-26 fiscal year through the 2029-30 fiscal year by requiring the SPI to annually calculate the difference between:
 - a) Current-law LCFF funding; and
 - b) The amount that would be generated under the revised formula established by the bill.
- 11) Requires a portion of that difference to be added to each school district's and charter school's LCFF entitlement during the transition period, increasing incrementally each year until full implementation.
- 12) Continuously appropriates the funding necessary to provide the transition adjustments.
- 13) Requires school districts and charter schools to demonstrate that any additional funding generated by the bill is used to support additional services for the targeted pupil groups.
- 14) Establishes a hold harmless provision prohibiting a school district or charter school from receiving less LCFF state aid per ADA than it received in the 2024-25 fiscal year.
- 15) Requires the LAO, on or before January 1, 2027, to study the impact of the bill's changes to the LCFF across and within geographic regions of the state.
- 16) States the intent of the Legislature to fully transition to the revised LCFF structure beginning in the 2030-31 fiscal year.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, "Education is the cornerstone of opportunity, yet California's current school funding system has neglected its most vulnerable students, particularly those experiencing homelessness. AB 1204 addresses these inequities by designating homeless students as "unduplicated pupils" under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), unlocking essential resources for support services like transportation, counseling, and shelters.

AB 1204 empowers districts to better serve high-need populations. This legislation aligns funding with equity goals, ensuring that resources are directed to those who need them most, while supporting local educators in enhancing attendance and graduation rates. Ultimately, AB 1204 is a moral imperative that seeks to fulfill California's promise of equity and excellence for every student."

- 2) ***This bill proposes a substantial redesign of the LCFF.*** This bill would make multiple structural changes to the state's primary K-12 funding formula, including expanding the definition of unduplicated pupils, increasing supplemental grant funding, lowering the concentration grant threshold, establishing a minimum annual COLA floor, creating future regional cost adjustments, directing adequacy studies related to grade span funding, and phasing in a new LCFF target structure through transition funding beginning in the 2025-26 fiscal year.

Collectively, these changes would move the LCFF significantly beyond its original 2013 structure. In many respects, the bill resembles the establishment of a second-generation LCFF funding target, similar to the original LCFF transition model adopted during the Brown Administration. The Committee may wish to consider whether these changes represent refinements to the existing formula or a broader redefinition of the underlying goals and philosophy of the LCFF itself.

- 3) ***Growing research and policy discussion regarding whether the LCFF sufficiently accounts for concentrated poverty and overlapping student need.*** Much of the recent academic and policy literature surrounding the LCFF has focused on whether the current formula adequately captures the intensity and concentration of student need. Research from organizations such as the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC), Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), and the Learning Policy Institute (LPI) has generally found that LCFF funding increases were associated with improved student outcomes, particularly in higher-needs districts. Studies have linked LCFF-driven spending increases to gains in graduation rates, reductions in suspensions, and modest improvements in academic achievement, especially among low-income students and students in districts receiving larger concentration grant increases.

At the same time, several reports have questioned whether the current supplemental and concentration grant structure adequately reflects the realities of concentrated and overlapping disadvantage. Under current law, pupils are counted only once for LCFF purposes, even when they simultaneously experience multiple risk factors. Similarly, homelessness is not separately recognized in the formula despite often generating distinct educational and service needs. Researchers have also raised concerns regarding the current 55% concentration grant threshold, arguing that it creates what is effectively a "funding cliff," where districts with otherwise similar student populations may receive substantially different funding levels depending on whether they fall just above or below the threshold.

This bill responds to many of those concerns by explicitly adding pupils experiencing homelessness as a targeted group and lowering the concentration grant threshold from 55% to 45%. Although earlier versions of the bill proposed double- and triple-counting certain pupils with overlapping disadvantages, those provisions were ultimately removed. Nevertheless, the bill still reflects a broader policy movement toward recognizing that concentrated poverty and overlapping student needs may require greater funding differentiation than exists under the current formula.

- 4) ***Adequacy versus equity in California's school finance system.*** One of the more notable aspects of this bill is its attempt to blend two historically distinct school finance concepts: equity and adequacy. The LCFF was originally designed primarily as an equity-based formula intended to simplify California's prior categorical funding structure while directing additional resources toward low-income students, English learners, and foster youth.

This bill moves further into adequacy-oriented territory by establishing a 4% minimum COLA floor regardless of inflation levels, requiring regional cost adjustments tied to housing and labor markets, and directing CDE to develop recommendations regarding whether current grade span base grants adequately reflect educational costs. That latter provision may be of particular interest to stakeholders who argue that current grade span funding does not fully reflect the actual costs of operating comprehensive high schools. For example, the California High School Coalition notes that, when adjusted for instructional time requirements, the current 9-12 grade span adjustment produces less funding per instructional hour than lower grade spans, while high schools also do not receive Expanded Learning Opportunities Program (ELOP) funding that is available for younger students. These provisions raise broader policy questions that have increasingly emerged in California school finance discussions, including what constitutes an "adequate" education in California, whether funding targets should differ significantly by region due to labor and housing costs, and whether the LCFF should eventually evolve into a regionally differentiated adequacy formula similar to those used in some other states.

The bill does not directly answer those questions, but it clearly moves California further in that direction.

- 5) ***Regional cost adjustments could significantly alter the distributional structure of the LCFF.*** Current LCFF funding rates are largely uniform statewide, notwithstanding major differences in local labor markets and cost pressures. This bill would require the CDE, by January 1, 2030, to establish regional cost adjustment factors addressing housing and labor cost differences.

Conceptually, regional adjustments seek to address a longstanding criticism of statewide formulas: equal funding levels do not necessarily provide equal purchasing power across vastly different labor and housing markets. This issue has become increasingly prominent in higher-cost coastal regions, where school districts frequently report difficulty recruiting and retaining staff due to housing affordability pressures.

At the same time, regionalized funding systems can create significant implementation and policy complexities. This bill leaves unresolved questions regarding how regions would be defined, what economic indicators would be used, how frequently adjustments would be recalculated, and whether regional differentiation could create significant funding disparities between otherwise similar local educational agencies (LEAs). In practice, California has historically approached regional inequities more indirectly through workforce incentives, categorical grants, and local bargaining pressures rather than through explicit regionalized base grant structures.

- 6) ***The bill would likely create substantial long-term Proposition 98 cost pressures.*** Although the bill states legislative intent to fully implement the revised formula by 2030-31, the measure would begin generating transition costs immediately, beginning in 2025-26 through required one-fifth annual transition adjustments.

According to the Assembly Appropriations analysis, each additional 1% LCFF COLA represents approximately \$800 million in additional costs. The analysis further estimates that establishing a 4% COLA floor could create annual costs of up to approximately \$3.2 billion, depending on inflation levels, while increasing the supplemental grant percentage from 20% to 35% could create approximately \$5 billion in additional annual costs based on current funding levels.

Those estimates do not fully account for future regional cost adjustments, future adequacy recommendations, or the interaction of these provisions with future Proposition 98 calculations. The Committee may wish to consider how the proposed formula changes interact with broader debates regarding the long-term sustainability of Proposition 98 obligations, competing K-12 priorities within the guarantee, and whether future increases in the guarantee should primarily be used to deepen LCFF investments versus funding categorical or targeted initiatives.

- 7) ***Broader legislative trend toward increased accountability for supplemental and concentration grant funding.*** Since the LCFF's enactment, the Legislature has repeatedly revisited concerns regarding whether supplemental and concentration grant funding is sufficiently transparent and demonstrably connected to services for the students generating the funding.

Over the past decade, multiple reports from PPIC, PACE, and the State Auditor have raised concerns regarding inconsistent local reporting practices, challenges in tracking proportionality requirements, and varying levels of stakeholder engagement in Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) development and implementation.

This bill continues that trend by requiring LEAs to demonstrate that any increased funding generated by the bill is used to support additional services for the targeted student groups. In doing so, the bill reflects an ongoing policy tension embedded within the LCFF itself: balancing broad local flexibility with the state's interest in ensuring that targeted equity funding is meaningfully connected to improved services and outcomes for high-needs pupils.

- 8) ***Arguments in Support.*** Supporters argue that the bill represents a necessary next step in the evolution of the LCFF by better accounting for concentrated student need, regional cost pressures, and the realities facing districts serving high-needs student populations.

The San Diego Unified School District writes that the bill "strengthens the LCFF while upholding its core principles of equity, accountability, and local control" and particularly emphasizes the importance of the bill's proposed regional cost

adjustment factor. According to the district, rising housing, transportation, and labor costs in high-cost regions have increasingly outpaced the purchasing power of statewide LCFF funding levels. The district argues that many families experiencing substantial economic hardship do not qualify as low-income under existing LCFF definitions, creating a disconnect between actual student need and the funding districts receive to support those students.

Supporters further contend that the lack of regional cost differentiation within the LCFF creates growing challenges for districts attempting to recruit and retain staff in high-cost areas. San Diego Unified states that “long-term, sustainable solutions require a funding formula that accounts for regional cost differences and their impact on staffing, operations, and student needs.”

More broadly, supporters view the bill as part of an ongoing effort to refine the LCFF to better reflect both concentrated student need and the differing operational realities faced by districts across the state.

- 9) ***Arguments in Opposition.*** Opponents generally do not dispute the existence of funding adequacy challenges within California’s K-12 finance system, but instead argue that the bill directs future Proposition 98 growth through the wrong mechanism.

Pleasanton Unified School District, part of a coalition of districts identifying themselves as “Raise the Base”, argues that the bill “distributes existing Proposition 98 funding in ways that constrain base grant growth, widen disparities, and limit local control.” The coalition contends that the bill primarily redistributes existing Proposition 98 resources through expanded supplemental and concentration grant mechanisms rather than increasing universally applied LCFF base grants that support core educational services for all students.

Opponents further argue that California districts across all demographic profiles have spent more than a decade absorbing inflationary pressures related to pensions, health care, insurance, labor markets, and utilities, while LCFF base grant purchasing power has eroded. According to the coalition, directing future funding growth primarily through targeted grants rather than the base grant risks creating larger funding disparities between districts while limiting unrestricted funding available for local decision-making.

SUPPORT

California Federation of Teachers
 Children Now
 EdTrust-West
 Los Angeles Unified School District
 Oakland Unified School District
 Public Advocates
 San Diego Unified School District
 San Mateo County School Boards Association Legislative Action Committee
 One Individual

OPPOSITION

Pleasanton Unified School District

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No: AB 2056 **Hearing Date:** June 3, 2026
Author: Alvarez
Version: February 18, 2026
Urgency: No **Fiscal:** Yes
Consultant: Ian Johnson

Subject: Teachers: exchange programs: local educational agencies.

SUMMARY

This bill revises and recasts the World Language Teacher Exchange and Recruitment Law of 1963 by expanding authorized teacher exchange and recruitment activities to include county offices of education and charter schools, expressly authorizing exchanges with Mexico, removing specified state-level administrative responsibilities, and authorizing designated visa sponsors to facilitate placements of teachers from Mexico in California schools for cultural exchange purposes.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the World Language Teacher Exchange and Recruitment Law of 1963.
- 2) Requires the State Board of Education (SBE) to adopt rules and regulations under which teachers employed by California school districts may exchange positions with teachers in schools in other countries for periods of one year or less.
- 3) Requires exchange arrangements to be made through the California Department of Education (CDE), in cooperation with teacher exchange programs administered by agencies of the federal government.
- 4) Authorizes participating school districts to grant leaves of absence to certificated employees participating in exchange programs and to employ replacement teachers during the period of exchange.
- 5) Provides that certificated employees participating in exchange programs retain specified rights and benefits, including retirement system membership rights and accumulated leave benefits.
- 6) Authorizes governing boards to enter into agreements and take actions necessary to carry out teacher exchange programs.

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Revises and recasts the World Language Teacher Exchange and Recruitment Law of 1963.
- 2) Expands authorized participation in teacher exchange and recruitment activities to include county offices of education and charter schools, in addition to school districts.
- 3) Expressly authorizes teacher exchanges and recruitment activities involving Mexico.
- 4) Removes the requirement that the SBE adopt rules and regulations governing teacher exchanges.
- 5) Removes the requirement that the CDE administer exchange arrangements or coordinate those arrangements with federal teacher exchange programs.
- 6) Eliminates the existing one-year limitation on teacher exchanges.
- 7) Authorizes, rather than requires, the adoption of regulations governing exchange and recruitment activities.
- 8) Requires any regulations adopted to authorize visa sponsors designated by the United States Department of State to sponsor teachers from Mexico for placement in school districts, county offices of education, and charter schools for purposes of cultural exchange.
- 9) Makes conforming and technical changes to update statutory references and terminology throughout the article.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “AB 2056 constitutes a bold and transformative legislative response to the persistent difficulties facing California’s bilingual education and English learner programs. By opening the opportunity for supporting exchanges with Mexico, this groundbreaking legislation unlocks access to a pool of exceptionally qualified temporary educators who bring rich expertise in Spanish-language instruction and culturally relevant teaching methods. With over 1.1 million English Learners in California’s public schools, the inclusion of Mexican teachers is not just beneficial but essential for cultivating an inclusive and supportive learning environment. This initiative not only aims to bridge the critical gap of bilingual teachers—particularly in subjects such as math, science, and special education—but also enhances the educational experience by fostering global education and cultural exchange.

“The proposed bill also seeks to enhance cultural exchange opportunities. Numerous teachers from Mexico have expressed interest in participating as

temporary educators in California. Beyond the professional benefits of program participation, these educators are afforded the opportunity to observe and engage with California's cultural environment. It also expands the range of opportunities, allowing local educational agencies, including school districts and county offices of education, to decide whether to participate in bringing a temporary international teacher from Mexico for cross-cultural exchange."

- 2) ***Modernizing a largely dormant statutory framework.*** The World Language Teacher Exchange and Recruitment Law of 1963 was enacted at a time when formalized teacher exchange programs were more centrally coordinated through state and federal agencies. Existing law still contemplates a state-directed structure in which the SBE adopts regulations, and the CDE administers exchange arrangements in coordination with federal programs. In practice, however, many modern international educator exchange programs operate through direct partnerships between local educational agencies (LEAs) and federally designated visa sponsors. This bill updates statute to better align with the current operational reality of international teacher recruitment and exchange programs.
- 3) ***Addressing ongoing bilingual teacher workforce challenges.*** California continues to experience staffing shortages in bilingual education and world language instruction. Teacher shortages have been particularly acute in dual language immersion programs and in schools serving large populations of English learners. LEAs have increasingly explored international recruitment pipelines, particularly with Mexico and other Spanish-speaking countries, as one strategy for addressing persistent workforce shortages. By expressly authorizing exchanges and recruitment activities involving Mexico and permitting placements facilitated through designated visa sponsors, this bill seeks to provide greater statutory clarity for these arrangements.
- 4) ***Shift from state-level administration to local flexibility.*** This bill substantially reduces the formal role of the SBE and the CDE in administering exchange programs. Rather than requiring statewide regulations and department-administered arrangements, the bill moves toward a more decentralized framework in which LEAs may work more directly with exchange organizations and visa sponsors. Supporters may argue that this approach provides greater flexibility and reduces unnecessary state administrative involvement. However, the shift also raises broader questions regarding consistency, oversight, and accountability across programs that may operate differently from one LEA to another.
- 5) ***Bill is similar to measure vetoed last year.*** AB 833 (Alvarez, 2025) would have required that the rules and regulations adopted by the SBE under which teachers employed by LEAs and charter schools may exchange positions with teachers in schools in other countries authorize J-1 visa sponsors designated by the United States Department of State, in addition to the CDE, to sponsor teachers from Mexico for placement in California LEAs to promote cultural exchange. That bill was vetoed by the Governor with the following message:

“This bill is unnecessary as there is no statutory barrier to expanding program sponsorship for teachers from other countries, including Mexico, to California. Federal law does not require a single exclusive sponsor. Further, the author’s stated goal is to help fill persistent educator shortages, which is contrary to the program’s purpose to promote cross-cultural understanding and short-term professional growth opportunities.”

This bill is substantially similar to AB 833, but additionally removes the requirement that exchanges be made through the CDE and removes the department’s authority to administer the program; eliminates the requirement that exchanges be limited to one year or less; states that exchanges with teachers from Mexico may help provide California pupils with access to bilingual instruction and assist LEAs in meeting bilingual education needs; and removes the authority for the department to accept federal grants for the program. As a result, this bill arguably moves even farther away from the traditional conception of a short-term cultural exchange program and more directly frames the program as a workforce strategy for addressing bilingual teacher shortages. The Committee may wish to consider whether those objectives are appropriately aligned with the historical purpose and federal structure of J-1 cultural exchange programs.

SUPPORT

Alameda County Office of Education
Association of California School Administrators
California Association for Bilingual Education
California Charter Schools Association
San Diego Unified School District
Santa Clara County Office of Education

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No: AB 1235 **Hearing Date:** June 3, 2026
Author: Rogers
Version: January 22, 2026
Urgency: No **Fiscal:** Yes
Consultant: Ian Johnson

Subject: California State University: skilled and trained workforce requirement.

SUMMARY

This bill requires contractors on California State University (CSU) design-build projects to commit that they and their subcontractors will use a skilled and trained workforce for work in apprenticeable occupations in the building and construction trades. The bill includes exceptions for projects covered by specified project labor agreements and for housing projects, including dormitories.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Trustees of the CSU and grants them authority over the construction and development of CSU campuses, buildings, facilities, and related improvements.
- 2) Authorizes the CSU Trustees to use design-build contracting, under which a contractor may provide all or significant portions of both the design services and construction of a project through a competitive process that considers criteria in addition to cost.
- 3) Requires a design-build contractor, when selecting subcontractors, to competitively bid those portions of work and provide CSU with a list of subcontractors whose work exceeds one-half of 1% of the total project cost.
- 4) Authorizes a public entity to require a bidder, contractor, or other entity to use a skilled and trained workforce, whether or not another statute or regulation requires that workforce standard.
- 5) Requires bid documents and construction contracts to include notice when a project is subject to a skilled and trained workforce requirement.
- 6) Defines “skilled and trained workforce” to generally mean a workforce in which workers performing apprenticeable work in the building and construction trades are skilled journeymen or registered apprentices.
- 7) Requires monthly compliance reports when a skilled and trained workforce is required.

- 8) Authorizes civil penalties for contractors or subcontractors that fail to use a skilled and trained workforce when required.
- 9) Defines a project labor agreement as a pre-hire collective bargaining agreement establishing terms and conditions of employment for a specific construction project or projects.

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Prohibits a contractor from being prequalified for, shortlisted for, or awarded a design-build contract with the CSU unless the contractor provides an enforceable commitment that the contractor and all subcontractors at every tier will use a skilled and trained workforce for all work on the project or contract that falls within an apprenticeable occupation in the building and construction trades.
- 2) Provides that this requirement does not apply if:
 - a) The CSU Trustees have entered into a project labor agreement that binds all contractors and subcontractors on the project to use a skilled and trained workforce, and the contractor agrees to be bound by that agreement.
 - b) The project or contract is being performed under the extension or renewal of a project labor agreement entered into by the CSU Trustees before January 1, 2027.
 - c) The contractor has entered into a project labor agreement that binds the contractor and all subcontractors at every tier to use a skilled and trained workforce.
 - d) The project or contract is for the development of housing, including dormitories.
- 3) Defines “project labor agreement” by cross-reference to existing law.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “Taxpayer funded university construction projects should be built to the highest standards, which means using a skilled and trained workforce. Because there are limited funds available to the higher education system in California for construction, it is critical that these projects be done on time and done right the first time in the most efficient and safe manner available. Additionally, a skilled and trained workforce delivers benefits to the entire community by improving worker standards and putting upward pressure on the overall wage floor.
- 2)

However, some California State University campuses do not utilize a skilled and trained workforce despite it being the general industry standard across most CSUs. This policy choice is unfortunate because the requirement to use workers being trained in, or that have graduated from, a state-approved apprenticeship program is the best workforce available. This will make projects safer and more efficient places to work, but will also incentivize the use of local workers on these projects and help ensure that taxpayer dollars are spent wisely.

