
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 2225	Hearing Date:	June 24, 2026
Author:	Patel, et al.		
Version:	June 17, 2026		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Therresa Austin		

Subject: Pupil achievement: Closing the Achievement Gap State Operations and Support Plan.

SUMMARY

This bill convenes a working group to develop a Closing the Achievement Gap State Operations and Support Plan (CTAG Plan), that includes, among other things, specific goals and benchmarks for the state to support school districts, county offices of education (COEs), and charter schools in closing the achievement gap; an assessment of state entities tasked with meeting the state's public education goals; and recommendations for appropriate remedial action if the state does not meet those benchmarks and goals.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the single multiple measures public school accountability system, which must measure the overall performance of numerically significant pupil subgroups in schools, including charter schools, school districts and COEs. Numerically significant pupil subgroups include: ethnic subgroups, socioeconomic disadvantaged pupils, English learners, long-term English learners, pupils with disabilities, foster youth, and homeless youth. (Education Code (EC) § 52052)
- 2) Requires Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs) to address how the district will address and improve in eight state priority areas, including pupil achievement as measured by, among other things, the percentage of pupils who have successfully completed courses that satisfy the requirements for entrance to the University of California (UC) and the California State University (CSU), or the completion of career pathways. (EC § 52060)
- 3) Requires local educational agencies (LEAs) to adopt and annually revise LCAPs. (EC §§ 47604.33, 52060, and 52066)
- 4) Establishes a single system for providing support (System of Support) to LEAs and schools and for programs established by the federal Every Student Succeeds Act to do all of the following:

- a) Support the continuous improvement of pupil performance within the state priorities;
 - b) Address the gaps in achievement between pupil subgroups;
 - c) Improve outreach and collaboration with stakeholders to ensure that the goals, actions and services described in school district and COE LCAPs reflect the needs of pupils and the community, especially for historically underrepresented or low-achieving populations. (EC § 52059.5)
- 5) Establishes the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE), whose purpose is to advise and assist school districts, county superintendents of schools, and charter schools in achieving the goals set forth in their LCAPs. The CCEE is required to achieve this purpose by facilitating continuous improvement for LEAs within California's system of public school support. (EC § 52074)
- 6) Requires, for any school district for which one or more pupil subgroups meet specified criteria, the county superintendent of schools to provide technical assistance for a minimum of two years following the identification that shall be focused on building the school district's capacity to develop and implement actions and services responsive to pupil and community needs. (EC 52071(c))

ANALYSIS

This bill:

Working group

- 1) Requires, on or before July 1, 2027, the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI), with the approval of the executive director of the State Board of Education (SBE), to select, and thereafter contract with, one or more research or nonprofit organizations that have experience assessing governance structures, improving strategies to close pupil academic achievement gaps, and working with stakeholders throughout the state.
- 2) Requires, on or before September 1, 2027, the organization or organizations selected pursuant to #1 to convene a working group and meet at least once per month until the Closing the Achievement Gap State Operations Plan (CTAG Plan) is submitted to the Governor and the Legislature. Requires that the working group consists of the following voting members:
 - a) The Speaker of the Assembly or the Assembly Member's designee.
 - b) The President pro Tempore of the Senate or the Senator's designee.
 - c) The SPI or the SPI's designee.
 - d) The President of the SBE or the SBE's designee.

- e) The Secretary of the California Health and Human Services Agency, or the secretary's designee.
- f) The executive director of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) or the executive director's designee.
- g) Five members appointed by the Governor, as follows:
 - i) One school district board member
 - ii) One school district superintendent
 - iii) One public high school teacher
 - iv) One classified public school employee
 - v) One parent of a public school student
- h) Four members appointed by the Senate Rules Committee, as follows:
 - i) One county board of education member
 - ii) One public school district chief business official
 - iii) One public elementary or middle school teacher
 - iv) One representative of a public school equity advocacy organization
- i) Four members appointed by the Speaker of the State Assembly, as follows:
 - i) One county superintendent of schools.
 - b) One charter school educator.
 - c) One representative of a school district that is a frontier school district, as specified, and has an average daily enrollment of 2,500 pupils or less.
 - d) One special education local plan area (SELPA) administrator.
- 3) Prohibits the members of the working group from being compensated for their service as part of the working group. Authorizes the reimbursement of the members of the working group for travel costs.
- 4) Encourages the members of the working group to participate in meetings remotely.

