

# California State Assembly



## Assembly Budget Agenda

### Assembly Budget Subcommittee No. 3 on Education Finance

Assemblymember David Alvarez, Chair

Tuesday, May 5, 2026

9:00 A.M. – State Capitol, Rm 447

#### ITEMS TO BE HEARD

Item	Description	Page
6100	California Department of Education	2
6870	California Community Colleges	2
0559	Labor Agency	2
0511	Government Operations Agency (California Education Interagency Council)	2
Issues	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Governor's Master Plan for Career Education and California Education Interagency Council</li><li>2. Dual Enrollment Proposal</li><li>3. Long Term English Language Learner proposals</li><li>4. Supporting Inclusive Practices Proposal</li><li>5. Charter School Facilities</li><li>6. Non-Presentation Items</li></ol>	 2 4 9 12 14 18

Public Comment will be taken in person after the completion of all panels and any discussion from the Members of the committees.

## Items To Be Heard

**6100 California Department of Education**

**6870 California Community Colleges**

**0559 Labor Agency**

**0511 Government Operations Agency (California Education Interagency Council)**

### Issue 1: Governor's Master Plan for Career Education

This panel will hear an update the Administration's Career Master Plan and California Education Interagency Council.

#### Panel

- Abby Snay, California Labor and Workforce Development Agency
- Mary Ann Bates, California Cradle to Career Office
- Chris Ferguson, California Community College Chancellor's Office
- Justyn Howard, Government Operations Agency
- Erika Torres, California Department of Education

#### Background

In August 2023, Governor Gavin Newsom called for a new Master Plan for Career Education. He urged state agencies and institutions of higher education to increase equitable access to well-paid jobs by creating and strengthening education and training pathways that are specific to 1) sectors, 2) regions, and 3) individuals' skills and experience. The EO's intent was that these pathways will ensure that all Californians can find opportunities that for high-paying and fulfilling career paths that don't require college degrees.

The Master Plan for Career Education has been described as a framework for responding to the complex, multifaceted challenges confronting California's labor market and educational landscape.

***Workforce and Education Efforts Encompass Many Services.*** The goal of education and training programs is to assist individuals in obtaining skills, in most cases tied to a career. As part of these efforts, the state funds schools and universities; provides grants, scholarships, or loan repayment to organizations and individuals; and conducts outreach and engagement efforts to both individuals and employers. These efforts serve a variety of populations and therefore the programs and services offered vary widely based on individuals' interests and goals.

**Programs Are Administered by Education Systems and Many Agencies.** The higher education system, K-12 schools, the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA), and the local workforce development boards as well as other agencies with overlapping priorities run education and training programs. California’s workforce efforts involve many agencies and programs in part because people in the various populations served tend to be looking for somewhat different outcomes.

**Governor’s 2025-26 Budget**

The 2025 – 26 Budget provided \$1.5 million general fund, ongoing for a new California Education Interagency Council (CEIC), contingent on authorizing legislation.

The Office of the California Education Interagency Council was established by AB 1098 (Fong and Padilla, 2025) and SB 638 (Padilla and Fong, 2025) within GovOps. CEIC was created as a coordinating body to implement the state's Master Plan for Career Education. California's education and workforce development programs are fragmented — spread across numerous agencies with separate funding streams, separate applications, and separate planning requirements — even when they're pursuing the same goals. Meanwhile, the income gap between college-educated and non-college households has widened dramatically since 1980. The CEIC is meant to serve as a neutral cross-sector convener to align TK-12, higher education, and workforce development agencies around common goals, particularly around career pathways, upskilling for adult learners, and preparing for AI-driven labor market changes. It builds on Governor Newsom's 2023 Executive Order N-11-23 on career education.

Panelists will provide an update on the final Master Plan, and key recommendations relevant to the Governor’s Budget, and existing priorities for the Administration, consistent with the Master Plan.

**Staff Comments**

**Suggested Questions:**

1. What are the Administration’s priorities within the Career Master Plan for the current year and Budget Year?
2. How will the CEIC and other agencies utilize the Cradle to Career data system?
3. What specific activities and actions does the Administration expect this council to accomplish this year?
4. What is the range of specific outcomes the Administration expects from this new Council over the next four years?

**Staff Recommendation:** Information Only

**Issue 2: Dual Enrollment**

This panel will hear the January Budget proposal to provide an additional \$100 million for Dual Enrollment programs.

**Panel**

- Melody Jimenez, DOF
- Michael Alferes, LAO
- Chris Ferguson, California Community College Chancellor’s Office
- Kimberly Rosenberger, California Department of Education

**Background**

**Dual Enrollment**

Credit from these college-level classes may count toward both a high school diploma and a college degree. By graduating high school having already earned college credits, students can save money and accelerate progress toward a postsecondary degree or certificate. Dual enrollment has various models. California’s two most widely used models are traditional dual enrollment and College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP). Traditional dual enrollment typically consists of individual high school students taking college-level courses on a community college campus or independently online. CCAP, on the other hand, allows cohorts of high school students to take college-level classes on a high school campus. Under both dual enrollment models, both the school district where the student attends and the community college are typically able to claim apportionment funding for the time that students are taking the community college courses.

**College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP)**

Chapter 618 of 2015 (AB 288, Holden) created CCAP. Unlike traditional dual enrollment, CCAP allows cohorts of high school students to take college-level classes on a high school campus. Community colleges may still claim apportionment funding for such instruction. Unlike traditional dual enrollment, CCAP students only need to attend their high school classes for 180 minutes (three hours) for school districts to generate attendance-based funding. Chapter 618 prohibits students in a CCAP program from being charged enrollment fees or fees for textbooks and other instructional materials. To form a CCAP program, school and community college districts must agree to a memorandum of understanding (MOU). These MOUs contain information such as the courses to be offered; the number of students to be enrolled; and which partner (the school or community college district, or both) is to cover program costs, including the cost of providing instructional materials.

According to CDE, there are over 1,000 schools now participating in CCAP.

**Middle College and Early College (MCEC) High Schools**

In addition to traditional dual enrollment and CCAP, the state authorizes “middle college high schools” and “early college high schools” (MCEC high schools) to serve as specialized programs focused on dual enrollment. Middle college high schools are a partnership between a school district or charter school and a community college to operate a high school on a community college campus. The state provides \$1.8 million in ongoing funding to support these programs. Early college high schools are partnerships between public schools and a community college, California State University, or University of California campus that allow students to earn a diploma and up to two years of college credit in four years or less. Both programs are targeted to students who are at risk of dropping out of high school.

**In 2022-23, State Provided \$200 Million One-Time Funding for Certain Dual Enrollment Programs.** The 2022-23 budget package provided \$200 million for dual enrollment programs through a competitive grant process administered by the California Department of Education (CDE). Statute requires half of the funding to be provided in \$100,000 grants per school site to establish or expand CCAP programs, while the other half of the funding was to be used to provide \$250,000 grants per school site to start up or expand MCEC high schools. Statute also specifies that priority is to be given to local education agencies (LEAs) where at least half of their student population consists of English learners or low-income students, as well as LEAs that have a higher than the state average rate of high school dropouts, suspensions or expulsions, child homelessness, foster youth, or justice-involved youth. CDE has made funding available through three application rounds, beginning in 2023-24. To date, CDE has fully allocated the funding set aside for CCAP grants, while \$33 million remains from funds set aside for MCEC high schools. CDE has indicated it will be opening another round of funding for MCEC high schools in 2026-27. Any uncommitted funding after this fourth round of applications will revert back to the state after June 30, 2027.

The following tables are from the CDE’s most recent legislative report on the products of dual enrollment funding:

**Total Number of Successful Course Completions by Course Category for CCAP Students**

<b>Course Category</b>	<b>Fall 2022</b>	<b>Spring 2023</b>	<b>Summer 2023</b>
English	4,499	3,814	272
Mathematics	1,915	1,935	92
History/Social Science	5,543	5,762	808
Science	1,224	1,536	228
World Language	1,568	1,732	318
Health	761	924	404
Computer Science	265	339	118
Visual Arts	1,054	1,211	341
Dance	132	128	0
Theatre	356	228	131
Music	390	404	218
Career Technical Education	7,103	8,801	369
Other	6,126	6,487	1,393

Source: CDE website

**Number Dually Enrolled Students by Grade Level in the 2022–23 School Year**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Middle College High School</b>	<b>Early College High School</b>	<b>Early College Programs</b>	<b>CCAP</b>
9 <sup>th</sup> Grade	796	1,292	726	6,357
10 <sup>th</sup> Grade	936	1,151	731	8,060
11 <sup>th</sup> Grade	1,184	1,043	905	15,228
12 <sup>th</sup> Grade	859	994	746	17,938

Source: CDE website

**Governor's 2026-27 Budget**

The Governor's budget proposes \$100 million one-time Proposition 98 General Fund to provide additional grants for expansion of CCAP or MCEC high schools, on a competitive basis. This funding must be committed by June 30, 2029.

The proposal includes trailer bill changes to the program design, and would allow dual enrollment students to have more lower instructional minutes standards.

**LAO Comments**

***No Clear Fiscal Barriers to Implementing Dual Enrollment.*** Research suggests that dual enrollment can be an effective model for improving college preparation. Moreover, the state supports an extensive amount of dual enrollment through several program models. In proposing additional one-time funding for dual enrollment, however, the administration fails to identify how additional funding might help remove barriers to implementing dual enrollment programs. In the case of CCAP, it is not clear that funding barriers exist at all. From 2020-21 through 2023-24, full-time equivalent enrollment in CCAP programs has grown from about 13,100 to over 24,000 (82 percent). Moreover, rather than posing fiscal barriers, funding policies for CCAP and MCEC high schools can work to the benefit of schools and colleges. When dually enrolled students take college courses in place of their regular high school coursework, schools can receive attendance-based funding even though they may only be providing three hours (rather than the standard six hours) of instruction per day. The state has also made legislative changes over the years to support expansion of CCAP. Most recently, Chapter 789 of 2024 (SB 1244, Newman) allowed community college districts to establish partnerships with school districts outside their service area.

***LEAs Can Use Proposed Discretionary Block Grant Funding for Same Purposes.*** As described in our recent publication [The 2026-27 Budget: Proposition 98 Guarantee and K-12 Spending Plan](#), the Governor's budget provides \$2.8 billion in one-time funding for a discretionary block grant that would be allocated based on average daily attendance. The grant would not have specific spending requirements, but trailer legislation suggests several potential uses, including dual enrollment programs. To the extent that one-time funding would help support the expansion of dual enrollment programs, LEAs could use the funding from the discretionary block grant to cover these costs.

**Recommendation**

***Recommend Rejecting Proposal.*** Given the proposed funding would provide one-time funding for ongoing activities and would not address any barriers to expanding dual enrollment, we recommend the Legislature reject the proposal. LEAs interested in using one-time funding

to expand dual enrollment programs could use funding from the proposed discretionary block grant for the same activities.

### Staff Comments

Staff recommends that the proposal be amended to ensure more enduring dual enrollment capacity for high school students, in LEAs opting into these funds. CCAPs and MCECs that opt into these one-time funds should commit to higher standards, including a maintenance of effort in dual enrollment course capacity, assurances that high school credit in a relevant subject area will be awarded, and assurances that A-G alignment will be met.

Is there alignment needed with the California College Guidance Initiative (CCGI)? Advocates are requesting technical assistance infrastructure to support more LEAs with the development of durable A-G aligned dual enrollment programs. This is a potential area of CCGI overlap or coherence?

CCAP statute currently says: It is the intent of the Legislature that courses offered to high school pupils in dual enrollment programs pursuant to this section are part of structured, well-sequenced pathways and count toward postsecondary certificate or degree requirements, and are counted toward high school graduation requirements in equivalent subject areas." BUT should this be required as a condition of new dual enrollment funding?

Other Suggested Questions:

- 1) Why are expansion grants for early college or middle college programs the same size as a planning or start-up grant? Is that necessary?
- 2) Why is there no cap on how much of the \$100 million is for MCECs? In light of the larger impact of CCAP programs, in terms of number of students and systems changes, should CCAP be a priority for funding?
- 3) Does the CCAP prohibit Community Colleges from charging student fees? Statute currently says:  
*(f) A high school pupil enrolled in a course offered through a CCAP partnership shall not be assessed any fee that is prohibited by Section 49011.*
- 4) Should the funds prioritize new CCAPs and new school sites participating in a CCAP over extension grants?
- 5) How many high schools do NOT participate in CCAP? Has there been a survey on why?
- 6) What is the justification for lowering instructional minutes for dual enrollment programs, if they are CCAP, which is located on a high school campus?
- 7) Can we fund an independent evaluation and data reporting for this program?

**Staff Recommendation:** Hold Open

**3: Long Term English Language Learners**

This panel will hear trailer bill proposals regarding students who are Long Term English Language Learners.

**Panel**

- Sade Neri, DOF
- Sara Cortez, LAO
- Kimberly Rosenberger, CDE

**Background**

Current law requires LEAs to assess the English Language Development of each pupil determined to be an English Language Learner (ELL), in order to determine the level of language proficiency, and requires that the summative assessment be conducted annually during a four-month period after January 1st of each year, as determined by the SPI, and with approval by the SBE. LEAs are required to conduct an annual assessment of ELs until students are redesignated as fully English proficient. (Education Code (EC) 313) Current law also requires the CDE, with the approval of the SBE, to establish procedures for conducting the assessment of English proficiency required and for the reclassification of a student from EL to English proficient. (EC 313)

Current law defines a Long Term English Language Learner (LTEL) as:

“ an English learner to which all of the following apply:

(A) Is enrolled in any of grades 6 to 12, inclusive.

(B) Has been enrolled in schools in the United States for six years or more.

(C) Has remained at the same English language proficiency level for two or more consecutive prior years, or has regressed to a lower English language proficiency level, as determined by the English language development test identified or developed pursuant to Section 60810, or a score determined by the Superintendent on any successor test.

(D) For a pupil in any of grades 6 to 9, inclusive, has scored far below basic or below basic on the prior year’s English language arts standards-based achievement test administered pursuant to Section 60640, or a score determined by the Superintendent on any successor test.

(2) A pupil for which the required testing results are not available for either subparagraph (C) or (D) of paragraph (1) shall not have that criteria applied and such pupil shall not be excluded based on that criteria.”

Current law also defines a student “At Risk of Becoming a Long-Term English Learner:

“ means an English learner to which all of the following apply:

(A) Is enrolled in any of grades 3 to 12, inclusive.

(B) Has been enrolled in schools in the United States for four to five years.

(C) Has scored at the intermediate level or below on the prior year’s English language development test identified or developed pursuant to Section 60810, or a score determined by the Superintendent on any successor test.

(D) For a pupil in any of grades 3 to 9, inclusive, has scored in the fourth or fifth year at the below basic or far below basic level on the prior year’s English language arts standards-based achievement test administered pursuant to Section 60640, or a score determined by the Superintendent on any successor test.

(2) A pupil for which the required testing results are not available for either subparagraph (C) or (D) of paragraph (1) shall not have that criteria applied and such pupil shall not be excluded based on that criteria.”

Current law requires the CDE to report data on both these student groups, and determined above.

**Governor’s 2026-27 Budget**

The January Budget trailer bill proposal would amend Education Code sections 313.1 and 313.2, which define Long Term English Language Learners, and pupils at risk of being a Long Term English Language Learner, and direct how the CDE provides data on Long Term English Language Learners.

**Staff Comments**

According to the Administration, the proposal’s goal is to align definitions for at risk and LTEL to the dashboard definitions and expedite data dashboard publications.

This trailer bill proposal has no budget nexus, and is a very sensitive, complex policy proposal impacting hundreds of thousands of students learning English as a second language. Staff recommends rejecting this proposal in its entirety, and that CDE follow the legislative policy process.

There are three distinct policy proposals in the January Budget:

- 1) Eliminate the current statutory criteria for a Long Term English Language Learner, and replace with:

*“a pupil who has not attained English language proficiency within seven years of initial classification as an English learner.”*

- 2) Eliminate the current statutory criteria for of students “at risk of being a Long Term English Language Learner” and replace with:  
*“a pupil who has not attained English language proficiency within six years of initial classification as an English learner.”*
- 3) Change the process by which the CDE provides LTEL and at risk student data, to limit the data to an internet posting.

Specifically, a coalition of English Language Learner advocates have expressed that the proposed at-risk -LTEL definition is concerning because it would no longer identify students who have been English learners (ELs) for four to five years. During the 2024–25 school year, there were 45,864 AR-LTEs in 4th grade (49% of ELs) and 36,778 AR-LTEs in 5th grade (42% of ELs). Under the proposed definition, very few to none of these students would be identified, resulting in missed targeted interventions when the likelihood of reclassification is higher in elementary school.

These advocates are requesting definitions that are consistent with the state’s English Learner Progress Indicator.

**Suggested Questions:**

- 1) What values should drive the definition for LTELs and students at-risk? Data posting standards or academic achievement standards?

**Staff Recommendation:** Reject and refer to policy committee.

**Issue 4: Supporting Inclusive Practices**

This panel will hear the January Budget Proposal impacting the Supporting Inclusive Practices Project.

**Panel**

- Alaina Powell, DOF
- Sara Cortez, LAO
- Kimberley Rosenberger, CDE
- Jolie Critchfield, Marysville Joint Unified School District

**Background**

The 2021-2022 Budget Act appropriated \$15 million one-time to expand the Supporting Inclusive Practices Project (SIP). The uncodified budget trailer bill language requires the program to increase opportunities for pupils with disabilities to participate in the least restrictive educational environment, through a tiered technical assistance program to LEAs on evidence-based inclusive practices.

The SIP project is administered by the CDE, and operated through two county offices of education. The project aims to help LEAs strengthen inclusive practices through tiered technical assistance and support. It has been operating for ten years through a combination of state and federal funds, but is not established in statute.

According to a 2026 policy brief by Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), *Advancing Inclusive Education in California Schools*, SIP serves a combination of LEAs referred through CDE’s Compliance and Improvement Monitoring (CIM) process when data indicate persistent, systemic patterns related to LRE. LEAs may also receive support from SIP when they express interest in strengthening inclusive practices.

SIP currently includes 96 grantees who voluntarily participate and 10 assigned by the CDE Special Education Division. Nearly all required participants (98% over 10 years) ask to continue engagement with SIP as voluntary grantees once CIM support ends.

PACE data regarding growth in inclusion for districts participating in SIP, indicate that:

- Growth in the percentage of students included in general education was 13 times the state average over five years;
- Growth in the percentage of students included in general education was 6 times the national average over five years; and

- Growth among CIM districts per year was 3 times the state average between 2022 and 2024.

According to the PACE report:

- Districts entering SIP with the lowest baseline rates have made the largest gains, while higher baseline cohorts showed smaller but still positive gains.
- SIP grantees also reduced the use of more restrictive placements. Across cohorts, use of separate schools (SPP Indicator 5c) declined in six of seven cohorts, with reductions of up to 11.7 percentage points, and three cohorts met the state’s separate-school target of 2.6 percent or lower.
- There were meaningful gains among LEAs that were required to participate through the CDE’s CIM process. CIM districts achieved 4.16% of growth in the 2021–21 cohort and 6.20% in the 2021–22 cohort.

**Governor’s 2026-27 Budget**

The Governor’s Budget extends the encumbrance period for the one-time 2021-22 appropriation for SIP from 2026 to 2027.

**Staff Comments**

According to CDE, \$4.8 million in SIP funds remain from the 2021-22 appropriation, which allows for an additional year of program implementation.

Suggested Questions:

- 1) Is SIP ready to expand beyond it’s current capacity to support more LEAs with inclusion goals?
- 2) How is SIP access impacting the new State Preschool inclusion targets?
- 3) Should SIP be expanded to regions with challenges meeting State Preschool inclusion targets?
- 4) Has CDE received interest in SIP beyond funding capacity?

**Staff Recommendation:** Information Only

**Issue 5: Charter School Facilities**

This panel will hear the January Budget proposals impacting the Charter School Facility Grant Program.

**Panel**

- Ethan Schroder, DOF
- Michael Alferes, LAO
- Will Jarrell, State Treasurer’s Office

**Background**

**Charter School Facility Leasing**

The Charter School Facility Grant Program (CSFG) was established in 2002 by SB 740 (O’Connell), to offset the unique facility leasing costs of charter schools. Funding under statute is allowable for lease costs and lease facility capital improvement. In the 2013-14 Budget Act, the CSFG program’s administration was transferred from CDE to the Charter School Finance Authority (Authority), in the State Treasurer’s Office. The CSFG provides annual grants to offset annual on-going facility costs for charter schools serving a high percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price meals (FRPM) or for charter schools located within a public elementary school boundary that serves a similar demographic for FRPMs.

Prior to the 2016-17 Funding Round, the CSFG was typically undersubscribed, which resulted in the Authority not awarding the entire annual apportionment. Subsequently, the California Department of Finance (DOF) implemented a programmatic change, and reduced the FRPM program eligibility threshold for charter schools from 70% FRPM to 55% FRPM. Since this change went into effect, the number of Program applicants, along with the percentage of funding disbursed has steadily risen. The chart below provides historical information related to Program apportionments, amounts awarded to schools, the number of applicants as well as the percentage of funding disbursed to schools.

