

Date of Hearing: July 8, 2025

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Mike Fong, Chair

SB 494 (Cortese) – As Amended April 10, 2025

SENATE VOTE: 27-10

SUBJECT: Classified school and community college employees: disciplinary hearings: appeals: contracted administrative law judges

SUMMARY: Introduces an appeal process for specified disciplinary actions for K-12 non-merit school districts and requires specified disciplinary action hearings for classified staff at non-merit community college districts to be overseen by an administrative law judge. Specifically, **this bill:**

K-12 section of the measure [applies to non-merit districts].

- 1) Restricts the conclusive authority of a K-12 school board to determine if there is sufficient cause for a disciplinary action to be taken against a classified K-12 employee.
- 2) Extends the time frame by which a classified employee may request a hearing on the disciplinary action notification provided to them by the K-12 school board of a school district from five days to no less than 30 days after the employee has received the notification of the disciplinary action.
- 3) Authorizes the school district to stop paying a permanent employee before a decision is rendered if 30 days have passed from the date the hearing was requested and permits a delay in implementation if this constitutes a conflict with existing collective bargaining agreements.
- 4) Establishes an appeal process for classified employees, excluding peace officers, in the event the school board of a school district determines the conduct of an employee is subject to a disciplinary action that warrants a dismissal or suspension. Requires a classified employee to notify the school board of the school district, in writing, of the appeal within 30 days of the initial disciplinary decision. The appeal process will:
 - a) Be conducted by an administrative law judge paid by the school district and selected by the school district and the employee or the employee's union organization. The administrative law judge will conduct the proceedings and make a determination in the same manner as other hearings for local and state agencies; or,
 - b) Be conducted pursuant to the alternative method for appealing the disciplinary action as outlined in the school district's collective bargaining agreement with the classified employee union. The decision, in this case, will be subject to judicial review only by specified standards.
- 5) Authorizes the appeal process to apply to classified employees employed by an entity created or established by one or more school districts who have joint power authority, as defined.
- 6) Defines, for purposes of the appeal, the following:

- a) “Administrative law judge” means an administrative judge contracted from the Office of Administrative Hearings, as defined; and,
 - b) “Disciplinary action” means dismissals and suspensions of classified employees and demotions of nonsupervisory classified employees and does not include reprimands or warning whether verbal or written.
- 7) Requires a governing board of a school district, an impartial third-party hearing officer, or an administrative law judge, as applicable, to delegate to a judge, as defined, the authority to determine if there is sufficient cause existing for disciplinary action against a classified employee if the employee is accused of egregious misconduct or if the allegations involve a minor, as defined. The judge’s ruling shall be binding to all parties.
- 8) Makes technical and conforming changes.

Higher Education section of the measure [only applies to non-merit community college districts].

- 1) Restricts the conclusive authority of the governing board of a California Community College (CCC) district in determining whether there is sufficient cause for a disciplinary action to be taken against a classified employee.
- 2) Extends the time frame by which a classified employee may request a hearing on the disciplinary action notification provided to them by the governing board of a community college district from five days to no less than 30 days after the employee has received the notification of the disciplinary action.
- 3) Establishes a hearing process for classified employees, excluding peace officers, in the event the governing board of a community college district determines the conduct of an employee is subject to a disciplinary action. The hearing as requested by the employee will either be:
 - a) Conducted by an administrative law judge paid by the community college district and selected by the community college district and either the employee or the employee’s union organization. The administrative law judge will conduct the proceedings and make a determination in the same manner as other hearings for local and state agencies; or,
 - b) Conducted in a manner compliant with the agreed upon procedures outlined in the district’s classified employee collective bargaining agreement. The decision, in this case, will be subject to judicial review only by specified standards.
- 4) Clarifies the hearing procedure applies to classified employees employed at entities created or established by one or more community college districts.
- 5) Delays the implementation of the hearing procedures pursuant to (3) of this analysis, if the procedures conflict with existing collective bargaining agreements established prior to January 1, 2026. Permits the hearing process, as outlined, to be implemented in subsequent collective bargaining agreements.
- 6) Defines for purposes of the hearing, the following:

- a) “Administrative law judge” means an administrative law judge contracted from the Office of Administrative Hearing, as defined.
 - b) “Disciplinary action” means an action excluding verbal or written reprimands or verbal or written warnings.
- 7) Removes references of an impartial third party judge officer as an entity who can conduct hearings requested by a classified employee in a community college district.
 - 8) Authorizes a community college district to stop paying a permanent employee before a decision is rendered if 30 days have passed from the date the hearing was requested and permits a delay in implementation if this constitutes a conflict with existing collective bargaining agreements.
 - 9) Makes technical and conforming changes.
 - 10) Establishes, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that this bill contains costs mandated by the state, the state shall reimburse the applicable entities.