AB 1235 not only harmonizes the CSU design build statutes with the rest of the Public Contract Code, but it ensures that a locally based skilled and trained workforce will work on taxpayer funded CSU projects for the betterment of the entire community.”

- 3) ***This bill applies a familiar skilled-and-trained workforce standard to CSU design-build projects.*** This bill does not create a new workforce concept. Rather, it applies an existing Public Contract Code framework to CSU design-build projects. Under existing law, skilled-and-trained workforce requirements already include definitions, monthly reporting obligations, and penalties for noncompliance. The policy question is therefore not whether the state should invent a new labor standard, but whether CSU design-build authority should be conditioned on the same type of workforce commitment used in other public construction contexts.
- 4) ***The housing exemption is a significant narrowing amendment.*** The latest version of this bill exempts projects or contracts for the development of housing, including dormitories. This appears to respond to concerns that additional labor requirements could increase costs or slow delivery of student housing projects at a time when housing affordability and availability remain major challenges for students. This exemption substantially narrows the bill’s application relative to CSU’s overall capital program and may help separate the bill’s workforce-policy objective from the state’s urgent student housing goals.
- 5) ***The committee may wish to consider how CSU would operationalize compliance.*** The Assembly Appropriations Committee analysis identified unknown but likely significant administrative costs to CSU to ensure compliance, as well as potential project cost impacts if the bill reduces competition or increases bid prices. A key implementation question is what level of review CSU would need to perform to verify contractor and subcontractor compliance, and whether existing skilled and trained workforce reporting and enforcement mechanisms are sufficient to avoid creating a duplicative administrative process.
- 6) ***Arguments in Support.*** The State Building and Construction Trades Council of California, sponsor of this measure, state that, “In 2015, SB 785 (Wolk) was signed into law that consolidated the disparate design-build (DB) statutes under the Public Contract Code. During the negotiations over that legislation the requirement to utilize a “skilled and trained workforce” in order to be able to utilize DB authority was maintained...AB 1235 not only harmonizes the CSU DB statutes with the rest of the Public Contract Code, but it ensures that a locally based skilled and trained workforce will work on CSU funded projects.”

- 7) ***Arguments in Opposition.*** The Associated General Contractors of California state in opposition that “while we support fair labor practices, requiring contractors to provide an enforceable commitment covering the entire subcontracting chain creates unmanageable liability, exposing prime contractors to compliance risks outside of their direct control. These types of measures impact the contractor pool for public works projects, as the administrative and oversight requirements consume fiscal and staffing resources that the contractor may not have available.”

SUPPORT

State Building & Construction Trades Council of California (sponsor)
California Federation of Labor Unions, AFL-CIO

OPPOSITION

Associated General Contractors, California Chapters
Western Electrical Contractors Association

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No: AB 1346 **Hearing Date:** June 3, 2026
Author: DeMaio
Version: February 21, 2025
Urgency: No **Fiscal:** Yes
Consultant: Olgalilia Ramirez

Subject: Public postsecondary education: residency: dependents of members of the Armed Forces: reenrollments.

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

SUMMARY

This bill extends eligibility for retaining resident classification for purposes of paying tuition at a public higher education institution to a dependent of an Armed Forces member who is granted reenrollment by the university, even if the Armed Forces member has been transferred out of state on military orders or has retired from active duty.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Generally known as the Uniform Residency Law, establishes a variety of residency requirements for students attending the California Community Colleges (CCC) or the California State University (CSU). The determination of such residency status is required in order to assess either resident or nonresident fees and tuition. The Regents of the University of California (UC) may, by resolution, make these provisions of law applicable to the UC (and historically have done so). (Education Code (EC) § 68000-68134)
- 2) Defines a “nonresident” as a student who does not have residence in the state for more than one year immediately preceding the residence determination date. (EC § 68018)
- 3) Establishes uniform residency requirements for purposes of ascertaining the amount of fees to be paid by students at CSU and CCC and establishes various exceptions to these residency requirements, including many for current and former members of the Armed Forces. (EC § 68074 and 68075)
- 4) Requires the CSU, and requests the UC, to require each campus in their respective systems to grant students the right to reenroll in their baccalaureate degree program after withdrawing or stopping out, if the student was in good academic standing with the university. (EC § 66208)

- 5) Prohibits a student who is attending, or has been admitted to, a public postsecondary educational institution from losing their resident classification if they are continuously enrolled at that institution and a dependent of a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, even if that member is (1) thereafter transferred on military orders to a place outside this state where the member continues to serve in the Armed Forces of the United States, or (2) thereafter retired as an active member of the Armed Forces of the United States. (EC § 68074 (b))

ANALYSIS

This bill extends eligibility for retaining resident classification for purposes of paying tuition at a public higher education institution to a dependent of an Armed Forces member who is granted reenrollment by the university after withdrawing from a baccalaureate degree program, even if the Armed Forces member has been transferred out of state on military orders or has retired from active duty.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “AB 1346 is a powerful tool to help our military dependents unlock their educational opportunities. This proposal will support students who faced setbacks but are determined to continue their education. By enabling them to return to school and still benefit from resident tuition rates, this legislation recognizes California’s commitment to second chances and personal growth.”
- 2) ***Tuition rates and residency classification.*** California public higher education institutions are publicly subsidized. As a result, students classified as California residents pay lower tuition rates than nonresident students. Students classified as nonresidents may pay several times more than those charged the resident rate, making eligibility for in-state tuition a significant financial benefit for students.

Current law extends in-state residency classification to a dependent of an Armed Forces member stationed in this state on active duty. If the Armed Forces member is transferred out of state or has retired, current law further provides that the in-state residency classification of a student who is the dependent of an Armed Forces member may be retained, but is contingent upon continuous enrollment at the institution. This bill would additionally authorize the retention of in-state residency classification when the student is granted reenrollment. Under current law, reenrollment rights into a CSU or UC baccalaureate degree program may be granted to students who withdrew or “stopped out” from the program.

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

AB 2203 (Tangipa, 2026) would require, beginning with the 2028-29 academic year, each campus of the CSU and the CCC, and requests each campus of the UC, that administers a priority enrollment system, to provide priority enrollment to a student who receives a California Department of Veterans Affairs (CalVet) fee

waiver or who is using any federal GI Bill benefits. AB 2203 has been referred to this Committee.

AB 2794 (Committee on Higher Education, 2026) would make technical and conforming changes to the EC regarding Montgomery GI Bill-Selected Reserve program federal education benefits and eligibility for in-state resident tuition. AB 2794 has been referred to this committee.

SUPPORT

California State University

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 1486	Hearing Date:	June 3, 2026
Author:	Soria		
Version:	January 22, 2026		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Olgalilia Ramirez		

Subject: Climate resiliency: research farms: grant program.

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

SUMMARY

This bill requires the California Department of Education (CDE), in consultation with the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA), to establish a grant program to provide grants to public postsecondary educational institutions that are designated as Agricultural Experiment Stations or Agriculture Research Institutes by the University of California (UC) and the California State University (CSU) to develop or expand research farms to improve climate resiliency.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes, under the California Constitution, the UC as a public trust to be administered by the Regents of the UC with full powers of organization and government, subject only to such legislative control as may be necessary to insure the security of its funds and compliance with the terms of the endowments of the university, and such competitive bidding procedures as may be made applicable to the university for construction contracts, selling real property, and purchasing materials, goods and services. (Constitution of California, Article IX, Section 9)
- 2) Declares the UC as the primary state-supported academic agency for research. (Education Code (EC) § 66010.4 (c))
- 3) Establishes the CSU, under the administration of the Trustees of the CSU, as one of the segments of public postsecondary education in the state. (EC § 66600)
- 4) Makes \$15,000,000 available, upon appropriation by the Legislature, to the State Department of Education, in consultation with CDFA, for purposes of providing grants to public postsecondary educational institutions that are designated as Agricultural Experiment Stations or Agricultural Research Institutes, to develop

research farms to improve climate resiliency, as specified. (Public Resource Code § 93570)

ANALYSIS

This bill requires CDE, in consultation with the CDFA, to establish a grant program to provide grants to public postsecondary educational institutions that are designated as Agricultural Experiment Stations or Agricultural Research Institutes by UC and the CSU to develop or expand research farms to improve climate resiliency.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) **Need for the bill.** As noted in the Assembly Appropriations analysis, “The \$10 billion Safe Drinking Water, Wildfire Prevention, Drought Preparedness, and Clean Air Bond Act of 2024, approved by voters in 2024 as Proposition 4, allocated \$300 million to fund improvements in climate resilience and sustainability of agricultural lands. As part of this allocation, the bond makes \$15 million available, upon appropriation, to CDE, in consultation with CDFA, to provide grants to public postsecondary educational institutions designated as agricultural experiment stations or agricultural research institutes to develop or expand research farms to improve climate resiliency. The bond language provides that this funding shall not exceed \$1 million per institution and “shall be constructed and maintained with environmentally sustainable infrastructure practices.”

“The Governor’s Proposition 4 expenditure plan, proposed as part of the administration’s January budget for the 2025-26 fiscal year, places this \$15 million in a “pending allocation” category. The Legislative Analyst’s Office noted in a February report that the administration is requesting that the Legislature provide more guidance around its intentions for three bond activities – including the \$15 million for research farms at postsecondary education institutions – for which the Governor’s expenditure plan does not yet include an appropriation timeline.”

The Budget Act of 2025 made the appropriation contingent upon the enactment of this bill. According to the author, “Proposition 4’s research farm grants will help California’s public colleges improve existing, or help start up, research farms with a focus on improving climate resiliency.”

- 2) **Agricultural Research Institutes and experiment stations.** The CSU Agricultural Research Institute consists of four member campuses: Fresno, San Luis Obispo, Pomona, and Chico, along with two associate member campuses, Humboldt and Monterey Bay. This multi-campus program focuses on conducting applied agricultural and environmental research. Project categories primarily focus on agricultural business, natural resources, biodiversity, food science and more. Within the UC system, Agricultural Experiment Stations are housed at UC Berkeley, Davis, Merced, Riverside, and Santa Cruz campuses. These stations engage in land-grant mission research, host outreach and demonstration programs, and collaborate with farmers, suppliers, and other stakeholders in the

agricultural industry, which aim to address issues related to agricultural natural resources and health.

This bill establishes a grant program for the purpose of providing state funding to CSU and UC Agricultural Research Institutes and Agricultural Experiment Stations with the goal of expanding research farms. The adopted bond measure and this bill assign the administration of the grant with CDE, even though the program is directed at CSU and UC, which function independently of CDE's jurisdiction. CDE is required to consult with CDFA in establishing the grant program.

SUPPORT

California State University

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 1555	Hearing Date:	June 3, 2026
Author:	Hadwick		
Version:	March 19, 2026		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Michelle Nguyen		

Subject: Community colleges: exemption from nonresident tuition fee: College of the Siskiyou.

SUMMARY

This bill authorizes the College of the Siskiyou to (1) exempt all or some of its nonresident tuition fee for 200 students per academic year residing in specified counties in Oregon and (2) claim state apportionment funding for students qualifying for an exemption of nonresident tuition fees.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the California Community Colleges (CCCs), a postsecondary education system in this state, under the administration of the Board of Governors (BOG), and specifies that the CCC system consists of community college districts (CCDs). (Education Code (EC) § 70900)
- 2) Authorizes the CCC BOG to enter into an interstate attendance agreement with any statewide public agency of another state that is responsible for public institutions of postsecondary education providing the first two years of college instruction, and that is an agency of a state that is a member of Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE), which is a regional interstate higher education compact between 15 states in the western United States. (EC § 66801)
- 3) Authorizes a CCD to admit nonresident students and requires that these students be charged a tuition fee, with specified exemptions, and requires that CCDs use one of several statutorily outlined options for the calculation of the nonresident tuition fee. (EC § 76140)
- 4) Exempts no more than 200 students in any academic year from paying all or part of nonresident tuition fees if they attend the Lake Tahoe CCD and reside in specified communities in the State of Nevada. (EC § 76140)
- 5) Exempts, until January 1, 2028, no more than 150 full-time equivalent students (FTES) from paying all or part of nonresident tuition fees if they are low income students who are residents of Mexico who register for lower division courses at specified community colleges near the California-Mexico border and who reside within 45 miles of the California-Mexico border. (EC § 76140)

- 6) Prohibits nonresident students from being reported as FTES for state apportionment purposes, except for specified instances, which include: (1) the CCD has fewer than 1,500 FTES, is within 10 miles of another state, and has a reciprocity agreement with that state or participates in the Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE) through WICHE; (2) if a CCD has between 1,501 and 3,000 FTES, is within 10 miles of another state, and has a reciprocity agreement with that state or participates in WICHE, the CCD can claim up to 100 FTES for state apportionment purposes; (3) the exemption for 200 students per academic years provided for Lake Tahoe CCD as specified in #4 above; and (4) the exemption provided for 200 students per academic year who are Mexican residents living near the California-Mexico border specified in #5 above. (EC § 76140)
- 7) Provides that specified nonresident students exempted from paying nonresident tuition may be reported as resident FTES for purposes of state apportionment and are required to pay 1.5 times the amount of the fee established for residents. (EC § 76140)

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Authorizes the College of the Siskiyous to exempt all or some of its nonresident tuition fee for 200 students per academic year residing in the Oregon counties of Jackson County, Josephine County, and Klamath County.
- 2) Authorizes the College of the Siskiyous to claim state apportionment funding for students qualifying for an exemption of nonresident tuition fees and requires the College of the Siskiyous to charge these students a per-unit fee that is one and one-half times the fee for residents.
- 3) Requires that the governing board for the College of the Siskiyous adopt rules and regulations for determining a student's residence classification and for establishing procedures for an appeal and review of the residence classification.
- 4) Requires that a student will be determined to have residence in one of the specified Oregon counties if they have lived in the county for more than one year immediately before seeking the nonresident tuition fee exemption.
- 5) Requires that residence be determined pursuant to existing laws for the determination of student residence, as specified.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, "along the California-Oregon border, residents see themselves not as Californians or Oregonians, but as one cross-border community. Residents of this bi-state community in Siskiyou County interact daily with neighboring Oregon communities for work, healthcare, commerce, and education. Recent data indicates 90 percent of community college students go to college within 50 miles of their home. The CoS provides workforce programs that

South Oregon University and nearby colleges cannot meet. ... However, Oregon applicants face significantly higher costs due to nonresident tuition and the total cost of college—often paying up to ten times more than California residents.

Assembly Bill 1555 allows the CoS to enroll Oregon students as in-state students. ... Current law already authorizes the Lake Tahoe Community College District to enroll an unlimited number of nonresident Nevada students in Lake Tahoe Community College as resident full-time equivalent students.”

- 2) ***College of the Siskiyou’s proximity to the California-Oregon border.*** The College of the Siskiyou, located in Weed, is the northern-most CCC in the system and therefore the closest to the California-Oregon border. The next closest CCC is Shasta College, which is located roughly 70 miles to the south in Redding.

The Oregon border is about 50 miles, or an hour, to the north of College of the Siskiyou. Josephine County, Jackson County, and Klamath County—the three counties specified in this bill—are three counties on the southern Oregon border. According to the college, these counties were selected for this bill based on past enrollment trends at the college. In academic year 2025-26, the College of the Siskiyou enrolled 61 students from these specific counties and 112 students from Oregon in total.

- 3) ***Student housing at College of the Siskiyou.*** The College of the Siskiyou currently has co-ed student housing for 154 residents and are single, double, or triple occupancy. According to the college, roughly 60% of students living in the college’s current student housing are Oregon residents.

In addition, the 2022 Budget Act awarded a \$32.6 million grant to College of the Siskiyou to construct new student housing as part of the Higher Education Student Housing Grant Program. As of May 2026, the 161-bed student housing project is scheduled to be completed in 2028, with the anticipation of a soft launch in spring 2028.

- 4) ***Reciprocity agreements and exchanges.*** The WUE is a program coordinated by the WICHE, and through the WUE, students from participating western states and territories from the WICHE may apply to enroll in college programs at a reduced tuition level. Existing law permits the College of the Siskiyou to annually serve a maximum of 100 FTES through WUE, which includes students from Oregon as well as other western states. Currently, the College of the Siskiyou serves 50 FTES from Oregon through WUE.

In addition, the College of the Siskiyou has a reciprocity agreement with the state of Oregon, called the Oregon Exchange, that allows the college to admit up to 50 eligible students who are Oregon residents to attend the college at a discounted rate. The reciprocity agreement also includes offering in-state tuition to eligible California residents attending College of the Siskiyou and seeking to transfer to, and attend, Southern Oregon University or Oregon Institute of Technology. Currently, the College of the Siskiyou serves 50 students through the Oregon Exchange.

For both of these agreements in the 2025-26 school year, students pay \$69 per unit (which is 1.5 times the resident fee) at the College of the Siskiyous instead of the out-of-state tuition of \$338 per unit.

- 5) ***Similar exemptions provided in recent years.*** SB 605 (Gaines, Chapter 657, Statutes of 2015) provided a nearly identical statutory exemption for students residing in specified communities in Nevada from paying nonresident tuition fees while attending Lake Tahoe CCD, with a sunset date of July 1, 2022. SB 436 (Dahle, Chapter 573, Statutes of 2021) removed the sunset date for the specified exemption for Lake Tahoe CCD.

In addition, AB 91 (Alvarez, Chapter 796, Statutes of 2023) exempts a maximum of 150 FTES from paying all or part of their nonresident tuition fees if they are low income students who are residents of Mexico who register for lower division courses at specified community colleges near the California-Mexico border and who reside within 45 miles of the California-Mexico border. This exemption is provided until January 1, 2028.

This bill seeks a similar exemption for students residing in specified communities in Oregon from paying nonresident tuition fees while attending the College of the Siskiyous.

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

AB 91 (Alvarez, Chapter 796, Statutes of 2023) exempts, until January 1, 2029, from the non-resident tuition fee, a non-resident, low-income student who is a resident of Mexico, registers for lower division courses at specified community colleges near the California-Mexico border, as defined, and has residence within 45 miles of the California-Mexico border.

AB 1998 (Smith, Chapter 495, Statutes of 2022) (1) authorizes the CCC BOG to enter into the WUE through WICHE; (2) allows small CCDs located near a bordering state to charge a lower tuition rate to out-of-state students from WUE participating states; and, (3) decreases the per-unit fee for eligible resident students from three to one and one-half times the amount established for resident students.

SB 436 (Dahle, Chapter 573, Statutes of 2021) removes the sunset date of provisions in current law, authorizing Lake Tahoe CCD to waive non-resident tuition fees and claim apportionment for a limited number of students residing in specified communities in the State of Nevada (in the Lake Tahoe Basin), thereby making the authorization permanent.

SB 605 (Gaines, Chapter 657, Statutes of 2015) exempts persons residing in specified communities in the State of Nevada from paying non-resident tuition fees if they attend Lake Tahoe CCD until July 1, 2022.

SUPPORT

College of the Siskiyous (sponsor)
Community College League of California
Fairchild Medical Center
Student Senate for California Community Colleges

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 1641	Hearing Date:	June 3, 2026
Author:	Jackson		
Version:	May 19, 2026		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Olgalilia Ramirez		

Subject: Postsecondary education: segments: tribal colleges and universities.

SUMMARY

This bill expands the statutory definition of public higher education to include tribal colleges and universities (TCUs) located in California and operated by an Indian tribal government, placing TCUs within the same statutory category as California Community Colleges (CCC), the California State University (CSU), and the University of California (UC).