- 5) Requires the working group, at its first meeting, as its first duty, to elect a chair and vice chair from among its members by a majority of the voting members of the working group.

CTAG Plan

- 6) Requires the working group to develop a CTAG Plan that shall be foundationally based in the supportive role that the state can plan with regards to LEAs.
- 7) Prohibits the CTAG Plan from recommending more local accountability processes and measures, local reporting requirements, or unfunded mandates.
- 8) Requires that the CTAG Plan include, but not be limited to, the following:
 - a) Specific goals and benchmarks for the state to support LEAs in closing the achievement gap, which shall be developed based on consideration of the following principles:
 - i) Measurable outcome targets for state entities, including but not limited to, the Governor, the Legislature, the California Department of Education (CDE), the SBE, the CTC, that allow for assessment of the extent to which state entities are supporting LEAs and not placing undue or unnecessary barriers on LEAs in their efforts to improve pupil outcomes.
 - ii) State imposed requirements and the extent that those requirements help or inhibit LEA efforts to close the achievement gap, including, but not limited to, the number and breadth of state-adopted policies, including state legislation, and determinations of whether the policies result in increased responsibilities LEAs that conflict with the state's goal of streamlining initiatives to focus on closing achievement gaps. This shall also include an impact analysis of newly adopted state requirements and the administrative workload for LEAs.
 - iii) Funding levels and alignment, including an assessment of restricted and unrestricted funding for LEAs. This shall also include the identification of state requirements that are unfunded or partially unfunded, as well as what proportion are related to activities that are not aligned with state-identified pupil outcome priorities.
 - iv) Interagency collaboration where state agencies, departments, and other state entities work together to avoid programmatic overlap or the provision of inconsistent or conflicting guidance. This also includes data interoperability, transparency, and a reduction in duplicative or unnecessary reporting requirements.
 - b) Specific performance targets aimed at closing the achievement gap for the SBE, the CDE, the CTC, and the CCEE.

- c) An assessment of state entities tasked with meeting the state's public education goals and the establishment of roles and responsibilities for those state entities, including actions the state can take to reduce fragmentation and prevent overlapping guidance and regulations.
 - d) Recommendations for specific actions that each state educational entity, including the Governor and the Legislature, can take to reduce the number of unfunded or partially funded mandates and align state-level operations and initiatives with the principles of local control.
 - e) The establishment of a clear definition of high-quality LEA technical assistance for differentiated assistance (DA), direct technical assistance, and related support.
 - f) Recommendations for appropriate remedial action if the state does not meet the benchmarks and goals to support LEAs in closing the achievement gap.
- 9) Authorizes the working group to consult with individuals and groups and establish subcommittees, including those that are advisory in nature, or other subgroups to assist in developing the CTAG Plan.
 - 10) Prohibits the provisions of this bill from being construed to allow for the establishing of new recommendations of either of the following:
 - a) New LEA mandates or allow for the new or revised local accountability structures for LEAs.
 - b) New requirements on LEAs or requirements to submit any new or additional report beyond existing federal and state reporting requirements.
 - 11) Requires the workgroup to only rely upon metrics provided through existing statewide data collections, to the maximum extent practicable.
 - 12) Requires the working group to submit the CTAG Plan to the Governor and the Legislature, as specified, on or before March 1, 2028.
 - 13) Encourages the Assembly Committee on Budget and Senate Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review to evaluate the state's progress in meeting the benchmarks and goals established in the CTAG, on or before September 1, 2028, and annually thereafter.
 - 14) Defines "local educational agency" to mean a school district, COE, or charter school.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, "AB 2225 convenes educators, families, researchers, and policymakers to develop a comprehensive statewide plan with clear goals, benchmarks, and annual performance targets to close

achievement gaps and evaluate how well our state education programs are supporting student success.

“The achievement gap - persistent disparities in academic outcomes between different groups of students, often along lines of income, race, language status, or access to resources - show up in test scores, graduation rates, and college readiness, and they reflect deeper inequities in opportunity.

“AB 2225 is the first of a package of 4 bills in CSBA’s package to address these persistent gaps.”

- 2) ***The Closing the Achievement Gap legislative package of bills.*** As noted above by the author, this bill is one of four bills sponsored by the California School Boards Association (CSBA) in the 2025-26 Legislative Session that seek to establish “a comprehensive state-level operations and support plan that clearly defines how the state will help LEAs close achievement gaps.” This bill creates a CTAG Plan, which informs the actions of the other bills:
 - a) AB 2149 (Garcia, 2026) would require the Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) to assess and publicly report to the Legislature and the Governor the state’s progress in closing pupil academic achievement gaps and to include recommendations on actions that the state can take to meet the performance targets proposed to be established in the CTAG Plan.
 - b) AB 2202 (Muratsuchi, 2026) would establish the Closing the Achievement Gap Commission, an advisory body to the SBE; and
 - c) AB 2514 (Ransom, 2026) would require the working group established by AB 2225 to include recommendations for the development of a State of the Achievement Gap Dashboard within the CTAG Plan.
- 3) ***California’s state education entities.*** This bill establishes a working group to develop a state operations and support plan to close student achievement gaps. The bill requires that the Plan includes, among other things, an assessment of the state entities tasked with meeting the state’s public education goals as well as recommendations on actions that the state can take to reduce fragmentation and prevent overlapping guidance and regulations. California’s education ecosystem comprises several entities with distinct objectives that are intended to work together to serve students and schools. They include the following:
 - a) The Governor signs legislation and proposes programs and school funding allocations through the state budget.
 - b) The Legislature reviews and approves the Governor’s budget and passes legislation, including those that establish new programs and initiatives, and define the roles and responsibilities of state and local educational entities.

- c) The SBE serves as a policymaking body appointed by the Governor that is responsible for adopting and approving academic standards, curriculum frameworks, instructional materials, state assessments, and regulations.
 - d) The SPI is an elected official who implements laws and programs as head of the CDE. The CDE and the SPI are responsible for administering educational programs; enforcing education laws and regulations; collecting demographic, fiscal, and performance data; providing technical assistance and training; distributing funds; and overseeing COEs and LCAPs.
 - e) The CTC develops program standards and accredits educator credential preparation programs; issues teaching and service credentials as well as permits; and administers credential discipline.
 - f) The CCEE provides various levels of academic support and technical assistance to LEAs (see CCEE section below).
 - g) The Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) helps LEAs identify, prevent, and resolve financial, operational, and data management challenges by providing management assistance and professional learning opportunities.
- 4) ***The Local Control Funding Formula.*** This bill seeks to address concerns voiced by LEAs that California's existing accountability and governance systems lack cohesion, which, in turn, creates barriers and burdens on their ability to support student outcomes. Much of California's current accountability mechanisms resulted from the state's shift away from a previous education funding model based on rigid categorical programs and highly centralized education programs to one that emphasizes local control—known as the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF).
- The LCFF was enacted in 2013-14 to simplify school funding and improve student outcomes by giving LEAs more control over how to spend state funding, and providing more resources to meet the educational needs of low-income students, English learners, and foster youth. To provide oversight regarding how LEAs spend LCFF funding and serve students, the state also established a new system of transparency, accountability, and stakeholder engagement through the LCAP, the California Schools Dashboard, the Statewide System of Supports (SSOS), and the CCEE. These systems work hand in hand to identify LEAs that need additional assistance in supporting students from historically underserved backgrounds and to monitor their progress in addressing student needs.
- 5) ***Local Control and Accountability Plans.*** The LCAP is a three-year plan that describes the goals, actions, services, and expenditures to support positive student outcomes that address state and local priorities. The LCAP provides an opportunity for LEAs (school districts, COEs, and charter schools) to share their stories of how, what, and why programs and services are selected to meet their local needs. LCAPs help ensure that (1) LEAs address the needs of consistently

low-performing student groups and (2) higher performing LEAs address the needs of low-performing schools within the LEA.

- 6) ***California School Dashboard.*** The Dashboard is an online tool that shares school and LEA performance and progress on both state and local measures that are drawn from the eight priority areas of the LCFF. State measures apply to LEAs, charter schools, and specified student groups, and are based on data that is collected consistently across the state. The state measures are as follows:

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| a) Academic Performance
(reported separately for
English language arts and
Math assessments) | d) English Learner Progress |
| b) Chronic Absenteeism | e) Graduation Rate |
| c) College/Career | f) Suspension Rate |
| | g) Science |

LEAs receive one of five color-coded performance levels on the state indicators. From highest to lowest, the five performance levels are: Blue, Green, Yellow, Orange, and Red.

Local measures apply at the LEA and charter school levels and are based on locally collected data. The local indicators are as follows:

- a) Basic Services and Conditions;
- b) Implementation of State Academic Standards;
- c) Parent and Family Engagement;
- d) School Climate;
- e) Access to a Broad Course of Study;
- f) Coordination of Services for Expelled Students (for COEs only); and
- g) Coordination of Services for Foster Youth (for COEs only).

