

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

AB 1721 (Muratsuchi)

As Amended August 21, 2026

Majority vote

SUMMARY

Requires the Education Commissioner, in consultation with the State Board of Education (SBE) and specified stakeholders, to develop recommendations on the development and approval processes for school safety plans and provide a report to the Legislature by July 1, 2028.

Senate Amendments

- 1) Removes the requirement to convene a workgroup and requires the Education Commissioner, in consultation with the SBE and specified stakeholders, to develop recommendations on the development and approval processes for school safety plans.
- 2) Adds a member of either a governing board of a school district or a county board of education and a member of the governing body of a charter school to the list of stakeholders required to be consulted.
- 3) Replace references to the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) with the Education Commissioner.

COMMENTS

School safety plans have become unwieldy and less effective due to frequent changes. In addition to a requirement to include new content and procedures in comprehensive school safety plans, AB 1747 (Rodriguez), Chapter 806, Statutes of 2018, required the California Department of Education (CDE) to develop and post on its website best practices for reviewing and approving school safety plans. Among other resources, the CDE developed and posted a Compliance Tool for a Comprehensive School Safety Plan which includes more than 30 items to be considered. One may question whether the multitude of requirements to be included in the content and related procedures of the comprehensive school safety plans required for California public schools have led to documents that are unwieldy and that may compromise school safety.

School safety plans as a key component of school safety. Comprehensive school safety plans are a key component of school safety and are required by state law. Safety plans are a collection of procedures for schools to use in the event of an emergency, as well as policies to promote a safe learning environment. Each school district and county office of education (COE) is responsible for the overall development of all safety plans for its schools that operate kindergarten or any grades one through 12. A charter school's petition is required to include the development of a school safety plan which largely mirrors the requirements for the school district and COE plans. The comprehensive school safety plan is developed by the schoolsite council or a safety committee.

According to the Author

"Schools are responsible for creating learning environments that are safe and secure for students, staff, and visitors. Schools must be prepared to respond to emergencies, including natural and man-made hazards, and strive to prevent violence and behaviors that undermine safety and security. Following the addition of multiple new requirements for a comprehensive school safety

plan in recent years, there is a need to have experts review the requirements, conduct a thorough assessment, and make recommendations on how to improve and update the plans while maintaining those elements critical to school safety."

Arguments in Support

The Association of California School Administrators writes, "Since 2013, 15 bills have been signed into law amending the California School Safety Plan's (CSSP) required content and procedures. In the 2023-24 legislative session alone, nine new measures were adopted, significantly impacting the required content and procedures that must be developed in a district's CSSP. While these changes reflect a growing recognition of the need for comprehensive support and safety procedures in educational environments, the rapid introduction of these new requirements has led to increasing concerns among administrators and stakeholders regarding the overall effectiveness and practicality of a district's CSSP.

Given the recent additions to the CSSP requirements, it is essential to engage experts in the field to conduct a detailed review of these new requirements. By requiring the Superintendent of Public Instruction to evaluate the CSSP framework in conjunction with public safety and emergency services experts and district site leaders, policymakers can assure students and families that the CSSP remains an effective tool for promoting student well-being and safety."

Arguments in Opposition

The California Public Defenders Association writes, "California public defenders represent thousands of young people across the state in youth justice and related education proceedings. While acutely aware of the need for enhanced safety in schoolhouses, and supportive of the convening of a statewide advisory working group to address those concerns, we have strong reservations about the emphasis on law enforcement/surveillance as the primary strategy for achieving that goal. We offer three proposed amendments to address those concerns.

We have suggested redefining the composition of the stakeholder workgroup to include youth advocates, behavioral health professionals, school counselors, restorative justice practitioners, disability rights organizations, LGBTQ+ student advocates, and representatives from communities disproportionately impacted by school policing. Depending on who is at the table, redefined safety plans could lead to the increased emphasis on threat assessment frameworks, surveillance tools, and formalized coordination with law enforcement agencies, rather than meaningful investment in counseling, prevention-based strategies, and community supports.

We would also like to see "safety" explicitly defined to include behavioral health, student well-being, suicide prevention, and trauma-informed practices—not solely threat mitigation. Last, we suggest including language that elevates prevention based and supportive strategies as primary safety tools, with enforcement-based approaches secondary and narrowly tailored. We all share the same goal of ensuring students in school are safe. How we define "safety" and who is brought to the table are important components of achieving that goal. We look forward to continuing to work with the author so that we can support this bill."

FISCAL COMMENTS

None on this version of the bill.

VOTES:**ASM EDUCATION: 8-0-0**

YES: Patel, Hoover, Alvarez, Bonta, Castillo, Garcia, Lowenthal, Zbur

ASM APPROPRIATIONS: 15-0-0

YES: Wicks, Hoover, Aguiar-Curry, Calderon, Caloza, Dixon, Fong, Mark González, Krell, Pacheco, Pellerin, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Ta, Tangipa

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 73-0-7

YES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Johnson, Krell, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

ABS, ABST OR NV: Arambula, Chen, Garcia, Kalra, Lackey, Ramos, Celeste Rodriguez

UPDATED

VERSION: August 21, 2026

CONSULTANT: Debbie Look / ED. / (916) 319-2087

FN: 0004273