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Defines, under federal law, Indian tribal government as the governing body of any tribe, band, community or group of Indians, or (if applicable) Alaska Natives, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, to exercise governmental functions. (Title 26, United States Code § 7701 (a)(40))
- 2) Establishes, under state law, the Donahoe Higher Education Act, which deems public higher education to consist of the CCCs, CSU and UC and sets forth their respective missions. (Education Code (EC) § 66010, et seq.)
- 3) Establishes, under state law, the California Private Postsecondary Education Act, which includes, for purposes of the Act, TCUs within the definition of “public higher education”. (EC § 94858.5 (b))

ANALYSIS

- 1) This bill expands, under the Donahoe Higher Education Act, the definition of public higher education to include TCUs located in California and operated by an Indian tribal government, thereby placing TCUs within the same statutory category as CCCs, the CSU, and the UC.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “California’s Tribal Colleges and Universities deserved to be recognized for their vital role in uplifting Native American students. These institutions serve as centers of identity, resilience, and opportunity that empower a historically underrepresented group to access and

thrive in higher education. By including them in the Education Code, we affirm their importance within the state and lay the foundation for long-term planning that acknowledges the essential role these institutions will continue to play in California's higher education landscape.”

- 2) ***Role of Tribal Colleges.*** A 2024 needs analysis prepared by California Indian Nations College (sponsors of the bill) as part of a feasibility study on tribal higher education in California describes TCUs as a unique higher education model developed to address longstanding access and retention challenges for Native American students. According to the report, tribal colleges emerged nationally to address access and success barriers experienced by Native students in traditional higher education settings, where institutions often lack culturally relevant academic support, Native faculty and mentors, and institutional structures that reflect Native student experiences and community connections. The report describes TCUs as serving functions beyond traditional academic instruction, including workforce development, language preservation, cultural continuity, and support for tribal self-determination. The report also cites evidence that Native students attending TCUs express stronger engagement and support than Native students in non-tribal institutions. For example, Native graduates of TCUs were stated to be twice as likely as peers in non-TCUs to report positive critical support measures during college.

As of 2023, there are 35 accredited TCUs in the country serving approximately 15,300 students. Responding to the higher education needs of Native students, TCUs serve an important role in facilitating college access and persistence for Native students. According to the report, TCUs continue to struggle with a lack of stable federal support and the decline of private funding.

- 3) ***Academic achievement gaps.*** The 2024 needs analysis also identifies persistent access and achievement gaps for Native students across California's existing public higher education systems and frames those gaps as part of the rationale for tribal higher education expansion. At the access level, Native American students remain significantly underrepresented. According to the report, only 81 Native American students enrolled as first-time freshmen in the CSU system in Fall 2022, representing far less than 1 percent of total first-time freshman enrollment, Native American students represented .5 percent of total UC enrollment that same year.

The report also identifies outcome disparities once students enroll. In the CCCs, Native student outcomes in several regions fall below statewide averages across measures such as course success rate in first year, completion of transfer level English, and persistence to the following term. The Inland Empire/Desert region, identified in the report as one of the areas served by emerging tribal college efforts, showed the largest performance gaps statewide. At the university level, the report points to similar concerns regarding continuation, persistence, and graduation outcomes for students at CSU and UC campuses. The report also notes that Native American students in California have comparatively low bachelor's degree attainment rates, with about 16 percent holding a bachelor's degree or higher. The report attributes some of these outcomes to limited availability of culturally relevant services for students in traditional institutions and

argues that TCUs are intended to address some of those barriers through a more culturally connected educational model. A stable California TCU system could potentially help address gaps in college access and student success for Native and non-native students, particularly in rural areas of the state.

- 4) ***California's Native American population.*** California has the largest Native American population in the nation, with approximately 330,000 Californians enrolled in federally recognized tribes, and that California is home to 109 federally recognized tribes roughly 20 percent of federally recognized tribes nationwide.
- 5) ***Related budget activity and California Indian Nations College.*** The 2025 Budget Act allocated \$20 million one-time General Fund to support the California Indian Nations College in Palm Desert, California. Currently, the California Indian Nations College recently earned its accreditation by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, the same accreditor used by California Community Colleges. The college is open to Native and non-Native students. Currently, the California Inland Nations College is the sole college that would be eligible for the public designation under this measure. However, the inclusion of other TCUs is possible.
- 6) ***Practical effect?*** This bill essentially creates a fourth segment of public higher education to be considered in the same category as the CCC, CSU, and UC. The bill amends the foundational definition section of the Education Code for California's public higher education framework under the Donahoe Act, in placing tribal colleges there, it's unclear whether statutes written for California public segments would, in turn, apply to tribal institutions. This change may raise broader structural questions, particularly around governance, tribal sovereignty and accountability. Each of California's public higher education systems operate within state-created governance structures while tribal institutions are chartered by their respective tribal governments. It is the intent of the sponsor of this measure that the bill's provisions do more than provide a symbolic recognition of TCUs rather act as a first step toward formal incorporation into accountability and regulatory structures applicable to California's public higher education systems. It seems reasonable for the state to formally acknowledge and recognize the important role TCUs located in California have in expanding access to higher education and serving tribal communities. *As drafted, the Committee may wish to consider how extending the same designation currently used for CCC, CSU, and UC would operate given the distinct governance structure of TCUs.*

SUPPORT

California Indian Nations College (sponsor)
California State University, Office of the Chancellor
Campaign for College Opportunity
EdTrust-West
Southwestern Community College District
University of California

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	ACA 7	Hearing Date:	June 3, 2026
Author:	Jackson		
Version:	May 26, 2026		
Urgency:		Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Olgalilia Ramirez		

Subject: Government preferences.

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

SUMMARY

This measure amends the California State Constitution, upon approval of the voters of California, by replacing “public education” with “higher education admissions and enrollment” in subdivision (a) Section 31, of Article I, which prohibits discrimination and preferential treatment on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin. It further requires that the measure appear on the ballot at the November 7, 2028, statewide general election.

BACKGROUND

United States Constitution:

- 1) Declares all people born or naturalized in the United States are citizens of the United States and are citizens of the state where they reside. Prohibits any state from making or enforcing any law that abridges the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States. Prohibits any state from depriving any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. Prohibits any state from denying any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law. (United States Constitution (USC), Amendment 14, the Equal Protection Clause)

Federal law:

- 2) No person in the United States will, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance except for specified circumstances, including membership of fraternities and sororities. (20 USC 1681-168 Title IX)
- 3) Prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or/and national origin in programs and activities receiving federal assistance. (42 USC 2000d et seq., Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964)

- 4) Prohibits discrimination in employment based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin and prohibits retaliation against employees who invoke their rights under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. (42 USC 2000e Title VII of the Civil Rights Act)

California State Constitution:

- 5) States that a person is not to be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law or denied equal protection of the laws. (Section 7 of Article 1 of the California State Constitution)
- 6) Prohibits the State, in the operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting, from discriminating against or granting preferential treatment to any individual or any group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin. States the implementation is to comply with federal laws and the USC and defines the “state” to include the public university system (including the University of California (UC)). Nothing in the aforementioned clause is to be interpreted as:
 - a) Prohibiting bona fide qualifications based on sex, which are reasonably necessary to the normal operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting.
 - b) Prohibiting action which must be taken to establish or maintain eligibility for any federal program, where ineligibility would result in a loss of federal funds to the State.
 - c) Invalidating any court order or consent decree, which is in force as of the effective date of the section. (Section 31 of Article 1 of the California State Constitution (Proposition 209))

State law:

- 7) Establishes the Donahoe Higher Education Act, setting forth the mission of the UC, California State University (CSU), and California Community Colleges (CCC); and, defines “independent institutions of higher education” as nonpublic higher education institutions that grant undergraduate degrees, graduate degrees, or both, and that are formed as nonprofit corporations in California and are accredited by an agency recognized by the United States Department of Education. (Education Code (EC) Section 66010, et seq.)
- 8) States that no person is to be subjected to discrimination on the basis of disability, gender, gender identity, gender expression, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or any characteristic listed or defined in Section 11135 of the Government Code or any other characteristic that is contained in the prohibition of hate crimes, as defined in subdivision (a) of Section 422.6 of the Penal Code, including immigration status. States the prohibition on the discrimination on the basis of the listed characteristics is extended to programs or activities conducted by any postsecondary education

institution that receives or benefits from, state financial assistance or enrolls students who receive state financial aid. (EC § 66270)

- 9) States that no person is to be subjected to discrimination on the basis of disability, gender, gender identity, gender expression, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or any other characteristic that is contained in the definition of hate crimes set forth in Section 422.55 of the Penal Code, including immigration status, in any program or activity conducted by an educational institution that receives, or benefits from, state financial assistance, or enrolls pupils who receive state student financial aid. (EC § 220)

ANALYSIS

- 1) This measure amends the California State Constitution, upon approval of the voters of California, by replacing “public education” with “higher education admissions and enrollment” in subdivision (a) Section 31, of Article I, which prohibits discrimination and preferential treatment on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin. Specifically, it:
- a) Removes “*public education*” from the list of activities which are prohibited from discriminating against or granting preferential treatment to, any individual or group, on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin.
 - b) Adds “*higher education admission and enrollment*” to the list of activities which are prohibited from discriminating against or granting preferential treatment to, any individual or group, on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin.
 - c) States that the prohibition on discrimination and the granting of preferential treatment only apply to actions of the State after the section’s effective date and is limited to the areas of public employment, higher education admission and enrollment, and public contracting.
 - d) Requires that the measure appear on the ballot at the November 7, 2028 statewide general election.
 - e) Makes various technical and clarifying changes.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) **Need for the bill.** According to the author, “ACA 7 seeks to provide clarity to existing legislation concerning Proposition 209, also known as Article I, Section 31 of the California Constitution. For too long, the provisions of this law have been subject to broad interpretation, leaving Californians without a clear understanding of its intended application. This measure introduces clarifying language and makes an adjustment to focus specifically on “higher education admissions and enrollment.” These changes will help ensure a more accurate interpretation of the state constitution, allowing its provisions to be implemented as originally intended.”

- 2) **Proposition 209.** Proposition 209, approved by voters in 1996, added Article 1, Section 31 to the California Constitution, prohibiting discrimination against or granting preferential treatment to individuals or groups on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in public employment, public education, and public contracting. Proposition 209 did not replace broader anti-discrimination protections, as state and federal constitutional equal protection guarantees and other civil rights laws continue to apply independently (outlined in the background section of this analysis). Seemingly, Proposition 209 serves as an additional constitutional limitation rather than the sole source of anti-discrimination protection. As noted in the Assembly Judiciary Committee analysis, “the language prohibiting discrimination was largely superfluous, given that the state and federal law as well as the equal protection clause of 14th Amendment, already prohibited such discrimination. What Proposition 209 effectively did was to prohibit preferential treatment which is generally understood to mean either setting quotas or, considering race as a one factor among many in someone’s qualification.”

Proposition 209 restricted affirmative action programs involving preferential treatment in the prescribed areas. According to the Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) in their review of Proposition 16 in 2020, prior to Proposition 209, state and local entities had policies and programs intended to increase opportunities and representation for people who faced inequalities as a result of their race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin. After the adoption of Proposition 209, for higher education, this meant public colleges and universities could no longer consider those characteristics in admission decisions or operate certain programs specifically designed to increase access, representation, or support for historically underrepresented student groups. After voters approved Proposition 209, some public universities created or modified policies and programs to instead consider characteristics not banned by Proposition 209.

- 3) **Related Supreme Court decisions.**
- a) *University of California v. Bakke.* In 1978, the Supreme Court ruled that a state may constitutionally consider race as a factor in its university admissions to promote educational diversity, but only if considered alongside other factors and on a case-by-case basis. The Court ruled, however, that California’s use of racial quotas in this case, did not meet those requirements and violated the Constitution’s Equal Protection Clause. The Court also ruled that the state has a legitimate and substantial interest in eliminating the disabling effects of identified discrimination.
- b) *Gratz v. Bollinger.* In 2003, the Supreme Court ruled that the University of Michigan’s undergraduate admissions policy, which automatically distributed one -fifth of the points needed to guarantee admission to every single “underrepresented minority” applicant, was not narrowly tailored to achieve the University’s asserted interest in diversity and did violate the Equal Protection Clause.

- c) *Grutter v. Bollinger*. In June 2003, the US Supreme Court ruled that the Equal Protection Clause does not prohibit the University of Michigan Law School's "narrowly tailored use of race in admissions decisions to further a compelling interest in obtaining the educational benefits that flow from a diverse student body."
 - d) *Fisher vs. University of Texas at Austin (2016)*. The US Supreme Court upheld the University of Texas's admissions policy, holding that a public university may consider race as one factor in admissions if the policy withstands strict scrutiny and is narrowly tailored to achieve the educational benefits of diversity. It held that the race-conscious admission program in use at the time of application is lawful under the Equal Protection Clause.
 - e) *Students for Fair Admissions, Inc, v, President and Fellows of Harvard College*. The US Supreme Court subsequently revisited the issue of race conscious admissions in 2023. The Supreme Court issued a decision addressing the use of race based admission policies in higher education. The US Supreme Court held that the consideration of an applicant's race as one factor in making an admission decision is unconstitutional violating the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment.
- 4) **Related ballot measure.** In 2020, the Legislature approved ACA 5 (Weber, Chapter 23, Statutes of 2020), which asked voters for full repeal of Proposition 209. ACA 5 was placed before California voters as Proposition 16 on the November 3, 2020, statewide general election ballot, where it failed passage with 57 percent of voters voting NO. The LAO noted in its fiscal analysis of the ballot measure, that it would have no direct fiscal effect on state and local entities because the measure would not require any change to current policies or programs. Instead, any fiscal effects would depend on future choices by state and local entities to implement policies or programs that consider race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in public education, public employment, and public contracting.

This measure, ACA 7, proposes a more targeted change to Proposition 209, limiting its application in public education to higher education admission and enrollment, thereby removing other K-12 and higher education activities from its scope.

According to the Assembly Judiciary Committee Analysis, "While leaving "higher education admissions and enrollment" in Article I, Section 31 is consistent with existing case law, it remains to be seen whether policies permitted under this proposed constitutional provision would violate the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment. To be clear, this measure would not – indeed, could not – by itself violate the equal protection clause; because it does not by itself discriminate against, or grant a preference to, any individual or group. It simply declares what the state cannot do; it does not say what it can or must do. The opponents of this measure, therefore, are apparently concerned that this proposed change in the state constitution might permit policies that violate the equal protection clause. If the intent of the measure is to permit K-12 to discriminate on the basis of race, or

permit colleges and universities to discriminate on the basis of race in everything other than admissions and enrollment, those policies might pass constitutional muster under the state constitution, as revised, but those policies might still violate the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment, at least as interpreted by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Students for Fair Admissions*.”

- 5) **Arguments in support.** As stated by EdTrust – West in their letter submitted to this committee, “This measure represents a critical step toward ensuring that California can finally address long-standing inequities in TK-12 public education and design race-conscious policies to close persistent achievement gaps. EdTrust-West’s *Black Minds Matter: Building Bright Black Futures* report highlights the severity of these disparities: Black students continue to face stark academic disparities, with only 3 in 10 meeting grade-level English language arts standards and math proficiency declining from 28% in third grade to just 16% by eleventh grade. Without meaningful policy change, these inequities will persist for generations. At the current pace, some estimates suggest that it will take until 2070 for all Black students to reach proficiency in reading and until 2089 for all Black students to reach proficiency in math, illustrating the profound limitations of race-neutral approaches that have failed to produce the progress students deserve. The inability to target the needs of students of color due to Prop 209’s restrictions on race-conscious policymaking has prevented California from closing racial equity gaps in educational outcomes. These gaps carry real consequences for graduation rates, college access, economic mobility, and long-term outcomes. ACA 7 directly responds to this longstanding barrier by allowing policy-makers to craft targeted, evidence-based interventions to address documented inequities that race-neutral policies alone have failed to address.”
- 6) **Arguments in opposition.** As stated by the Pacific Legal Foundation, “While ACA 7 preserves the prohibition on discrimination in higher education enrollment, it will permit the government to discriminate in all aspects of K-12 education and all other aspects pertaining to colleges and universities. This uneven and inconsistent preservation of equality and opportunity fails to fully live up to the guarantee of the equal protection of the laws under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. Adherence to the Fourteenth Amendment mandates that ‘[e]liminating racial discrimination means eliminating all of it.’ It is thus insufficient under our constitution that government cannot discriminate in higher education enrollment but can discriminate everywhere else. Opposing ACA 7 will uphold the promise of equality that Proposition 209 protects. Since the passage of Proposition 209, Californians have consistently given strong support to the constitutional prohibition on racial preferences and discrimination. In 2020, Californians defeated Proposition 16 in a landslide, rejecting an amendment to repeal Proposition 209. And in 2024, an attempt to permit broad exceptions to Proposition 209 was unsuccessful when the Legislature failed to pass ACA 7.”
- 7) **Prior legislation.**

ACA 5 (Weber, Chapter 23, Statutes of 2020) a constitutional amendment asked the voters of California to vote on repealing Proposition 209, thereby permitting the use of race, gender, and ethnic diversity as factors in college admissions, government hiring, and government contracting. ACA 5 was placed before

California voters as Proposition 16 on the November 3, 2020, statewide general election ballot, where it failed passage with 57 percent of voters voting NO.

SCA 5 (Hernández, 2013) would have asked the voters if Proposition 209 should be amended to permit the use of gender and race in UC and public school admissions. The measure was held by the Senate Desk.

SB 185 (Hernandez, 2011) stated the Legislature's intent to authorize the CSU and the UC to consider race, gender, ethnicity and national origin, geographic origin, and household income, along with other relevant factors, in undergraduate and graduate admissions, as specified, and required the CSU and requested the UC to report on the implementation of these provisions to the Legislature and Governor by November 1, 2013, as specified. SB 185 was vetoed by the Governor, whose veto message read:

***“I wholeheartedly agree with the goal of this legislation. Proposition 209 should be interpreted to allow UC and CSU to consider race and other relevant factors in their admissions policies to the extent permitted under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution. In fact, I have submitted briefs in my capacities as both Governor and Attorney General strongly urging the courts to adopt such an interpretation.*”**

“But while I agree with the goal of this legislation, I must return the bill without my signature. Our constitutional system of separation of powers requires that the courts -- not the Legislature -- determine the limits of Proposition 209. Indeed, there is already a court case pending in the 9th Circuit against the State and the UC on the same issues addressed in this bill. Signing this bill is unlikely to impact how Proposition 209 is ultimately interpreted by the courts; it will just encourage the 209 advocates to file more costly and confusing lawsuits.”

AB 2047 (Hernandez, 2010) would have authorized the CSU and the UC to consider geographic origin, household income, race, gender, ethnicity and national origin along with other relevant factors, in undergraduate and graduate admissions, and required and requested the CSU and UC, respectively, to report on the implementation of these provisions to the Legislature and Governor by November 1, 2012, as specified. AB 2047 was ultimately vetoed by the Governor, whose veto message read, in pertinent part:

“The UC and CSU systems are aware of and supportive of the important goal of student diversity and make every attempt through its comprehensive review admissions process. That process considers many of the factors contained in this legislation, but do so within current constitutional restrictions. The intent of this bill would be more appropriately addressed through a constitutional change of those current restrictions.”

ACA 23 (Hernandez, 2009) would have exempted public education institutions from the constitutional prohibitions established by Proposition 209 for the purposes of implementing student recruitment and selection programs at public postsecondary education institutions. The proposed constitutional amendment passed the Assembly Higher Education Committee by a vote of 6-1 in July 2009 and was referred to the Assembly Judiciary Committee, but was never heard.

AB 2387 (Firebaugh, 2004) would have authorized the UC and the CSU to consider culture, race, gender, ethnicity, national origin, geographic origin, and household income, along with other relevant factors, as specified, in undergraduate and graduate admissions, so long as no preference is given. AB 2387 was vetoed by the Governor, whose veto message read, in pertinent part:

“The practical implementation of the provisions of this bill would be contrary to the expressed will of the people who voted to approve Proposition 209 in 1996. Therefore, since the provisions of this bill would likely be ruled as unconstitutional, they would be more appropriately addressed through a change to the State Constitution.”

