

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

AB 2008 (Patel)

As Amended June 18, 2026

Majority vote

SUMMARY

Requires a future bill that would require a local education agency (LEA) to complete a plan or report with an unspecified date to include a provision that repeals the reporting requirement four years after it goes into effect, unless the author directs otherwise. Requires the California Department of Education (CDE) to develop a standardized template for use by LEAs when completing programmatic or expenditure competitive state grant reports by October 1, 2027.

Senate Amendments

- 1) Clarify that the standardized report template created by CDE shall specifically apply to programmatic or expenditure reports for competitive state grant programs, except for grants for technical assistance providers.
- 2) Requires the CDE to ensure the template creates efficiencies for LEAs. Requires the CDE to consult relevant stakeholders when creating the template, including soliciting initial input and providing opportunities to provide input on drafts before the template is finalized.
- 3) Require the template to solicit information on the anticipated future of the funded activity, rather than a sustainability plan.
- 4) Require the template to solicit additional information if required by statute, rather than certifications deemed necessary.
- 5) Require the CDE, beginning January 1, 2028, to issue the final report template to LEAs as part of the notice of award information, and again six months before the final report due date. Require the CDE to prepopulate the template with the relevant administrative information.
- 6) Clarify that a bill that would require an LEA to complete a plan or report shall include a provision repealing that requirement no later than four years following enactment if the bill has an undefined end date, or four years after the final specified due date of any plan or report.

COMMENTS

Multiple recent reports have commented on LEA's administrative burden from reporting requirements. This bill attempts to streamline and create structures that help reduce administrative burden for LEAs from a myriad of reporting requirements. In recent years, reports have been published that speak to the reporting burden felt by LEAs and how that takes away from their core educational mission.

- 1) SB 1315 (Archuleta, Chapter 468, Statutes of 2024) required CDE, by March 1, 2025, to provide a report on the number and types of reports that LEAs are required to annually submit, and for that report to include the purpose of each report and recommendations for which reports can be consolidated, eliminated, or truncated. This legislation was sponsored by the California School Boards Association (CSBA) and the California Association of

School Business Officials. In CDE's report, they stated the following: "While the CDE recognizes the important role data plays in measuring outcomes, fostering transparency, and supporting accountability; the CDE further recognizes the frustration educators and LEA administrators experience when data collection efforts impact their ability to serve students, especially if those data collections fail to render information that clearly connects to improved student outcomes."

- 2) Shortly after the Governor signed SB 1315, CSBA published a report in October 2024 called "Drowning in Documentation: Toward More Effective and Manageable Reporting for California Districts". The report described the volume and complexity of reporting requirements for LEAs and how it's often underappreciated how a single new reporting requirement can generate thousands of hours of additional work annually across the state. The report also focused on how the myriad of reporting requirements can be especially administratively burdensome for smaller districts with limited staff capacity.
- 3) The Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE) released a policy brief in May 2026 called "California's Balance Between State and Local Control" that stated "administrative burden is pervasive across the system, though its value varies across activities. ... Some compliance activities support core governance goals such as equity, civil rights, accountability, and fiscal stewardship. Others are experienced as duplicative, low-value, or disconnected from instructional improvement."

LEA reporting processes are currently fragmented. A full account of the number and types of reports that LEAs must complete each year has been difficult to produce, in part because there is not a single submission platform that processes all reports. A 2025 report by the CDE identified 59 examples of data they collect, which schools report across 39 different submission portals. This does not include federal requirements. The required plans, applications, and reports LEAs submit to the state fall into some of the following categories:

A report by Fresno County Office of Education (COE) identified over 204 reporting requirements, which must be submitted through 36 different collection systems to 17 divisions of the CDE. They report that individual school administrators spend 30% of their time each week on reporting requirements. The 2025/2026 Master Calendar created by Fresno County Superintendent of Schools includes a non-exhaustive list of 28 reports that required data submissions that year.

The utility of a standardized reporting template. In its 2025 report on reports, the CDE noted that there are currently at least 39 distinct data reporting systems that LEAs use to complete required reports. Furthermore, the 2024 CSBA analysis highlights that LEA reporting activities are often highly duplicative, as school administrators are asked to input the same information (e.g., school attendance rates) across multiple different reporting documents. The use of a standardized template could simplify and expedite the reporting process.

The auto-repeal of government reports. In 2010, the State enacted a measure to remove obsolete reports and require an automatic sunset provision be added to all future reports required of state agencies (AB 1585 (Committee on Accountability and Administrative Review), Chapter 7, Statutes of 2010). The Assembly Committee on Business and Professions analysis of the bill noted that, at the time, there were more than 1,200 obsolete reporting requirements in statute.

These obsolete reports were identified by examining the list of reports maintained by the Office of Legislative Counsel. As LEA reports are not submitted to the Office of Legislative Counsel, most LEA reporting requirements were not examined in this cleanup process. Similarly, the sunset provision that this statute applied to future reports from state agencies does not apply to LEAs. AB 2008 would remedy this, providing LEAs with the same protections against obsolete reports that are currently afforded to state agencies.

The bill includes opt-out provision due to not being able to compel a future Legislature. This bill requires a future bill that would require an LEA to complete a plan or report to also include a provision in the bill that repeals the planning or reporting requirement four years after the bill becomes operative or four years after the final due date of a plan or report, unless the person requesting the bill specifies otherwise. Existing law provides a nearly identical automatic repeal of reports for state agencies specifically. This bill and existing law both have an opt-out provision that states that the requirement does not apply if the person requesting the bill directs Legislative Counsel to do otherwise. This opt-out provision is inserted because this bill cannot compel a future Legislature to automatically repeal reporting requirements, but according to the author, this bill aims to prompt the question about when and why reporting requirements may be needed for their bills. Similarly, the bill includes opt-out provisions to use an alternative reporting process if the person requesting the bill directs Legislative Counsel not to reference the standardized reporting template.

According to the Author

California's schools administer an ever-growing number of state and federal programs that help them operate. However, each program requires schools to submit plans and reports on how the money is used. While individually these requirements appear reasonable, their cumulative impact is overwhelming. And while the State often adds new requirements, old ones are rarely removed, even when they become outdated.

AB 2008 would add an automatic sunset to school planning and reporting requirements, making them inoperable four years after they go into effect. This common-sense provision, which already exists for other state government agencies, will allow schools to submit a reasonable amount of data without being bogged down by perpetual requirements.

School administrators from across the state have been asking for 'permission to focus.' They want to spend their time on improving student success, not filling out endless reports. AB 2008 would give them that permission. By automatically sunseting outdated reporting requirements, AB 2008 would give much-needed time back to school administrators and allow them to better serve our students.

Arguments in Support

According to the Association of School Administrators, "Our organizations strongly support transparency and responsible stewardship of public funds, and we recognize that planning and reporting are essential components of California's education accountability system. At the same time, local educational agencies (LEAs) face an opportunity cost in redirecting limited staff that would otherwise support teachers and students to complete planning and reporting requirements. One way the state can carefully balance these two interests is by considering the appropriate duration of any new reporting and planning requirements it chooses to enact."

Arguments in Opposition

None on file.

FISCAL COMMENTS

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

The CDE estimates General Fund costs of \$224,000 each year and 1.3 positions to comply with the bill's requirements. The workload activities include the establishment of a standardized reporting template for LEAs, ongoing data governance management, consultation with stakeholders, and completion of the bill's reporting requirement.

VOTES:**ASM EDUCATION: 9-0-0**

YES: Patel, Hoover, Alvarez, Bonta, Castillo, Garcia, Lowenthal, Pellerin, 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: 72-0-8

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, Irwin, Jackson, Johnson, Kalra, 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, Zbur, Rivas

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

SENATE FLOOR: 39-0-1

YES: Allen, Alvarado-Gil, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Becker, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cervantes, Choi, Cortese, Dahle, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Grove, Hurtado, Jones, Laird, Limón, McGuire, McNERney, Menjivar, Niello, Ochoa Bogh, Padilla, Pérez, Richardson, Rubio, Seyarto, Smallwood-Cuevas, Stern, Strickland, Umberg, Valladares, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener

ABS, ABST OR NV: Reyes

UPDATED

VERSION: June 18, 2026

CONSULTANT: Sarah Cate Hawthorne / ED. / (916) 319-2087

FN: 0003822