

Date of Hearing: April 2, 2025

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT AND RETIREMENT

Tina S. McKinnor, Chair

AB 1247 (Garcia) – As Introduced February 21, 2025

SUBJECT: Classified employees: school districts and community college districts: contracting out: training requirements

SUMMARY: Amends existing laws relating to contracts for personal services by school districts and community college districts (hereinafter, both simultaneously referred to as “district”), respectively, by adding certain prescribed conditions. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Adds, among other existing conditions or criteria relating to proposals eligible to contract out, that the contract guarantee contributions to any bona fide fringe benefit programs providing health care or retirement benefits to a direct hire that are equivalent to the amount that would be contributed if the contracted worker was a direct hire.
- 2) Amends existing law by providing that the contract include specific provisions pertaining to the qualifications of the contracted worker that will perform the work under the contract, and that contracted workers meet or exceed the minimum qualifications and standards required of direct hires who perform or have performed the same job functions, including, but not limited to:
 - a) Completion of a criminal history and background check before beginning employment.
 - b) Required level of academic attainment.
 - c) Required licensure.
 - d) Required years of experience.
 - e) Mandated reporter status.
 - f) Physical requirements.
 - g) Required scores on assessment exams.
 - h) Ongoing performance standards.
 - i) Completion of initial and ongoing training mandated by law, a collective bargaining agreement, or an employer policy.
- 3) Requires a district to compensate classified employees at their regular rate of pay for time necessary to complete training mandated by law, a collective bargaining agreement, or employer policy; to allow for classified employee questions and have them answered by a natural person in real time during training; and, training regarding child abuse reporting, suicide prevention, sexual harassment, or discrimination be conducted in person.
- 4) Makes technical and nonsubstantive changes for these purposes, and includes pro forma provisions relating to reimbursement of costs.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Authorizes personal services contracting for all services currently or customarily performed by classified school employees to achieve cost savings, unless prohibited, and when certain prescribed conditions are satisfied. Cost savings may not cause employee “displacement,” i.e., layoff, demotion, involuntary transfer to a new classification or location requiring a change in residence, and time base reductions, and “displacement” does not include changes in shifts or days, nor reassignment to other positions in the same classification and general location or employment with the contractor, provided that wages and benefits are comparable to those paid by the district. (Sections 45103.1 and 88003.1, Education (Educ.) Code.)
- 2) Authorizes contracts for management consulting services relating to food services, but includes certain prescribed restrictions. (Sections 45103.5 and 88004.5, Educ. Code.)
- 3) Requires the governing board of district, respectively, and except as provided, to employ persons not requiring certification qualifications or that are not academic positions, and to classify these employees and positions known as the “classified service.” (Sections 45100 *et seq.* and 88000 *et seq.*, Educ. Code.)
- 4) Authorizes the legislative body of any public or municipal corporation or district to contract with and employ persons for furnishing special services and advice in financial, economic, accounting, engineering, legal, or administrative matters if such persons are similarly trained and experienced and competent to perform the special services required, among other provisions. (Section 53060, Government (Gov.) Code.)
- 5) Provides for task order contracting for school districts to provide an optional alternative procedure for bidding these projects. (Sections 20118.5 *et seq.*, Gov. Code.)
- 6) Establishes, through legislative findings and declarations, that classified school employees play a vital role in the education of our pupils and students in our public schools and community colleges. They do the essential work that keeps our campuses safe, clean, and well maintained so that our pupils and students can get to school, focus on learning, and succeed at their highest levels. (Section 45390 (a), Educ. Code.)

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown. This bill is flagged as fiscal by Legislative Counsel.

COMMENTS:**1) Dual Referral**

The committee is informed that this bill is also referred to the Assembly Committee on Higher Education as to matters that are germane to its jurisdiction.

2) Background

Information provided by the author states that, “[w]orkers at public elementary and secondary schools were once almost always direct employees of the relevant school district. This traditional employer-employee relationship delivered many benefits for both parties, as well as students and their families.

“For employers, this structure reduced cost and improved control over hiring decisions. Workers enjoyed a simplified management structure and often higher wages than in the private sector, while students and their families could rest assured that education workers had been properly trained, thoroughly vetted, and intentionally selected for the job at hand. Unfortunately, all too often, this traditional employer-employee relationship is now a thing of the past. Education employers now frequently hire private entities to supply workers, especially for classified positions. Jobs such as instructional aides, after-school program instructors, security officers, custodians, and countless others are now commonly performed by employees of outside contractors, with predictably concerning results.