SUPPORT

A2MEND

Advanced Consulting, LLC
Berkeley Reparations Coalition
Black Educator Advocates Network
Black Parallel School Board
Black Students of California United
BLU Educational Foundation
Bulletproof Group
Californians for Justice
Californians Together
Canal Alliance
Center for Black Educator Development
Central Valley Movement Building Organizing Institute
Children Now
Chinese for Affirmative Action
Community Schools Learning Exchange
Congregations Organized for Prophetic Engagement
EdTrust-West
EdVoice
Grand Performances
Innecity Struggle
Island Grad and SBCUSD Pasifika Program
Los Angeles Urban Foundation
National Equity Project
Northern California College Promise Coalition
Parent Engagement Academy
Prismatic Research & Strategy
Public Advocates
Southeast Asia Resource Action Center

Southern California Pacific Islander Community Response Team
Students Rising Above
Teach Plus California
The Village Method
United Parents and Students
Watts of Power Foundation
Young Invincibles

OPPOSITION

Californians for Equal Rights Foundation
Elk Grove Chinese Association
Equal Rights for All Pac
San Diego Asian Americans for Equality
The American Civil Rights Project
Several Individuals

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 1659	Hearing Date:	June 3, 2026
Author:	Ransom		
Version:	March 9, 2026		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Therresa Austin		

Subject: Juvenile court school pupils: joint transition planning policy: courses of study

SUMMARY

This bill requires school districts in a juvenile court school (JCS) pupil's community to assign a district staff member to serve as the district's point person for transition liaison responsibilities.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Requires county offices of education (COEs) and county probation departments to have a joint transition planning policy to coordinate the transition of pupils between JCSs and other public schools. Requires a COE to assign transition oversight responsibilities to existing COE personnel, who shall coordinate with the county probation department and relevant local educational agencies (LEAs) to ensure:
 - a) The immediate enrollment of a pupil transferred from a JCS in an appropriate public school in their community, and their immediate placement in appropriate courses;
 - b) The transfer of education records, including an individualized education program (IEP) and pursuant to the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and the pupil's plan adopted pursuant to Section 504 of the federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973 plan, if applicable, within 72 hours of a pupil's release from a JCS;
 - c) The acceptance of full or partial course credits for coursework completed by the student while enrolled in a JCS;
 - d) The implementation of the pupil's transition plan, if one exists; and
 - e) Access to information about postsecondary opportunities, including college financial aid. (Education Code (EC) § 48647)
- 2) Requires LEAs to accept full or partial credit for coursework satisfactorily completed by a student while attending a public school, including JCS. (EC § 48645.5 and 51225.2.)

- 3) Requires LEAs to provide educational records of transferring students to their next LEA within two business days of receiving the transfer notification. The records include, among other items, a transcript updated with full or partial credit for coursework completed by the student. (EC § 49069.5)

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Requires school districts in a JCS pupil's community to assign a staff member of the school district to serve as the district point person for transition liaison responsibilities.
- 2) Requires the school district to notify the COE and county probation department of the assigned staff member's name and contact information.
- 3) Requires the assigned staff member, and other existing school district personnel as needed to serve the individual pupil, to work in collaboration with the COE transition oversight personnel throughout the calendar year to ensure all of the following:
 - a) The timely transfer of complete and accurate education records, including the pupil's IEP adopted pursuant to the federal IDEA and the pupil's plan adopted pursuant to Section 504 of the federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973, if applicable, when a pupil enters the JCS.
 - b) The immediate enrollment in an appropriate public school in the school district when a pupil is transferred from the JCS.
 - c) The acceptance, upon enrollment by the pupil in a public school, of course credits, including partial credits, for coursework completed in the JCS, as specified.
 - d) The immediate placement in appropriate courses, based on coursework completed by the pupil, as specified.
- 4) Restates existing law that requires LEAs to issue full or partial credits on an official transcript within two business days of foster youth transferring between public schools and JCSs.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, "Students who are justice-impacted are children who deserve stability, care, and support, especially during major transitions in their lives. AB 1659 provides greater support for these students by ensuring there is a designated point of contact when a student transitions back to their home school district upon release from a court school. This bill strengthens the partnership between the county office of education and the student's home district to put the student first and establish a more effective transition support system. A smooth reintegration process will reduce disruptions to these students'

education and help them stay engaged, focused on their future, and moving toward success.”

- 2) ***What is a juvenile court school?*** According to the California Department of Education (CDE), JCSs are COE operated educational programs located within juvenile detention facilities, serving youths who are under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court and are temporarily or permanently out of traditional school settings due to incarceration or legal proceedings.

Juveniles who are under the authority of the juvenile court system are required to attend school under California’s compulsory education requirements. JCS students are provided a California standards-based curriculum and must take educational assessment tests required of all students in the state’s public schools. The minimum school day for JCSs is 240 minutes of instruction. These schools offer students a course of study that leads to a high school diploma or high school equivalency certificate.

Upon release, or after the court terminates jurisdiction, students of ages sixteen to eighteen who are not exempt from compulsory school attendance are required to continue their public education. These students are provided with planning and transition services critical to a successful transfer back to a public school.

For the 2023-24 school year, CDE reported the total enrollment of 13,203 students across the state’s 51 JCSs, with a mean enrollment of 264.1 students and a median of 131 students per school.

- 3) ***JCS Transition Statewide Work Group Report and Recommendations.*** In 2014, the Legislature passed AB 2276 (Bocanegra, Chapter 901, Statutes of 2014), requiring the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI), in consultation with the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) to convene a statewide group with stakeholders from the community, advocacy organizations, and education and probation department leaders to study four specific performance areas impacting pupils transitioning from a JCS back to public schools in their community. The legislation directs the statewide work group to develop a model, study existing successful county programs and policies, report its findings, and provide recommendations for state actions to improve:
- a) Immediate transfer of educational records;
 - b) Uniform systems for calculating and awarding course credits;
 - c) Transition planning; and
 - d) Immediate enrollment of transferring pupils.

The resulting report found, among other things, that communication between COE, school district, county probation, and other stakeholders was inadequate, complete and accurate educational student records were not immediately

transferred, and school districts had difficulty complying with statutes requiring the immediate enrollment of a pupil transitioning from a JCS.

Relative to transition planning, the report makes the following recommendations, among other things:

- a) A student transition team should be established for each student and shall include, at a minimum, a representative from the COE, the pupil's resident school district, and the county probation department.
- b) The student transition team should provide each student with a plan that includes the requisite academic and behavioral actions necessary to establish a clear pathway back to a comprehensive public school in their community.
- c) Identified staff shall be accountable for providing necessary assistance and effective case management to each transitioning student. Each COE, county probation department, and school district shall have one or more individuals specifically identified as the juvenile court student transition liaison/specialist. The transition liaison/specialist from each agency should coordinate their efforts to ensure successful student transition.
- d) Accurate student records shall be available for all students transitioning into and out of a juvenile court facility.
- e) A transitioning student from a JCS shall be immediately enrolled, regardless of the availability of academic records, among other things.
- f) Each school district shall identify one or more persons responsible for ensuring the immediate enrollment of a student transitioning from a juvenile court facility.
- g) School districts and COEs should adopt and comply with the California Model Policy, which provides a partial credit calculation formula, explanations of the policy's provisions, and implementation tools for use by school personnel and social workers.

In the years following the release of the report, several recommendations have gone on to be codified, including requirements for COEs to ensure that a student enrolled in a JCS for more than 20 school days has an individualized transition plan, and that COEs specifically assign personnel to collaborate with county probation departments to be responsible for transition oversight.

This bill seeks to implement another area of recommendations made by the report, namely, for school districts to assign a staff member to serve as the district point person for transition liaison responsibilities.

4) ***Related and prior legislation.***

AB 2181 (Gipson, Chapter 703, Statutes of 2024) requires a JCS operated by a COE to exempt a student from local graduation requirements of the COE, and to permit a student to remain enrolled to complete statewide coursework requirements for graduation, under specified conditions.

AB 1354 (Gipson, Chapter 756, Statutes of 2019) requires COEs to ensure that a student enrolled in a JCS for more than 20 school days has an individualized transition plan and access to specified educational records upon release.

AB 1124 (Cervantes, Chapter 754, Statutes of 2017) permits the education rights holders of students enrolled in JCSs to voluntarily defer or decline the issuance of a diploma for meeting state graduation requirements so that a student may take additional coursework at the JCS or, once released, at a school operated by an LEA.

AB 2276 (Bocanegra, Chapter 901, Statutes of 2014) required the SPI, in consultation with the BSCC, to convene a statewide stakeholder group to develop a model for the immediate transfer of educational records, uniform systems for calculating and awarding credits, transition planning, and the immediate enrollment of pupils who are being transferred from JCSs; and report recommendations for state action to the Legislature by January 1, 2016.

SUPPORT

Alameda County Office of Education (sponsor)
Association of California School Administrators
Back to the Start
California Alliance of Child and Family Services
California County Superintendents
California Teachers Association
Children Now
Disability Rights California
East Bay Community Law Center
Fresh Lifelines for Youth
Los Angeles County Office of Education
National Center for Youth Law
Office of the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools
Santa Clara County Office of Education
Yolo County Board of Education

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 1713	Hearing Date:	June 3, 2026
Author:	Ransom		
Version:	March 16, 2026		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Ian Johnson		

Subject: Public postsecondary education: students with disabilities: verification: academic accommodations.

SUMMARY

This bill requires the California Community Colleges (CCCs) and the California State University (CSU), and requests the University of California (UC), to accept a student's individualized education program (IEP) or Section 504 plan as verification of disability for purposes of requesting academic accommodations. The bill also prohibits public postsecondary institutions from requiring students to obtain new or additional diagnostic evaluations solely to verify a disability, while authorizing institutions to request supplemental information necessary to determine appropriate accommodations.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability under Section 504 of the federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and requires entities receiving federal financial assistance, including public postsecondary institutions, to provide equal access to educational opportunities for individuals with disabilities.
- 2) Prohibits discrimination against individuals with disabilities under the federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
- 3) Prohibits postsecondary educational institutions that receive state financial assistance from discriminating on the basis of disability or other protected characteristics.
- 4) Defines "disability" for purposes of the Equity in Higher Education Act to mean a mental or physical disability.
- 5) Expresses legislative intent to provide funding for Disabled Student Programs and Services (DSPS) at the CCCs, including funding for disability-related counseling, mobility assistance, interpreter services, testing accommodations, specialized tutoring, and other supports for students with disabilities.
- 6) Requires, beginning in fall 2026, the CSU to establish, and requests the UC and independent institutions to establish, a Disability Access and Compliance

Training Program to ensure campus personnel understand their legal responsibilities related to accommodations for students with disabilities.

- 7) Provides that provisions of the Donahoe Higher Education Act do not apply to the UC unless adopted by the Regents.

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Defines the following terms for purposes of the bill:
 - a) "504 plan" to mean a plan adopted pursuant to Section 504 of the federal Rehabilitation Act of 1974.
 - b) "IEP" to mean an individualized education program adopted pursuant to state and federal special education law.
 - c) "Local educational agency" to mean a school district, county office of education, or charter school.
 - d) "Public higher education institution" to mean a campus of the CCCs, the CSU, or the UC.
- 2) Requires, beginning September 1, 2027, a public higher education institution that requires documentation to verify a student's disability for purposes of academic accommodations to accept an IEP, a Section 504 plan, or both, issued by a local educational agency (LEA), as verification of the student's disability.
- 3) Prohibits, beginning September 1, 2027, a public higher education institution from requiring a student to obtain a new or additional diagnostic evaluation to verify a disability if the student has provided an IEP or Section 504 plan documenting the disability.
- 4) Authorizes a public higher education institution to request supplemental information from a student with an IEP or Section 504 plan solely for purposes of determining appropriate accommodations necessary to ensure equal access to the institution's academic requirements.
- 5) Prohibits a public higher education institution from using supplemental information to invalidate or dispute a student's disability as documented in the student's IEP or Section 504 plan.
- 6) Requires implementation of the bill to be consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and Section 504 of the federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973.
- 7) Specifies that the bill does not apply to a public higher education institution's implementation of Title IX of the federal Education Amendments of 1972.
- 8) Applies the bill's provisions to the UC, contingent upon action by the Regents.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “AB 1713 is focused on providing students with disabilities recognition of their unique needs to ensure they are able to participate in California’s world-renowned higher education system without difficulty or discrimination. AB 1713 will require institutions of higher education to accept a student’s diagnosis from their IEP or Section 504 Plan from their previous educational institution, fast-tracking their access to the accommodations they need and allowing them to spend more time in the classroom and less time in the doctor’s office.”

- 2) ***Standardizing the disability verification practices across California’s public higher education systems.*** This bill addresses the documentation process students with disabilities encounter when seeking accommodations in higher education. Under current practice, postsecondary institutions may establish their own standards regarding what documentation is necessary to verify a disability and determine eligibility for accommodations. As a result, documentation standards and verification practices may vary across campuses and higher education segments.

This bill would establish a statewide standard requiring public postsecondary institutions to accept an IEP or Section 504 plan as sufficient documentation that a disability exists, while still preserving institutional discretion to determine appropriate accommodations in the higher education environment.

- 3) ***K-12 and higher education disability systems serve different legal and operational purposes.*** The provisions of this bill operate between two distinct disability accommodation systems. In the K-12 system, schools are responsible for identifying students with disabilities, evaluating eligibility, and proactively developing plans and services intended to support student success. By contrast, higher education institutions generally operate under an access-based framework in which students self-identify, request accommodations, and participate in an interactive process to determine reasonable accommodations.

As a result, while IEPs and Section 504 plans may establish the existence of a disability, the accommodations provided in K-12 settings do not necessarily translate directly into the postsecondary environment. This bill appears to acknowledge that distinction by requiring institutions to accept these documents for disability verification purposes, while still permitting institutions to request supplemental information necessary to determine reasonable accommodations at the college level.

- 4) ***Could reduce duplicative evaluation costs and administrative burdens for some students.*** Students with disabilities transitioning from the K-12 system into higher education may encounter differing institutional documentation requirements when seeking accommodations. In some cases, students who previously received services pursuant to an IEP or Section 504 plan may nonetheless be asked to obtain updated medical or psychoeducational evaluations to verify a disability in the postsecondary setting.

This bill would establish greater consistency across California's public higher education systems by requiring institutions to recognize existing K-12 disability documentation as sufficient verification of a disability. To the extent students would otherwise be required to obtain additional evaluations solely for verification purposes, the bill could reduce both administrative burdens and out-of-pocket costs associated with securing accommodations.

At the same time, the bill preserves institutional authority to request supplemental information necessary to determine reasonable accommodations in the postsecondary environment, recognizing that accommodations appropriate in K-12 settings may not always translate directly to higher education coursework, instructional models, or campus environments.

- 5) ***Implementation may require institutions to clarify documentation and accommodation procedures.*** Although the bill establishes that an IEP or Section 504 plan must be accepted as verification of a disability, it does not establish standards regarding the age, completeness, or specificity of those documents. In practice, documentation contained within IEPs and Section 504 plans may vary depending on the nature of the disability, the age of the student, and the practices of the originating LEA.

As institutions implement the bill, public higher education segments may need to further clarify what types of supplemental information may appropriately be requested for accommodation planning purposes, particularly in situations where a student's educational needs, course of study, or functional limitations have changed since the issuance of the original plan.

SUPPORT

California Association for Postsecondary Education and Disabilities
California Community Colleges, Chancellor's Office
Southwestern Community College District

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 1829	Hearing Date:	June 3, 2026
Author:	Fong		
Version:	April 6, 2026		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Michelle Nguyen		

Subject: Community colleges: CalWORKs Recipients Education Program: services.

SUMMARY

This bill allows the California Community Colleges (CCCs) to use funds appropriated for the CalWORKs Recipients Education Program for direct aid designed to meet ongoing basic needs services and resources, as specified. This bill also allows CCCs to waive the requirement for employers to contribute 25% of the wage for workstudy positions funded by the program if the number of on-campus and off-campus workstudy positions will not decrease.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the CalWORKs Recipients Education Program within the CCC system, and states it is the intent of the Legislature that the services provided by the program assist CalWORKs recipients prepare for employment. (Education Code (EC) § 79200 and 79201)
- 2) Requires, to the extent that funding is provided in the annual Budget Act, a CCC to receive funding for educational services provided to CalWORKs recipients based on the number of CalWORKs recipients enrolled at the CCC and the scope and number of programs that the college plans to offer to assist CalWORKs recipients obtain employment. (EC § 79202)
- 3) Authorizes, to the extent that funding is provided in the annual Budget Act, a CCC to use funding received for curriculum development and design for CalWORKs recipients for all of the following purposes:
 - a) To develop or redesign vocational curricula for CalWORKs recipients so that courses may be offered as part of a short-term intensive program.
 - b) To link CalWORKs courses to job placement through work experience and internships.
 - c) To redesign basic education and English as a second language courses so that they may be integrated into vocational training programs.
 - d) To expand the use of telecommunications in providing the new curricula to CalWORKs recipients. (EC § 79203)

- 4) Requires, to the extent that funding is provided in the annual Budget Act, a community college district (CCD) to receive funding for purposes of providing special services to CalWORKs recipients, to assist CalWORKs recipient students and those students transitioning off CalWORKs in achieving long-term self-sufficiency through coordinated student services offered at a CCC. (EC § 79204)
- 5) Authorizes that special services may include any of the following services: a) job placement; b) coordination with county welfare offices and other local agencies, including, but not limited to, local workforce investment boards; c) child care and workstudy; d) instruction; e) postemployment skills training and related skills training; and f) campus-based case management, as specified. (EC § 79204)
- 6) Requires that funds allocated for the purposes of workstudy be used for payments to those employers that currently participate in campus-based workstudy programs or are providing work experiences that are directly related to and in furtherance of student educational programs and work participation requirements. Requires the specified payments not exceed 75% of the wage for the workstudy positions and that employers pay at least 25% of the wage for the workstudy positions. (EC § 79205)
- 7) Requires that funds allocated for the CalWORKs Recipients Education Program shall be budgeted to meet the state's Temporary Assistance for Needy Families maintenance of effort requirement, as defined, and may not be expended in any way that would cause their disqualification as a federally allowable maintenance of effort expenditure. (EC § 79209)

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Allows CCCs to use funds appropriated for the CalWORKs Recipients Education Program for direct aid designed to meet ongoing basic needs services and resources, which includes, but is not limited to, housing, food, clothing, feminine hygiene, diapers, technology, childcare services and resources, and mental health services and resources.
- 2) Allows CCCs to waive the requirement for employers to contribute 25% of the wage for workstudy positions for workstudy funded by the program if the number of on-campus and off-campus workstudy positions will not decrease.
- 3) Requires that special services provided through the CalWORKs Recipients Education Program assist CalWORKs recipient students and those students transitioning off CalWORKs in achieving *economic mobility*, in addition to *long-term self-sufficiency*.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, "Supporting students' essential needs is fundamental to long-term self-efficiency. ... [CalWORKs] REP students are typically single parents with childcare needs who may be unable to visit the college

computer lab during evenings and weekends due to work and family responsibilities. Currently, CalWORKs REP funding has limited flexibility to provide students with direct financial support through aid payments, vouchers, or reimbursements. As a result, colleges face constraints in providing adequate resources and support to CalWORKs REP students. ... AB 1829 strengthens financial support for low-income student-parents participating in the California Community Colleges CalWORKs Recipient Education Program (REP) by allowing the use of existing program funds to provide basic needs assistance.

In addition, CalWORKs REP requires employers that offer work-study to recipients to provide a 25% match for work-study wages. This requirement often serves as a disincentive for employers to participate in the work-study program, particularly off-campus employers. As a result, students may have fewer opportunities to secure work-study placements that align with their educational and professional goals. ... The bill expands access to off-campus work-study opportunities through employer match flexibility.”

