Student Advisory Board on Education Proposals 2025

Description: Item 03 Addendum Attachment 1: Student Advisory Board on Education Report.

This PDF was provided, as is, to the California Department of Education (CDE) by The California Association of Student Councils (CASC).

CASC Contact Information:

- **Executive Director:** Kelly Wachowicz
  Email: kelly.wachowicz@casc.net

- **State President:** Lawrence Kim
  Email: david.bae@casc.net

California Department of Education, November 2025

STUDENT ADVISORY BOARD ON EDUCATION

PROPOSALS

2025

California Association of Student Councils

The Student Advisory Board of Education
Wednesday, November 5, 2025

Transparency in District Budgeting and Goals

Speaker: Ava Messervy-Stone Writer: Kaylin Wen Research: Alice Ahn, Sunny Hills High School
Facilitator: Lawrence Kim, Chino High School
Group Members: Daphne Fong (Newark Memorial High School), Ryan Park (Science Academy), Justin Pettey (Del Oro High School), Antonio Rivera (Santa Rosa High School), Claire Sim (Henry M. Gunn High School), Ava Messervy-Stone (Torrey Pines High School), Devesh Swarnachandrabalaji (Aliso Niguel High School), Kaylin Wen (Maria Carrillo High School) Chloe Xu (Bonita High School)

I. PRIORITY

The Student Advisory Board on Education has recognized the ongoing shortfall of community engagement, regarding the allocation and usage of Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) resources. Though the current established priorities include “Parent Involvement”, these priorities don’t sufficiently embrace community feedback and involvement due to the lack of comprehensible documents which students and parents cannot understand.

Many community members, especially those from underrepresented backgrounds, remain in the dark on how their money from LCFF is allocated and utilized in the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP)–-unaware of how their money is actually funded towards the wellbeing of students. The lack of comprehensible documents and awareness could chain-result into the possibility of decline in student enrollment and overall undermines the communities’ trust.

II. RECOMMENDED SBE ACTION

TheStudent AdvisoryBoard on Education strongly urges that the State Board of Education considers to revise Priority 3, adding a subsection to “Parent Involvement" LCFF’s Priority 3, to effectively share resources with California schools to restore greater transparency within the relationships between community and the district. We chose to revise Priority 3 because it’s relevant to supporting our purpose of addressing the communication of information to parents which allows the general public to access the LCAPS and have the opportunity to understand and engage in future conversations.

III. LOCAL AND STATEWIDE IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

In order to work towards implementing the revision of Priority 3, the first step is to amend the Priority 3's format to include a specific section stating "comprehensible fiscal awareness". This addition would allow the SBE and/or CDE to have a reference when posting resources on their websites (e.g. Resources in Regards to Priority 3). Examples of possible resources that can be posted will be developed by the CDE. This solution not only provides schools with readily accessible resources to effectively make the LCAP a comprehensible resource for community members, but also establishes transparency as another component of the LCAP, ensuring that all districts would have a reference point to accomplish transparency.

IV. KEYISSUES

The Student Advisory Board on Education concluded this problem through the basis of identifying minor issues that underlie the overarching problem. The LCFF and LCAP funds are allocated and are only easily accessible to specific people with granted authority. This in return limits the public's engagement with issues that directly involve and impact them, also resulting in the lack of public understanding and relevance, inconsistent public involvement, and minimal guidance that could possibly stem from community members.

Parents and staff are faced with barriers such as limited access to translated material, infrequent updates on fiscal situations and changes, and visibility on how the students themselves are getting help they need. The dense documents with unfamiliar terminology is not the best possible way for the public to understand and therefore contribute to issues that directly affect them. The district is devoted to serving their community; with the loss of reliable accountability and communication, effective engagement in the community is no longer motivated nor achievable.

V. PROVENRESULTS

One of our delegates, Justin Pettey from Placer Union, learns andexperiencesdirectlyasa student from a district that has positive turnouts from successfulimplementationoftransparent district engagement systems. Placer Union High School voluntarilyattachedalinkontheir district's homepage, a comprehensible 2-page display, statingto"[provide]easypublicaccessto enhance fiscal transparency". This link drives easy first-handaccesstoannualcopiesofthe LCAP to anyone interested, not only granting them visibilitytothegeneraleyebutalsothe ability to analyze and identify spending patterns but also thefreedomtoreferbacktothese documentations whenever. This proves that this projected planworks.PlacerUnionhasshown an increase of transparency, integrity, and an expected decreaseinCPRAs.
In addition, the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD)isanotherexampleofa California district that has taken notice of the importance of transparencyinLCAPfunds. Managing 18.8 billion dollars in the 2025-2026 school year, theyimplementedanexecutive summary with big charts and straightforward graphics to make itlessintimidatingandeasierfor students and parents to understand the district's budgeting.

VI. FISCAL ANALYSIS

The onlycostsinvolved on the ends of the SBE/CDE will be small costs in finding, developing, and posting resources to be on the website. No other cost will be involved.

VII. RATIONALE

Transparency is imperative when it comes to establishing a secure and stable district for the community; it's the foundation to creating a district with control. Parent and student engagement shouldn't be solely used as a symbol to stand in place for the meaningful action that is intended to be occurring. Minimal student/parent representatives on school district boards aren't sufficient to express an accurate depiction of true community feedback. Embedding transparency into the state's Priority 3 of Parent Involvement will ensure restoration of trust in the community, promote equity, and overall reinforce the original intent of LCFF to the people. Transparency isn't a possibility but a moral and encouraged responsibility. With the implementation of a revision of Priority 3, engagement becomes not only participatory but more importantly, effective. This proposal aligns exactly with the intent of LCFF to foster equity in community engagement, flexibility, and promote stable funding.

VIII. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS DISCUSSION AND ACTION

CDE Actions

- Simplification of theLCAP overtheyears (e.g.consolidationof tables, reducing redundancy, simplifying instructions, etc)
- Revisions to templates
    - Updating and adjusting to improve clarity, and consistency in LEAs

Legislative Actions:

- CaliforniaEducation Code (EC) sections 52065 and 47606.5:
    - Mandates LCAP to be posted publicly in all LEA websites prominently
    - Ensure basic access and compliance but not necessarily comprehensibility/easy understanding
    - Is no set format for LCAPs, leading to the variation in how data is presented and interpreted across districts

The Student Advisory Board of Education

Wednesday, November 5, 2025

Providing Inclusive Opportunities for Students with Special Education

Speaker: Gianna Kim (University High School, Irvine)

Writer: Marissa Herrera (Highland High School, Bakersfield)

Research: Claire Pohlmayer (University Preparatory High School, Redding)

Facilitator: Christine Yeeun Oh (Crean Lutheran High School, Irvine)

Group Members: Marilyn Ramirez-Peña (Soledad High School, Soledad), Sasha Hahn (El Cerrito High School, El Cerrito), Brooke Miles (Vista High School, Richmond), Kimaya Rajput (Lincoln High School, Stockton), Devin Witten (Hercules High School, Hercules), Asteris Ling (Carlmont High School, Balmont), Avery Updike (Cerritos High School, Cerritos), Kapil Shastry (Mountain View High School, Mountain View)

❖ PRIORITY

The priority of this proposal is to further the creation of a school environment where students truly understand and value inclusivity for neurodivergent peers in the education system. By teaching the student body about neurodiversity and fostering genuine awareness, we can build a culture of empathy that extends beyond the classroom. Neurodivergent students should have the same opportunities to learn, participate, and connect; whether through integrated classes, adapted sports, or extracurricular programs & activities that strengthen social-emotional and life skills. We aim for every California student to leave school not only academically prepared, but also compassionate and ready to support an inclusive community.

❖ RECOMMENDED SBE ACTION

We implore that the California State Board of Education endorse integrative initiatives for neurodivergent students following the following provided structures [see III, “Local and Statewide Implementation Details] as best practice recommendations to California Schools, and readily provide access to the framework to California Schools through the Cal SBE website.

❖ LOCAL AND STATEWIDE IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

Integrative initiatives are most effectivewhentailored to thestudent body inquestion. For this reason, our council group has created structures for school activities based onsubject to ensure a streamlined process for initiative development. These structures are designedwith high Schools in mind, relying heavily on student leadership and student programs(Associative Student Body, Subject Departments, Clubs, &c.) to participate in the organization of these initiatives. That being said, K–8 schools may choose to adopt similar strategieswith a reliance on administrative bodies in lieu of High Schools’ reliance on student leadershipand programs.

Subject-based structures

- ❖ Arts & Humanities

- ➢ Step-by-Step (general initiative development)
    i. Identify focus subject area (music, ceramics, mixed media, literature, &c.)
    ii. Identify an activity that could be used to engage the school's general population with the subject area (music festivals, art showcases, poetry nights, &c.)
    iii. Identify any necessary adaptations to equipment, activity rules, and cognitive requirements, and tailor them to the participation body. (noise level, art mediums, sophistication of writing, &c.)
    iv. Engage SpEd students with GenEd students as partnerships and/or teams, or simply as sharers of the space in the activity on a large scale

- ❖ Science & Mathematics
    - ➢ Step-by-Step (general initiative development)
        i. Identify focus subject area (simple arithmetic, mathematical principles, laws of motion, mechanical advantage, &c.)
        ii. Identify the ideal setting given focus subject area (science based focus areas are more likely to be suitable towards large scale demonstrative activities with school wide access, whereas math based focus areas are more likely to be suitable towards small scale activities with participation within individual classes)
        iii. Identify necessary & suitable adaptations to equipment, activity rules, sophistication, &c. (Classroom math activities will likely see success in the use of sensorially engaging aspects like manipulatives, and "real world" scenario activities)
        iv. [In the case of school-wide activities] Engage SpEd students with GenEd students as partnerships and/or teams, or simply sharers of space in the activity on a large scale
        v. [In the case of classroom activities] Engage IEP/504 students with non-IEP/504 in the activity on a collaborative level
- ❖ Athletics
    - ➢ Step-by-Step (general initiative development)
        i. Identify an outdoor/athletic activity that typically involves multi-student involvement (volleyball, dodgeball, freeze tag, &c.)
        ii. Identify any necessary adaptations to equipment, activity rules, and exertion level, and tailor them to the participating body (softer balls, balloons, flags instead of contact tag, rest periods, &c.)
        iii. Engage SpEd students with GenEd students as partnerships and/or teams in the activity on a large scale
- ❖ World Cultures
    - ➢ Step-by-Step (general initiative development)
        i. Identify a focus demographic (latin cultures, Asian cultures, Pacific islander cultures, &c.)
        ii. Identify an activity that could be used to engage the school's general

population with the subject area (cultural festivals, cultural music demos, cultural history initiatives)

iii. Identify any necessary adaptations to equipment, activity rules, and cognitive requirements, and tailor them to the participating body. (noise level, sophistication, &c.)

iv. Engage SpEd students with GenEd students as partnerships and/or teams, or simply as sharers of the space in the activity on a large scale

❖ School Spirit

➢ Step-by-Step (general initiative development)

i. Identify intended level of comfort (comfort, growth, or panic)

ii. Identify an activity that follows the intended level of comfort (dress up days, rallies, movie nights &c.)

iii. Identify any necessary adaptations to equipment, activity rules, cognitive requirements, and tailor them to the participating body

iv. Engage SpEd students with GenEd students as partnerships and/or teams, or simply as sharers of the space in the activity on a large scale

Specific Initiative Examples

❖ KEY ISSUES

❖ Limited Early Exposure to General Education Peers

➢ Disabled elementary students are often kept in separate classrooms, with only 61% of California students in general education spaces for ≥80% of the day (*Overview of Special Education in California*, 2019). This reduces the students opportunities to interact with nondisabled peers, denying them chances to practice social and collaborative skills. This early segregation can reinforce stigma and social isolation.

❖ Disparities in Opportunities

➢ Students with disabilities often have limited access to enrichment activities, creating gaps in achievement between students with and without disabilities. This limits long-term academic and career opportunities, further reinforcing inequities. Barriers contributing to this gap include insufficient inclusive programming, lack of adaptive/accessible equipment, transportation challenges, and lack of staff training in inclusive extracurricular contexts (e.g. sports, clubs, and community groups) (*Examining whether student participation in School-Sponsored Extracurricular activities in IEPs,* 2020)

❖ PROVEN RESULTS

Districts across the state have taken up similar initiatives and seen improved attendance, improved test scores, and increased participation in campus life and surrounding community.

❖ CVUSD reports that students with disabilities have shown improved attendance (+3.1%) and improved benchmark assessment scores in cotaught math classes in middle school (*THRIVE conejo, What Has Changed*)

❖ Another EUSD news article reports that students in the specialized “Community Bases Instruction” program have increased participation in campus life and the

surrounding community, helping transition students toward independence (*El Monte Union recognizes Special Education Day across Campuses, 2021*)

❖ FISCAL ANALYSIS

For the purpose of specification regarding the fiscal aspect of this proposal, the counsel group intends to restate that the suggested initiatives are reliant on existing infrastructure and resources, including SpEd staff, student leadership, and materials that exist for general use.

❖ RATIONALE

The nature of this proposal makes it feasible in ways many proposals aren't. Since it relies entirely on existing events, infrastructure, programs, and resources, it requires no staff development programs or special funding.

❖ SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS DISCUSSION AND ACTION

- ❖ Senate Bill No. 692 (Cortese) —*Chapter919,Statutesof2022*
  - ➢ SB 692 aimed to promote transparency and accountability in special education inclusion by requiring CDE (California Department of Education) to publish federal LRE indicators (the percentage of students with disabilities educated in general settings) and post them on the California School Dashboard. It also reaffirmed California's policy that *"all pupils are general education pupils first."*
  - ➢ SB 692 added Education Code 56049–56049.1, directing CDE to include disaggregated LRE data by district and student subgroup. Implementation relies on public reporting rather than penalties, ensuring that districts use these data in LCAP development and continuous improvement cycles.
- ❖ Senate Bill No. 939 (Umberg) —*Chapter 907, Statutes of 2024*
  - ➢ This bill required the California Department of Education (CDE) to evaluate whether local educational agencies (LEAs) provide adequate school-site and community resources for neurodivergent pupils as part of their existing monitoring under the Safe Place to Learn Act. The goal was to strengthen equity and ensure that schools actively support neurodivergent students through accessible programs, staff training, and community partnerships.
  - ➢ SB 939 amended sections 234.1, 234.5, 234.6, and 32283.5 of the Education Code to include neurodivergent pupils within the framework of state monitoring and compliance reviews. The law requires LEAs to maintain and demonstrate available support and may be subject to state-mandated local program requirements.
- ❖ Assembly Bill No. 181 (Committee on Budget) —*Chapter 52, Statutes of 2022*
  - ➢ AB 181 clarified that students with exceptional needs may participate in independent study only if their Individualized Education Program (IEP) team determines it appropriate and ensures compliance with Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) standards under IDEA. The bill sought to strengthen individualized decision-making for students with disabilities and prevent inappropriate placement in independent study.
  - ➢ AB 181 amended Education Code 51745 and required districts to update local independent study policies. Implementation was guided by CDE's 2022 policy memorandum, which directed districts to document IEP team decisions and maintain evidence that independent study supports the student's learning goals and accommodations.

- Assembly Bill No. 560 (Irwin) —*Chapter 707, Statutes of 2025*
  - AB 560 created Special Education Teams at each school site to promote collaboration between general and special education staff. The goal was to strengthen coordination of inclusive practices, improve communication about student needs, and establish equitable staffing ratios for resource specialists and special-day classes.
  - The bill required districts to establish site-based teams that meet regularly to review data, share strategies, and monitor student outcomes. Implementation occurs through district inclusion plans and professional learning systems, aligned with the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) framework to ensure consistent application across schools.

The Student Advisory Board on Education

Wednesday, November 5, 2025

AI in Education

Speaker: Sarina Khangura (Royal High School, Simi Valley) Writers: Siddharth Ganesh (American High School, Fremont), and Rishaan Marwaha (Sage Hill High School, Newport Beach)

Research: Katherine Kim (Royal High School, Simi Valley)

Facilitator: Daniel Chung Lee (Portola High School, Irvine)

Group Members: Ariadne Tatsis (Piedmont High School), Joey Wang (Francis Parker School, San Diego), Jaehee Kim (University Preparatory School), Lasya Cherukupalli (Royal High School, Simi Valley), London Stevenson (Envision Academy), Kaylin Bonilla (Mira Monte High School, Bakersfield), Albert Miro Wright (Lincoln High School)

I. PRIORITY

The Student Advisory Board on Education delegation has identified that the unethical usage of artificial intelligence by students is largely due to the lack of artificial intelligence literacy in schools. This disconnect between emerging technologies and the students' understanding of them leads to over-reliance on artificial intelligence. As a result, students who use AI improperly hinder their learning and development of critical thinking skills. Without instruction on artificial intelligence, students cannot utilize it effectively and ethically, which impacts not only their learning but also their preparedness for the future.

II. RECOMMENDED SBE ACTION

The Student Advisory Board on Education proposes that the State Board of Education (SBE) recommend the incorporation of artificial intelligence (AI) literacy content into English classes from grades 4-8. This recommendation would build on top of existing AI literacy content introduced in 2024 in California Assembly Bill 2876, which incorporates AI literacy content into mathematics, science, and history-social science curriculum frameworks upon the next revision of the framework.

III. LOCAL AND STATEWIDE IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

Statewide Implementation:

- The SBE recommends that the Instructional Quality Commission (IQC) develop English Language Arts (ELA)/English Language Development (ELD) content for grades 4-8 to incorporate comprehensive AI literacy standards as framed in AB 2876 without deeply affecting ELA/ELD education curriculum.
- This would be integrated into the ELA/ELD framework upon the next revision of the framework.

    - The framework shall equip students with key knowledge in AI, including but not limited to:
        - Understanding AI concepts
        - Evaluating and using AI tools ethically
        - Recognizing algorithmic bias and its roots
        - Responsible application of AI in writing and research
        - Data privacy with AI
        - Digital-citizenship in an AI-enabled world.
        - Technical foundations of AI
- To ensure the successful implementation of this proposal, SABE recommends that educational materials and resources finalized and approved by the IQC be integrated into all California Local Educational Agencies (LEAs).

Local Implementation:

- Should LEAs adopt the AI literacy content:
    - LEAs may adapt the content to better fit their curriculum, instructional content, and student needs while maintaining state standards.
    - LEAs should create clear guidelines and policies on responsible AI usage in academic settings

---

IV. KEY ISSUES

Students lack proper knowledge on how to use AI constructively in academic settings. Most do not have the AI literacy to supplement their learning, so they use it incorrectly.

- A 2025 study by Gerlich on the cognitive effects of AI shows that:
    - AI is used more commonly by younger people
    - AI usage is shown to have a strong negative correlation with critical thinking
- A study on the effects of AI usage on students by Shanmugasundaram & Tamilarasu says that AI usage leads to lower attention spans and superficial learning.

Overall, improper AI usage is shown to have significant impacts on students' cognitive abilities, undermining their skills rather than enhancing them. AI can be harnessed properly, but students are not taught to do so.

V. PROVEN RESULTS

The effectiveness of AI literacy in the classroom has been substantiated through academic and international research demonstrating measurable improvements in ethical awareness, critical thinking, and responsible technology use among students.

- A 2025 systematic review done by Zhang et al., in Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, examines 68 K-8 AI education programs across 20 countries and found that explicit instruction in AI ethics and literacy consistently increased students' ethical awareness, digital self-regulation, and critical reflection skills.
- A 2024 study done by Lee and Chan in the *British Journal of Educational Technology* involving 363 secondary students established that AI literacy programs strongly correlated with responsible technology attitudes, which included ethical usage of generative AI in the classroom.

- The OECD's 2024 *Empowering Learners for the Age of AI* framework, done by UNESCO, shows that students who are taught AI literacy in schools show a stronger capacity to challenge algorithmic bias and make evidence-based digital decisions.

These studies together provide empirical support for integrating AI literacy into a 4-8 curriculum. The demonstrated improvements in ethical reasoning, critical evaluation, and academic honesty present a compelling, evidence-based rationale for California's adoption of such a framework.

VI. FISCAL ANALYSIS

Due to the existing bill, A.B. 2876, the framework of AI literacy content has already been established in mathematics, science, and history-social science curricula. Because of this, the most significant cost would be the cost to create the ELA AI literacy curriculum. This could cost around $300,000-$800,000, based on previous precedent from the IQC.

VII. RATIONALE

As time goes on, AI grows increasingly prevalent, so it is essential that students are aware of how they can use it to their advantage, but not as something to depend on. This solution is the most rational out of all possible solutions to AI in Education, because it prioritizes a framework that builds off of a prior legislature, which means this solution is already legitimate and has been reviewed. In addition, it is more cost-effective to have a minimalist framework compared to other solutions, including outright banning AI in schools. AI is constantly evolving, and society as a whole has to come to the realization that it is not going to leave; due to this, the proposal does not speak on the method of AI usage, but rather focuses on preventative measures, such as how to utilize it ethically to ensure students do not exhibit academic dishonesty.

Our proposal is the most relevant to students because it focuses on grades 4-8. This is pertinent to our proposal because in the state curriculum, students are not introduced deeply to technology until 4th grade, where they start to use tools such as Google Docs and forms to do assignments. AI literacy stops after the 8th-grade English level because at that point, students should already understand how to use AI responsibly and should focus on other advanced English topics and literature.

VIII. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS DISCUSSION AND ACTION

- AB-2876 Pupil instruction: media literacy: artificial intelligence literacy: curriculum frameworks: instructional materials:
    - Media literacy: Schools will more strongly consider teaching how to access, evaluate, analyze, and use media and information, basically how to be smart users of social media, news, digital information, etc.
    - AI literacy: The bill introduces a definition: AI literacy means knowing how artificial intelligence works (what it can/can not do), how to use it, and its ethical/societal implications.
    - The bill says that when the state updates school curriculum frameworks or picks new instructional materials for subjects such as math, science, and history/social science (and

also ELA/English) after certain dates, they must consider including media literacy and AI literacy.

- SB-1288 Public schools: artificial intelligence working group
  - ○ Establishes a statewide "Artificial Intelligence in Education Working Group" within the California Department of Education (CDE) to develop guidance and a model policy for use of AI in public K-12 schools (including charter schools).
  - ○ The working group must, by January 1, 2026, provide guidance to local educational agencies (LEAs) & charter schools regarding safe use of AI (e.g., academic integrity, acceptable vs unacceptable uses, data privacy, procurement practices)
  - ○ By July 1, 2026, the working group must deliver a model policy for LEAs/charters on AI use.
- AB-1064 Leading Ethical AI Development (LEAD) for Kids Act
  - ○ To regulate artificial intelligence (AI) systems that are used by children (defined in the bill as under 18) in the state of California.

The Student Advisory Board on Education

Wednesday, November 5, 2025

Speaker: Arlene Ramos (Golden Valley High School, Bakersfield) **Writer**: Linda Frazier (Pacific Academy, Irvine) and Ojasvi Chhabra (Royal High School, Simi Valley) **Research:** Diya Thennarasu (Early College High School, Fairfield) **Facilitator:** Kevin Hur (Sunny Hills High School, Fullerton) **Group Members:** Sofia Rodriguez (San Marino High School, San Marino), Elizabeth Rakowski (Royal High School, Simi Valley), Rakan Samani (Inderkum High School, Sacramento), Abby Deng (Enterprise High School, Redding), Elly Deng (Enterprise High School, Redding), Carlos Barrios (Cajon High School, San Bernardino), Diego Harris (High Tech High Chula Vista, San Diego)

I. PRIORITY

The Student Advisory Board on Education delegation has identified that while there are many civic education and advocacy opportunities available to students across California, there is a significant lack of awareness and promotion of these programs in schools. This disconnect prevents students from engaging with valuable resources that could strengthen their understanding of the government, law, and civic responsibility. As a result, many students remain unaware of how to participate in advocacy or connect with local and state initiatives, leading to an underrepresentation of youth voices in civic spaces and missed opportunities when resources were provided.

II. RECOMMENDED SBE ACTION

To address the lack of student awareness regarding civic education and advocacy opportunities, the Student Advisory Board on Education recommends that the State Board of Education include three (3) student representatives to the existing task force on K-12 on Civic Learning, each from a different region of California. These regions would represent diverse areas: suburban, urban, and rural. Representatives from each region would contribute ideas to improve accessibility to civic programs, help identify outreach gaps, and collaborate with educators and policymakers to make opportunities more visible and relevant to their peers.

III. IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

- The SBE would provide a recommendation to the CDE to include student representatives to the task force.
- Information regarding the position could be distributed through the CDE website, with resources provided to LEA's via email, counselors, and teachers.
- The information would include:
    - Process to select the student representatives.

    - Roles of the student representatives.
    - Topics that could be covered in the meetings, such as:
        - Programs increasing civic learning among students
        - Introducing pre-existing programs to younger students for Civic readiness
        - Reviving lost Civic opportunities in schools
- Inclusion of the position would revitalize the created material of the task force to include effective implementation for students.

IV. PROVEN RESULTS

According to a 2023 Media report on students:

- In a sample of 46 California school districts, only about a quarter used the word “civics” in their local LCAP
- Only about 2% of the state’s high school graduates had the newly implemented State Seal of Civic Engagement insignia in 2021-2022

- This shows how the lack of civic opportunity advertisement dims the creativity and passion for students to get involved civically and not just academically, minimizing their range of knowledge and skills. This means that with a student task force present, the student body would be represented and introduced to a world of civic opportunities that have been lost in education over the years.

According to the Generation Citizen study:

- From a sample of 617 students in 55 classrooms, GC’s action civics intervention showed positive gains in students’ action civics knowledge and civic self-efficacy
- The qualitative coding identified three types of project characteristics that captured variability in the action projects students chose to present: context, contact, and content with decision makers

- The significant increase in student involvement and improvement in civics and creative, real-world projects displays the need for more civic education and student advocacy throughout the statewide curriculum. This displays that there is a need for a student representative on the task force to stay consistent with the increase in student involvement in civics caused by the few districts that provide civic opportunities.

V. FISCAL ANALYSIS

The creation and establishment ofastudent representative on the current Task Force or even a student-led Task Force on Civic education wouldrequire a flexible and flexible allocation of funds to support transport only. This approach wouldstreamline efforts currently dispersed across districts, decreasing the actual amount of funds needed andeliminating duplicate costs. By using existing resources from the Department of Education, the statecould achieve savings while enhancing and improving civic education learning outcomes through student-ledleadership and ad.

VI. RATIONALE

Theinclusion of student representatives on the State Board of Education's civic education task force would ensure that student perspectives are directly incorporated into statewide discussions and initiatives. When students are given the opportunity to participate in these decision-making processes, they gain a deeper understanding of how educational policy is developed and implemented. This representation not only empowers students to advocate for their peers but also ensures that civic education resources are designed with the needs and interests of students in mind. With representation from all three types of areas–rural, urban, and suburban–the SBE can ensure that all students' ideas and concerns are equally shared and advocated for. Such collaboration encourages mutual respect between students and educators, promotes shared responsibility in improving civic engagement, and fosters a sense of belonging within the broader educational community.

VII. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS DISCUSSION AND ACTION

- SB-745American government and civics: curriculum guide: State Seal of Civic Engagement.
    - ○ Existing law requires a pupil to complete designated coursework while in grades 9 to 12, inclusive, to receive a diploma of graduation from high school. These graduation requirements include, among others, the completion of 3 courses in social studies, including a one-semester course in American government and civics..
- AB-24
    - ○ Focused on creating a State Seal of Civic Engagement to recognize high school students who demonstrate excellence in civics education and participation. The bill aimed to encourage elementary and secondary students to become civically engaged in democratic institutions at local, state, and national levels.
- Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP)
    - ○ A comprehensive three-year plan developed by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) that details how they will use state funds to improve student outcomes and meet state and local priorities. The LCAP outlines specific goals, actions, services, and expenditures, with input from parents, educators, and the community. Its primary functions are to ensure resources are aligned with educational goals and to demonstrate how the LEA is improving opportunities and outcomes for all students, particularly those from low-income, foster youth, and English learner backgrounds.
- SB-584 Pupil instruction: civic engagement.
    - ○ This bill would expand the California Serves Program to promote access to effective service learning for pupils in grades 1 to 12, inclusive, who are enrolled at participating local educational agencies. By expanding the purposes of ongoing appropriations, the bill would make an appropriation. The bill would require the department, in partnership with CaliforniaVolunteers, on or before January 1, 2027, to (A) review available evidence on ways to incorporate effective service learning for pupils in grades 1 to 12, inclusive, (B) develop model uniform metrics for the measurement of pupil progress for grades 1 to 12, inclusive, and (C) provide recommendations to the Legislature on, and post on the department's and CaliforniaVolunteers' internet websites information related to, evidence-based strategies to expand access to high-quality service learning programs for grades 1 to 12, inclusive, as provided.

The Student Advisory Board of Education

Wednesday, November 5, 2025

OPPORTUNITY AND ACHIEVEMENT GAP

Speaker: Keegan Beecher (Walnut High School, Walnut)

Writer: Patrick Tse (Sacramento Country Day School, Sacramento)

Research: Marianne Bestenheider (Bella Vista High School, Fair Oaks)

Facilitator: Rudri Soni (Centennial High School, Corona)

Group Members: Samreen Sandhu (Liberty High School, Bakersfield) Esmeralda Ramos (Arvin High School, Arvin), Peter He (Chino Hills High School, Chino Hills) Annali Bojorquez (Long Beach Poly High School, Long Beach), Elizabeth Flores (Otay Ranch High, San Diego) Ethan Duncan (Canyon High School, Anaheim), Zion Rucker (Oakland Tech, Oakland), Giovanni Bravo (Soledad High School. Soledad)

I. PRIORITY

The Student Advisory Board on Education has identified significant concerns with how school districts identify and support students who lack sufficient English skills to understand their core curriculum. Currently, schools rely on the Home Language Survey, a form that parents complete to indicate which language is spoken at home. While the intent behind this process is sound, its implementation often falls short. Many parents misunderstand the questions or worry about how their responses will be used; immigrant parents fear that their responses could be used to incriminate them. As a result, students who need language support sometimes go unidentified, while others who are already proficient in English may be incorrectly placed in language programs. Nevertheless, inconsistencies from language support systems create inequities across the state.

II. RECOMMENDED SBE ACTION

The Student Advisory Board on Education recommends that the State Board of Education take several clear actions to improve fairness and accountability in English Learner programs. SABE suggests districts across the state to participate in a diagnostic assessment for kindergarteners for their proficiency in the English language. This would ensure that placement decisions are based on objective results rather than subjective parent forms, promoting consistency and equity across all school districts. Second, schools should be required to publicly report their English Learner program outcomes each year. This reporting should include how many students move out of English Learner status, their progress toward English proficiency, and the overall effectiveness of

these programs. Making this information accessible to families and communities encourages transparency and helps hold schools accountable for student success, while also reducing the tendency for schools to keep students in English Learner programs longer than necessary.

III. LOCAL AND STATEWIDE IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

- The Home Language Survey (HLS) requires an update to improveaccuracy in identifying English Learners (ELs).
- Schools should not rely solely on parent responses; a kindergartenerEnglish proficiency screening would provide a clearer picture of each student's languageability.
- The plan would roll out in two phases to ensure fairness, transparency, and consistency across the state.

Phase 1: Statewide Kindergarten English Proficiency Assessment

- All kindergarteners would take the same state-approved English proficiency assessment.
- The California State Board of Education (SBE) would establish a working group of teachers, linguists, and assessment specialists to design or select an assessment aligned with state standards.
- The assessment would be piloted in select districts to ensure fairness, reliability, and accessibility for all student populations.
- Once approved, educators across the state would be trained to administer and score the screening consistently.
- Assessment results would manage English Learner placement decisions based on actual performance, reducing reliance on parental reports.
- Families would receive results and explanations in their home language, ensuring understanding and transparency in placement decisions.

Phase 2: Transparent Reporting and Accountability

- The state would publish district-level data on:
    - The number of students reclassified from English Learner program
    - Program success rates and student outcomes
- Each district would use a state-provided reporting template to ensure consistent and clear annual data sharing.
- Reports would be translated to key community languages to then get published on district websites

- The SBE would monitor district reporting for compliance and utilize acquired data to improve statewide English Learner support.
- Community meetings and online sessions would engage families and educators to review results and suggest improvements.

District Flexibility and Support

- Local districts retain autonomy in instructional methods and resource allocation, provided they meet state standards.
- Districts may use existing funds from LCAP or Title III to:
    - Train teachers in effective English Learner instruction and assessment practices
    - Educate parents about assessing and placement processes
    - Translate materials into multiple languages for equitable access
- Outreach should emphasize that screening is for educational purposes only, helping build trust with immigrant families and ensuring accurate information.
- The SBE should conduct annual program reviews to assess effectiveness, gather feedback, and make necessary adjustments for fairness and transparency.

IV. KEYISSUES

- The Home Language Survey is unreliable due to parent misunderstanding or fear.
    - Some parents underreport language use to avoid stigma or perceived disadvantages. Others overreport to access additional support services.
    - Both scenarios result in misidentification of English Learners.

- Inconsistency across districts:
    - Different identification tools and conditions make statewide comparison difficult.
    - Some students remain in ELD programs longer than necessary, while others who need support are overlooked.
    - Lack of data transparency prevents evaluation of program effectiveness and accountability.

V. PROVENRESULTS

- California's 2017 English Learner Roadmap improved fairness but did not resolve accountability issues.
- Research findings:
    - Accurate identification of language needs by kindergarteners correlates with better academic outcomes in later years.

- Ages 5–8 are critical for language acquisition, making kindergarten ideal for statewide assessment.

- Other states' successes:
  - Texas and New York have implemented statewide English Learner screening systems.
  - Results show reduced misplacement, improved outcomes, and stronger trust with immigrant families through clear communication.

VI. FISCALANALYSIS

- No new funding is required; implementation can rely on existing Title III and LCAP funds for screening, staff training, and reporting.
- Federal grants may supplement costs, particularly for outreach and communication efforts.
- A portion of funds should support family engagement initiatives, ensuring parents, especially in immigrant communities, understand that their data is safe and used only for educational purposes.

VII. RATIONALE

Implementing a statewide kindergarten English proficiency assessment ensures fairer and more accurate identification of English Learners. This system replaces subjective survey data with objective performance metrics.

Recognizing that there is no single EL profile and no one-size-fits-all approach that works for all English learners, programs, curriculum, and instruction must be responsive to different EL student characteristics and experiences. EL students entering school at the beginning levels of English proficiency have different needs and capacities than do. .Recognizing that EL students have diverse backgrounds, skills, and starting points, the approach rejects a one-size-fits-all model, instead promoting adaptable instruction that responds to individual needs—whether a child is just beginning to learn English or already has intermediate proficiency. By publishing assessment results, the system fosters transparency and builds trust within the community, while reducing fear and confusion among immigrant families by focusing on measurable student performance rather than solely on self-reported home language.Publishing these results also promotes transparency and accountability, strengthening trust in the community. For immigrant families, this approach reduces fear and confusion by focusing on student performance, not

self-reported home language use. Ultimately, the proposal ensures that every student receives the right level of support, fostering equity and academic success.

VIII. SUMMARYOFPREVIOUSDISCUSSIONANDACTION

- California's 2017 English Learner Roadmap set goals for equitable access but lacked strong accountability mechanisms.
- Federal Requirements:
    - *Title VI of the Civil Rights Act* mandates schools to identify and support students whose first language is not English.
    - *Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)* requires annual screening but offers no standardized process for early identification.
    - *Title III funds* support English Learner programs but suffer from inconsistent oversight.
- This proposal builds on existing frameworks by prioritizing fairness, accuracy, and trust.
- It ensures that every student, regardless of language background, receives appropriate support through consistent assessing, transparent reporting, and community engagement.
- Assembly Bill No. 1454
    - Require state board on or before Jan 31, 2027 to adopt instructional materials for kindergarten and grades 1 to 8, inclusive in English Language arts and English language development. Requires the state board to ensure instructional materials adhere to specified criteria
- Senate Bill No. 114
    - Require the state board to appoint an independent panel of experts on or before January 31, 2024, to create an approved list of screening instruments for assessing pupils in kindergarten and grades 1 and 2 for risk of reading difficulties
    - The panel will approve the list of screen instruments and require the board or body of a local educational agency serving pupils in kindergarten to grade 2 to adopt a screen instrument.
    - If a pupil is identified as being at risk of having reading difficulties after being screened pursuant to these provisions, the bill would require the local educational agency to provide the pupil with supports and services, as provided.

The Student Advisory Board of Education

Wednesday, November 5, 2025

Mental Health Awareness

Speaker:AddisonLuong (VistaDel Lago High School, Sacramento)

Writer: Lucy Montemerlo (Mountain View High School, Santa Clara)

Research: Arifa Omid (Whitney High School, Placer)

Facilitator: Angela Lee (Temple City High School, Los Angeles)

Group Members: Macy Zhu (Westridge School, Los Angeles), Ifunanya Ifeanyichukwu (Centennial High School, Riverside), Julianna Garcia (Grace M. Davis High School, Stanislaus), Luis Hernandez, Anneliese Leon (West High School, Kern), Ethan Chen (Enterprise High School, Shasta), Benjamin (Chanyoung) Jung (Irvine High School, Orange)

I. PRIORITY

The current landscape of student mental health decisions in California, while paramount, exhibits a **critical deficit in youth participation**. Existing initiatives such as the Student Mental Health Policy Workgroup, convened in 2012 by SSPI Tom Torlakson, excludes students. This oversight is compounded by the absence of a dedicated youth advisory council within the State Board of Education, as well as any formalized channels for incorporating student perspectives into policy development.

II. RECOMMENDED SBE ACTION

The Student Advisory Board on Education (SABE) recommends that the State Board of Education (SBE) **forms a Mental Health Youth Advisory Council** that advises the Board twice a year on region-specific mental health disparities and impact of SBE decisions/policies, ensuring that the voice of the students that will be affected by the actions of the board are present and represented in the proceedings that determine decisions that directly affect them.

III. LOCAL AND STATEWIDE IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

TheState Board ofEducation will **establishaMentalHealthYouthAdvisoryCouncil** considering the following framework, and will commit to hearing the Council's input, integrating proposed advice as they see fit:

- 13 Council Members currently attending a California Public High School will serve one-year terms on the Mental Health Youth Advisory Council.
    - This adopts the framework applied to numerous other Youth Advisory Committees, including enough members to accurately represent the whole of California while also keeping the advisory a manageable size.
    - Rotating annual cohorts allows for a continuous stream of current and equitable advocacy from California school districts.

- The 13 Council Member positions will be filled with a lottery from a pool of all California School District Student Board Representatives that have opted to nominate themselves for the position (ideally due to an interest in mental health).
    - *The following restrictionshould be taken into consideration: anynumberof student school board representatives from a given district can enter the lottery, but no more than one from each school can be selected for the Mental Health Youth Advisory Council*
    - The limitationofthesememberstoStudentBoardRepresentativesmitigates the necessityofpre-screeningapplicants,andensuresthatmembersofthe Mental healthYouthAdvisoryCouncilareexperiencedinrepresenting California students.

Role of Members: The primaryroleofthemembersistovoicetheirconcernsinrespecttothe discrepancies and issues regardingmentalhealthintheirspecificareas

Meeting Logistics: The YouthMentalHealthAdvisoryCouncilconvenestwiceayear,with meetings included in the agendaofthesecondandfifthStateBoardofEducationmeetingsof the year (or meetings to beselectedatthediscretionoftheBoard).

- These sessionsaresupplementaltoStateBoardofEducationmeetings,which are alreadyincompliancewiththeBrownandBagley-KeeneActs respectively, and therefore do not require additional public notice. This reduces the logisticalburdenontheBoard.

The meetings of the Council will be held virtually on zoom,removingthepossibilityof travel costs and logistics preventingstudentrepresentativesfromservingontheCouncil, further ensuring socio-economic equity.

- The structure for Zoomsessionsalreadyexists,asmembersoftheStateboard of Education are abletovirtuallyattendsessionstheycannotinperson.
    - Similarly, this wouldnotbeanintroductionofanewframeworkregarding youths in SBE meetings,withtheCASCconferenceofSABEbeing implemented withintheNovembermeetings.
- Therefore, sessionswillbefacilitatedbyMembersoftheBoard,further alleviating the needforthecreationofanofficetofacilitatemeetingsofthe Mental Health YouthAdvisoryCouncil.

Meeting structure and integration: MuchlikeSABE(thoughmoretime-efficient)each member of the commission will giveatwominutestatementincludingbutnotlimitedtohow State Board of Education policies andestablishedcurriculaaffectmentalhealthattheirschool, as well as highlighting regionally specificissuestheyhavemadenoteof.Thesestatementswill occur at the beginning of each designatedBoardMeeting.

IV. KEY ISSUES

The repeated exclusion of student representation and voice within mental health policy development constitutes a significant institutional deficit, fundamentally impeding the creation of credible and effective policies that adequately address student-needs.

- According to Challenge Success, a nonprofit affiliated with the Stanford University Graduate School of Education, found that surveyed students reported they wished their

parents and teachers understood/knew their struggles
    - This indicates a disturbing trend of students feeling "unheard" by even the lowest level forms of authority in their lives, raising concerns in respect to student voice on higher (state and decision making) levels.
- Senate Bill 531, proposed by Senator Susan Rubio in 2025 and written to implement age-appropriate mental health education into K-12 curriculum, did not pass a vote by the Senate Education Committee, and therefore was not recommended for further consideration by the full Senate Body.
    - The failure to pass this bill, which was heavily backed and was based on student input– with notable personal statements from youths having been given– is evidence of the longstanding precedent of underrepresented student voices.

V. PROVEN RESULTS

- The following successes in the field of Youth Advisory Groups in respect to California policy making demonstrates the **potency of youth input into governmental action**. When we give students a voice, *they use it.*
    - The convening of **State Superintendent Tony Thurmond's Youth Advisory Council in 2021** established a council of selected youths that directly advise California policymakers on a student perspective, allowing for the input of student voice into legislative action and more equitable change
    - Assembly Bill 46 (2021/2022 session) authored by Luz Rivas creating the **Youth Empowerment Commission (2021)**. This commission was composed of 13 members with the ability to vote and advise on legal issues that are pertinent to youths to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, legislators, and the Governor.

VI. FISCAL ANALYSIS

The cost of this proposal to the board is modest, primarily consisting of the minimal allocation of funding to staff members to facilitate the lottery system and manage virtual-session logistics in regards to the council. This is a low-cost solution that aligns with the Board's priority of fiscal restraint while delivering high return in student engagement and well being.

VII. RATIONALE

The proposal of the establishment of a Mental Health Youth Advisory Council under the State Board of Education is necessary because it resolves the issue of the functional absence of student representation at the decision-making level.

- The proposed Mental Health Youth Advisory Council leverages frameworks that have already been implemented in organizations like the California Department of Education, and proven themselves successful in amplifying student voices. This ensures the feasibility of this proposal, diminishing the need for extensive planning and/or drafting of framework for this advisory council.
- State Board of Education jurisdiction includes the creation of policies that are later administered by the Department of Education. Input from the Advisory Council at the

earliest stages of this process means that the policies created and eventually implemented are more representative of the student body in California.

- The lottery system employed by the member selection process, coupled by the one-year position limit, ensures for equitable representation of California as a whole. Furthermore, the random selection alleviates the need for the creation of an office to review and select members for this Mental Health Youth Advisory Council.
- The inclusion of students into the legislative process of the State Board of Education will, over time, better the alignment of student services with student-identified needs, and strengthen the relationship between students and the educational governance that serves them by exposing students to larger-scale education governance.
- **Nobody knows better what students are in need of than students themselves**. The proposed council would allow students to bring first hand experience to these proceedings, expanding student influence on the mental health policies that will directly affect them. Additionally, by giving students the opportunity to use their unique perspective to advise the Board, policies influenced will more effectively respond to the mental-health needs of students and districts across the state.

    ○ Long term this will culminate in pertinent policies being implemented with the potential to relieve overly-burdened staff members in a far more beneficial and specific manner than any generalized decision.

Insummary:the establishment of theproposed council gives policymakers valuable access to a currently untapped source of input. This gives students who experience the disparities and adversity the ability to bring awareness to regionally specific mental health deficits.

VIII. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS DISCUSSION AND ACTION

SB 224 (Portantino, 2021) - Pupil instruction: mental health education.

- Required mental health instruction in middle & high School health courses,with the intention of state expansion of mental health curricula before January of 2024.

AB 748 (Carrillo, 2021) - Pupil mental health: mental health assistance posters

- Each school site in a district, County Office of Education (COE), or charter school, serving pupils grades 6-12, must create and display a poster on student mental health. In addition, the California Department of Education must develop a model poster

Ed Code 215 - Pupil and Student Suicide Prevention Policies

- Local Education Agency's must adopt a written suicide prevention policy for grades 7-12

AB 727 (González, 2025) Pupil and student safety: statewide resources: identification cards

- Under the provision of implementation dates, Student IDs are mandated to include crisis hotline information (including the Suicide hotline).

Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act (2008)

- Requires insurance companies to treat mental health and substance use disorder coverage to the same degree as pre-established physical health coverage.

Affordable Care Act (ACA) (2010)

- Expands mental health coverage under most health insurance plans and increases funding for community-based mental health services.

National Suicide Hotline Designation Act (2020)

- Creates a nationwide mental health crisis line (available by dialling 988) for immediate help and suicide prevention.

The Student Advisory Board of Education

Wednesday, November 5, 2025

Speaker: Jacob Garcia (West Valley EarlyCollegeHigh School,Cottonwood)

Writer: Jaden Khan (Monterey High School, Monterey)

Research: Jasleen Khangura (Royal High School, Simi Valley)

Facilitator: Maeve Cottin-Rack (Lincoln High School, Stockton)

Group Members: Liana DeLeon (Needles High School, Needles); Aneri Patel (Centennial High School, Corona); Meghan Bir (Centennial High School, Corona); Sravya Nallapareddy (Simi Valley High School, Simi Valley); Ivanka Kumar (Palo Alto High School, Palo Alto); Isabella Wang (Walnut High School, Walnut); Euri Kim (Arnold O. Beckman High School, Tustin); Aayan Hanif (Monte Vista High School, Danville)

PRIORITY

The Student Advisory Board on Education delegation has identified a lack of statewide accountability for ensuring that students receive equitable, comprehensive postsecondary counseling across California. Many students are not presented with the full range of post–high school options—including community college, career and technical education, trade programs, military service, apprenticeships, and direct-to-work pathways—and are often steered toward only one perceived "acceptable" route. The quality and breadth of guidance a student receives can vary widely based on their school's resources, demographics, or local priorities. These inconsistencies disproportionately disadvantage students from historically underrepresented communities, limiting their access to opportunities that align with their goals and strengths.

RECOMMENDED SBE ACTION

- The Student Advisory Board on Education recommends that the State Board of Education strengthen statewide expectations for equitable postsecondary counseling by integrating an equity-focused postsecondary counseling prompt into the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) template. This addition would require districts to describe how they ensure students receive unbiased, comprehensive information on all postsecondary pathways, including four-year universities, community colleges, career and technical education, military service, apprenticeships, and direct-to-work options.
- This resolution would ensure that every district reflects on equitable counseling practices, without imposing new financial requirements.

LOCAL AND STATEWIDE IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

- The California State Board of Education will add a prompt to the LCAP template questioning the equitable post-secondary opportunity practices of a district.
    - Because the LCAP reflects each district's goals, actions, and progress, adding this prompt furthers equitable postsecondary counseling as a statewide priority. It encourages districts to review their current advising practices, identify gaps, and adopt improvements using their existing resources. This approach improves accountability

and transparency without imposing new mandates or additional costs.
    - Districts may choose—at their discretion—to provide training or professional development that aligns with equitable counseling practices. For districts with limited resources, the LCAP prompt ensures they still engage in reflective planning and have access to statewide guidance, even if they are unable to invest in additional training.
    - Because districts must outline how they pursue their priorities in the LCAP, addingthis focus encourages them to consider investing in counselor development as part of their strategy to improve equitable postsecondary advising.

- **KEY ISSUES**
    - Students across California do not have consistent access to equitable, unbiased, and high-quality postsecondary counseling. The guidance a student receives too often depends on factors outside of their control—such as their district's resources, the priorities of individual schools, or the subjective practices of counselors. Without a clear statewide expectation for comprehensive advising across all postsecondary pathways, significant disparities persist. These inconsistencies widen the gap of opportunity, particularly for students from underrepresented backgrounds, and leave many without the information or encouragement needed to pursue the full range of post-high school options available to them.
        - At Walnut High Schools, counselors do not inform students of military-subsidized programs, such as ROTC, leading to missed opportunities for low-income students.
        - At Centennial High School, college visits are frequent and FAFSA workshops are common, however vocational education options are rarely, if ever mentioned as a viable pathway to students.
        - At Simi Valley High School, Camila was unable to apply for the Questbridge program which she had wanted to do for years since her school counselor was uneducated about the program and its deadlines.

PROVEN RESULTS

- In 2016, college andcareer readiness was elevated within the LCAP through adjusting the LCAP template to achievePriority 4 (Pupil Achievement) and Priority 7 (Course Access), prompting districts to report howthey were preparing students for postsecondary success. Without requiring new funding, districtsresponded by expanding dual enrollment, A-G access, and Career Technical Education(CTE) pathways. This shift in the LCAP template led to increased enrollment in dual credit courses, higher A-G completion rates, and greater participation in CTE—particularly among low-income and first-generation students. Incorporating equitable postsecondary counseling into the LCAP would operate similarly, using transparency and reporting to drive improved access and outcomes statewide.
- The 2023-24/2024-25 template update of the LCAP requires annual updates on planned versus actual outcomes and descriptions of changes that will occur the next year. An annual update

table was introduced, and districts must explain if a goal wasn't met, as well as the new action that will be taken. The new transparency and annual review created accountability, and requiring annual reporting of postsecondary metrics ensures college and career readiness receive similar scrutiny.

- **FISCAL ANALYSIS**

  The fiscal responsibility of the SBE would be negligible as the proposal is merely an additional guideline to the LCAP template. Districts will only have to report on what measures are being taken to meet LCAP goals. The addition of a post-secondary equity prompt to the LCAP would encourage school districts to demonstrate and reflect on active, transparent, and prioritized actions towards equitable student opportunities.

- **RATIONALE**

  The adoption of a new prompt to the LCAP template would hold school districts accountable for postsecondary counseling as a part of a movement for more equitable student opportunities. With these requirements, school districts are required to transparently report their actions regarding their prioritization of equitable postsecondary counseling in order to uphold the LCAP prompt. The prompt would include descriptions of how schools are equally promoting all post-secondary opportunities to students, such as military scholarships, vocational training, trade school, or employment.

- ## SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS DISCUSSION AND ACTION
  - Senate Bill 114 (2023): Amended the education code to require revision of the LCAP and annual update template and instructions
  - The SBE approved a revised LCAP template in November 2023 with new components including the "Annual Update" templateand updated prompts to be used from 2024-2025
  - Previous statewide efforts to improve postsecondary counselingin California have relied largely on encouragement and professional guidance rather than accountability. The state has not establisheda consistent expectation for how districts should provide equitable counseling across all postsecondary pathways.
  - Past approaches have offered general suggestions on improving access to postsecondary information, but without a mechanismfor transparency or review, implementation has remained uneven.Asa result, a student's exposure to different post-high school options continues to depend on their district's internal priorities, staffing, and resources. Integrating equitable postsecondary counselinginto the LCAP template would shift this to a statewide expectationfor reflection and continuous improvement, creating an updated template that promotes equity without imposing new mandatesor costs.
  - The California Legislation has passed bills such as AB 288 (2015)

expanding dual enrollment between community colleges and high schools.

- The SB 1108 in 2012 required data recording on college and career readiness indicators