Provided an LEA satisfies the performance standards for each local measure, the Dashboard will automatically assign a performance level of *Met*. If an LEA does not meet the performance standards, the Dashboard will automatically assign a performance level of *Not Met* or *Not Met for Two or More Years*, as applicable. Earning a performance level of *Not Met for Two or More Years* may be a factor in being identified for DA.

The Dashboard is updated annually. For LEAs and schools in need of additional assistance or intervention, the Dashboard helps identify specific areas in need of targeted assistance.

- 7) ***California Collaborative for Educational Excellence.*** The CCEE was established as part of the LCFF to advise and assist LEAs in achieving the goals set forth in their LCAPs and facilitate continuous improvement within the SSOS. The CCEE provides universal, targeted, and intensive supports and resources for LEAs through the work of their three Centers for Educational Excellence:
- a) The Center for Teaching, Learning, and Leading (TTLC) – Builds capacity and support for LEAs currently receiving and in need of direct technical assistance to effectively address the systemic and instructional needs of students historically underserved.
 - b) The Center for Innovation, Instruction, and Impact (I3) – Implements a statewide approach to improving LEAs' capacity by collaboratively developing, delivering, sharing, and spotlighting research-based practices that demonstrate the power to improve outcomes.
 - c) The Center for Transformative Systems (TSEE) – Facilitates the realization of a shared vision for implementing the SSOS, developing coordinated actions that result in equitable educational outcomes as defined in an LEA's LCAP goals.
- 8) ***California's Statewide Systems of Support.*** The SSOS was established under the LCFF to provide varying levels of assistance to meet the unique needs of LEAs. This system ensures that all educational agencies have access to the resources and support they need to improve student outcomes. The purpose of the SSOS, as articulated in statute, is to build the capacity of LEAs in each of the following ways:
- a) Support continuous improvement of student performance in each of the eight state priority areas, based on Dashboard results;
 - b) Address the gaps in achievement between student groups; and
 - c) Improve outreach and collaboration with stakeholders to ensure that goals, actions, and services described in school district and COE LCAPs reflect the needs of students and the community, especially for historically underrepresented or low-achieving groups.

The SSOS is based on a three-level framework:

- Level 1 - Universal Support: This foundational level of support is available to all districts, charters, COEs, and SELPAs in California. Universal supports include access to tools and resources, professional learning, and services provided by various technical assistance providers within the SSOS, coordinated by the CCEE and the CDE.
- Level 2 – Targeted/Supplemental Assistance or DA: Targeted support is available to LEAs with an identified area of need that meets the eligibility requirements set by the SBE. At this level, COEs, the CDE, and the Geographic Lead Agencies (Geo Leads) provide DA to eligible LEAs in

the form of individually designed assistance to address identified performance issues, including significant performance disparities among student groups. Targeted supports often include specialized professional learning, coaching, consultation, and/or strategic planning.

- Level 3 – Intensive (Direct Technical Assistance): Intensive support is provided to districts and charters identified as requiring an additional level of hands-on partnership, often due to persistent performance challenges and a lack of improvement over three of the last four consecutive years. Intensive support often involves a collaborative process with the CCEE, COE, SELPA, the CDE, and/or Geo Leads to determine the most effective support strategies. This tier of support may include identifying a technical assistance provider with relevant expertise to work closely with the district or charter to improve student outcomes.

Outside the three levels of support, a referral to the SPI may occur with approval from the SBE if the LEA has failed or is unable to implement the recommendations of the CCEE, or if the LEA's inadequate performance is either so persistent or so acute as to require intervention by the SPI.

9) ***California's 21st Century California School Leadership Academy (21CSLA).***

As part of the SSOS, the 21CSLA provides high-quality, equity-centered professional learning for educational leaders in schools and districts in California that receive Title II funds. The professional learning offered through the 21CSLA is free for participants and includes coaching, training, and mentorship around supporting the following topics:

- a) Effective standards-aligned instruction and other instruction that promotes critical thinking, inclusive practices, social-emotional learning, restorative practices and other alternative behavioral programs;
- b) Effective language acquisition programs for English learners;
- c) Strategies for addressing performance gaps among pupil groups;
- d) Strategies for leveraging wraparound services to support healthy development of pupils;
- e) Strategies for enhancing civic engagement;
- f) Strategies for building collegial environments;
- g) Strategies for effectively engaging parents and guardians; and
- h) Strategies for using resources provided by the CDE related to the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CASPP) System.

Cohort 1 of the 21CSLA ran from June 15, 2020, to June 30, 2023. Cohort 2 of the 21CSLA is currently underway, running from July 1, 2023, to June 30, 2026.

Cohort 3 will begin on October 1, 2026, and will continue until September 30, 2029.

- 10) **LCFF Equity Multiplier.** The LCFF Equity Multiplier is directly intended to support LEAs in their efforts to close achievement gaps. The LCFF Equity Multiplier provides additional funding to LEAs for allocation to schoolsites with prior year nonstability rates greater than 25% and prior year socioeconomically disadvantaged pupil rates greater than 70%. Equity Multiplier funding must be used to provide evidence-based services and supports for students at these schoolsites, and LEAs must document efforts to improve outcomes for students at these schoolsites in their LCAP. LCAPs are required to include focus goals for each school generating Equity Multiplier funding. These focus goals must address all student groups with the lowest performance on one or more state indicators on the Dashboard, as well as any underlying issues in the credentialing, subject-matter preparation, and retention of the school's educators, if applicable to the schoolsite. In addition, focus goals for each and every Equity Multiplier schoolsite must identify specific metrics for each identified student group, as applicable.
- 11) **Local control.** This bill shifts the focus from an LEA's role in closing student achievement gaps to what state-level entities can do to support LEAs in their endeavors. It does so by calling for the development of a state operations and support plan, complete with benchmarks and goals to support LEAs in closing achievement gaps, as well as recommendations for appropriate action if the state does not meet those benchmarks. As previously discussed, the state currently offers LEAs a number of tools to support student outcomes, ranging from specialized funding and initiatives to intensive assistance and intervention. LEAs are empowered to utilize these supports to meet the unique needs of their students and local communities. This framework of local control was a guiding principle of the LCFF, which sought to shift education funding away from a rigid, top-down categorical system and instead give LEAs greater flexibility to tailor their programs to the unique needs of their communities.

Recent author amendments specify that the provisions of this bill shall not be construed to allow the development of recommendations for LEA mandates or the establishment of new or revised LEA accountability structures. However, the *Committee may wish to consider* that the ultimate measure of how well the state is supporting LEAs in closing student achievement gaps will likely be the actual student outcomes resulting from its supports. If the LEAs do not see improvements in student outcomes despite implementing the CTAG Plan, it may lead to future conversations about the line between local control and state oversight.

- 12) **Maintaining focus on students.** This bill seeks to create a CTAG Plan to streamline and enhance coherence among state entities and the support they provide to LEAs. The author and sponsors contend that by alleviating some of the unnecessary or undue administrative barriers that LEAs face, they would be better equipped to support student outcomes and close student achievement gaps. Concerns have been raised by education equity groups that, while a unified education system would allow for a direct focus on system improvements,

the bill's emphasis on compliance requirements may crowd out conversations about holistic approaches to tackling achievement gaps needed to comprehensively address barriers to equitable academic outcomes. They further argue that, taken together with the other measures in the CSBA Closing the Achievement Gap package, the new structures may ultimately encourage more incoherence and the passing of responsibility among state, regional, and local actors.

The Committee may wish to consider the following:

- *How will the proposed CTAG Plan's recommendations strike the appropriate balance between reducing LEA administrative burdens, improving student outcomes, and maintaining appropriate oversight on the use of public funds?*
- *How can the state play a greater support role in closing achievement gaps while maintaining the ethos of local control that guides the LCFF?*
- *This bill explicitly prohibits the CTAG Plan from including recommendations for additional local accountability processes and measures, local reporting requirements, or unfunded mandates. If the goal of the bill is to improve student outcomes, and the impacts to student outcomes are measured at the local level, is it premature to specify such a prohibition?*
- *By focusing conversations on how state entities may contribute to the administrative burdens on LEAs, could the CTAG plan set off a sequence of finger-pointing that diverts attention from evidence-based practices and investments that work to close achievement gaps?*
- *There are other ongoing conversations surrounding state education governance and coherence, including the governance proposal in the Governor's January budget. Should those efforts move forward, how might this bill and its proposed timelines comport with a restructured CDE and new Education Commissioner?*
- *The state requires many things of LEAs, not only as providers of quality education but also as major employers within a community. How will the CTAG Plan make determinations about the efficacy of state requirements that may tangentially relate to student outcomes but also serve other purposes?*
- *What might remedial actions look like if changes to state processes do not improve outcomes for students?*
- *Will every future program established through legislation or budget action need to be evaluated through the lens of the proposed CTAG Plan and align with its objectives? What power would the CTAG Plan have to compel that alignment?*
- *How will the CTAG Plan align with existing state and federal accountability structures?*