- 2) ***CalWORKs Recipients Education Program purpose and funding.*** According to the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO) 2019 report on the CalWORKs Recipients Education Program, “in fiscal year 1997-98, the California Community Colleges received \$65 million in new funding to establish a CalWORKs program on every campus. Colleges were to utilize the funds to work in partnership with their local county welfare departments to assist welfare recipient students in achieving long-term family self-sufficiency through education, the provision of work study and other supportive services.” However, these funds were significantly reduced during state budget deficits in 2002 and 2009.

The 2014 Budget Act codified the CalWORKs Recipients Education Program within the CCC system, with the services provided by the program intended to assist CalWORKs recipients prepare for employment, and provided funding of \$35.5 million. As of the 2025 Budget Act, the program is funded at a level of \$56.9 million and receives an annual cost-of-living adjustment.

The program served 25,200 students who were CalWORKs recipients in 2024-25, bouncing back from a low of 11,000 students in 2021-22, and the program allocates funding for the following services described in statute: job placement; coordination with county welfare offices and other local agencies, such as local workforce investment boards; childcare and workstudy; instruction; postemployment skills training; and campus-based case management.

- 3) ***Growing statewide fund balance for CalWORKs Recipients Education Program.*** The CCCCCO states that fund balances for the CalWORKs Recipients Education Program have grown in the recent years and are currently roughly \$30 million across the CCC system. Program funds were able to carry over funds across years starting in 2019-20, and a growing balance has been attributed to enrollment declines that took place during the COVID-19 Pandemic. To be eligible for this program, a student must be a CalWORKs recipient and enrolled in CCC coursework, and many CalWORKs recipients were unable to enroll in online classes because they were caring for children who had to stay home during the pandemic.

In addition, there was a significant influx of federal COVID relief funds to support higher education systems during the pandemic, and it is likely that CCDs were spending down their federal COVID relief funds in the early years of the pandemic, which may have created larger than usual fund balances for this program. The author proposes to amend the CalWORKs Recipients Education Program to expand how the program funds can be spent, in part to address the significant fund balance for this program.

- 4) ***Current prohibition on providing direct aid for this program with Proposition 98 funds.*** In 2024-25, the CalWORKs Recipients Education Program was funded at \$63.6 million, which was comprised of \$55.6 million in Proposition 98 General Fund and \$8 million in federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families funds. Of this total, roughly \$4.9 million was spent on direct student support, all of which were paid with federal funds, and the CCCCCO's legal team indicates that colleges are unable to use state funding for this program for direct aid without it being explicitly authorized in statute. Many other CCC categorical programs are permitted to use their funds for direct aid. Any aid provided for a student, including direct aid provided by the CalWORKs Recipients Education Program, counts toward a student's financial aid package, and the amount of aid provided for a student would not be able to exceed that student's unmet need, as defined by federal financial aid rules.
- 5) ***Employer contribution to workstudy positions.*** An eligible use of funds from the CalWORKs Recipients Education Program is to pay for workstudy positions for students who are CalWORKs recipients. Ideally, a student's workstudy position under this program is aligned with their educational goals, and that may include for-profit and non-profit employers who are on-campus or off-campus. Under existing law, funds from the program would fund 75% of the workstudy position wages, and an employer would contribute the remaining 25% of the workstudy position wages. According to the CCCCCO, it can be difficult to get off-campus employers to agree to participate in workstudy, and allowing the employer contribution of 25% to be waived (and otherwise paid for by the program) would help encourage more off-campus employers to participate.

In 2024-25, the CalWORKs Recipients Education Program spent \$5.8 million on workstudy positions, funding 2,374 positions for 1,141 students. Of these workstudy assignments, 57% of the positions required students to work between 20 and 30 hours per week, and 36% of the positions required students to work between 10 and 20 hours per week.

- 6) ***Committee amendments.*** *Committee staff recommends, and the author's office has accepted, amendments as follows:*
 - a) Remove the word "ongoing" from the phrase "ongoing basic needs services and resources".
 - b) Add Assemblymember Schiavo as a coauthor to this bill.

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

AB 363 (Bryan, 2025) would have expanded participation in the CalWORKs Recipients Education Program, would have allowed CCDs to waive the requirement for employers to contribute 25% of the wage for workstudy positions funded by the program, and would have authorized direct aid as an eligible use of funding. AB 363 is similar to AB 1829, except that AB 1829 does not have the same provisions to expand participation in the CalWORKs Recipients Education Program. AB 363 was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

SB 860 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 34, Statutes of 2014) establishes the CalWORKs Recipients Education Program within the CCC system, and states it is the intent of the Legislature that the services provided by the program assist CalWORKs recipients prepare for employment.

SUPPORT

California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (sponsor)
 Cabrillo Community College District
 CalWORKs Program at San Bernardino Valley College
 Chaffey Community College District
 Clovis Community College
 College of Marin
 College of the Canyons
 Faculty Association of California Community Colleges
 Feather River College
 Fresno City College CalWORKs Program
 Gavilan College
 Glendale Community College District CalWORKs Office
 Kern Community College District
 Los Angeles Trade-Technical College
 Merritt College
 Norco College
 Reedley College CalWORKs Program
 Rio Hondo College
 Riverside Community College District
 San Diego College of Continuing Education
 San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership
 San Jose-Evergreen Community College District
 Southwestern Community College District Governing Board
 Student Senate for California Community Colleges
 West Los Angeles College
 Woodland Community College CalWORKs Program
 Several Individuals

OPPOSITION

None received

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No: AB 2726 **Hearing Date:** June 3, 2026
Author: Fong
Version: April 13, 2026
Urgency: No **Fiscal:** No
Consultant: Ian Johnson

Subject: School facilities: disposal of surplus technology property.

SUMMARY

This bill authorizes school districts, county offices of education (COEs), and community college districts to establish streamlined processes for disposing of surplus technology property, including through online auctions, trade-in or buyback programs, negotiated sales, and donations, while requiring governing boards to adopt policies addressing competition, data security, and environmentally responsible disposal practices.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Authorizes the governing board of a school district or community college district to sell personal property that is no longer needed, is being replaced, or is unsuitable for school use, subject to specified notice and bidding requirements.
- 2) Authorizes school districts to conduct sales of personal property through public auction, including auctions conducted by private auction firms.
- 3) Authorizes school districts to sell low-value personal property through private sale or donate property that lacks sufficient value to justify sale costs.
- 4) Authorizes school districts to dispose of personal property for replacement purposes through bid processes that include trade-in credits toward replacement equipment.
- 5) Requires proceeds from the sale of school district personal property to be deposited into specified district funds.
- 6) Prohibits a county superintendent of schools from disposing of COE personal property valued over \$25,000 without an independent valuation, public advertisement, county board review, and county board approval.
- 7) Requires county superintendents of schools to report dispositions of COE personal property valued under \$25,000 to the county board of education through quarterly reports.

- 8) Requires school districts to maintain an inventory of equipment exceeding specified value thresholds, including information regarding acquisition, location, and disposal.

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Authorizes school districts, COEs, and community college districts to declare district-owned technology to be “surplus technology property.”
- 2) Authorizes surplus technology property to be disposed of through any of the following methods if authorized by locally adopted governing board policy:
 - a) Public auction, including online auctions;
 - b) Sealed bid sales;
 - c) Structured trade-in or buyback programs with vendors or manufacturers;
 - d) Negotiated sales to public agencies, nonprofit organizations, or private entities when determined to be in the best interest of the educational agency and reasonably calculated to yield fair market value; and
 - e) Donations to public agencies or nonprofit public benefit corporations.
- 3) Requires governing boards, prior to disposing of surplus technology property, to adopt policies and procedures that address:
 - a) Determinations that technology is no longer needed or suitable for use;
 - b) Competition or market testing requirements;
 - c) Compliance with state and federal student and employee data privacy requirements, including device wiping and data sanitization; and
 - d) Compliance with restrictions attached to state or federal categorical funding sources.
- 4) Requires school districts, COEs, and community college districts, to the extent practicable, to structure technology disposal practices in ways that:
 - a) Maximize financial return or value; and
 - b) Minimize electronic waste while promoting recycling, refurbishment, and reuse.
- 5) Specifies that the bill does not limit any existing authority related to the disposal of personal property.

- 6) Defines “technology” broadly to include electronic, digital, or electromechanical equipment and associated software, licenses, or services used for instructional, administrative, operational, facilities, public safety, laboratory, or related purposes.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “Today’s students rely on technology to learn and teachers use multimedia channels for teaching. School districts that do not upgrade technology disadvantage teachers and students when equipment break down, operate inefficiently, or do not contain the most modern programs. Existing law establishes a process for disposing surplus real property such as school buildings or land, but does not provide a process for disposing surplus technology such as computers or laptops. AB 2627 establishes a process for school districts, county offices of education and California Community College Districts to dispose surplus technology, including the opportunity to participate in trade-in or buy back programs. These programs help reduce waste while allowing school districts to leverage surplus property to reduce costs for new equipment.”

- 2) ***Modern technology procurement cycles may not align neatly with traditional surplus property statutes.*** Existing law governing the disposal of school and community college personal property was largely developed around conventional surplus assets and traditional public sale processes. Educational technology, however, operates differently than many other forms of district property. Devices such as laptops, tablets, servers, networking equipment, and instructional technology systems often depreciate rapidly, are replaced on short refresh cycles, and may retain more value within vendor trade-in or buyback arrangements than through traditional auction processes.

As schools and colleges have become increasingly dependent on technology for instruction, administration, testing, communication, and campus operations, local educational agencies (LEAs) have begun using procurement practices that resemble those commonly used in the private sector and broader public procurement environments. This bill appears intended to clarify that LEAs may use more flexible and modern disposal methods for outdated technology equipment, while still requiring local governing board oversight and policy adoption.

- 3) ***The bill reflects the growing scale of technology management responsibilities within LEAs.*** LEAs now manage large inventories of devices and technology infrastructure that, in many cases, did not exist when California’s surplus property statutes were originally enacted. One-to-one student device programs, classroom technology integration, cybersecurity infrastructure, audiovisual systems, surveillance systems, and remote learning investments have significantly increased both the volume and complexity of technology assets maintained by schools and colleges.

Managing these assets involves more than simply disposing of obsolete equipment. LEAs must balance fiscal stewardship, data security, environmental

considerations, and operational continuity when replacing technology systems. This bill attempts to create a more tailored statutory framework specifically for surplus technology property, rather than relying exclusively on broader personal property disposal statutes that may not fully contemplate the operational realities of modern educational technology management.

- 4) ***Data security considerations distinguish technology disposal from other forms of surplus property.*** Unlike many other forms of district property, surplus technology may contain sensitive student, employee, or operational data. Improper disposal practices can create cybersecurity and privacy risks, particularly when devices contain stored records, login credentials, communications, or access to cloud-based systems.

For this reason, the bill requires governing boards to adopt policies addressing secure data deletion, device wiping, and verification of sanitization prior to transfer to third parties. These provisions recognize that technology disposal is not solely a property management issue, but also a data governance and information security issue. As LEAs continue to experience increased cybersecurity threats and heightened responsibilities regarding student data privacy, these requirements may help ensure that more flexible disposal authority is accompanied by appropriate safeguards.

- 5) ***This bill raises broader questions regarding sustainability and lifecycle management of educational technology.*** California schools and colleges replace substantial quantities of electronic equipment on a recurring basis. As technology refresh cycles accelerate, educational agencies face increasing pressure to manage electronic waste responsibly while also maximizing the residual value of aging equipment.

This bill encourages recycling, refurbishment, reuse, and trade-in arrangements that may both reduce disposal costs and extend the useful life of technology equipment. In practice, some devices that no longer meet the operational needs of a school district or community college may still retain educational or charitable value elsewhere. The bill's authorization for negotiated sales and donations may create additional pathways for reuse while also helping educational agencies recover value from outdated equipment.

At the same time, the bill maintains guardrails requiring competition or market testing and fair value considerations, reflecting the Legislature's longstanding interest in ensuring public assets are disposed of transparently and in the public interest.

SUPPORT

Foothill-De Anza Community College District (sponsor)

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 1860	Hearing Date:	June 3, 2026
Author:	McKinnor		
Version:	April 13, 2026		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Ian Johnson		

Subject: School facilities: design-build: alternative design-build: county superintendents of schools.

SUMMARY

This bill authorizes county superintendents of schools to use the same design-build and alternative design-build procurement methods currently available to school districts for eligible public works projects, including awarding contracts based on either lowest responsible bidder or best value.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Authorizes a school district, with approval of its governing board, to use the design-build procurement method for public works projects in excess of \$1 million.
- 2) Authorizes a school district to award a design-build contract based on either lowest responsible bidder or best value, as specified.
- 3) Requires specified information submitted as part of a design-build proposal to be verified under penalty of perjury.
- 4) Requires school district design-build projects to comply with various labor and workforce requirements, including the use of a skilled and trained workforce for work falling within apprenticeable occupations in the building and construction trades.
- 5) Authorizes a school district, until January 1, 2029, to use the alternative design-build procurement method for public works projects in excess of \$5 million.
- 6) Defines “alternative design-build” as a project delivery process in which both the design and construction of a project are procured from a single design-build entity based on specified project cost components.
- 7) Defines “best value” for purposes of design-build procurement as a value determined through objective criteria that may include price, experience, project features, functions, and lifecycle costs.

- 8) Authorizes certain county boards of education to acquire, lease, lease-purchase, hold, and convey real property for purposes related to housing county office operations and services.

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Authorizes a county superintendent of schools to procure design-build contracts for public works projects in excess of \$1 million, subject to the same requirements currently applicable to school districts.
- 2) Authorizes a county superintendent of schools to award design-build contracts based on either lowest responsible bidder or best value.
- 3) Authorizes a county superintendent of schools to procure alternative design-build contracts for public works projects in excess of \$5 million, subject to the same requirements currently applicable to school districts.
- 4) Applies to county offices of education (COEs) the existing statutory framework governing school district design-build and alternative design-build procurement processes, including requirements related to contractor prequalification, proposal evaluation, labor compliance, and use of a skilled and trained workforce.
- 5) Provides that, notwithstanding any other law, a county superintendent of schools has exclusive authority to award design-build and alternative design-build contracts on behalf of a COE and county board of education.
- 6) Declares that the bill addresses a matter of statewide concern and therefore applies to all counties, including charter counties.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “AB 1860 would authorize design-build and progressive design-build for COE, align COE authority with K–12 districts and community colleges, and improve project coordination, reduce delays, and increase efficiency. This bill would also preserve all applicable prevailing wage and labor standards, such as public works contractor registration, apprenticeship utilization, and the use of a skilled and trained workforce. In addition, AB 1860 would ensure long-term workforce development in the skilled trades on COE projects by continuing to provide meaningful on-the-job training hours and prevent dishonest contractors who cut corners on wages, safety, or training from bypassing apprenticeship obligations.”
- 2) ***Extends existing K-12 facilities procurement authority to COEs.*** This bill largely seeks to place COEs on equal footing with school districts with respect to facilities procurement authority. Existing law already authorizes school districts and community college districts to utilize design-build procurement methods for certain large public works projects. This bill extends that same authority to county superintendents of schools acting on behalf of COEs.

Under a traditional “design-bid-build” model, a public entity separately contracts for design and construction services, often resulting in a sequential process in which construction cannot begin until design is substantially complete. By contrast, design-build procurement consolidates responsibility for both design and construction within a single entity. Supporters argue this can reduce project fragmentation, accelerate timelines, reduce change orders, and improve coordination between architects, engineers, and contractors.

- 3) ***Alternative design-build authority remains time-limited under existing law.*** This bill also extends to COEs the alternative design-build authority currently available to school districts until January 1, 2029. Alternative design-build, sometimes referred to as “progressive design-build,” differs from traditional design-build in that project costs continue to be negotiated after initial contract award and after portions of the design process have begun. Under existing law, school districts utilizing this authority must report specified project information to the Legislature by January 1, 2028.

Unlike traditional low-bid procurement models, both design-build and alternative design-build allow contracts to be awarded based on “best value” criteria that may include experience, qualifications, project approach, lifecycle costs, and other non-price factors. Supporters contend this flexibility is particularly useful for complex facilities projects where project coordination and long-term performance are important considerations.

- 4) ***Preserves existing labor and workforce standards.*** The bill does not create a new procurement framework for COEs, but instead imports the same statutory requirements already applicable to school district design-build projects. As such, projects procured pursuant to this authority would remain subject to existing prevailing wage laws, apprenticeship requirements, contractor registration requirements, and skilled and trained workforce requirements.

Supporters view these workforce provisions as important safeguards against contractors undercutting labor standards or bypassing apprenticeship obligations.

- 5) ***Clarifies governance authority for county office projects.*** The bill additionally specifies that county superintendents of schools have exclusive authority to award design-build and alternative design-build contracts on behalf of COEs and county boards of education. This provision appears intended to avoid ambiguity regarding whether such authority would otherwise reside with a county board of education, particularly given the differing governance structures that exist among county offices statewide.
- 6) ***Arguments in Support.*** The District Council 16, International Union of Painters and Allied Trades, writes, “County Offices of Education (COE) are responsible for building and maintaining some of the most complex and specialized educational facilities in the state. However, COE lack access to modern project delivery tools widely used across public education. Without design-build authority, COE face delays, higher costs, and fragmented oversight of projects. As COE construction needs grow, there is a risk that some contractors could exploit gaps in

procurement authority to undercut wages, safety laws, and apprenticeship standards.

AB 1860 would authorize design-build and progressive design-build for COE, align COE authority with K–12 districts and community colleges, and improve project coordination, reduce delays, and increase efficiency. This bill would also preserve all applicable prevailing wage and labor standards, such as public works contractor registration, apprenticeship utilization, and the AB 1860 Page 3 use of a skilled and trained workforce. In addition, AB 1860 would ensure long-term workforce development in the skilled trades on COE projects by continuing to provide meaningful on-the-job training hours and preventing dishonest contractors who cut corners on wages, safety, or training from bypassing apprenticeship obligations.”

SUPPORT

District Council 16, International Union of Painters and Allied Trades (co-sponsor)
State Building and Construction Trades Council (co-sponsor)
American Council of Engineering Companies of California
California Federation of Labor Unions
California State Association of Electrical Workers
California State Pipe Trades Council
Western States Council Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation

OPPOSITION

Associated General Contractors, California Chapters
Western Electrical Contractors Association

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No: AB 1920 **Hearing Date:** June 3, 2026
Author: Mark González and Ahrens
Version: February 12, 2026
Urgency: No **Fiscal:** Yes
Consultant: Michelle Nguyen

Subject: Community colleges: California College Promise: fee waiver eligibility.

SUMMARY

This bill prohibits a community college from deeming a student ineligible for a fee waiver under the California College Promise program if a student was awarded a certificate by a postsecondary educational institution as part of a course sequence leading to an associate degree.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the California Community Colleges (CCCs), under the administration of the Board of Governors (BOG), as one of the segments of public postsecondary education in this state. (Education Code (EC) § 70900)
- 2) Requires community college districts (CCDs) to charge students an enrollment fee of \$46 per unit per semester. (EC § 76300)
- 3) Requires a waiver of enrollment fees for students who meet specified income requirements based on any of the following criteria:
 - a) At the time of enrollment, the student is a recipient of benefits under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program, the Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment Program, or a general assistance program.
 - b) Demonstrates eligibility according to income standards established by regulations of the BOG.
 - c) Demonstrates financial need in accordance with the methodology set forth in federal law or regulation for determining the expected family contribution of students seeking financial aid.
 - d) At the time of enrollment, the student is a homeless youth or former homeless youth. (EC § 76300)
- 4) Additionally provides for a waiver of fees for certain types of students, including:

- a) Dependents or surviving spouses of California National Guard members, either killed or who died from a permanent disability, as a result of service to the state.
 - b) A surviving spouse or child of a California law enforcement officer or firefighter killed in the performance of active law enforcement or fire suppression duties or who died as a result of performing those duties.
 - c) The dependent of any California resident killed in the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks.
 - d) The child of a United States military veteran who has a service-connected disability, or was killed in action, or died of a service-connected disability.
 - e) The child of a recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor. (EC § 66025.3)
- 5) Establishes the California College Promise, under the administration of the Chancellor of the CCCs, and requires the Chancellor, upon appropriation by the Legislature, to distribute funding to CCDs to fund colleges that meet specified requirements. (EC § 76396)
 - 6) Authorizes a community college to use funding appropriated for the California College Promise to waive some or all of the fees for two academic years for first-time community college students and returning community college students, as defined, and who complete and submit either a Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) or a California Dream Act application (CADAA). (EC § 76396.3)
 - 7) Prohibits a student who has previously earned a degree or certificate from a postsecondary educational institution from being eligible for a fee waiver from California College Promise funding. (EC § 76396.3)

ANALYSIS

This bill prohibits a community college from deeming a student ineligible for a fee waiver under the California College Promise program if a student was awarded a certificate by a postsecondary educational institution as part of a course sequence leading to an associate degree.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “AB 1920 clarifies eligibility rules under the California College Promise Program to ensure that first-time, full-time community college students are not penalized for earning certificates while progressing toward a degree.

Under the current interpretation of Education Code Section 76396.3, students who receive the AB 19 Community College Promise fee waiver lose eligibility if they earn any degree or certificate while enrolled—even when that credential is part of a

longer program of study. ... Many community college programs are intentionally designed with stackable or nested credentials, allowing students to earn certificates along the pathway to an associate degree. These interim awards provide workforce value and recognize academic milestones.

As a result, students on this fee waiver that are working towards Associate's degrees for transfer and earning a certificate from the college on that academic journey, lose access to this program without completing their Associate's degrees. This ambiguity in the law penalizes students for academic success and discourages colleges from recognizing their hard work."

- 2) **Statutory fees and fee waivers for the CCC system.** At \$46 per unit, and with an annual average tuition of \$1,380 for full-time California resident students, the CCC system offers the lowest tuition in the nation, as of February 2026. Enrollment fees are waived for CCC students demonstrating financial need, which was almost half of CCC students, or over 1 million students, in 2024-25. For decades, this waiver was known as the BOG fee waiver and has existed since CCC enrollment fees were established in 1984. The fee waiver has since been renamed the California College Promise Grant—not to be confused with the separate California College Promise Program. A CCC student meeting specified income standards may qualify and may receive the waiver, so long as they are eligible to take courses; there is no minimum unit requirement, and the fee waiver is applied to any course for which a student must pay the enrollment fee.
- 3) **"Free College" for first-time, full-time students through the California College Promise.** The California College Promise was established by AB 19 (Santiago, Chapter 735, Statutes of 2017). The program, broadly marketed as providing "free college", allowed participating CCCs to waive some or all enrollment fees for one academic year for first-time, full-time community college students who completed and submitted a FAFSA or CADAA. Unlike the statutory fee waivers for CCC students demonstrating financial need, the California College Promise allowed CCCs to waive fees for students who did not demonstrate financial need but met other program criteria. Though some have critiqued the California College Promise for not being a means-tested program, others have indicated that the "free college" marketing have created interest and enthusiasm in CCCs that exceeds the costs of the program.
- 4) **Eligible recipients.** Though the initial statute intended for California College Promise cohorts to be comprised of first-time, full-time community college students, subsequent legislation has gradually expanded, and clarified, student eligibility for the program:
 - a) AB 2 (Santiago, Chapter 509, Statutes of 2019) authorized for a student enrolled in fewer than 12 units to be deemed as full-time at the discretion of the institution if the student has been certified as full-time by a staff person in the disabled student services program.
 - b) AB 3137 (Voepel, Chapter 226, Statutes of 2020) required that a student who is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, and is called to duty, may withdraw from participation in the California College Promise

and resume program participation upon the student's return from duty without losing eligibility for the benefits of the program, including fee waivers.

- c) AB 183 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 54, Statutes of 2022) made returning students, defined as a student who has taken a break of one or more semesters (or the quarterly equivalent), eligible for the program.
- d) AB 1342 (Megan Dahle, Chapter 102, Statutes of 2023) clarified that a high school pupil who enrolls in community college as part of dual enrollment programs are required to be considered a first-time community college student for purposes of the California College Promise upon the student's enrollment in community college after high school graduation.

The initial appropriation for the California College Promise was \$46 million in 2018-19, and program funding has grown to \$91.2 million in 2025-26. The largest augmentation for the program was attributed to expanding the program to be for two academic years, rather than one academic year.

Program eligibility for the California College Promise has included first-time community college students since program inception, and current statute specifically prohibits students who have previously earned a degree or certificate from a postsecondary educational institution as not eligible for a fee waiver under the California College Promise. This bill seeks to clarify that students would not be deemed ineligible for a fee waiver under the California College Promise program if a student was awarded a certificate by a postsecondary educational institution as part of a course sequence leading to an associate degree.

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

AB 1342 (Megan Dahle, Chapter 102, Statutes of 2023) clarified that a high school pupil who enrolls in community college as part of dual enrollment programs is required to be considered a first-time community college student for purposes of the California College Promise upon the student's enrollment in community college after high school graduation.

AB 183 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 54, Statutes of 2022) made returning students, defined as a student who has taken a break of one or more semesters (or the quarterly equivalent), eligible for the program.

AB 3137 (Voepel, Chapter 226, Statutes of 2020) required that a student who is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, and is called to duty, may withdraw from participation in the California College Promise and resume program participation upon the student's return from duty without losing eligibility for the benefits of the program, including fee waivers.

AB 2 (Santiago, Chapter 509, Statutes of 2019) authorized for a student enrolled in fewer than 12 units to be deemed as full-time at the discretion of the institution if the student has been certified as full-time by a staff person in the disabled student services program.

SB 77 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 53, Statutes of 2019) expanded the California College Promise by allowing community colleges to waive enrollment fees for first-time, full-time students for two academic years, as opposed to one academic year.

SUPPORT

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (sponsor)
Cabrillo Community College District
CalWORKs Program at San Bernardino Valley College
CFT – A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO
Chaffey Community College District
Community College League of California
Fresno CalWORKs Program
Immigrants Rising
Kern Community College District
Los Angeles Trade-Technical College
Norco College
Ohlone Community College
Rio Hondo College
Riverside Community College District
San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership
San Jose-Evergreen Community College District
Southwestern Community College District's Governing Board
Student Senate for California Community Colleges
One Individual

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 1943	Hearing Date:	June 3, 2026
Author:	Gipson		
Version:	March 23, 2026		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Therresa Austin		

Subject: Pupil safety: notifications: firearms.

SUMMARY

This bill recasts, updates, and expands existing annual notice requirements related to safe firearms storage by requiring the California Department of Education (CDE) to develop and post model language for a Secure Firearm Storage Notice to be issued annually by local educational agencies (LEA) to the parents and guardians of enrolled pupils.

BACKGROUND

- 1) Provides that a person is guilty of criminal storage of a firearm if the person keeps a loaded firearm within any premises with knowledge that a child is likely to gain access to the firearm. (Penal Code (PC) § 25100)
- 2) Makes it a crime to keep a firearm within any premises with knowledge that a child is likely to gain access, if the child obtains access to the handgun and carries it off premises. (PC § 25200)
- 3) Requires a person to ensure that any firearm the person possesses in a residence is securely stored, as specified, whenever the firearm is not being carried or readily controlled by the person or another lawful authorized user. (PC § 25145)
- 4) Requires LEAs, at the beginning of the first semester or quarter of the regular school term, to send several specified notifications to parents or guardians. (Education Code (EC) § 48980)
- 5) Requires LEAs to annually provide parents or guardians of enrolled pupils with information related to state laws on firearm storage and child access prevention, as developed by the CDE. Additionally, establishes immunity from civil liability for LEAs, private schools, and the CDE for any damages arising out of these notifications. (EC § 48986)
- 6) Requires the CDE to develop and maintain several resources on their public-facing website, including best practices pertaining to school shooter or other armed assailant drills. (EC § 32298.6)

- 7) Requires each school district or county office of education to be responsible for the overall development of all comprehensive school safety plans (CSSP) for its schools operating kindergarten or any of grades 1 through 12. Requires that the CSSP include, among other things, strategies, policies, and procedures to prevent and respond to potential incidents involving emergencies, natural and other disasters, hate crimes, violence, active assailants/intruders, bullying and cyberbullying, discrimination and harassment, child abuse and neglect, discipline, suspension and expulsion, and other safety aspects. (EC § 32281 and 32282)

ANALYSIS

This bill recasts, updates, and expands existing annual notice requirements related to safe firearms storage. Specifically, this bill:

- 1) Requires the CDE, in consultation with the Department of Justice (DOJ), on or before July 1, 2027, to develop and post on its internet website, model language for a Secure Firearm Storage Notice. Requires that the notice contains the following information:
 - a) A description of the risks of children accessing unsecured firearms in the home;
 - b) Information and resources about the importance of secure firearm storage for preventing youth firearm suicide and preventing children and teens from accessing guns and bringing them to school.
 - c) A plain language summary of California's child access prevention laws and laws relating to the secure storage of firearms, as specified.
 - d) The internet website address for the DOJ's Roster of Firearm Safety Devices Certified for Sale.
- 2) Requires LEAs to inform the parents or guardians of each enrolled pupil of the importance of practicing secure firearm storage in all homes in which firearms are present by annually issuing the Secure Firearm Storage Notice noted above.
- 3) Requires the CDE, in consultation with the DOJ, on or before July 1, 2028, and annually thereafter, to update the model language developed pursuant to #1 above as necessary to reflect any change in law or Uniform Resource Locators (URLs).
- 4) Requires the CDE, on or before July 1, 2027, to provide formatting and content options for LEAs to post the notice developed pursuant to #1 above on their respective internet websites and for posting other relevant information and resources about secure firearm storage using other internet-based communication, as specified.
- 5) Encourages LEAs to share information within the Secure Firearm Storage Notice with school communities through easily accessible mediums, including but not

limited to internet-based communications such as the LEA's internet website, any social media used by the LEA, and other digital and non-digital communications.

- 6) Requires the CDE to encourage each LEA to adopt a policy and practice of providing the Secure Firearm Storage Notification to parents, guardians, and caregivers when otherwise providing notice to parents, guardians, or caregivers of disciplinary actions or supports given related to threats against other pupils or threats of self-harm.
- 7) Requires the CDE to update existing best practices materials developed for use by LEAs pertaining to school shooter or other armed assailant drills, to additionally include the distribution of the Secure Firearm Storage Notice when providing advanced notice of a drill to parents and guardians of pupils.
- 8) Requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction to include the Secure Firearm Storage Notification model language in its existing annual notice to LEAs encouraging middle, junior high, and high schools to provide suicide prevention training to each school counselor at least one time while employed as a counselor, as specified.
- 9) Repeals existing law made redundant by this bill, which instructs the CDE and LEAs on how to inform parents and guardians of firearm safety laws.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) **Need for the bill.** According to the author, "AB 1943 strengthens and modernizes California's school-based secure firearm storage notifications, so they reflect our updated legal standards and focus on the very real risks of unsecured firearms. Too often, tragedies involving children—whether school shootings, unintentional shootings, or youth suicide—are preventable. Research shows that simply locking and securing firearms can significantly reduce these devastating outcomes. AB 1943 ensures that information provided through our schools is not only updated, but more visible and actionable for parents and caregivers. By expanding how schools share secure storage information, including posting it on district websites and digital platforms, we increase the likelihood that families will see and engage with these critical safety messages. Secure firearm storage is one of the most effective steps we can take to protect children and prevent avoidable tragedies. I introduced AB1943 because we know that secure firearm storage saves lives—and we must do more to ensure families have clear, accessible, and timely information about their responsibilities under the law."
- 2) **Risks associated with child access to firearms.** A systematic review of research on the effects of child access prevention laws conducted by the RAND Gun Policy in America Initiative has highlighted the following:
 - a) Data from the National Fatality Review Case Reporting System from 2004 to 2015 showed that, among firearm suicides by children ages 10 through 18 for which storage practices could be identified, more than three-fourths

involved the use of a gun that had been stored loaded and unlocked (Schnitzer et al., 2019). An earlier study (Grossman et al., 2005) also found that cases of unintentional firearm-related injury or death were less likely to occur in households where guns were stored unloaded or locked or where guns and ammunition were stored separately.

- b) Some data suggest that parents who own firearms often underestimate the risk of their child gaining access to the household firearm. A survey of 280 parent-child pairs found that in homes where parents believed that their child could not access a firearm, 22% of their children stated that they could access a firearm within five minutes, and an additional 15% stated that they could access a firearm within one hour (Salhi et al., 2021).
- 3) **California laws on secure firearms storage and child access prevention.** In California, all firearm owners are required to ensure that their firearms are stored securely in their residences whenever the firearms are not being carried or readily controlled by the owner or another authorized user. A firearm is considered *securely stored* if it is maintained within, locked by, or disabled using a DOJ-certified firearm safety device or a secure gun safe.

California law also makes it a crime for a person to negligently store or leave a firearm on their premises in a location where the person knows, or reasonably should know, that a child under the age of 18 is likely to gain access to the firearm without the permission of the child's parent or legal guardian.

- 4) **California's existing safe firearm storage notice requirements for schools.** In 2022, the Legislature passed AB 452 (Friedman, Chapter 199, Statutes of 2022) and SB 906 (Portantino, Chapter 144, Statutes of 2022), which worked in tandem to establish the landscape for annual parental notices and best practices related to safe firearm storage and child firearm access prevention.

According to proponents of this bill, while AB 452 and SB 906 served as an important foundation, the implementation of the laws has provided key insights on how to enhance their effectiveness and accessibility. The following issues, among others, have been noted in a letter submitted by the bill's sponsor coalition, comprised of Everytown for Gun Safety, Moms Demand Action for Gun Sense in America, and Students Demand Action for Gun Sense in America:

- a) The current "Template Memoranda for Safe Firearms Storage" developed by the CDE includes several sentences with statistics about youth suicides and children knowing where their parents' firearms are stored, but the bulk of the text is a summary of California laws and criminal liability. The complexity of this material may reduce the likelihood of a parent engaging with the necessary information.
- b) The current safe firearm storage and child firearm access prevention notices are included alongside other existing annual notices at the beginning of the school year. As a result, parents and guardians may feel overwhelmed and be less likely to engage with the material.

- c) Resources found on CDE's violence prevention webpage contain inoperative links, which may derail an engaged parent from seeking further information and resources.

This bill establishes a standardized and streamlined pathway for LEAs to meet these notice requirements by requiring the CDE to provide model language for a Secure Firearm Storage Notice that is written in plain language and provides updated information on resources parents and guardians can use to help prevent youth firearm suicide and prevent children and teens from accessing guns and bringing them to school.

It also diversifies the channels through which the notice can be shared with families by requiring the CDE to develop and provide formatting and content options for LEAs to post the Secure Firearm Storage Notice and related resources through other means, such as social media.

5) **Prior and related legislation.**

SB 53 (Portantino, Chapter 542, Statutes of 2024) requires a person who possesses a firearm in a residence to keep the firearm securely stored when the firearm is not being carried or readily controlled, as specified, violation of which is punishable as an infraction or misdemeanor, as specified. The bill also removes exemptions to existing child access laws for individuals who have no reasonable expectation that a child is likely to be present on the premises.

AB 452 (Friedman, Chapter 199, Statutes of 2022) requires LEAs to provide notification to parents of each student about California's child access prevention laws and laws relating to the safe storage of firearms, and requires the CDE to develop model language for this notification in consultation with the DOJ.

SB 906 (Portantino, Chapter 144, Statutes of 2022) requires (1) LEAs to annually provide information to parents or guardians about California's child access prevention laws and laws relating to the safe storage of firearms; (2) requires school officials to report to law enforcement any threat or perceived threat; and (3) requires law enforcement or the school police to conduct an investigation and threat assessment, including a review of the DOJ's firearm registry and a search of the school and/or students' property by law enforcement or school police.

SUPPORT

Everytown for Gun Safety Action Fund (sponsor)
 Alameda County Office of Education
 Brady California
 Brady United Against Gun Violence
 California Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry
 California Teachers Association
 CFT – A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO
 Los Angeles County Office of Education
 Moms Demand Action for Gun Sense in America
 Students Demand Action for Gun Sense in America

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 2107	Hearing Date:	June 3, 2026
Author:	Pellerin		
Version:	May 26, 2026		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	No
Consultant:	Michelle Nguyen		

Subject: Expanded Learning Opportunities Program: offering access: unduplicated pupils.

SUMMARY

This bill requires school districts and charter schools participating in the Expanded Learning Opportunities Program (ELOP) that have an unduplicated pupil percentage (UPP) of 55% or higher to prioritize offering access to unduplicated pupils in ELOP programs.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Defines “expanded learning” as before school, after school, summer, or intersession learning programs that focus on developing the academic, social, emotional, and physical needs and interests of students through hands-on, engaging learning experiences. (Education Code (EC) § 8482.1)
- 2) Expresses the intent of the Legislature that expanded learning programs are pupil-centered, results-driven, include community partners, and complement, but do not replicate, learning activities in the regular schoolday and school year. (EC § 8482.1)
- 3) Defines “unduplicated pupil” as a pupil enrolled in a school district or a charter school who is either classified as an English learner, eligible for a free or reduced-price meal, or is a foster youth. Specifies that a school district’s or charter school’s UPP is calculated by dividing the enrollment of unduplicated pupils in the school district or charter school by the total enrollment in that school district or charter school. (EC § 42238.02)
- 4) Establishes the ELOP with the intent of the Legislature that all local educational agencies (LEAs) offer all unduplicated pupils in classroom-based instructional programs access to comprehensive after school and intersessional expanded learning opportunities. (EC § 46120)
- 5) For the purposes of ELOP, defines “local educational agency” as a school district or charter school, excluding a charter school that submitted a petition directly to a board of education that would serve pupils for whom the county office of education

would otherwise be responsible for providing direct education and related services. (EC § 46120)

- 6) Requires, commencing with the 2023-24 school year, as a condition of receipt of ELOP funding, the following:
 - a) That LEAs with a prior year UPP of 55% or more offer the program to all pupils in kindergarten through 6th grade and provide access to any pupil whose parent or guardian requests their placement in a program. These LEAs are known colloquially as “Tier 1” and receive an allocation equal to \$2,750 multiplied by the number of unduplicated pupils at an LEA.
 - b) That LEAs with a prior year UPP less than 55% offer the program to at least all unduplicated pupils and provide access to any unduplicated pupil whose parent or guardian requests their placement in a program. These LEAs are known colloquially as “Tier 2” and receive an allocation based on the amount of funding remaining after accounting for Tier 1 allotments.
 - c) That on schooldays, LEAs offer no less than 9 hours of combined instructional time, recess, meals, and expanded learning opportunities per instructional day, and that for at least 30 nonschooldays, LEAs offer no less than 9 hours of in-person expanded learning opportunities per instructional day. (EC § 46120)
- 7) Requires LEAs to prioritize ELOP services at schoolsites in the lowest income communities, while maximizing the number of schools and neighborhoods with ELOP programs across their attendance area. (EC § 46120)
- 8) Defines the following terms:
 - a) “Offer access” means to recruit, advertise, publicize, or solicit through culturally and linguistically effective and appropriate communication channels.
 - b) “Provide access,” with respect to an “expanded learning opportunity program,” means to enroll in the expanded learning opportunity program. If a parent or guardian has a signed expanded learning opportunity program registration form and that form is on file, the pupil shall be considered enrolled in the expanded learning opportunity program. (EC § 46120)

ANALYSIS

This bill requires school districts and charter schools participating in the ELOP that have a UPP of 55% or higher to prioritize offering access to unduplicated pupils in ELOP programs, which may include, but is not limited to, specialized outreach to the parents and guardians of unduplicated pupils and providing assistance with enrollment of unduplicated pupils.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “though local educational agencies’ entitlement amounts are based on the number of unduplicated pupils enrolled and the CDE advises that LEAs prioritize ELOP enrollment for these students, there is currently no explicit requirement that LEAs prioritize offering access to these pupils. While the majority of LEAs respect the intent of the law, stakeholders in the education space have identified instances where access has been offered to non-unduplicated students prior to being offered to unduplicated students.

To ensure that the legislative intent of the Expanded Learning Opportunities Program is fulfilled, AB 2107 clarifies that local education agencies are required to prioritize offering access to low-income students, English learners, and foster youth.”

- 2) ***Differences between Tier 1 LEAs and Tier 2 LEAs for ELOP relating to funding rates and program requirements.*** Though this bill makes changes to ELOP for Tier 1 LEAs specifically, statute establishes two funding rates for ELOP that vary based on an LEA’s percentage of unduplicated pupils, also known as UPP:
 - a) Tier 1 LEAs are defined as having a UPP that is 55% or higher, and they receive a rate of \$2,750 per unduplicated pupil. Tier 1 LEAs are required to offer ELOP to all TK-6 pupils and provide access to any pupil whose parent or guardian requests placement in the program.
 - b) Tier 2 LEAs are defined as having a UPP lower than 55%, and they receive an allocation based on the amount of funding remaining after accounting for Tier 1 allotments. Tier 2 LEAs are required to offer the program to at least all unduplicated pupils and provide access to any unduplicated pupils whose parent or guardian requests placement in the program. The 2026-27 Governor’s Budget proposes to provide a guaranteed rate of at least \$1,800 per pupil for Tier 2 LEAs.
- 3) ***Offering access vs. providing access.*** Statute defines and creates distinctions between “offering access” and “providing access” for ELOP. *Offering access* generally refers to outreach, and means to “recruit, advertise, publicize, or solicit through culturally and linguistically effective and appropriate communication channels”. This bill specifically aims to require Tier 1 LEAs to prioritize *offering access* to unduplicated pupils in ELOP programs, which may include, but is not limited to, specialized outreach to the parents and guardians of unduplicated pupils and providing assistance with enrollment of unduplicated pupils. This bill intends to ensure that unduplicated pupils in Tier 1 LEAs are aware of ELOP programs in their schools, including resources these pupils may use to access these programs.

Providing access generally refers to enrolling a student in ELOP, and if a parent or guardian has a signed ELOP registration form and that form is on file, the pupil shall be considered enrolled. However, the definition for providing access is

specific to a signed registration form and does not reference children receiving ELOP services or care.

For Tier 1 LEAs, they are required to offer ELOP to all TK-6 pupils and to provide access to any pupil whose parent or guardian requests placement in the program. Because providing access to any pupil means enrolling a student, but not necessarily providing services, California Department of Education (CDE) guidance explicitly specifies that LEAs should be prioritizing enrollment for unduplicated pupils. However, given the discrepancy between enrolling and serving pupils, CDE has shared that they have received some complaints from parents reporting that, despite having a signed enrollment form on file with their LEA, their unduplicated children have been placed on a program waitlist while non-unduplicated pupils have been offered spots. CDE has also stated that other complaints indicate that unduplicated pupils are being placed at the bottom of a waitlist once capacity is reached. However, CDE was unable to provide the number of complaints it received on this topic, or any other characteristics about the situation from which these complaints originated. According to some stakeholders, this issue exists but may not be widespread.

4) ***Related and Prior Legislation.***

AB 121 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 8, Statutes of 2025), commencing with the 2025-26 school year, lowers the UPP requirements for Tier 1 LEAs from 75% to 55% and doubles the minimum ELOP funding for LEAs to \$100,000 in a fiscal year.

AB 181 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 52, Statutes of 2022), commencing with the 2023-24 school year, and as a condition of receipt of ELOP funds, LEAs with a calculated UPP less than 75% (Tier 2 LEAs) shall offer to at least all unduplicated pupils in K-6 classroom-based instructional programs access to ELOP, and shall provide access to any unduplicated pupil whose parent or guardian requests their placement in a program.

AB 130 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 44, Statutes of 2021) establishes the ELOP and appropriates \$753 million for allocation to specified school districts and charter schools serving a high proportion of unduplicated pupils. Requires, upon receipt of funding for this purpose, specified schools serving pupils in kindergarten through grade 6 to provide at least 50% of unduplicated pupils with ELOP for a minimum of 9 hours of combined in-person instruction and expanded learning opportunities on school days and no less than 9 hours of expanded learning opportunities per day for at least 30 non-school days during summer and intersessional periods.

SUPPORT

Alameda County Office of Education
California Association for Bilingual Education
Delta Kappa Gamma California
Partnership for Children and Youth

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No: AB 2148 **Hearing Date:** June 3, 2026
Author: Muratsuchi
Version: April 13, 2026
Urgency: No **Fiscal:** No
Consultant: Ian Johnson

Subject: Elementary and secondary education: public school employees: contractors: natural persons.

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

SUMMARY

This bill clarifies that, for purposes of the Education Code, public school employees and contractors performing services in public schools must be natural persons, thereby affirming that interactions between students and school personnel are to be conducted by human beings rather than artificial intelligence (AI) systems.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes California’s system of public elementary and secondary education, under which school districts, county offices of education, and charter schools employ personnel to provide instruction and services to pupils.
- 2) Defines AI for purposes of Education Code provisions governing statewide guidance on AI use in schools.
- 3) Requires the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to convene a statewide working group to develop guidance and model policies regarding the safe and effective use of AI in schools.
- 4) Requires community college instructors and specified staff to be persons.
- 5) Requires school districts to provide for substantial teacher involvement in the selection of instructional materials, including technology-based instructional materials.

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Defines a “public school employee” to mean a natural person.

- 2) Specifies that a contractor performing services in a public school also means a natural person.
- 3) Clarifies that the term applies to school personnel, including, but not limited to, certificated employees, classified employees, teachers, educators, short-term employees, principals, administrators, counselors, school nurses, school psychologists, and school social workers.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “As AI and automated decision systems become more common in schools, we must ensure that educators are not forced to use or be evaluated by technology that undermines their professional judgment or puts their jobs at risk. AB 2148 protects educators’ autonomy and ensures technology serves educators rather than replacing or penalizing them.”
- 2) ***This bill reflects growing concerns regarding the role of AI in schools, but was substantially narrowed to focus on a core policy declaration.*** As introduced, this bill proposed sweeping restrictions related to AI, automated decision systems (ADS), and educational technology in both K-12 and higher education settings, including provisions prohibiting employers from requiring educators to use educational technology or relying on AI-generated information in employment decisions. However, those provisions raised significant operational, equity, and implementation concerns, including impacts on attendance systems, grading platforms, communication systems, instructional technology, and special education supports.

The bill has since been amended down substantially and now instead focuses narrowly on clarifying that school employees and contractors providing services in schools must be natural persons. As currently drafted, the bill functions primarily as a statement of legislative intent regarding the role of human interaction in public education rather than a comprehensive regulatory framework governing AI in schools.

- 3) ***Broader questions about the appropriate role of AI in education.*** While the bill is now limited in scope, it emerges within a broader and rapidly evolving policy discussion regarding the use of AI in educational settings. AI use in schools has expanded significantly in recent years, with more than half of surveyed educators and students reporting school-related AI use in 2025.

Supporters argue that AI should supplement rather than replace educators, emphasizing that teaching depends heavily on human judgment, emotional connection, mentorship, and trust between students and school personnel. Opponents of the bill’s earlier versions cautioned that overly broad restrictions on educational technology could undermine basic school operations and create inequities in access to instructional tools and student supports.

Current law already directs the California Department of Education (CDE) to convene a statewide working group on AI in schools and develop guidance and model policies related to the safe and effective use of AI by July 1, 2026. As those statewide recommendations are still under development, the Committee may wish to consider whether additional statutory direction regarding AI in schools should await the completion of that stakeholder-driven process.

- 4) ***Existing law and policy generally contemplate AI as a tool to support, not replace, educators.*** Current state guidance on AI emphasizes a “human-centered” approach in which AI enhances, rather than substitutes for, the role of educators. Both the CDE and the U.S. Department of Education have recommended policies that “center people,” including students, educators, and parents, in AI implementation decisions.

Similarly, statewide AI guidance under development is expected to address educator protections, student well-being, data privacy, procurement practices, and strategies to ensure AI does not exacerbate educational inequities. The bill’s remaining provisions are therefore generally consistent with the broader policy direction emerging at the state and national levels that educational systems should preserve meaningful human involvement in instruction and student services while allowing schools to continue utilizing technology as a support tool.

SUPPORT

California Teachers Association
TechEquity Action

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 2178	Hearing Date:	June 3, 2026
Author:	Quirk-Silva		
Version:	February 19, 2026		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	No
Consultant:	Michelle Nguyen		

Subject: Community colleges: county probation departments: instructional service agreements.

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

SUMMARY

This bill authorizes a home community college district (CCD), as defined, or an eligible institution associated with a home CCD, to enter into an instructional services agreement (ISA) with a county probation department to provide academic or career technical education courses at a juvenile justice facility operated by the county probation department.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the California Community Colleges (CCCs), a postsecondary education system in this state, under the administration of the Board of Governors (BOG), and specifies that the CCC system consists of CCDs. (Education Code (EC) § 70900)
- 2) Authorizes the governing board of a CCD to enter into a College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP) partnership with the governing board of a school district, a county office of education, or the governing body of a charter school, for the purpose of offering or expanding dual enrollment opportunities for pupils who may not already be college bound or who are underrepresented in higher education. (EC § 76004)
- 3) Authorizes the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO) to establish the Rising Scholars Network and to enter into agreements with CCCs to provide additional funds for services in support of postsecondary education for justice-involved students, who are defined as a person who is currently or formerly incarcerated in a California correctional facility, or currently or formerly detained in a juvenile facility. (EC § 78070 - 78076)
- 4) Permits CCDs with an ISA with a public safety agency as specified, commencing January 1, 2024, to annually submit data to the CCCCCO on course offerings, student enrollment and full-time equivalent students (FTES), and course

completion, and permits CCDs with an ISA with a public safety agency as specified to annually submit a copy of its most up-to-date ISA to the CCCCO for review. Requires the CCCCO, upon review and analysis of CCD agreements and program data, to issue a recommendation to the Department of Finance and the Legislature on the apportionment that CCDs are eligible to claim through FTES generated through ISAs. (EC § 84750.4)

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Specifies that the provisions of this bill shall be known, and may be cited, as the Juvenile Justice Education Access and Equity Act.
- 2) Authorizes, notwithstanding any other law, a home CCD, or an eligible institution associated with the home CCD, to enter into an ISA with a county probation department.
- 3) Authorizes, notwithstanding any other law, a non-home CCD, or an eligible institution associated with the non-home CCD, to enter into an ISA with a county probation department if the home CCD and all eligible institutions associated with the home CCD are unable, unwilling, or fail to provide requested academic or career technical education courses at a juvenile justice facility within 90 days of a written request from the administrator of the juvenile justice facility.
- 4) Requires, upon occurrence of the conditions described in #3 above, that the home CCD and an eligible institution associated with the home CCD not prohibit, block, or otherwise interfere with the ability of the non-home CCD, or an eligible institution associated with the non-home CCD, to provide instruction at the juvenile justice facility.
- 5) Specifies that the provisions of this bill not be interpreted to:
 - a) Prevent the home CCD, or an eligible institution associated with the home CCD, from continuing to offer its own courses.
 - b) Grant exclusive instructional rights to a non-home CCD or an eligible institution associated with the non-home CCD.
 - c) Eliminate requirements to comply with applicable ISA, apportionment, academic, or reporting requirements.
- 6) Specifies that these provisions of this bill only be interpreted to expand access to postsecondary education for justice-involved youth when existing delivery mechanisms fail to meet documented needs and that the provisions of this bill not be construed to restructure community college governance, modify CCD service areas, or alter statewide apportionment policy.
- 7) Defines the following:

- a) “Eligible institution” as an accredited community college authorized to enter into ISAs under state law.
- b) “Home community college district” means the CCD assigned to serve the geographic area in which the juvenile justice facility is located.
- c) “Instructional services agreement” means an agreement to provide academic or career technical education courses to a juvenile justice facility.
- d) “Juvenile justice facility” means a juvenile hall, youth correctional center, or camp operated by a county probation department.
- e) “Non-home community college district” means a CCD not assigned to serve the geographic area in which the juvenile justice facility is located.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for this bill.*** According to the author, “Juvenile justice facilities typically rely on the home community college district for requested educational services. However, the needs of youth in county probation systems vary widely across the state. In some cases, a single community college district cannot provide the full range of academic or career technical education programs requested by a juvenile facility. When the home community college district cannot meet those requests, youth in juvenile justice facilities may face limited course offerings, reduced access to educational programs, or long waitlists. These barriers can reduce opportunities for education, workforce training, and successful reentry. ... AB 2178 expands access to educational programs for youth in juvenile justice facilities by allowing greater collaboration between community college districts. ... The bill does not limit the role of the home community college district. Instead, it ensures that other community college districts can step in when needed to provide services.”
- 2) ***Postsecondary education sometimes offered at juvenile justice facilities.*** With regard to the juvenile justice system, following arrest, youths are generally turned over to county probation departments and may be held for a short period of time in a county juvenile facility, before determining whether to refer youths to juvenile courts in cases where they are accused of committing a crime that occurred before they turned 18 years old. Juvenile courts place most youths with their families where they are supervised by county probation departments, but some are placed in county juvenile facilities, such as juvenile halls, camps, and ranches.

Youths in county juvenile facilities are provided public education by the county office of education in the county in which the facility is located, which are called juvenile court schools, and these youths are required to attend school under the state’s compulsory education requirements. Some juvenile court schools—through the county office of education operating the school—partner with CCCs to provide postsecondary instruction and/or related support services. According to an April 2026 report prepared by the CCCCO on the Rising Scholars Network, 45 CCCs serve youth across 60 juvenile justice facilities. The CCCCO also indicated that

there are 10 additional CCCs that provide services for youths in juvenile justice facilities without grant funding from the Rising Scholars Network.

- 3) ***Rising Scholars Network provides additional support for currently and formerly incarcerated students, including in juvenile justice facilities.*** The Rising Scholars Network was established in 2014 to expand the number of justice-involved students participating and succeeding in the CCC system, and it is the CCC system's statewide program serving currently and formerly incarcerated students. AB 417 (McCarty, Chapter 558, Statutes of 2021) codified the Rising Scholars Network and authorized the CCCCO to enter into agreements with CCCs to provide additional funds for services in support of postsecondary education for justice-involved students.

The program began with a \$10 million appropriation in 2020-21, and program funding has grown to \$35 million in ongoing funding as of 2025-26. The CCCCO administers the Rising Scholars Network by providing funding for adult programs and for juvenile programs. According to a March 2025 report on the program, the CCCCO allocated \$21 million of the \$35 million program total for serving youth in juvenile justice facilities—specifically 45 CCCs across 60 juvenile justice facilities. These funds may be used for, but are not limited to, the following: a) supporting in-person instruction at juvenile facilities, community, and alternative schools; b) assisting students with transitional support and services to support enrollment and persistence in higher education upon release; and c) assisting with accessing community resources such as record clearance, housing assistance, mental health support, and social services.

- 4) ***ISAs within the CCC system.*** ISAs are not currently defined in statute or in regulations. However, the CCC system widely understands them to be a formal agreement between a CCC and another entity to provide specific services and training. These entities are usually public safety agencies, but they can sometimes be private entities. Through an ISA, a CCC may hire individuals with specific expertise to teach courses approved by the college's curriculum approval process.

Districts may be able to claim FTES for state apportionment for ISA-based courses if they meet specific requirements set forth in the California Education Code and Title 5 regulations. Districts claiming FTES for these students are paid at credit rate for incarcerated students, which is \$7,424 in 2024-25.

This bill attempts to create clarity for CCDs and county probation departments seeking to enter into an ISA to provide instruction at a juvenile justice facility.

- 5) ***Committee amendments to provide additional clarity.*** To provide clarity to processes introduced by this bill and to use language that is more consistent with language used in the Education Code, ***committee staff recommends, and the author's office has accepted, amendments as follows:***
- a) *Remove the definition for "eligible institution" and replace the use of that phrase in this bill by instead referencing "colleges that are part of a community college district".*

- b) *Replace a CCD's "geographic area" with "service area".*
- c) *Remove the definition for "non-home community college district" because a "home community college district" is already defined.*
- d) *For the provision specifying when a CCD may enter into an ISA with a county probation department outside its service area, use language that mirrors recent amendments to dual enrollment statute by SB 1244 (Newman, Chapter 789, Statutes of 2024).*

Specifically, require that for a CCD entering into an ISA with a county probation department outside its service area, the home CCD must have declined a written request from the administrator of the juvenile justice facility to provide requested instruction, or that the home CCD must have failed to take action within 60 calendar days of a request by the administrator of the juvenile justice facility to provide requested instruction.

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

AB 1942 (Muratsuchi, Chapter 930, Statutes of 2022) permits CCDs with an ISA with a public safety agency as specified, commencing January 1, 2024, to annually submit data to the CCCCCO on course offerings, student enrollment and FTES, and course completion, and permits CCDs with an ISA with a public safety agency as specified to annually submit a copy of its most up-to-date ISA to the CCCCCO for review.

AB 417 (McCarty, Chapter 558, Statutes of 2021) authorizes the CCCCCO to establish the Rising Scholars Network and to enter into agreements with CCCs to provide additional funds for services in support of postsecondary education for formerly and currently incarcerated students.

SB 1391 (Hancock, Chapter 695, Statutes of 2014) authorized CCDs to claim apportionments for classes the CCD provides to inmates of specified local and state facilities.

SUPPORT

Chief Probation Officers of California

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 2248	Hearing Date:	June 3, 2026
Author:	Hoover		
Version:	March 26, 2026		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Therresa Austin		

Subject: Pupil services: educational counseling: California College Guidance Initiative.

SUMMARY

This bill expands existing annual notice requirements to additionally require a local educational agency (LEA) to issue a notice to the parents or guardians of specified pupils that includes the benefits of the California College Guidance Initiative (CCGI) and encouragement to create parent accounts.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Requires the governing board of each school district to annually notify the parent or guardian of a minor pupil regarding various rights or responsibilities of the parent or guardian relevant to the school environment. (Education Code (EC) § 48980)
- 2) Requires, as part of the annual parent notification, that parents be informed of the following:
 - a) A brief explanation of the college admission requirements;
 - b) A list of the current University of California (UC) and California State University (CSU) websites that help students and their families learn about college admission requirements and that list high school courses that have been certified by the UC as satisfying the requirements for admission;
 - c) A brief description of what career technical education is, as defined by the department;
 - d) Information about how pupils may meet with school counselors to help them choose courses at their schools that will meet college admission requirements or enroll in career technical education courses, or both;
 - e) In a separate and distinct disclosure, that data may be shared with the CCGI to provide students and their families with direct access to online tools and resources for college and career planning; and

- f) Direction to the CaliforniaColleges.edu platform in order to access resources that help pupils and their families learn about college admissions requirements. (EC § 51229)
- 3) States the intent of the Legislature that the CCGI, upon full implementation and ongoing administration, provide all of the following services:
- a) A free college and career planning curriculum and internet website for grades 6 to 12, inclusive, designed to provide touch points three to six times per year.
 - b) Financial aid curriculum for grades 9 to 12, inclusive, and developed in consultation with the California Student Aid Commission (CSAC).
 - c) Support to LEAs to plan for and monitor use of planning tools and curriculum.
 - d) Tools to enable pupils and their families to determine if they are on track to meet college qualifications, based on their individual goals, and to allow authorized secondary school counselors to view the progress of individual pupils on meeting CSU and UC eligibility requirements.
 - e) Validation of data relating to A–G admission requirements in local pupil information systems that is flagged with respect to the UC Course Management Portal (CMP).
 - f) Technical assistance to LEAs on data cleanup processes.
 - g) Providing statewide pupil identification numbers to the California Community Colleges (CCC), the CSU, the UC, and CSAC so that information stored in local systems will improve matches for research purposes and the California Cradle-to-Career Data System
 - h) Transcripts processed in near real time with the CCC, the CSU, the UC, and CSAC, using an application programming interface.
 - i) Inform the CCC, the CSU, and the UC of high school pupils' demographic and program participation information, including, but not limited to, whether they are a first-generation college student, homeless, migrant, or economically disadvantaged.
 - j) Provide information and data on race or ethnicity, grade point average, high school graduation status, pupil and parent contact information, and where pupils applied to college to the CSAC through a faster application programming interface format and pursuant to a memorandum of understanding.
 - k) Prepopulation of CCC, CSU, and UC application fields related to statewide pupil identification numbers, transcript data, demographic information, and other data elements that can reduce barriers for pupils.

- l) Development of new planning tools related to career and technical education pathways, apprenticeships, transfer options, and regional labor markets. (EC § 60900.5)
- 4) Authorizes the CCGI to provide its services to all LEAs and requires LEAs to submit students' grade point average and transcript information to the CCGI. Requires LEAs to ensure that 11th graders complete financial aid lessons on CaliforniaColleges.edu platform. (EC § 60900.5, EC § 51225.8 (b) and EC § 60900 (f))
- 5) Requires LEAs to submit grades 9 to 12, inclusive, pupil transcript information to the CCGI, as specified, in the format approved by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI). (EC § 60900)
- 6) Requires an LEA to annually notify the parents or guardians of pupils admitted to, or advancing to, grades 7 to 12, inclusive, of any dual enrollment or International Baccalaureate (IB) opportunities. (EC § 48980.6)

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Requires an LEA, at the beginning of the first semester or quarter of the regular school term, to annually notify the parents or guardians of pupils admitted to, or advancing to, grades 7 to 12, inclusive, of the benefits of the CCGI and an encouragement to create parent accounts, alongside its existing annual notice requirements related to its dual enrollment and IB course offerings.
- 2) Defines "local educational agency" to mean a school district, county office of education (COE), or charter school.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, "Every student deserves an equal opportunity to strive for academic achievement and prepare for college and career success. Too often, that opportunity is determined by a student's access to information. By requiring Local Educational Agencies to notify parents of the California College Guidance Initiative, AB 2248 seeks to ensure no student is denied the opportunity to prepare for their future simply because they were never informed of the support available to them."
- 2) ***The California College Guidance Initiative.*** CCGI is a public-nonprofit partnership focused on reducing obstacles to student success by creating clearer pathways between K-12 and higher education institutions. While CCGI's work dates back to 1998, it was codified in 2021 as part of the California Cradle-to-Career Data System to streamline the college and financial aid application processes for students, while providing educators with the information necessary to inform data-driven counseling practices and real-time decision-making. CCGI does this work through its management of CaliforniaColleges.edu, California's

official college and career planning platform for students in grades 6 through 12. CaliforniaColleges.edu is free to use and serves as an infrastructure for post-secondary planning, data-driven student guidance, and standardized student record sharing between LEAs and California's public higher education systems and CSAC.

Through the CCGI, all students in grades 6 through 12 can create a Basic Account, providing access to:

- Career assessments to help them discover their interests, personality, learning style, and more;
- College, major, and career search tools that help them explore their options;
- Curated college, career, and financial aid planning content that guides them through developing a post-secondary plan;
- A digital portfolio to track their academic, career, and financial aid plans to chronicle experiences and maintain related documents; and
- A function to launch their Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) and California Dream Act Application (CADAA).

Students in grades 9 through 12 with transcript-informed Partner Accounts also have access to a dashboard that displays the courses which they are currently taking and the courses they have completed. This information comes directly from the LEA's transcript files submitted to CCGI. Through their transcript-informed Partner Accounts, students in grades 9 through 12 are also able to:

- View CSU and UC Eligibility Tools that allow them to see their progress towards meeting the minimum requirements for admission to CSU and UC;
- Verify that the A-G courses they are taking or have completed have been officially approved as A-G courses in the CMP administered by the UC Office of the President. A-G course alignment is critical for ensuring students meet UC/CSU eligibility requirements; and
- Launch applications for CCC, CSU, and UC, and import district-verified A-G courses and grades into Cal State Apply and UC Applications.

Once a student has registered for an account, parents or guardians can register for a Parent Account, allowing families to view and monitor their student's engagement with the CaliforniaColleges.edu platform, as well as their progress on college, career, and financial aid planning lessons.

Current law requires LEAs to provide annual notices to parents and guardians, informing them that student data may be shared with the CCGI to inform the CaliforniaColleges.edu platforms college and career planning tools.

This bill would require that a notice on the benefits of CCGI and encouragement for parents to create parent accounts be included alongside existing annual notices on dual enrollment and IB course availability.

3) Prior and related legislation.

AB 1796 (Alanis, Chapter 143, Statutes of 2024) requires an LEA, COE, or charter school, at the beginning of the first semester or quarter of the regular school term, to annually notify the parents or guardians of students admitted to, or advancing to, grades 7 to 12, inclusive, of any dual enrollment or IB opportunities.

SUPPORT

Alameda County Office of Education
California Charter Schools Association
Delta Kappa Gamma International - Chi State

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No: AB 2455 **Hearing Date:** June 3, 2026
Author: Haney
Version: February 20, 2026
Urgency: No **Fiscal:** No
Consultant: Michelle Nguyen

Subject: Bruce Lee Day.

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

SUMMARY

This bill designates May 17 of each year as a day having special significance called Bruce Lee Day, and this bill encourages all public schools and educational institutions on Bruce Lee Day to conduct exercises remembering the life of Bruce Lee, recognizing his accomplishments, and familiarizing pupils with the contributions he made to the state. This bill also requires the Governor to annually proclaim May 17 as Bruce Lee Day.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Indicates that for each day designated and set apart as a day having special significance, all public schools and educational institutions are encouraged to observe and conduct suitable commemorative exercises. Indicates that it is the intent of the Legislature that the commemorative exercises be integrated into the regular school program and be conducted by the school or institution within the amount of time otherwise budgeted for educational programs. (Education Code (EC) § 37222)
- 2) Designates a number of days as days having special significance, including the following days recognizing specific individuals: John Muir Day (April 21), Harvey Milk Day (May 22), Ronald Reagan Day (February 6), and Dolores Huerta Day (April 10). (EC § 37222.10 – 37222.21)
- 3) Requires public schools to close on a number of holidays, including January 1, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, Lincoln Day, Washington Day, Memorial Day, July 4, Labor Day, Veterans Day, Thanksgiving Day, December 25, all days designated by the Governor and President for a public fast, thanksgiving, or holiday, any special or limited holidays on which the Governor provides that the schools close, and any other day designated as a holiday by the governing board of a local school district. (EC § 37220)

- 4) Requires, for some specified holidays for which schools are required to close (Dr. Martin Luther King Day, Lincoln Day, Washington Day), that schools conduct exercises in commemoration. (EC § 37220)
- 5) Authorizes public schools to close on other days if the governing board, pursuant to a memorandum of understanding reached through collective bargaining, agrees to close schools for that purpose. These days are Cesar Chavez Day (March 31), Native American Day (fourth Friday in September), Genocide Remembrance Day (April 24), Diwali (the 15th day of the month of Kartik in the Hindu lunar calendar). (EC § 37220.5 and 37220.7)
- 6) Requires public schools to remain open on specified days—unless otherwise closed due to a governing board of a school district designating a day as a holiday—and to celebrate the significance of those days with appropriate commemorative exercises. These days are the anniversary of the adoption of the United States Constitution, the birthdays of Luther Burbank (March 7) and Susan B. Anthony (February 15), and the death of Crispus Attucks (March 5). (EC § 37221)

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Designates May 17 of each year as a day having special significance called Bruce Lee Day, which means that all public schools and educational institutions are encouraged to observe that day and to conduct suitable commemorative exercises.
- 2) Encourages all public schools and educational institutions on Bruce Lee Day to conduct exercises remembering the life of Bruce Lee, recognizing his accomplishments, and familiarizing pupils with the contributions he made to the state.
- 3) Requires the Governor to annually proclaim May 17 as Bruce Lee Day.
- 4) Makes finding and declarations related to the life of Bruce Lee as a trailblazing Chinese American martial artist, actor, and filmmaker; for his contributions to the Chinese American community, including his influence in the San Francisco Bay Area and other regions of the state; his status as the first Asian American actor to play a leading role in a Hollywood movie; and his commitment to civil rights, racial solidarity, and community.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “many Asian Americans report feeling marginalized or excluded in American society. According to a 2021 Pew Research Center survey, approximately one-third of Asian Americans say they have been subjected to racial slurs or jokes, and many report feeling treated as “foreigners” regardless of how long they or their families have lived in the United States.

During Bruce Lee's lifetime, these barriers were even more pronounced. Asian actors were often limited to stereotypical or minor roles, rarely appearing as leading figures on screen. Lee's success fundamentally challenged those norms, opening doors for generations of Asian American performers and creators.

Despite his profound cultural influence and his roots in San Francisco, California has never formally recognized Bruce Lee's contributions to representation and cultural progress. ... [This bill recognizes] one of the most influential Chinese Americans in California history."

- 2) ***State has designated multiple days as having special significance.*** For days that the state has designated and set apart as having special significance, all public schools and educational institutions are encouraged to observe that day and to conduct suitable commemorative exercises. Currently, the state has designated a dozen separate days as having special significance. These days of special significance differ from holidays for which all public schools are required to close, as well as days for which a school's governing board makes a local decision to close. If this bill is to be enacted, all public schools and educational institutions would be encouraged to observe Bruce Lee Day and to conduct suitable commemorative exercises in recognition of Bruce Lee's life and accomplishments.
- 3) ***Other dates recognizing Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) communities.*** The state has recognized the cultural heritage and contributions of AAPI communities by designating and setting apart other days as having special significance to the AAPI communities, including Lunar New Year and the Fred Korematsu Day of Civil Liberties and the Constitution, and the state recognizes that public schools may be closed for Diwali, which is on the 15th day of the month of Kartik in the Hindu lunar calendar of each year. In addition, the Governor issues a proclamation every May declaring the month as Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month.
- 4) ***Arguments in support.*** According to a letter submitted to this committee from Asian Americans Advancing Justice Southern California, "According to a survey by the Pew Research Center, about one-third of Asian Americans have reported feeling treated as "foreigners" and have been subjected to racist rhetoric. Additionally, the AANHPI community faced heightened levels of anti-Asian hate during the COVID pandemic. Approximately 4 in 10 U.S.-born Asian Americans know of an Asian individual who was threatened or attacked since the pandemic first began.

During Bruce Lee's lifetime, these challenges were even more significant. Asian American representation in the film and media space was very limited to minor roles or roles that paint him as the villain. Lee's success challenged these stereotypes, paving the way for generations of Asian American performers and artists. Despite Lee's impact on California, the state has never formally recognized his contributions. This bill will be the first bill in our state to honor a Chinese American."

According to a letter submitted to this committee from the San Francisco Chinese Chamber of Commerce, "Bruce Lee was more than a martial artist or film icon. He

represented confidence, discipline, innovation, and cultural pride at a time when Asian Americans were often overlooked or misrepresented in mainstream American society. Through his work, he helped redefine how Asian Americans were viewed not only in entertainment, but also in broader public life. His influence transcended generations, cultures, and borders, making him one of the most recognizable cultural ambassadors of Chinese and Asian heritage in modern history.

Bruce Lee also holds a unique and deeply personal connection to San Francisco's Chinese-American community. He was born at Chinese Hospital in Chinatown, an institution founded in the 1800s to serve immigrant communities during a time when Chinese Americans faced widespread discrimination and limited access to healthcare. The Chinese Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco was among the founding community institutions that helped establish and support Chinese Hospital, making this recognition especially meaningful and historically significant to our organization and community.

California is home to one of the largest and most diverse Asian American communities in the nation. Recognizing Bruce Lee's legacy reflects the values of inclusion, perseverance, and cultural exchange that continue to shape our state. Designating "Bruce Lee Day" would also provide an opportunity for schools, community organizations, and future generations to learn about the historical challenges Asian Americans faced and the contributions they have made to California's cultural and economic fabric."

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

AB 268 (Kalra, Chapter 358, Statutes of 2025) adds Diwali to the list of state holidays, authorizes public schools and educational institutions throughout the state to close on Diwali, and authorizes state employees to elect to take specified leave in recognition of Diwali.

AB 2596 (Low, Chapter 792, Statutes of 2022) recognizes Lunar New Year as a state holiday and authorizes eligible state employees to elect to receive eight hours of holiday credit for that date in lieu of receiving eight hours of personal credit, as specified.

AB 1775 (Furutani, Chapter 241, Statutes of 2010) designates January 30 of each year as Fred Korematsu Day of Civil Liberties and the Constitution, a day having special significance.

SUPPORT

Chinese Historical Society of America (co-sponsor)
Stand with Asians (co-sponsor)
Asian Americans Advancing Justice Southern California
Asian Law Alliance
Asian Leaders Alliance
Asian Pacific Islander Council of San Francisco
ASIAN, Inc.

BeChinatown
Center for Asian American Media
Chinese Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
Chinese Hospital
Oakland Chinatown Chamber of Commerce
Rose Pak Community Fund
San Francisco Eastern Neighborhoods Democratic Club
San Francisco Travel Association
Sunset Chinese Cultural District
Teamsters Local 665
The 1990 Institute
The Asian American Foundation
United Playaz

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No: ACA 18 **Hearing Date:** June 3, 2026
Author: Caloza
Version: April 29, 2026
Urgency: **Fiscal:** Yes
Consultant: Olgalilia Ramirez

Subject: University of California: regents: student members.

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

SUMMARY

This measure proposes to modify Article IX of the State Constitution to require, rather than authorize, the members of the University of California (UC) Board of Regents to appoint four students enrolled at a UC campus to the Board of Regents.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) The California Constitution establishes the UC, a public trust to be administered by the Regents of the UC and grants the Regents full powers of organization and government, subject only to such legislative control as may be necessary to insure security of its funds, compliance with the terms of its endowments, statutory requirements around competitive bidding and contracts, sales of property and the purchase of materials, goods and services. (Article IX, Section (9)(a) of the California Constitution)
- 2) The California Constitution establishes the requirements for appointment and terms to be served by a member of the Regents of the UC. The Constitution specifically requires that members of the board be composed of 7 ex officio members of which include; the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, the Speaker of the Assembly, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the president and the vice president of the alumni association of the university, and the acting president of the university, and 18 appointive members. The Constitution also provides that the Senate, a majority of the membership concurring, approve any Regent appointee made by the Governor. (Article IX, Section (9)(a) and (b)(1) of the California Constitution)
- 3) The California Constitution authorizes the UC Regents to appoint students or faculty and establishes procedures for their appointment. Specifically, it authorizes the members of the board to appoint either a member of the faculty at a campus of the university or of another institution of higher education, or a person enrolled as a student at a campus of the university, or both, as members

of the board serving for no less than one year with all rights of participation. The Constitution also provides that the board appointed student or faculty member serve for not less than one year commencing on July 1. (Article IX, Section (9)(c) of the California Constitution)

ANALYSIS

This constitutional amendment proposes to place before the voters a change to the California Constitution to modify the membership of the Board of Regents of the UC. Specifically, it:

- 1) Requires, rather than authorizes, the UC Regents, beginning on July 1, 2027, to consult annually with the student representatives including University of California Student Association (UCSA) and the University of California Graduate and Professional Council, or their successor organizations, respectively, to appoint to the board four UC students to serve as members of the board with all powers, duties, voting authority, rights, and responsibilities as regular members of the board. The students are to be appointed as follows:
 - a) One undergraduate student appointed in an even numbered year is to serve a term of two years. The first year, the undergraduate student is to serve as the student Regent-designee with nonvoting authority, and in the second year, the undergraduate student is to serve as student Regent with full voting authority.
 - b) One undergraduate student appointed in an odd numbered year is to serve a term of two years. The first year, the undergraduate student is to serve as the student Regent-designee with no voting authority, and in the second year, the undergraduate student is to serve as student Regent with full voting authority.
 - c) One graduate student appointed in an even numbered year is to serve a term of two years. The first year, the graduate student is to serve as the student Regent-designee with no voting authority, and in the second year, the graduate student is to serve as the student Regent with full voting authority.
 - d) One graduate student appointed in an odd numbered year is to serve a term of two years. The first year, the graduate student is to serve as the student Regent-designee with no voting authority, and in the second year, the graduate student is to serve as the student Regent with full voting authority.
 - e) Provides that a student Regent who is authorized to serve as a Regent who graduates on or after January 1 in the second year of student's two year term can continue to serve for the remainder of the student's term as Regent.
 - f) Makes other technical and clarifying changes.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) **Need for the bill.** According to the author, “Sixteen years ago, I came to the State Capitol as a UC San Diego student to protest tuition hikes by the UC Regents. Today, students are facing those same challenges—only worse: rising tuition, unaffordable housing, and growing uncertainty that impacts their ability to succeed. Yet on the 26-member UC Board of Regents, only one student has a vote.

“Students deserve more than a seat in the room—they deserve a vote that counts. ACA 18 is about fairness, accountability, and meaningful representation. By expanding student voting power on the UC Board of Regents, we ensure that the voices of those most impacted by decisions on tuition, housing, and student life are heard loud and clear.

“Now more than ever, it’s time to put students first and give them a real say in the decisions that shape their education and future.”

- 2) **Student Regents.** Under the Constitution, the UC Regents have the option of appointing a student to serve as a member of the Board. The student Regent and Regent-designate positions are established and affirmed by regental policy. The two student members of the UC Regents serve staggered two-year terms, with the first year of a student’s membership, known as a regent-designate, limited to participation but not voting. This bill requires the appointment of four student representatives, two with voting privileges. The proposed changes also ensure representation from both the undergraduate and graduate student populations. The author notes that the last time an *undergraduate* student was represented on the UC Regents was in 2021.
- 3) **Student consultation.** Under this measure, appointments are to be made in consultation with student representatives, including UCSA (sponsors of this measure) and the Graduate and Professional Council. UCSA is a systemwide organization composed of representatives from UC student governments that participates in student engagement, policy discussions, and shared governance matters affecting UC students. The Graduate and Professional Council is the equivalent organization for graduate and professional students. This measure identifies UCSA and the Graduate and Professional Council as student representative organizations to be consulted during the selection process but does not prohibit the Regents from seeking input from other student groups. Further, the student Regent serves as an individual member of the Board and is not formally designated as a representative of any particular student organization.
- 4) **Effect on existing Regents.** The California Constitution provides for 18 Regents to be appointed by the Governor and approved by the Senate. In addition, the Constitution affords seven ex officio members, that include publicly elected officials. UC Regents may choose to also appoint a member of the faculty. According to the UC website, two faculty members-- the chair and vice chair of the Academic Council, sit on the Board as non-voting members. This

measure does not change the number of gubernatorial appointees or ex officio members. Instead, it expands student representation by increasing the number of voting student Regents from one to two and nonvoting student Regents from one to two, resulting in a larger board and giving students two votes instead of one in Board decisions. It additionally provides that student Regents serve with the same authority and responsibilities as other Regents.

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

SCA 5 (Glazer, 2021) would have modified Article IX of the State Constitution to require, rather than authorize, the members of the UC Board of Regents to appoint two students enrolled at a UC campus. SCA 5 died in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

SCA 1 (Lara, 2016) proposed to modify Article IX of the State Constitution to reduce the term of an appointment as a Regent of the UC from 12 years to 10 years for terms commencing on or after the effective date of this measure and prohibits these members from serving more than two terms. SCA 1 was placed on the inactive file on the Senate Floor by the author.

SUPPORT

University of California Student Association (sponsor)

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --