
UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Bill No: SB 1082
Author: Niello (R)
Amended: 7/2/26
Vote: 21

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 7-0, 4/15/26

AYES: Pérez, Ochoa Bogh, Cabaldon, Choi, Cortese, Gonzalez, Reyes

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 7-0, 5/14/26

AYES: Cervantes, Seyarto, Cabaldon, Dahle, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

SENATE FLOOR: 39-0, 5/27/26

AYES: Allen, Alvarado-Gil, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Becker, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cervantes, Choi, Cortese, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Grove, Hurtado, Jones, Laird, Limón, McGuire, McNerney, Menjivar, Niello, Ochoa Bogh, Padilla, Pérez, Reyes, Richardson, Rubio, Seyarto, Smallwood-Cuevas, Stern, Strickland, Umberg, Valladares, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Dahle

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 71-0, 8/6/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Pupil attendance: interdistrict transfers: agreements: policies

SOURCE: Association of California County Boards of Education
Just Advocates

DIGEST: This bill (1) requires a school district of proposed enrollment to begin review of an interdistrict transfer request upon receipt, if a parent or guardian of a student submits an interdistrict transfer request concurrently to a school district of proposed enrollment and a school district of residence; and (2) requires that either school district determines that a request for an interdistrict transfer is incomplete, the school district shall notify the parent within 30 days of receipt of the application and identify missing information or documentation to process the request.

Assembly Amendments (1) permit school districts to extend the review period of an interdistrict transfer request by 30 calendar days, if a school district determines that the request received from a parent is incomplete and notifies the parent of the missing information or documentation, and (2) restricts the rationale that school districts may use to extend the review period of interdistrict transfer requests to be if an individualized education program meeting has been scheduled or if the meeting is pending.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Authorizes the governing boards of two or more school districts to enter into an agreement, for a term of up to five school years, for the interdistrict attendance of students who are residents of the school districts. (Education Code (EC) § 46600)
- 2) Authorizes the agreement to provide for the admission to a school district other than the school district of residence of a student who requests a permit to attend a school district of proposed enrollment (that is a party to the agreement). (EC § 46600)
- 3) Requires the agreement to stipulate the terms and conditions under which interdistrict attendance shall be permitted or denied, and authorizes the agreement to stipulate terms and conditions established by the school district of residence and the school district of enrollment under which the permit may be revoked. (EC § 46600)
- 4) Requires a school district of proposed enrollment to ensure that students who are admitted are selected through an unbiased process that prohibits an inquiry into or evaluation or consideration of whether or not a student should be enrolled based on academic or athletic performance, physical condition, proficiency in English, family income, or any of protected characteristics (race or ethnicity, gender, gender identity, gender expression, and immigration status). (EC § 46600)
- 5) Requires that a student who has been determined by personnel of either the school district of residence or the school district of proposed enrollment to have been the victim of an act of bullying committed by a student of the school district of residence to be given priority for interdistrict attendance. (EC §

46600)

- 6) Requires each school district of residence and school district of proposed enrollment to post on its website the procedures and timelines regarding a request for an interdistrict transfer permit in a manner that is accessible to the public, including a link to the policy of the governing board of the school district. (EC § 46600.2)
- 7) Requires that a school district of residence and a school district of proposed enrollment to notify a parent submitting a current year request of its final decision within 30 calendar days from the date the request was received. (EC § 46600.2)
- 8) Requires a school district that denies a request for an interdistrict transfer to advise the parent, in writing, of the right to appeal to the county board of education within 30 calendar days from the date of the final denial. (EC § 46600.2)
- 9) Provides for a process to appeal a request for an interdistrict transfer, including
 - a) requiring a parent to appeal to a county board of education within 30 calendar days should they choose to file an appeal, and
 - b) requiring the county board of education to determine whether the student should be permitted to attend the school district of proposed enrollment and the applicable period of attendance within 30 calendar days after the appeal is filed. (EC § 46601)

This bill:

- 1) Requires a school district of proposed enrollment to begin review of an interdistrict transfer request upon receipt, irrespective of the status of the school district of residence's response, if a parent or guardian of a student submits an interdistrict transfer request concurrently to a school district of proposed enrollment and a school district of residence.
- 2) Requires that if either the school district of residence or school district of proposed enrollment determines that a request for an interdistrict transfer is incomplete, the school district shall notify the parent within 30 calendar days of receipt of the application and identify missing information or documentation required by the policies of the school district to process the request.

- 3) Permits either the school district of residence or school district of proposed enrollment to extend the review period of an interdistrict transfer request by 30 calendar days if a school district determines that the request received from a parent is incomplete pursuant to #2.
- 4) Authorizes that if an individualized education program meeting has been scheduled or if the meeting is pending, the school district of residence or school district of proposed enrollment may extend the review period by up to an additional 30 calendar days, if written notice is provided to the parent within 30 calendar days of receiving the request.
- 5) Requires the governing board of a school district entering into an interdistrict attendance agreement to adopt a policy regarding the relevant procedures and timelines relating to a request for an interdistrict transfer, and to require all agreements entered on or after January 1, 2027 to include the provisions of these policies. The policy shall include, but not be limited to, the following provisions:
 - a) The date that the school district will begin accepting and processing interdistrict transfer requests for the subsequent school year and any other applicable timelines for submitting a request.
 - b) The criteria the school district will use to approve or deny a request, and any information or documents that must be submitted as supporting evidence.
 - c) The process and timelines for which a denial of a request may be appealed within the school district before the school district renders a final decision, and any other relevant information regarding the appeals process.
 - d) That failure of the parent to meet any timelines established by the school district shall be deemed an abandonment of that request.
 - e) Applicable timelines for processing a request, including:
 - i) Notifying a parent submitting a current year request of its final decision within 30 calendar days of the date the request was received, and that if a response is not issued by the school district of residence within 30 calendar days, the request shall be deemed approved for the school district of residence.

- ii) Notifying a parent submitting a future year request of its final decision as soon as possible, but no later than 14 calendar days after the commencement of instruction in the school year for which interdistrict transfer is sought.
 - f) The conditions under which an existing interdistrict transfer permit may be revoked or rescinded.
- 6) Makes findings and declarations stating that timely access to educational opportunities and school choice is a fundamental right for all California pupils and that this bill seeks to clarify and expedite the well-established interdistrict transfer process for school districts.

Comments

Need for this bill. According to the author, “families requesting interdistrict transfers often experience lengthy delays—sometimes 60 to 90 days or longer—from the district of residence. During this time, districts of desired attendance frequently wait to begin their own review until a release decision is issued. These delays are rarely intentional and often reflect administrative workload and capacity constraints. However, the impact of families can be significant, leaving them unable to make timely educational decisions and increasing the likelihood of appeals to county boards of education.”

The author continues, “SB 1082 builds on existing law by clarifying expectations and ensuring that inaction does not function as an unintended denial. ... [This bill] streamlines the interdistrict transfer process by clarifying review timelines ... The bill enables districts of residence to waive review and approve an exit request when no response is issued within 30 days ... Together, these changes ensure families receive timely decisions while reducing the administrative burden for school districts and county boards of education.”

Process and timelines for interdistrict transfers. The state has several options that allow students to transfer to other school districts, and interdistrict transfers are a longstanding state policy that allows a student to transfer from one district to another when both districts consent to the transfer. A student may wish to transfer for multiple reasons, including seeking certain educational programming not available in their district of residence. For a district of residence, many districts evaluating a request have a limited set of reasons for which they will release a student, and examples may include the availability of childcare in the other district

or the attendance of a sibling already enrolled in the other district. For a district of proposed enrollment, they may be evaluating impacted enrollment at the school and within the grade, as well as capacity constraints for the student's expected courses if they are in middle or high school.

Regarding timelines, for a parent submitting a current year request for an interdistrict transfer, the school district is currently required to notify a parent of its decision within 30 calendar days from when the request was received. For students denied a release, parents may appeal the decision to their county board of education within 30 calendar days from the date of final denial, and the county board of education has another 30 calendar days after the appeal is filed to determine whether the student should be permitted to attend the school district of proposed enrollment, as well as the applicable period of attendance.

A parent should theoretically be waiting 30 days to learn if their request was approved. If denied and then appealed to a county board of education, this process could take another 30 to 60 days, depending on when the parent files an appeal. In total, according to existing timelines, this means that a parent should be waiting between 1 to 3 months for a final decision on an interdistrict transfer permit. In contrast, the author's office indicates that families are often waiting 60 to 90 days just for the district of residence.

Lack of data makes it difficult to verify to what extent this is a statewide problem. The author indicates that families requesting an interdistrict permit often experience significant delays far exceeding statutory timelines, which can create unnecessarily burdensome timelines for parents and students. Unfortunately, the state generally does not publish statewide or district-level data for the interdistrict permit system that can verify these claims. A Legislative Analyst's Office report from February 2021 on the District of Choice Program stated that in 2018-19, 146,109 students used an interdistrict permit and that 635 districts accepted students through interdistrict permits; however, this data relies upon a special data extraction prepared by the California Department of Education (CDE). *Without publicly available data on interdistrict transfers—including how many requests are approved or denied every year, how long requests take to be resolved, how often and when appeals are filed, and which districts or county boards of education are seeing longer than expected delays—it is difficult to know to what extent this is a statewide problem without a more in-depth survey of the individual county offices of education.*

Could concurrent review expedite the overall process while also creating unnecessary workload for school districts of proposed enrollment? School districts of proposed enrollment often do not begin reviewing interdistrict transfer requests until school districts of residence have approved them. The typical rationale for this is that if the school district of residence denies the request, the request is considered denied regardless of the school district of proposed enrollment's response, so it is wise to wait for the school district of residence's decision to avoid unnecessary workload. However, if a parent decides to appeal a denied request, a county board of education would ideally review an appeal with responses from both the school district of residence and the school district of proposed attendance, in order for a more timely resolution and to avoid the possibility of needing a *second* appeal if the county board of education is receiving information from the two school districts on separate timelines.

Related/Prior Legislation

SB 399 (Niello, 2025) would have (1) required school districts to keep record of all requests for interdistrict transfer and records of the disposition of those requests, including specified information; (2) required school districts to submit annually the information for the current school year to the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI); and (3) required the SPI to post annually the information on CDE's website. SB 399 was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

AB 1127 (Luz Rivas & Robert Rivas, Chapter 781, Statutes of 2019) requires a school district of residence to approve an intradistrict transfer request for a victim of an act of bullying, and requires a school district of proposed enrollment that elects to accept an interdistrict transfer to accept all students to apply pursuant to this bill, as specified.

FISCAL EFFECT: Appropriation: No Fiscal Com.: No Local: No

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

This bill could result in one-time Proposition 98 General Fund costs ranging from the tens of thousands of dollars to low hundreds of thousands of dollars for school districts to develop or modify their interdistrict transfer policies and also provide guidance to parents. This estimate assumes that each district would require several hours of personnel time on these activities.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/6/26)

Association of California County Boards of Education (co-source)
Just Advocates (co-source)
California Policy Center
Families in Action for Quality Education
Kern County Office of Education
Lighthouse Community Public Schools
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Monterey County Office of Education
Navigator Schools
Orange County Board of Education
Placer County Office of Education
San Mateo County Office of Education
Seneca Family of Agencies
One Individual

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/6/26)

CFT – A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 71-0, 8/6/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Addis, Castillo, Flora, Fong, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Valencia

Prepared by: Michelle Nguyen / ED. / (916) 651-4105
8/7/26 13:36:12

**** END ****