“These contracted out workers rarely, if ever, receive all of the training required of direct hires. This means countless education workers across California have not received legally mandated instruction on how to perform [cardiopulmonary resuscitation], [...] prevent sexual harassment, or even how to report child sexual abuse, among other critically important subjects. This alarming oversight leaves students and workers unprotected from a variety of serious hazards while creating significant liability exposure for our underfunded school system.”

The author further notes that, “[a]dditionally, these workers are prohibited from participating in the [California Public Employees’ Retirement System (CalPERS)], leaving them with inadequate, if any, retirement security [...] significantly reducing both worker and employer contributions to that system.

“It should also be noted that these contracted out workers often don’t meet the job qualifications or experience required of direct hires, but very often earn more money, sometimes \$5 - \$10 per hour or more. Sometimes they will even refuse to perform certain undesirable tasks, such as changing diapers, leaving such duties to the direct hires. This creates significant animosity and conflict within the workplace while exacerbating recruitment and retention issues throughout our classified workforce.

“Finally, even when these workers do receive the required training, the training itself is inadequate for both direct hires and contracted out workers. Many of these trainings are done online and without any meaningful opportunity for workers to ask questions or inquire about how a topic may relate to their lived experience. Given the sensitive and essential nature of many of these trainings, [...] they should be done properly and more thoroughly for all workers, regardless of employer of record.”

3) **Government Contracting Public Services: Ongoing Questions and Concerns Regarding the Use of Public Funds, Transparency, Accountability, and Quality of Service Delivery**

Government contracting of public services, generally, is to provide a particular service for a common public need. For example, in California, to address significant wildfires, the state may, and does, regularly contract with a private company or companies to operate specialized aircraft for firefighting purposes to cover terrain that is difficult to access by traditional ground equipment and personnel.

Governments also contract with nonprofits to provide services to individuals or communities where it lacks sufficient or cost-effective access, and nonprofits may help to fill a void for an otherwise deficiency in access to, or absence of, such services. In this instance, nonprofits help serve a critical role to assist government in needed access and service provision where many nonprofits can, and do, fulfill not only their mission with the financial support of public or private monies, or both, but also work to adhere to the mandates of governmental contract performance requirements while providing a service. However, there are instances where, for example, the nonprofit sector has not been immune from engaging in questionable practices; thus, raising concerns regarding transparency, accountability, and service provision.¹

“Government transparency strengthens democracy, promotes fiscal responsibility, checks corruption, and bolsters public confidence. Sunshine laws enshrine transparency into the fabric of government by guaranteeing citizens access to information regarding government expenditures and policies. When government contractors assume control of public services, in many cases they are able to circumvent sunshine laws and shield important information from disclosure. Corporations may refuse to release records that would otherwise be available by claiming that transparency would hurt their bottom lines. Many times, contractors claim that the information is a “trade secret” or “proprietary” and legally protected from public review.

“To protect the public’s right-to-information, decision-maker- should adopt strong sunshine laws that require government contractors to follow the same disclosure rules as government entities. As an additional protection, state and local governments should also include disclosure requirements in contracts.” (“*Closing the Books: How Government Contractors Hid Public Records*,” at p 2. In the Public Interest (ITPI), March 2015.)

In the aforementioned report, ITPI reviewed government contracting practices in several states. Generally, the report specifically identifies among the various states reviewed, how government contractors: a) can hide their fees; b) hide how they spend public funds; and, c) hide indicators of service quality.

¹ See, “*San Francisco police poised to cut contract of scandal-riddling SF SAFE nonprofit.*” The San Francisco Standard, February 16, 2024; “*Performance Audit of the City of Oakland’s Homelessness Services: Better Strategy and data are needed for more effective and accountable service delivery and positive outcomes for Oakland’s homeless residents.*” Oakland City Auditor, September 2022; and, “*Exclusive*” How Sacramento’s NAACP branch leaders mismanaged county funds and hired themselves.” The Sacramento Bee, January 8, 2024.

In another ITPI report, its analysis of 22 specific case studies of government contracting in a variety of sectors found that, companies: a) reduce the quality and accessibility of the service for its users and recipients; b) reduce the number of workers, eliminate staff trainings, lower employee compensation, and neglect worker safety (these profit-making measures not only harm employees, but also can impact the service itself); c) remove or fail to implement protections for the general public; and, d) remove or fail to implement protections for the environment.²

Additionally, an ITPI memo in 2019, “*Protecting the Common Good in Public Services*,” among other things, notes that, “[as] local and state policymakers look for ways to balance their government budgets, some consider privatization of important public services as a way to save money. But, as shown repeatedly in many localities, privatization is not a cure for financial woes. [It] can actually increase costs for a city, compromise the quality of critical services relied on by residents, and harm the local community and economy. Policy makers may also lose the ability to ensure accountability and exercise critical oversight over public services. Privatization can also outsource responsibilities traditionally performed by government that can have long-lasting negative consequences for residents and undermine the very idea of the common good.”

Some of the public services privatization risks identified in the memo are: a) little or no cost savings; b) reduced service quality; loss of middle-class jobs; c) loss of accountability and transparency; lack of adequate monitoring and oversight; and, d) money leaves the community.

In the ITPI reports and memo, suggested approaches to address the common findings center on the overall theme of contractual performance, and more specifically, the need for increased transparency, accountability, and increased monitoring for efficacy by government officials.

4) **Increasing Reliance by Public Employers on Contracting Out for Services**

The committee is reminded of its informational hearing on May 10, 2023, titled “Strengthening California through the Public Sector and Its Workforce,” which focused on various subjects, including contracting out of public employee work.

During that hearing, the committee heard from a number of panelists, including experts from the University of California at Berkeley Labor Center, where data was provided and substantial concerns were expressed by other panelists about the ongoing and increasing reliance by public employers, including the state – as an employer, on a contingent, part-time, temporary, contracted out, or retired annuitant workforce to fill public sector vacancies, or to perform the duties of willing and capable existing and prospective public employees. These concerns also detailed how public employers are increasingly relying on these forms of employment and in a manner that has deleterious effects on wage growth, employee morale, employer-employee relations, and the need to ensure operational consistency and quality in the provision of services to the public that could be performed by permanent employees.

² “*Cutting Corners: How Government Contractors Harm the Public in Pursuit of Profit*, ITPI, April 2016.

These concerns also detailed how public employers are increasingly relying on these forms of employment and in a manner that has deleterious effects on wage growth, employee morale, employer-employee relations, and the need to ensure operational consistency and quality in the provision of services to the public that could be performed by permanent employees.

Following the committee's hearing in 2023, another informational hearing was held on April 17, 2024, titled: "Public Service Delivery and Workforce Wellbeing – Addressing the Vacancy Crisis in Local Government," where civil service vacancies, impacts of vacancies on the civil service workforce and services, and collaborative solutions to address civil service vacancies, were discussed.

5) **Concerns Relating to Ambiguity, Other Deficiencies in Clarity, Other Relevant State Laws and Inconsistency, and Relation to Federal Law**

a) **Huh? Proposed Statutory Ambiguity**

As previously enumerated, this bill requires, among other things, that the contract guarantee contributions to any bona fide fringe benefit programs providing health care or retirement benefits to a direct hire that are equivalent to the amount that would be contributed if the contracted worker was a direct hire.³ However, this provision could be construed to have two separate and distinct meanings. For example, this provision could be construed to mean that the contract include a guarantee that contributions are: (1) made to any fringe benefit program... (e.g., California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS), California State Teacher's Retirement System (CalSTRS), or independent public employee retirement system; or, (2) to any other fringe benefit program providing the same (e.g., a private retirement, stock bonus, or other profit-sharing plan).

It is noted that information provided by the author regarding this bill unambiguously expresses a requirement that contributions be made to CalPERS by the public entity *on behalf of the contracted out worker* to somewhat alleviate the financial incentive to not hire direct employees while improving the solvency of this key institution, as but one means of addressing the stated problem. While this information provides additional clarity and could, but does not have to, be considered upon judicial review by a court of competent jurisdiction if the statute were enacted and legally challenged, this information could serve as a guide to the court regarding legislative intent in issuing its ruling. However, the express provisions of this bill are inconsistent with that supplemental information.

Erring on the side of caution as to what is explicitly stated in the bill, because this provision in the bill is deficient in clarity, and based on a plain reading of the proposed statute itself, it could be construed to have two separate and distinct legal meanings and applications, and is ambiguous.

³ See Sections 45103.1 (a) (2) and 88003.1 (a) (2) of this bill.

b) Who Pays What to Whom...? Other Deficiencies in Clarity

Similarly, this bill does not explicitly state what entity is responsible for making contributions to a “fringe benefit program....” As such, it is unclear whether the district or the contractor would be responsible for making such contributions.

It is noted that the contractor would not lawfully be responsible for making contributions to a public employee pension plan, such as CalPERS, as neither private entities as such and their employees are eligible to participate in the system for that employment. To require otherwise more likely than not, would run afoul of state and federal laws discussed further below. In addition, it also is unclear as to how the requirement would be enforced to ensure compliance.

If the intent of the author is for the district to make such contributions, the provisions of this bill must be amended in the future to provide explicit clarity. However, even if the bill were amended to provide such clarity, other concerns exist regarding existing state and federal laws, discussed further below.

c) Who is Paying for What? Other Relevant State Laws and Inconsistency

Existing laws establish the Public Employees’ Retirement Law (PERL), administered by CalPERS.

The express purpose of the PERL is to effect economy and efficiency in the *public service* by providing a means whereby *employees* who become superannuated or otherwise incapacitated may, without hardship or prejudice, be replaced by more capable employees, and to that end provide a retirement system consisting of retirement compensation and death benefits. (Emphasis.)

Within this body of law, for example, the following terms are defined in the Gov. Code: “Annuity” (Section 20018); “Beneficiary” (Section 20019); “Benefit” (Section 20020); “Contracting Agency” (Section 20022); “Employee” (Section 20028); “Employer” (Section 20030); “Labor Policy or Agreement” (Section 20049); “Normal Contribution” (Section 20053); “Pension” (Section 20054); “Public Agency” (Sections 20056, 20057, and 20057.1); “Retirement” (Section 20060); “Retirement Allowance” (Section 20061); “School Employer, including, except those participating in a risk pool” (Sections 20063 and 20062.5, respectively), among others. None of these provisions or others throughout the PERL address private contractors and their employees who provide services to a district under an agreement, nor their participation and receipt of retirement benefits from the system.

A requirement that an agreement between the district and contractor include provisions that guarantee contributions to a “fringe benefit program...” may appear to be an attractive means to deter or minimize district contracting while simultaneously financially supporting the long-term sustainability of CalPERS. As these may be viewed as laudable intents, and

indeed, as this bill may resolve to encourage district direct hiring and increase pension system participation towards those ends, districts participating in CalPERS can currently make discretionary contributions to CalPERS for various reasons (e.g., reduce or eliminate liability, or increase future budgetary savings) provided that additional available or unencumbered budgetary means exist to do so. However, mandating such contributions, especially to a public employee pension plan like CalPERS, may not be legally tenable and could run afoul of substantive federal laws relating to CalPERS' federal qualified plan tax status, also discussed below.

d) Wait a Minute. Not So Fast. Federal Law: Section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code

Section 401, Title 26 of the United States Code (Internal Revenue Code (IRC) Section 401) establishes the qualification requirements as a qualified trust for certain profit-sharing, stock bonus, and pension plans under federal law. In sum, IRC Section 401 provides, among other things, that the plans of an employer are for the *exclusive benefit of its employees or their beneficiaries*. (*Emphasis.*) A public employee pension plan, such as CalPERS, derives and maintains its federal tax status as a bona fide (rather, qualified) plan through federal law compliance for purposes of qualifying for, and maintaining, this important qualification.

The committee is informed that to the extent that this bill maintains a requirement that a district (or contractor, as it is currently unclear as to whom is responsible) pay contributions to CalPERS (or other "fringe benefit program...") for: (1) contract worker/private sector employee (who is not eligible for CalPERS membership based on that employment); or, in the alternative, (2) pay contributions that are not specifically attributable to a CalPERS member since there is no direct hire on whose behalf to make such contributions, and those contributions would be for purposes unrelated to the direct provision of a retirement and associated benefits that exclusively inure to the benefit of the direct hire/employee or their beneficiary – even as a measure of sorts to deter or minimize contracting – may have substantially negative implications that could jeopardize CalPERS' ability to maintain its federal qualified plan tax status, which in turn, negatively impact CalPERS-participating and contracting employers, and perhaps, CalPERS members.

It is further noted that while IRC Section 401 regarding plan qualification has largely remained stable for decades, given ongoing uncertainty at the federal government level regarding the potential for changes to existing or new laws, it is recommend that the committee exercise caution and remain vigilant as to changes, either through congressional action or executive fiat, that may interfere with or disrupt California public employee pension plans' ability to maintain their IRC Section 401 qualified plan status.

6) Provisions Relating to Minimum Qualifications and Training

It is noted that Sections 45103.1 (a) (7), inclusive, and 88003.1 (a) (7), inclusive, of this bill propose to amend existing laws by requiring specified minimum qualifications and standards of the contractor's hiring practices. Some, if not many or all, of these standards may be similar to

the minimum qualifications that individuals interested in entering the classified service must possess for employment consideration or hire by a district.

As to the training provisions in Section 45103.3, inclusive, and 888033.3, inclusive, it is further noted that while some may be averse to spending time on or in employment training, historically, such training (including in-person and/or interactive) is viewed as operationally positive as a means of assisting the employer, employee, and service recipient to continuously improve the quality of services provided, and/or for compliance with various laws.

7) Suggestions to the Author and Other Important Information for Future Consideration

Based on the discussions under Comment 5), above, it is highly advised that the author fully resolve these matters in the future. If these concerns cannot fully be cured, it is highly advised that the author remove the proposed amendments in Sections 45103.1 (a) (2) and 88003.1(a) (2).

If, however, the author subsequently intends, instead, to amend this bill to explicitly clarify that the contract between the district and contractor guarantee contributions by the contractor to a “fringe benefit program...” that does not involve contributions to a pension plan such as CalPERS, the author is informed that current law, known as the California Savers Retirement Savings (CalSavers) Program established pursuant to Chapter 804, Statutes of 2016 (Senate Bill 1234, De León), which is administered by the CalSavers Retirement Savings Board within the Office of the State Treasurer, exists for private sector employee retirement savings, subject to certain requirements.⁴

8) Statement by the Author

“Despite not always saving the state money, contracting out public sector jobs has become an increasing issue. Public schools have become no exception and classified workers are especially taking the hit. Instructional aides, afterschool program instructors, custodians and more are all being filled by third party contractors. These contracted out workers often make more money than employees that were directly hired, even though they often lack the same training qualifications and experience. [This bill] protects our classified school employees and students by furthering wage parity, training quality and a more equitable hiring system for all.”

9) Comments by Supporters

The California Faculty Association – A Union of Educators and Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO (CFT) expresses that contracting by districts reduces costs, but direct hiring delivers benefits to employees, the district, students, and their families. However, direct hiring where an employer-employee relationship is established is becoming a thing of the past. The CFT further expresses that, contracted workers often don’t meet job qualifications or experience required of direct hires, but earn more money per hour, and are provided inadequate, if any, retirement

⁴ Also visit: <https://www.treasurer.ca.gov./calsavers>

security. This bill proposes to address these issues, including the training quality for all classified workers.

Other supporters offer statements similar to those of the CFT.

10) Comments by Opponents

Among other things, a coalition of local education agencies (LEAs) state that, “[m]any school districts and community college districts rely on contractors to support urgent or temporary staffing needs, yet [this bill] significantly limits their ability to do so. The requirement that employers demonstrate a contracted worker meets or exceeds the minimum qualification for direct hires creates yet another barrier to quickly filling critical roles. With the current education workforce crisis, adding administrative hurdles only delays necessary students for LEAs and the students they serve. Moreover, [this bill] would result in logistical and operational difficulties for LEAs. The requirement that trainings allow for real-time questions and answers, and those specified trainings be conducted in person, presents serious logistical challenges. Many schools rely on virtual training to efficiently and effectively train thousands of employees. This bill would eliminate that flexibility, complicating compliance and increasing costs.

“Additionally, this bill results in increased financial burdens for school districts. Mandating in-person training and offering live questions and answers will drive up staffing costs. Larger districts with thousands of employees will be faced with exponential cost increases, while smaller districts with fewer resources will struggle to meet the requirements. Finally, compliance with these new requirements creates additional legal risks, potentially exposing LEAs to disputes and lawsuits, further increasing costs at a time when school budgets are already stretched thin.”

11) Prior or Related Legislation

Assembly Bill 1233 (Hoover, 2025) proposes to require a person applying for a noncertificated position at a school district, county office of education (COE), or state special school to provide that prospective employer with a complete list of every school district, COE, charter school, or state special school where the applicant was previously employed. This bill is currently pending in the Assembly Committee on Public Employment and Retirement.

Assembly Bill 393 (Connolly, 2025) proposes to require the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation and the State Department of State Hospitals, before entering into a personal services contract to have a contractor fill a budgeted State Bargaining Unit 16 physician position, to take specified actions. This bill is currently pending in the Assembly Committee on Appropriations.

Assembly Bill 339 (Ortega) proposes to require the governing body of a public agency, board, and commission to give a recognized employee organization written notice regarding contracts to perform services that are within the scope of work of job classifications represented by the

recognized employee organization. This bill is currently pending in the Assembly Committee on Appropriations.

Assembly Bill 24 (DeMaio, 2025) establishes legislative intent to enact a constitutional amendment to achieve cost savings for the state and balance the budget by, among other things, *requiring state government agencies to competitively source or contract out services.* (*Emphasis.*) This bill is currently pending in the Assembly Committee on Local Government.

Chapter 409, Statutes of 2024 (Assembly Bill 2561, McKinnor) requires certain actions by local public agencies and provides certain entitlements to recognized employee organizations relating to employment vacancies, recruitment, and retention efforts, among other provisions.

Assembly Bill 2557 (Ortega, 2024) proposes to makes changes to existing law relating to contracts by local governments (i.e., counties, cities, local public agencies, and municipal corporations) for certain services by requiring such contracts to include specific standards and requirements, among other provisions. This bill was held in the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Assembly Bill 2489 (Ward, 2024) proposed to makes changes to existing law relating to contracts by local governments, i.e., counties, cities, local public agencies, and municipal corporations, for certain services by requiring the local governing body, as prescribed, to provide written notice to the exclusive representative of the workforce affected by the contract, among other provisions. This bill was held in the Assembly Committee on Appropriations.

Assembly Bill 775 (Arambula, 2023) proposed to require the Department of State Hospitals to establish a physician registry for the Patton State Hospital under a three-year pilot program by January 1, 2025, among other provisions. This bill was held in the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Assembly Bill 657 (Cooper, 2021) originally proposed to establish certain prohibitions and reporting requirements relating to a state agency contracting with a professional, as defined, among other provisions. This bill was substantially amended to address an unrelated subject.

Senate Bill 422 (Pan, 2021) proposed to amend existing law relating to the use of personal services contracts by the state by establishing a health professional registry consisting of existing state employees for supplemental, temporary work that would otherwise be performed by health contractors from private company medical registries, among other provisions. This bill was vetoed by the Governor who stated that:

“This bill is unclear on implementation and does not demonstrate how it would significantly reduce DSH’s reliance on contractors. While I am supportive of ideas to reduce state reliance on contractors, the creation of the registry and the determination of associated compensation are matters that are more appropriately handled through the budget and labor negotiations processes.”

Assembly Bill 1250 (Jones-Sawyer, 2017) proposed to establish specific standards for the use of personal service contracts by counties and cities, among other provisions. This bill was held by the Senate Committee on Rules.

Chapter 504, Statues of 2014 (Assembly Bill 2387, Pan) exempted the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) from certain notification requirements when entering into personal services contracts, as specified, and exempts both the POST and the Office of Emergency Services from the requirement of obtaining three competitive bids when those contracts are solely for the services of instructors for public safety training.

Chapter 196, Statutes of 2013 (Assembly Bill 583, Gomez) requires the board of trustees, common council, or other legislative body of a city or the board of trustees of a library district in which a withdrawal from the county free library system becomes effective on or after January 1, 2012 to comply with specified requirements before entering into a contract to operate the city's or the district's libraries with a private contractor that will employ library staff to achieve cost savings, among other provisions.

Chapter 611, Statutes of 2011 (Assembly Bill 438, Williams) imposed specified requirements, until January 1, 2019, on a city or library district that intends to withdraw from a county free library system and operate libraries with a private contractor that will employ library staff to achieve cost savings.

Senate Bill 906 (Alarcon, 2003) proposed to establish standards for the use of personal service contracts by local government, similar to those of state government and school districts, for work currently or customarily performed by civil service employees. This bill failed passage by the Assembly.

Chapter 894, Statutes of 2002 (Senate Bill 1419, Alarcon) establishes standards for the use of personal service contracts in school and community college districts.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

California Federation of Teachers - a Union of Educators and Classified Professionals,
AFT, AFL-CIO

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO
California School Employees Association, AFL-CIO

Opposition

Alameda County Office of Education
Alameda Unified School District
California Association of School Business Officials
California Association of Suburban School Districts

California County Superintendents
Orange County Department of Education
Riverside County Superintendent of Schools
School Employers Association of California

Analysis Prepared by: Michael Bolden / P. E. & R. / (916) 319-3957