EXISTING LAW: *State law pertaining to classified staff in non-merit K-12 school districts.*

- 1) Establishes the procedures by which a K-12 school district may provide a disciplinary action for a classified employee. Specifically stipulates, a school district must adopt rules and procedures for disciplinary proceedings that include providing the employee a written notification of the specific charges against the employee, information on the employee’s right to a hearing, and how the employee can request a hearing including a requirement that the district must be notified at least five days after the service of notice to the employee. The burden of proof will remain with the governing board of the school district. Authorizes the governing board of the school district or a third-party impartial hearing officer to determine whether there is sufficient cause for the disciplinary action. If the school district elects to use an impartial hearing officer, the governing board of the school district will retain the ability to review the determination, as defined. Prohibits the suspension, demotion, or dismissal of an employee, who has requested a hearing, unless the governing board of the K-12 district or the third-party impartial hearing officer have determined the employee engaged in either criminal misconduct, misconduct that presents a risk of harm to pupils, staff, or property, or committed habitual violations of the district’s policies or regulations. For specific disciplinary actions involving allegations of egregious misconduct and conduct involving a minor, the governing board of a district will delegate its authority to a judge and the judge’s rule in the disciplinary matter will be binding for all parties. Clarifies the above appeal procedures only apply to non-merit K-12 districts (Education Code (EDC) Section 45113).

State law pertaining to classified staff in non-merit community college districts.

- 1) Establishes the California Community Colleges (CCC) under the administration of the Board of Governors of the CCC, as one of the segments of public postsecondary education in this state. The CCC shall be comprised of community college districts (EDC Section 70900).
- 2) Establishes that CCC districts are under the control of a board of trustees, known as the governing board, who has the authority to establish, maintain, operate, and govern one or more community colleges, within its district as specified (EDC Section 70902).

- 3) Establishes the procedures and disciplinary proceedings for classified staff in non-merit community college districts. Specifies, the governing board of a community college district will adopt procedures for disciplinary proceedings that contain a provision for informing the employee by written notice of the specific charges, the employee's right to a hearing, and the timeframe an employee has to request a hearing (must be at a minimum five days after the notice is received by the employee of the disciplinary action). Permits the governing board of a community college district to delegate authority as to whether there is sufficient cause for disciplinary action to an impartial third-party hearing officer (pursuant to the classified employee's collective bargaining agreement), but the governing board will retain authority to review the determination under specific circumstances, as defined. Prohibits the suspension, demotion, or dismissal of an employee, who has requested a hearing, unless the governing board of the community college district or the third-party impartial hearing officer have determined the employee engaged in either criminal misconduct, misconduct that presents a risk of harm to pupils, staff, or property, or committed habitual violations of the district's policies or regulations. Stipulates if a hearing is conducted by a third-party hearing officer the district will stop paying the employee after 30 calendar days from the date the hearing is requested. Clarifies the above appeal procedures only apply to non-merit community college districts (EDC Section 88013).

FISCAL EFFECT: According to the Senate Committee on Appropriations:

By requiring an administrative law judge to settle disciplinary appeal hearings for non-merit districts, this bill could result in unknown, but potentially significant Proposition 98 General Fund costs to school and community college districts. A precise amount would depend on the number and scope of such proceedings each year. The cost associated with each hearing can average about \$7,000 but can be significantly higher for more complicated cases. The bill provides that the appeal hearings shall be paid by the districts.

COMMENTS: *Double referral.* This bill passed out of the Assembly Committee on Public Employment and Retirement on June 25, 2025, with a vote count of 5-0. The Committee has heard the measure as it pertained to matters that were germane to its jurisdiction.

Author's intent. As explained by the Author, "classified employees are the lifeblood of a school — these employees drive our school buses, prepare and serve meals to children, and carry out essential office functions. They deserve the same due process rights as teachers. SB 494 promotes a more fair and equitable discipline system. Having administrative law judges arbitrate over disciplinary actions will protect the rights and liberties of classified school staff."

Difference between K-12 vs. CCC in the measure. If this measure were to pass it would introduce a secondary appeal process for K-12 classified employees for disciplinary actions resulting in dismissals and suspensions; however, for community college classified staff it would require existing hearings requested by classified employees to either be subject to collective bargaining procedures or to be conducted by an administrative law judge. See the below diagram for a depiction of the differences between the K-12 section of the measure and the CCC section of the measure:

Existing K-12 Law	SB 494 K-12 Section	Existing CCC Law	SB 494 CCC Section
Written notice of specific charges – statement of employee’s rights to a hearing – time in which the hearing can be requested by the employee, no less than five days.	Written notice of specific charges – statement of employee’s rights to a hearing – time in which the hearing can be requested by the employee, no less than 30 days.	Written notice of specific charges – statement of employee’s rights to a hearing – time in which the hearing can be requested by the employee, no less than five days.	Written notice of specific charges – statement of employee’s rights to a hearing – time in which the hearing can be requested by the employee, no less than 30 days.
Hearing can be conducted by the governing board or by a third party officer depending upon the collective bargaining agreement.	Same	Hearing can be conducted by the governing board or by a third party officer depending upon the collective bargaining agreement.	Hearing shall be conducted by either an administrative law judge or by the terms and conditions of the collective bargaining agreement.
	<p>Establishes an appeal process in addition to the above procedure if the disciplinary action is a dismissal or suspension. The employee will have 30 days from the initial disciplinary notification to request an appeal.</p> <p>The appeal will either be a hearing conducted by an administrative law judge or;</p> <p>The appeal will be conducted by the terms and conditions of the collective bargaining agreement.</p>		

Classified Staff at CCC. Education Code Section 88003 authorizes the governing boards of community colleges to employ individuals in nonacademic positions. For non-merit districts the

governing board of the community college classifies which employees and positions at the community college are “classified positions.” The California Code of Regulations Section 52510 of Title 5 defines nonacademic employees as anyone employed by a community college who is not an academic employee, an administrator, a classified administrator, an educational administrator, or faculty. The CCC Chancellor’s Office Management Information System Data Element Dictionary, defines classified administrative and support service employees as employees serving a formal probationary period or who have vested rights to employment by a CCC. The position also encompasses classified administrators, supervisors, management, and confidential positions.¹ In fall 2024, the CCC system employed 2,811 classified administrators, 3,765 classified professionals, and 22,827 classified support staff.²

Examples of classified positions include: athletic trainers, custodians, educational center assistants, financial aid supervisor, informational technology administrator, and student support specialists.³

Disciplinary proceedings for classified staff at CCC non-merit districts. Community colleges are organized into community college district which are overseen by a locally elected board of trustees, known as a community college district governing board. In addition to identifying classified positions and employing classified employees, the governing board is ascribed the authority to prescribe the written rules and regulation of the personnel management of classified employees including, but not limited to the disciplinary proceedings.

Education Code Section 88013 places the following parameters around the proceedings for disciplining classified employees:

- 1) A permanent (non-probationary) employee may only be subject to discipline for cause as prescribed by the rules and regulations adopted by the governing board; and,
- 2) An employee will be provided written notice of the specific charges against the employee, a statement of the employee’s right to a hearing, and the ability to request a hearing within five days of receipt of the written notice of the charges.

These parameters conform to the requirements of *Skelly v. State Personnel Board* (1975) 15 Cal.3d 194; which required all public employees to be entitled to the following, also known as a Skelly hearing:

- 1) Notice of the proposed disciplinary action;
- 2) A statement of the reasons for the proposed action;
- 3) A copy of the charges and materials upon which the proposed action is based; and,
- 4) The right to respond either orally or in writing to the authority initially imposing the discipline.

¹ <https://webdata.cccco.edu/ded/eb/eb08.pdf>

² https://datamart.cccco.edu/Faculty-Staff/Staff_Annual.aspx

³ <https://www.schooljobs.com/careers/losriosccd/Classified>

After the Skelly hearing or a pre-disciplinary hearing, a public employee may have the right to appeal. In the case of community college classified employees the right to appeal comes in the form of a hearing.

The Education Code does not prescribe exactly how a hearing is to transpire for community college districts and much of the disciplinary proceedings is subject to the policies adopted by the governing board or the local collective bargaining agreement between the community college district and the classified employees' union.

Committee staff examined the board policies and the classified employee collective bargaining agreements of seven community college districts located in all seven regions of California. Each district contained policies and procedures for providing procedural due process to classified staff which followed a basic blueprint as described below:



However, the type of disciplinary actions, who conducts the hearing, and the time frame an employee is to request a hearing, differed across all seven districts examined by Committee staff. In several cases, the classified employees were allowed to select an impartial third party to conduct the hearing and in other cases, an appeal process existed beyond the initial hearing. The level of impartiality and whether an employee can appeal is all subject to collective bargaining.

AB 494 (Cortese) establishes a uniform procedure for community colleges by requiring the hearing to be conducted by either 1) an administrative law judge; or, 2) in a manner as agreed upon by the community college district and the classified employees in their collective bargaining agreement.

Administrative law judges. AB 494 (Cortese) requires the appeal hearing for K-12 districts and the initial disciplinary hearing for community college districts to be conducted by an administrative law judge, if the disciplinary process is not collectively bargained. The administrative law judge is provided by the Office of Administrative Hearings.

Established in 1945, the Office of Administrative Hearings acts as a quasi-judicial tribunal that hears and decides on administrative disputes for over 1,500 state and local government agencies. The Office of Administrative Hearing manages 10,000 -14,000 cases each year with hearings only accounting for a small percentage of the office's overall work. The Office of Administrative Hearings has four regional offices and employs a total of 58 administrative law judges.⁴

AB 494 (Cortese) requires the proceedings of the hearings to be conducted in a manner consistent with the codified requirements for resolving administrative disputes for local and state agencies. The hearing will be conducted in a manner similar to a civil court trial, with each party being afforded the opportunity to give opening statements, produce evidence and witnesses,

⁴ <https://www.dgs.ca.gov/oah/About>

cross examine opposing party's witnesses, and make closing arguments. The administrative law judge then will provide a written decision within 30 days.⁴

By requiring the classified employee disciplinary hearing to be conducted by an administrative law judge, AB 494 (Cortese) ensures the proceedings are conducted in a fair and neutral manner across all non-merit community college districts.

Personnel Commissions and the merit system – Merit districts. A personnel commission is an independent board separate from the governing board of a district and the leadership of a college within a district. The purpose of the personnel commission is to maintain a merit system for classified employees of the district and campuses within the district and to oversee the work of the executive director and personnel commission staff. The personnel commission's main directive is to ensure fair and objective treatment of all applicants and employees.

Established in Education Code Section 88060 through 88139, a personnel commission is comprised of three to five citizens who are appointed into staggering terms to oversee the work of the personnel commission staff. In some K-12 and community college districts, the personnel commission staff are the human resources staff of either the district or campus within the district. However, that is not always the case and for many the personnel commission staff are independent positions separate from the district. If the classified staff elects to have a merit system, the personnel commission is established to oversee and enforce the merit system.

A merit system is a set of rules and procedures to ensure the selection, promotion, retention, and discipline of classified staff is conducted in a manner without favoritism or prejudice. As part of its role, the personnel commission is tasked with classifying and reclassifying positions and serves as the appeal hearing officer for disciplinary actions taken against classified staff. As of 2024, only five of the 73 community college districts have a merit system and therefore have a personnel commission.⁵ SB 494 (Cortese) would provide comparable circumstances between classified staff in merit and non-merit districts by requiring that the hearing process requested by classified staff in merit-community college districts be conducted by a neutral administrative law judge or by the terms of agreed to by the employee in the collective bargaining agreement.

Arguments in support. As described by CFT – A Union of Educators and Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO, “the need for SB 494 (Cortese) is necessary because “current law requires a neutral third party to settle discipline appeal hearings involving most public sector employees, but classified school employees are not among this group. For example, school boards are not involved in discipline appeal hearings for teachers. The Commission on Professional Competence is tasked with overseeing disciplinary appeal proceedings involving TK-12 teachers. The commission consists of three people appointed for each disciplinary case: an administrative law judge working for the State Office of Administrative Hearings, a management appointed commissioner and a commissioner designated by the teacher. SB 494 would require an administrative law judge or independent hearing officer to determine on appeal if a permanent classified employee in a non-merit district should be subject to disciplinary action. The administrative law judge or independent hearing officer would be selected jointly by the district and labor union, and the district would be responsible for paying for whomever is chosen. With this reform, SB 494 would still allow unions and districts to negotiate alternative

⁵ <https://meritsystem.org/1092-2/>

appeal hearings in their collective bargaining agreements, but classified employees would finally win fair appeal rights granted to teachers and most other public sector workers.”

Arguments in opposition. The Community College League of California opposes the measure as, “ SB 494 removes the authority of a duly elected community college board to render personnel decisions concerning disciplinary actions. The measure mandates that, upon an employee’s request, the district must fund an administrative law judge for a disciplinary appeal, with the judge selected jointly by the district and the employee or the employee’s representative. Currently, hearing officers are selected using a process determined by a district’s collective bargaining agreement, which is negotiated at the local level. The measure also changes the time an employee may ask for a hearing from five to 30 days. SB 494 turns that local process upside down and would further delay the resolution of sensitive personnel matters by requiring a community college district to schedule, fund, and wait for a hearing before an administrative law judge, which would further delay necessary and time-sensitive disciplinary actions involving an employee. The League believes that this measure would lead to significant increases in appeals being filed, multiplying a college’s existing costs, regardless of the merits of the case. We remain concerned about the cost implications SB 494 would have on community college districts, particularly given the current fiscal uncertainties our state faces. SB 494 is contrary to the spirit of local control and removes a layer of authority from locally elected officials and delegates that authority to an unelected entity.”

Assembly Committee on Education comments. As previously illustrated in this analysis, SB 494 (Cortese) establishes an appeal process for K-12 classified employees beyond the initial hearing already required by existing law. The classified employee has the right to an initial hearing as requested by subdivision (c) of the measure and then could appeal the decision from the initial hearing pursuant to subdivision (g) if the disciplinary action would result in a dismissal or suspension of the employee. Proponents of the measure has asserted this measure provides parity between certificated teachers and classified employees by allowing for a neutral third party to preside over the appeal proceedings; however, SB 494 (Cortese) introduces a secondary appeal process previously not included in code.

This measure would incur further costs to non-merit K-12 districts by requiring an appeal hearing to transpire upon the request of an employee 30 days after initial disciplinary notification.

The Committee should consider amending the bill to allow the fiscal burden of the appeal to be shared between the district and the employee/employee union.

Committee staff also note the distinct differences in the language between the K-12 section of the measure and the higher education section of the measure and asks if future bills contain such differences the bill be referred to both committees for analysis.

Committee comments and amendments. AB 494 (Cortese) strikes a balance between local authority of the governing board and the desire for classified staff to have a neutral party determine punitive disciplinary actions. AB 494 (Cortese) does not dismiss local control, as it permits an alternative to disciplinary hearing overseen by an administrative law judge. Technically for both K-12 and community college districts, the measure permits the governing board (or school board) and the classified employee representatives the opportunity to determine an alternative method for the disciplinary proceedings.

Existing law already permits both K-12 and community college districts the ability to release authority as the “final decision maker” for dismissals and suspensions to third parties. In the collective bargaining agreements reviewed by Committee staff roughly half of the community college districts reviewed delegated the final decision to a neutral third party. SB 494 (Cortese) empowers other districts to follow suit by introducing a binary requirement; either a district will collective bargain the disciplinary proceedings or an administrative law judge will preside of the hearing.

In reviewing the measure, Committee staff noticed two policy points that required clarification. The first was the preservation of existing law that permits a K-12 district to delegate authority to a neutral third party; this authority was entirely delegated to the administrative law judge or the agreement in the collective bargaining agreement in the community college section of the measure. The second clarification was whether the hearing or the entire disciplinary proceeding are to be subject to the provision of the Government Code.

In order to preserve the Author’s intent, while also providing clarity to the above, the Committee has suggested and the Author has agreed to the following:

- 1) Deletes subdivision (e) from Education Code Section 45113 (K-12 Section).

~~(e) This section shall not be construed to prohibit the governing board of a school district, pursuant to the terms of an agreement with an employee organization under Chapter 10.7 (commencing with Section 3540) of Division 4 of Title 1 of the Government Code, from delegating its authority to determine whether sufficient cause exists for disciplinary action, as described in subdivision (b), against classified employees, excluding peace officers as defined in Section 830.32 of the Penal Code, to an impartial third party hearing officer. However, the governing board of the school district shall retain authority to review the determination under the standards set forth in Section 1286.2 of the Code of Civil Procedure.~~

- 2) Amends subdivision (g) paragraph (2) from Education Code Section 45113 (K-12 Section) to read as follows:

(2) If an appeal is requested by the employee pursuant to this subdivision, either of the following shall occur:

(A) The hearing proceeding shall be conducted and a decision made in accordance with Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 11500) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code and the governing board shall have all the power granted to an agency in that chapter.

(B) ~~except that~~ If the employer and employee organization, as that term is defined in subdivision (d) of Section 3540.1 of the Government Code, have agreed upon an alternative method of appealing the disciplinary action, the procedures for the appeal agreed to shall apply, and any decision shall be judicially reviewable only under the standards of subdivision (a) of Section 1286.2 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

- 3) Amends subdivision (e) from Education Code Section 88013 (Community College Section) to read as follows:

(e) (1) If an employee, excluding a peace officer as defined in Section 830.32 of the Penal Code, requests a hearing pursuant to subdivision (c), either of the following shall occur:

(A) An administrative law judge paid by the community college district and jointly selected by the district and the employee or their employee organization, as that term is defined in subdivision (d) of Section 3540.1 of the Government Code, shall preside over the hearing and provide a determination as to the outcome of the disciplinary action. The hearing shall be conducted and a decision made in accordance with Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 11500) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code and the governing board shall have all the power granted to an agency in that chapter.

(B) If the employee organization and the community college district have entered into an agreement pursuant to Chapter 10.7 (commencing with Section 3540) of Division 4 of Title 1 of the Government Code providing an alternative method for the hearing and determination as to the outcome of the disciplinary action, the hearing shall be conducted pursuant to the procedures agreed to in the agreement shall apply, and any decision shall be judicially reviewable only under the standards of subdivision (a) of Section 1286.2 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

~~(e) (1) If an employee, excluding a peace officer as defined in Section 830.32 of the Penal Code, requests a hearing pursuant to subdivision (c), an impartial third party hearing officer paid by the community college district and jointly selected by the district and the employee or their employee organization, as defined in subdivision (d) of Section 3540.1 of the Government Code, shall preside over the hearing and provide a determination as to the outcome of the disciplinary action.~~

~~(2) The impartial third party hearing officer's determination shall be subject to judicial review, on petition of either the governing board or the employee, pursuant to the standards of subdivision (a) of Section 1286.2 of the Code of Civil Procedure and in the same manner as a decision made by an administrative law judge under Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 11500) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code. The court, on review, shall exercise its independent judgment on the evidence. The proceeding shall be set for hearing at the earliest possible date and shall take precedence over all other cases, except older matters of the same character and matters to which special precedence is given by law.~~

4) Makes technical and conforming changes.

Previous legislation. SB 433 (Cortese) of 2023, vetoed by the Governor, would have established a disciplinary proceeding for classified staff at a community college district and K-12 school district that included a hearing with an impartial third-party officer. The measure was heard by this Committee and passed with a vote of 8-3 and received a veto from the Governor with the following message:

“I am returning Senate Bill 433 without my signature.

This bill requires an impartial third-party hearing officer to hear disciplinary appeals of permanent classified personnel at school or community college nonmerit districts. This bill also requires the district to pay for the third-party hearing officer, and for the third-party hearing officer to be jointly selected by the district and the classified employee from a list of arbitrators, unless the parties agree otherwise.

Under the status quo for certificated employees, the district absorbs the full cost of appeals hearings if the employee prevails. If it is determined that the certificated employee should be dismissed or suspended, the cost is shared equally with the State and the district. This bill for classified employees requires districts to bear the full costs of a disciplinary hearing before an arbitrator, no matter the outcome. This could increase the number of appeals and would create significant costs for the State and must be considered in the annual budget in the context of all state funding priorities.

In partnership with the Legislature, we enacted a budget that closed a shortfall of more than \$30 billion through balanced solutions that avoided deep program cuts and protected education, health care, climate, public safety, and social service programs that are relied on by millions of Californians. This year, however, the Legislature sent me bills outside of this budget process that, if all enacted, would add nearly \$19 billion of unaccounted costs in the budget, of which \$11 billion would be ongoing.

With our state facing continuing economic risk and revenue uncertainty, it is important to remain disciplined when considering bills with significant fiscal implications, such as this measure.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.”

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, Afl-cio
California Federation of Labor Unions, Afl-cio
California School Employees Association
California State Council of Service Employees International Union (seiu California)
Cft- a Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, Aft, Afl-cio
United Administrators of Southern California (UASC)

Oppose

Alameda County Superintendent of Schools
Alameda Unified School District
Association of California Community College Administrators
Association of California School Administrators
California Association of School Business Officials (CASBO)
California County Superintendents
California School Boards Association
Carocp - the Association of Career and College Readiness Organizations
Community College League of California
Dublin Unified School District
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Office of the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools
Orange County Department of Education
Pleasanton Unified School District

School Employers Association of California (SEAC)
Small School Districts' Association

Analysis Prepared by: Ellen Cesaretti-Monroy / HIGHER ED. / (916) 319-3960