

---

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Benjamin Allen, Chair

2017 - 2018 Regular

---

**Bill No:** AB 3205 **Hearing Date:** June 20, 2018  
**Author:** O'Donnell  
**Version:** March 20, 2018  
**Urgency:** No **Fiscal:** Yes  
**Consultant:** Ian Johnson

**Subject:** School facilities: modernization projects: door locks.

### SUMMARY

This bill requires school districts with modernization projects under the state School Facility Program, for school facilities constructed before January 1, 2012, to include interior locks as part of the project.

### BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Specifies the duties of a governing board of a school district and gives authority to the governing board to enter into contracts, establish funds, and make payments for the purpose of maintaining property.
- 2) Requires, under the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998, the State Allocation Board to allocate to applicant school districts, prescribed per-unhoused-pupil state funding for construction and modernization of school facilities, including hardship funding, and supplemental funding for site development and acquisition.
- 3) Requires, on and after July 1, 2011, all new construction projects submitted to the Division of State Architect to include locks that allow doors to classrooms and any room with an occupancy of five or more persons to be locked from the inside. Requires the locks to conform to the specifications and requirements set forth in Title 24 regulations. Exempts doors that are locked from the outside at all times and pupil restrooms from the requirement.

### ANALYSIS

This bill requires school districts with modernization projects under the state School Facility Program, for school facilities constructed before January 1, 2012, to include interior locks as part of the project.

### STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, "The casualties at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Florida remind us that we need to do more to protect our children, teachers and school staff. It is our responsibility to provide protection in

both older and new schools. Allowing teachers to lock a classroom door from the inside can save lives.”

- 2) **Related State Allocation Board Subcommittee meeting.** In March 2013, the State Allocation Board Program Review Subcommittee met to review physical safety on school campuses. Information was provided by both the California Emergency Management Agency and the California Department of Education (CDE). Among other things, the CDE noted that school infrastructure security measures can include safe rooms (classroom locks) communication systems, environmental design to deter criminal behavior, and consistent maintenance of school buildings. In addition, the California Emergency Management Agency (Cal EMA) reported that it provides emergency preparedness information and resources for schools throughout California, in partnership with the CDE. In response to the Sandy Hook incident, Cal EMA designed a School Active Shooter seminar which brings together schools and local law enforcement, fire and emergency services to prepare for such an incident.
- 3) **One size fits all?** Current law provides for grants and funding for the development of safety plans by local educational agencies and grants school districts the flexibility to determine the most appropriate use of these funds for programs and strategies for promoting school safety on their respective campuses. This bill establishes parity between modernization and new construction requirements in the state School Facility Program, thereby presuming that state bond funds must be made available for these costs.

Are interior locks a better safety measure than fences, communication systems, or increased security personnel? Would interior door locks be appropriate in classrooms that have students with special needs or behavioral issues? Is it reasonable to assume that this is the best security measure for all school districts? How do safety needs and the resulting response vary by geographic area or district size?

- 4) **Implementation concerns.** As currently drafted, it is not clear if the requirements included in this bill only apply to school districts that have not submitted a modernization project application to the Office of Public School Construction (OPCS) by the effective date of January 1, 2019. As currently drafted, the bill may be interpreted by some to apply to school district modernization applications that have already been submitted to OPSC but have not yet been processed, been processed by OPSC but not granted bond authority, or been granted bond authority but not actually funded by January 1, 2019. To avoid confusion, and if it is the desire of the Committee to pass this measures, **staff recommends** that the bill be amended to apply to modernization projects submitted to OPSC on or after January 1, 2019.

## SUPPORT

California Federation of Teachers (sponsor)  
 California School Employees Association  
 California State PTA  
 California Teachers Association

City of Signal Hill

**OPPOSITION**

None received

**-- END --**