<i>History of Apportionments, Awards, and Distribution Allocation for the Charter School Facility Grant Program</i>				
Fiscal Year	State Budget Appropriation	Funds Awarded	Percentage of State Budget Appropriation Disbursed	School Awardees
2011-2012*	\$76,509,000	\$5,166,452	6.75%	43
2012-2013*	\$92,031,000	\$37,525,209	40.77%	261
2013-2014	\$92,031,000	\$65,575,245	71.25%	318
2014-2015	\$92,031,000	\$74,902,988	81.39%	331
2015-2016	\$112,031,000	\$89,969,742	80.31%	372
2016-2017	\$112,031,000	\$98,667,899	88.07%	396
2017-2018	\$133,177,000	\$133,177,000	100.00%	418
2018-2019	\$136,786,000	\$136,786,000	100.00%	415
2019-2020	\$136,786,000	\$136,786,000	100.00%	426
<i>* Program under CDE administration; upon program transfer, the Authority issued \$42,691,661 in awards to schools that had applied through CDE</i>				

Source: Office of State Treasurer

2019-20 was the first time SB740 was oversubscribed to the point where rent/lease-based awards left no pro-rated funds available for other facility related costs. During the 2018-19 funding round around 277 applicants submitted other costs, requesting a total of \$37,362,321 or about \$90,685 per applicant. A majority of these applicants, 272, are also applicants for 2019-20 Funding Round and were not able to submit other costs due to the oversubscription.

For the 2025-26 funding round, 492 timely applications were submitted, 449 were deemed eligible, and received their initial program disbursement of 50% of their projected annual grant award. When eligible funding requests exceed the amount of funds appropriated, awards are pro-rated across all eligible applicants. Below is updated data highlighting the Program's funding and subscription levels since 2020:

<u>FY</u>	<u>Appropriation</u>	<u>Awarded</u>	<u>% of Appr.</u>	<u>Pro-Rata</u>	<u>Applicants</u>	<u>Awardees**</u>
2020-21	\$136,786,000	\$136,786,000	100.00%	92.6%	436	423
2021-22	\$143,520,000	\$143,520,000	100.00%	98.9%	435	421
2022-23	\$154,273,000	\$153,387,473	99.42%	N/A	426	409
2023-24	\$163,583,000	\$163,583,000	100.00%	95.7%	452	427
2024-25	\$168,041,000	\$168,041,000	100.00%	90.6%	469	453
2025-26*	\$181,733,000	\$181,733,000	100.00%	96.1%	492	449

\* Current Active Round. \*\* Eligible applicants with eligible costs.

Source: Office of State Treasurer

This program receives a statutory COLA.

**The Governor’s 2026-27 Budget**

The Governor’s Budget proposes two increases to the Charter School Facility Grant Program— (1) \$1.75 million for a statutory COLA adjustment to account for increasing costs over time and (2) a \$7.42 million Current Service Level adjustment to address increased demand.

**Staff Comments**

Suggested Questions:

1. Is the Charter School Facility Grant program intended to be an entitlement program?
2. Do regular public schools have parity in access to funding for facilities, compared to this program?
3. What is the total amount of funding Highlands Charter received from this program between 2019 and 2024 (during the time the State Auditor found apportionment abuses over \$180 million)?
4. Does the program need better protections against abuse, as seen in the Highlands Charter use of the program?
5. What percentage of the program’s funds are used to renovate and improve privately-owned properties?
6. Should public funds be allowed to renovate privately-owned property?

A 2017 report titled *Spending Blind*, published by In the Public Interest (a research and policy center), describes deficiencies with the current regulations that have allowed millions of dollars to be vested in private limited liability companies and charter management organizations (CMOs) by funneling the funds through public charter schools and eventually converting those dollars into private real estate holdings.

These egregious examples underline the importance of protecting the use of Proposition 98 funding for public goods in the education system. Should the CSFG program have the same restrictions as the Office of Public School Construction's charter facility program, and restrict capital improvements to public agency-held title?

**Staff Recommendation:** Hold Open

## Non-Presentation Items

### Issue 5: Non-Presentation Items

The Department of Finance will not be formally presenting the following items but is available to answer any questions from the Subcommittee related to these budget proposals. Public comment at this hearing is available.

- 1. Education Trailer Bill Proposal:** Uncodified: Curriculum-Embedded Performance Tasks for Science.
- 2. Education Trailer Bill Proposal:** Amends Section 117 of Chapter 48 of the Statutes of 2023: Literacy Roadmap Encumbrance.
- 3. Budget Change Proposal:** Increases the Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team funding by \$994,000 ongoing Proposition 98.
- 4. Budget Change Proposal:** Increases the California School Information System funding by \$966,000 ongoing Proposition 98.
- 5. Budget Change Proposal:** Increases the K-12 High Speed Network funding by \$629,000 ongoing Proposition 98.

**Staff Recommendation:** Hold Open