- 13) **Arguments in support.** The California School Boards Association, the sponsor of this bill, states in their letter of support submitted to this Committee:

“This legislative package proposes that the state, similar to local school district and county office of education boards, must adopt clear goals, measurable benchmarks and transparent and understandable reporting to the public on the state’s progress towards a more aligned state system that improves outcomes for California students. This north star would guide the state’s public education entities and serve as a common throughline to a shared goal of closing achievement gaps. Together, they represent a landmark effort by the Legislature to help further focus and align the state’s policy, fiscal and operational efforts to support schools and establish a new level of shared accountability between state entities and local educational agencies for closing achievement gaps. The goal of these measures is to create the conditions needed to close achievement gaps by aligning state policy, funding and oversight around a clear operations and support plan that empowers LEAs.”

- 14) **Prior and related legislation.**

AB 2149 (Garcia, 2026) requires the LAO to assess and publicly report to the Legislature and the Governor the state’s progress in closing pupil academic achievement gaps and to include recommendations on actions that the state can take to meet its performance targets to be established pursuant to AB 2225 (Patel, 2026). *AB 2149 is set for the same hearing as AB 2225 in this Committee.*

AB 2202 (Muratsuchi, 2026) would establish the Closing the Achievement Gap Commission, an advisory body to the SBE. *AB 2220 is set for the same hearing as AB 2225 in this Committee.*

AB 2514 (Ransom, 2026) would require the working group and CTAG Plan to be established by AB 2225 (Patel, 2026) to include recommendations for the development of a State of the Achievement Gap Dashboard. *AB 2514 is set for the same hearing as AB 2225 in this Committee.*

SB 153 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 38, Statutes of 2024) established the LCFF Equity Multiplier to provide additional funding to LEAs for allocation to schoolsites with prior year nonstability rates greater than 25% and prior year socioeconomically disadvantaged pupil rates greater than 70%.

SB 77 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 53, Statutes of 2019) established the Center to Close Achievement Gaps. This bill required the center to seek to fulfill its mission and improve the capacity of teachers, education specialists, and school administrators to close gaps in academic achievement through both of the following: strengthening professional preparation on effective instructional practices, effective school leadership practices, effective LEA leadership practices, and the use of data and continuous improvement strategies; and serving LEAs as a clearinghouse for evidence-based strategies and promising practices for closing academic achievement gaps.

SUPPORT

California School Boards Association (sponsor)
ABC Unified School District
Alisal Union School District
American Association of University Women - California
Anaheim Union High School District
Antioch Unified School District
Brentwood Union School District
Calexico Unified School District
California Association of Suburban School Districts
California Chamber of Commerce
California Charter Schools Association
California State PTA
Castro Valley Unified School District
Chowchilla Elementary School District
Contra Costa County
Downey Unified School District
El Monte Union High School District
El Rancho Unified School District
Fresno County Office of Education
Huntington Beach Union High School District
Irvine Unified School District
Jefferson Union High School District
Legislative Action Committee - San Mateo County School Boards Association
Liberty Union High School District
Long Beach Unified School District
Los Angeles County School Trustee Association
Los Angeles Unified School District
Monterey County Office of Education
Monterey County Superintendent of Schools
Moreno Valley Unified School District
Mount Pleasant Elementary School District
Napa Valley Unified School District
Needles Unified School District
Newark Unified School District
Newport-Mesa Unified School District
Parlier Unified School District
Perris Elementary School District
Placer County Office of Education
Pleasanton Unified School District
Rim of the World Unified School District
Rincon Valley Union School District
Ripon Unified School District
San Benito County Board of Education
San Francisco Unified School District
San Lorenzo Unified School District
San Lorenzo Valley Unified School District
San Ramon Valley Unified School District

Santa Clara County Office of Education
Santa Cruz City Schools
Santa Paula Unified School District
Santa Rosa City Schools
Scotts Valley Unified School District
Sierra Sands Unified School District
Solana Beach School District
Soledad Unified School District
South Monterey County Joint Union High School District
Spreckels Union School District
Turlock Unified School District
Val Verde Unified School District

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --