



Los Angeles Unified School District **CALIFORNIA EDUCATION POLICY AGENDA**

October 2026

WWW.LAUSD.ORG

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Preface.....	2
Academics	5
PROMOTING HIGH-QUALITY EARLY LEARNING	5
MANDATORY KINDERGARTEN	6
TEACHER PREPARATION	7
CURRICULUM AND GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS	8
COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS	9
Accountability	10
Adequacy of Funding.....	11
PROTECT PROPOSITION 98	12
UPDATING THE LOCAL CONTROL FUNDING FORMULA	12
ENROLLMENT-BASED FUNDING	13
SPECIAL EDUCATION	14
FUNDING HEALTHCARE AND PENSION COSTS	15
STATE REVENUE SOLUTIONS	16
Artificial Intelligence and Technology.....	17
Emergencies.....	17
School Facilities	18
Student Homelessness	19
Whole Child Wellness	19
Conclusion	20

Executive Summary

Academics – California continues to experience stubborn achievement gaps between student groups and lower performance overall compared to other states and countries. Supporting the early learning system, making kindergarten mandatory, undertaking a holistic review of California's curriculum and graduation requirements, instituting effective college and career pathways, and taking steps to improve teacher preparation would support better student outcomes.

Accountability – California administrators spend an enormous amount of time meeting administrative reporting requirements that do not result in data or information that systemically changes action or policy. Los Angeles Unified urges the State to revise California's accountability standards into systems that are coherent and aligned with state priorities, less burdensome to schools, and provide higher-quality information.

Adequacy of Funding – Recent increases in state spending on education have been outmatched by rising costs for school districts. Acting to contain healthcare and pension costs, fully funding Proposition 98, updating the local control funding formula, including a consideration of enrollment-based funding and need-based investments in special education, and implementing tax policies that increase state revenues will promote more equitable and sustainable school funding.

Artificial Intelligence and Technology – AI is a rapidly evolving technology with the potential to reshape how we work, learn, and solve problems. Yet the risks of prolonged chatbot interactions by children may pose real harms to the physical and mental health of our students. Los Angeles Unified supports policy guardrails to ensure the dangers of these powerful tools are reined in.

Emergencies – When natural disasters strike, schools must respond immediately to the situations on the ground. Passing state laws or regulations that automatically trigger local flexibility in times of emergency would improve the local response and eliminate delays caused by State administrative action.

School Facilities – Existing state review processes for school facilities projects regularly delay construction by up to nine months, depriving students of quality school environments and increasing project costs. With additional staffing at the Division of the State Architect for concurrent or milestone-based review processes, K–12 schools could benefit from the same tools currently available for community college projects.

Student Homelessness – Hundreds of thousands of TK–12 students experience homelessness. Strengthening coordination and collaboration between state agencies, local governments, and school districts would improve the systems of support available to housing-insecure young people, as well as providing dedicated funding through the Local Control Funding Formula.

Whole Child Wellness – Schools' roles have evolved over time, taking on responsibilities of student health and wellness, including addressing mental health needs of youth. Continued investment into the services that schools provide through the CYBHI, LEA BOP, and SMAA will help close these gaps. Additionally, prioritizing directing funds from the \$2.1 billion Meta settlement to schools to address negative impacts of social media will reinforce schools as the front line of defense against social media harms.

Preface

The Los Angeles Unified School District (Los Angeles Unified) welcomes the opportunity to serve as a resource and partner to the State of California as it shapes the next chapter of public education. As the largest school district in California and the second largest in the nation, our scale, diversity, and experience provide a unique perspective on both the opportunities and practical challenges facing school systems across the state.

Spanning a geographic area that stretches across 710 miles, including the City of Los Angeles and parts of 25 other cities in the greater Los Angeles Area, Los Angeles Unified takes immense pride in its duty to ensure that every student graduates ready for the world.

Los Angeles Unified serves a diverse community of nearly 400,000 students in pre-kindergarten through adult education. As of fall 2025, English and 166 other languages are spoken by students at Los Angeles Unified schools. Over 86 percent of our students are identified as low-income, English learners, and/or foster youth. The students of Los Angeles Unified comprise every demographic group in California and include a greater number of African American and Latino students than the average California public school.

Ethnicity/Race	California ¹	LAUSD ²
African American/Black	4.8%	7.0%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.4%	0.1%
Asian	10.3%	3.5%
Filipino	2.2%	1.8%
Latino/Hispanic	56.0%	72.0%
Pacific Islander	0.4%	0.2%
White	19.7%	9.9%
Two or More Races	4.9%	2.3%
None Reported	1.3%	3.2%

As the new Administration establishes its priorities, Los Angeles Unified stands ready to share data, implementation experience, subject-matter expertise, and lessons learned. Our scale will not mirror every district, but it allows us to test policy across a uniquely broad range of student needs, communities, facilities, and operating conditions. We welcome the opportunity to serve as a thought partner to the Governor, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Board of Education, Legislature, and state agencies in developing policies that are effective, equitable, practical to implement, and responsive to California's diverse school communities.

Since emerging from the COVID-19 pandemic, Los Angeles Unified has achieved major increases in student achievement, with meaningful improvements in English, Math and Science that outpace the

¹ California Department of Education. (2026). "Fingertip Facts on Education in California." [Website] Accessed at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/ceffingertipfacts.asp>

² Los Angeles Unified School District. (2026). "Fingertip Facts 2026-27." [Fact sheet] Accessed at <https://www.lausd.org/facts>

academic growth of other large urban school districts in the state and nation.³ The percentage of students who scored “proficient” or “advanced” on the Smarter Balanced Assessment has significantly increased in every subject and for all grade levels and almost all student groups. Over the past year alone, scores have risen at least three percent in each subject. More students are completing A-G requirements, and access to opportunities such as Advanced Placement coursework and Gifted and Talented Education has expanded.

Despite the districtwide academic gains, achievement gaps persist for African American and Latino students, and the largest gaps are found in Students with Disabilities and English Learners— long-term trends that are mirrored in school districts throughout California.⁴

Los Angeles Unified leads the state in offering targeted interventions and innovative programs designed to address historical challenges common to large and diverse urban school districts, and is consistently at the cutting edge of policies and initiatives that drive national conversations, as illustrated by the initiatives listed below:

- **Phone-Free School Day** – One of the first major school districts in the nation to adopt a “bell to bell” cell phone ban to promote academic performance and student well-being.
- **Student Screen Time Limits** – Adopted developmentally appropriate guardrails on instructional technology for all grade levels, including eliminating school-issued devices for EECs-1st grade and limiting screen time on school-issued devices to durations of time considered appropriate for each grade span.
- **Community-Based Safety** – Committed to a community-based safety model that aligns programs and strategies to address the unique needs of school communities, including Safe Passage, community development, violence prevention, and peacebuilding efforts. This approach emphasizes collaboration with community partners to create safer, more supportive environments for students and families.
- **Black Student Achievement Plan (BSAP)** – Open to all students, BSAP addresses the longstanding disparities in educational outcomes for marginalized students by fostering high academic performance, social-emotional awareness and management, and a positive cultural identity for students.
- **We Are One** – Through the We Are One campaign, Los Angeles Unified provides resources and support for students and families, reinforces our commitment to schools as safe and welcoming places for all students and families regardless of immigration status, and ensures school sites provide support and resources for all members of the school community.
- **Supporting LGBTQ+ Students and Families** – Advanced inclusion through District efforts supporting all students, including LGBTQ+ students, and fostering safe, welcoming, and inclusive school environments.
- **Early Learning Expansion** – Led in expanding Transitional Kindergarten (TK) to serve all four-year-olds ahead of the state mandate. LAUSD is expanding its State Preschool Program and Early Education Centers to serve additional younger children.

³ Educational Opportunity Project. (2026). “Trends in Academic Performance in Los Angeles Unified, California.” [Report] Accessed at https://edopportunity.org/reports/trends/2025/CA/report_CA_0622710_los-angeles-unified.pdf

⁴ Legislative Analyst’s Office. (2020). “Narrowing California’s K-12 Student Achievement Gaps.” [Report] Accessed at <https://lao.ca.gov/Publications/Report/4144>

- **Dual Enrollment** – Early adopter of dual enrollment program where high school students may earn college credit through dual enrollment in Los Angeles Community Colleges, or on the high school campus through a College and Career Access Pathways partnership.
- **Magnet Programs** – 333 magnet programs across Los Angeles Unified provide rigorous, high-quality, theme-based instruction across diverse areas of interest. These programs are designed to support academic achievement while helping students develop knowledge and skills aligned with their academic and career interests.
- **Linked Learning Pathways** – More than 70 established Linked Learning Pathways prepare students for college and career by blending rigorous academics, career technical education, work-based learning, and comprehensive student supports. Students gain hands-on experience and develop the skills and certifications needed to pursue high-demand careers.
- **Multilingual Multicultural Education** – Reflecting the diversity of the city, Los Angeles Unified students have opportunities to study Spanish, French, Korean, Mandarin, American Sign Language, Italian, Japanese, Arabic, Russian, German, and Latin. Los Angeles Unified is proud to offer dual language immersion programs in seven languages – Spanish, French, Korean, Armenian, Mandarin, Arabic and Japanese.
- **Electrifying Our Bus Fleet** – Reduced carbon emissions by electrifying 250 (nearly 20 percent) of the District's school bus fleet. Nearly three-quarters of the District's 1,300 buses now run on alternative fuel.
- **Employee Housing** – Facilitated the development of 235 units of affordable housing across four affordable housing apartment complexes on district property, including units with a preference for Los Angeles Unified employees.
- **School Greening** – Expanding green spaces and tree canopy across District campuses through schoolyard greening, tree planting, shade improvements, and the replacement of heat-absorbing pavement with more sustainable surfaces to create cooler, healthier learning environments for students.

Los Angeles Unified is often on the front lines of responding to the region's most significant opportunities and urgent challenges. In the face of heightened immigration enforcement, we have engaged extensively with our network of families and community partners to provide trusted resources and support to our immigrant communities. Ahead of the 2020 Census, we conducted an outreach campaign to help ensure students and families were counted. Los Angeles Unified remains committed to collaborating with the State and other stakeholders on efforts that will shape the region in the coming years, from responding to ongoing immigration enforcement activities to planning for the 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Games in Los Angeles, and the 2030 Census.

Strong leadership from the State of California is critical to the ability of Los Angeles Unified and school districts throughout the state to support the academic achievement and social-emotional well-being of students while closing educational equity gaps. As the second largest employer in Los Angeles County, this Policy Agenda was developed with insights from our experienced district instructional leaders and is grounded in Los Angeles Unified's core beliefs of equity, collaboration, and excellence.

Academics

California has transformed the educational experience in the last decade, introducing major new initiatives such as Community Schools, Transitional Kindergarten, and the Expanded Learning Opportunities Program. However, the State is still largely educating students using a system that was developed early in the 20th century. Despite increases in state spending, California continues to experience stubborn achievement gaps between student groups and lower performance overall compared to other states and countries.⁵

California recently embarked on a major initiative to revise teacher training, professional development and curriculum adoption to improve reading and literacy instruction in the early grades. While this initiative is still underway, the State cannot wait to turn a similar focus to mathematics. The opportunity gap is particularly pronounced in mathematics – between 2015 and 2025, the math gap between poor and nonpoor students grew from roughly 2.8 to 3.2 grade levels, an increase of about 13 percent.⁶ In 2025, a report from UC San Diego found that one in eight admitted students was unprepared for college math.⁷

We believe that the time has come to open conversations about how education should be changed to promote success for all students in the modern world. This means not only increased funding or services to existing programs, but also a new consideration of what modern research tells us about how students learn, what environments best support education, and ways we can offer diverse opportunities to meet diverse needs.

PROMOTING HIGH-QUALITY EARLY LEARNING

Los Angeles Unified offers opportunities for all learners from early education through adulthood. One of our missions in supporting our students and their families is to offer high-quality early learning and care opportunities. Los Angeles Unified operates a large full-time California State Preschool Program (CSPP), offering families high-quality, full-day, full-year care, and a smaller General Childcare contract that allows us to offer care for infants. We are proud to support our parenting students with infant care, including a dedicated school for new mothers completing high school.

The expansion of Transitional Kindergarten (TK) has been transformative for families statewide but has caused significant structural challenges for providers serving young children. Traditionally, four-year-olds have served to “subsidize” infants and toddlers, who require a far lower ratio of adults to

⁵ Lafortune, J., Ugo, I. & Guinan, B. (2025). “Updating California’s school funding formula: Assessing alternatives and trade offs.” [Reports]. Public Policy Institute of California. Accessed at <https://www.ppic.org/publication/updating-californias-school-funding-formula-assessing-alternatives-and-trade-offs/>

⁶ Loeb, S. (2026). “Toward a Stronger Next Generation of California Education.” [Summary Report] Getting Down to Facts III. Accessed at <https://gettingdowntofacts.com/sites/default/files/Toward%20a%20Stronger%20Next%20Generation%20of%20California%20Education.pdf>

⁷ University of California San Diego Senate-Administration Workgroup on Admissions. (November 6, 2025). “Final Report.” Accessed at <https://senate.ucsd.edu/media/740347/sawg-report-on-admissions-review-docs.pdf>

children for high-quality care.⁸ As four-year-olds moved to TK, the child care reimbursement system has not adequately adjusted to cover the higher cost of infant and toddler care without a revenue-generating preschool classroom. Additionally, the developmental needs and practices of an infant and toddler classroom are very different from that of a preschool classroom. Many preschool teachers lack both the training and interest to move to infant and toddler work.⁹ As a result, many preschool teachers have transitioned to TK classrooms, where they can continue to work with their preferred age group, often at higher pay.

To stabilize the early learning sector, and expand access to 0–4-year-olds, Los Angeles Unified strongly supports the proposed single reimbursement rate system. We urge the State to begin the challenging work of identifying an ongoing funding stream outside the Proposition 98 guarantee that can support this vital initiative. We also support efforts to reframe and expand CSPP to serve younger students, now that many four-year-olds are instead enrolling in TK. Those efforts include removing the sunset on serving two-year-olds, the new expansion of community eligibility announced in the 2026 budget trailer bill, and a review of enrollment and eligibility requirements that make CSPP less attractive than other options, even when it is a better fit for the child’s or family’s needs.

MANDATORY KINDERGARTEN

The first five years of a child’s life are pivotal for their physical, intellectual, and social-emotional development. Kindergarten helps build the educational foundation for future learning and success. However, since kindergarten is not a mandatory grade level, students who do not attend miss fundamental instruction, putting them at a disadvantage in a classroom setting as they enter first grade. The full expansion of Transitional Kindergarten magnifies this impact—children who are entering school for the first time in first grade are sitting next to peers who already have two years of formal education.

Research demonstrates that children exposed to kindergarten mandates are more likely to go to college, earn more, and are less likely to experience poverty as adults. These impacts are larger for African American and Latino youth than for their white peers.¹⁰ Currently, eighteen states and Washington, D.C. require kindergarten attendance.¹¹ Mandatory kindergarten furthers equity and has the potential to help reduce the opportunity gap, which dramatically increased during the COVID-19 pandemic. In Los Angeles Unified, our internal data demonstrates that kids who attend kindergarten do better on their year-end assessments in first, second, and third grade and have higher scores on their Smarter Balanced tests as late as fifth grade.

⁸ Bilik, L. et al. (2025). “Building a vision for universal public childcare: Principles of a childcare system that works for workers and families.” [Report] Roosevelt Institute. Accessed at https://economicsecurityproject.org/wp-content/uploads/RI_Building-Universal-Public-Childcare-Workers-Families_Report_072025.pdf

⁹ Fuller, B. Land, A. & Zhang, Q. (2025). “Pre-K pivot? How preschools shift to younger children in Los Angeles.” [Policy brief] UC Berkeley Equity and Excellence in Early Childhood. Accessed at <https://drive.google.com/file/d/18KAT7-aXb1DoHDiFzaknPL9dNXgipri1/view>

¹⁰ Jenkins, J. and Rosales-Rueda, M. (August 29, 2019). “The Returns of an additional year of school; the case of state-mandated kindergarten.” *Medium*. Accessed at <https://medium.com/esspri/the-returns-of-an-additional-year-of-school-the-case-of-state-mandated-kindergarten-caf446de1f2d>

¹¹ Education Commission on the States. (2023). “50 state comparison; state K-3 policies.” [Webpage] Accessed at <https://www.ecs.org/50-state-comparison-state-k-3-policies-2023/>

Furthermore, California has invested significant sums in improving outcomes for our youngest learners, through Transitional Kindergarten, expansion of the California State Preschool Program, and literacy screening and coaching programs in early grades. Mandatory kindergarten will help leverage these investments for the greatest outcomes, decreasing the achievement gap and helping all California children to succeed. To support successful implementation, we urge the State to implement mandatory kindergarten starting in 2029 to allow time for districts to prepare and conduct outreach to families.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Research has established that teacher preparation and certification are by far the strongest correlates of student achievement in reading and mathematics, even when controlling for student poverty and language status.¹²

Unlike many states, California primarily prepares teachers through a one-year post-graduate credential program, rather than integrating teacher preparation within a four-year baccalaureate program. As a result, teacher preparation programs are unable to focus on developing deep subject matter knowledge in addition to pedagogy.¹³ Additionally, California is unusual in that its most common credentials stretch across grade spans. Both the single subject credential and multiple subject credential are permitted for use in grades from preschool to adults, despite different pedagogical strategies needed to address different ages.¹⁴

California's single-year preparation system may impact the ability of teachers to obtain the strong subject-matter knowledge necessary to effectively teach. This may especially impact mathematics instruction, where many multiple-subject credential holders often do not focus on deep mathematics knowledge in their undergraduate degree. Conversely, the single year of preparation may mean that single-subject credential holders may have technical fluency but lack pedagogical skill, particularly when teaching younger students in elementary or middle school.¹⁵

Other credential programs also suffer from misalignment of curriculum with the eventual job function. For example, the School Counselor credential focuses on mental health and social-emotional wellness, but the actual job of a school counselor is to support the successful progress of students through school to college or career (mental health may be provided by a counselor but is now more frequently provided by a dedicated school psychologist, social worker, or other staff). In Los Angeles Unified's experience, many counselors hired do not have the foundational knowledge

¹² Darling-Hammond, 2000, as cited in: Lieberman, T. (June 23, 2021). "Senate Bill 488 Committee Analysis." California Assembly Committee on Education.

¹³ Grossman, P. and Kaul, M. (2026). "Teacher certification policies: balancing quality and access in the teaching profession." [Technical Report] Getting Down to Facts III. Accessed at https://gettingdowntofacts.com/sites/default/files/Teacher%20Certification%20Policies_%20Balancing%20Quality%20and%20Access%20in%20the%20Teaching%20Profession.pdf

¹⁴ Ibid

¹⁵ Gallagher, H., Towne, L., Gomez, D., and Loeb, S. (May 2026). The California State role in supporting district capacity for TK-8 math improvement. [Technical report]. Getting Down to Facts III. Accessed at <https://gettingdowntofacts.com/sites/default/files/The%20California%20State%20Role%20in%20Supporting%20District%20Capacity%20for%20TK%E2%80%938%20Math%20Improvement.pdf>

of graduation requirements, A-G requirements, dual enrollment, financial aid, and other detailed information that is needed to support student academic success.¹⁶

This very broad and general preparation may in turn contribute to the very high turnover rate for new teachers, by leaving teachers unprepared for the specific challenges they may face in the classroom. More than one in four teachers quit in their first year or two of teaching, a rate that remains elevated for teachers in their third to fifth year. New teachers are additionally burdened by a shortage of mentor teachers and frequent placement in the most challenging schools, among other reasons. These factors contribute to high teacher turnover, a major factor in the persistent teacher shortage.¹⁷

Los Angeles Unified urges the new Governor, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and State Board of Education to convene robust conversations about how California's teacher preparation programs can be comprehensively revised and improved to offer prospective teachers the knowledge and skills that will allow them to enter the classroom feeling prepared and supported.

The research papers cited in this section offer a variety of recommendations that the State could consider in conversations to improve teacher training. We recommend that the State consider questions including:

- Should California shift from a post-baccalaureate degree to focus primarily on integrated four-year degrees, as is common in other states?
- Are existing teacher preparation programs adequately preparing candidates to teach foundational skills in literacy, mathematics, and other priority areas?
- What skills and capacities should a candidate be expected to learn during the credentialing process? What skills and capacities should the LEA be expected to offer during the first two years of a teacher's career? Are both entities funded and supported to meet their respective requirements?
- Are existing enforcement mechanisms adequate to ensure that teacher training programs meet their expected goals?
- Would age-span specific credentials (like the P3 credential) better prepare teachers to meet students' developmental needs?
- How can California support ongoing professional development opportunities after a teacher is fully credentialed?
- How can California develop incentives to encourage teachers to stay in the field and continue to develop their skills?

CURRICULUM AND GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS

Los Angeles Unified supports efforts to update California's curriculum frameworks and graduation requirements to prepare all students to succeed in the modern world and to promote the values of health, wellness, equity, and inclusion by uplifting stories and perspectives that have not traditionally been emphasized.

¹⁶ Alexander, C. (July 28, 2026). Personal Communication.

¹⁷ Leung-Gagné et al. (2026). "California's teacher shortages: trends in supply, demand and turnover." [Report]. Learning Policy Institute. Accessed at <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/gdtf-californias-teacher-shortages-brief>

At the same time, legislative efforts in recent sessions have added substantial new requirements without removing or revising existing standards. In the 2025–26 session, the Legislature introduced nine bills to add additional items to various parts of the curriculum. All were signed by Governor Newsom. Given the fixed amount of instructional time per day and throughout the school year to meet all mandated curricula, adding requirements without removing or revising others results in classes that are rushed and superficial, rather than allowing students time to deeply understand topics and develop critical thinking and learning skills. Piecemeal efforts, sometimes led by individual interest groups, are not the best way to develop a holistic, comprehensive curriculum that helps all students graduate ready for the world.

In a specific example, the State recently adopted a mathematics framework that is an unwieldy 900 pages long. This lengthy revision was made without consideration for the training and preparation teachers receive. One report noted that “Many teachers lack the content knowledge and pedagogical skills needed to teach TK–8 mathematics in the ways the Framework envisions, and they have limited access to the sustained professional learning that would help them develop those capacities.”¹⁸

The impulse to continually add without ever reducing applies as well to graduation and other course requirements. Los Angeles Unified is committed to providing comprehensive graduation pathways that provide all students with access to equitable opportunities for college and career readiness. Students already receive a broad liberal arts education that prepares them to pursue a variety of career and life goals upon graduation. While well-intentioned, every additional required class removes the opportunity for a student to pursue an elective, career technical education, or advanced learning in a field of interest. Constricting options for students by mandating additional required classes further complicates master schedules at high schools and decreases the flexibility necessary to increase enrollment in Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, dual enrollment, and career technical education options for students. Additional required classes also compound inequity for students who need to complete English Language Development in addition to English Language Arts, students who need to retake classes to graduate, and other students who may fall behind the typical curriculum schedule.

We urge the State to undertake a holistic review of California’s curriculum to identify what items are outdated or no longer a priority and can be removed to make room for more modern or inclusive learning. Similarly, a comprehensive review of graduation requirements to ensure that a diploma signifies a mastery of a broad liberal arts education, while still allowing students the freedom to explore and individualize, would be a very welcome and valuable exercise. We would encourage the State to make appropriate updates to the Education Code within the next two to three years.

COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS

The District’s “Dream It, Achieve It!” initiative is an innovative model integrating dual enrollment and career technical education designed to empower all students to graduate ready for college, career, and beyond with meaningful guidance and support from the District. These powerful pathways give students the opportunity to build real-world skills, earn college credit, and open doors to future success.

¹⁸ Gallagher, H., Towne, L., Gomez, D. and Loeb, S. (May 2026)

Available to all high school students, the Two for One for Everyone pathway empowers students to graduate with a high school diploma and an associate's degree from a Los Angeles Community College — or complete a career certification before graduation.

Through Career Technical Education and Linked Learning pathways, Los Angeles Unified students can earn industry-recognized certifications in one of 14 industry sectors across 70 pathways that blend rigorous academics, career technical education, work-based learning, and comprehensive student supports to equip students with the skills and certifications they need to succeed in high-demand careers.

Every Los Angeles Unified student has access to career pathway opportunities consistent with the recommendations of California's Master Plan for Career Education 2025. While these opportunities are not universally available to all students in California, Los Angeles Unified's model can serve as a framework for instituting effective career pathways up and down the state.

Accountability

Over the past several years, multiple reports have catalogued the challenges facing California's accountability and governance systems. The 2026 Getting Down to Facts III report indicates that the average administrator spends half of their time on compliance and reporting activities. However, this exceptional dedication of time and effort does not produce a strong result: "Researchers assessing California's system against six principles of effective public accountability found that the state partially meets standards on only two and fully meets none."¹⁹

California schools report data and information in many formats, on many platforms. However, this information is not consistently presented in a way that allows administrators, educators, parents, or the public to compare schools or districts to other similar institutions or track improvement trends over time.²⁰

In short, California administrators spend an enormous amount of time meeting administrative reporting requirements that do not result in data or information that systemically changes action or policy. Indeed, it is likely that this exceptional administrative burden contributes to California's challenges at improving student performance, by reducing the amount of time and effort that administrators can devote to improving educational outcomes.

We encourage the State to explore ways to streamline the reporting system to create coherence and alignment in state priorities and provide clarity as to how each mandatory report or data point informs state and federal accountability. This work has already begun with the existing State Board of Education revisions to Differentiated Assistance and Direct Technical Assistance, as well as with legislation reconsidering the role of the School Accountability Report Card (SARC) and requiring sunset dates for legislative reports. We hope that this valuable effort will be sustained.

¹⁹ Loeb, S. (2026).

²⁰ Alonso, J. et al. (2026). "Governing for improvement: transparency, alignment, and accountability in California education." [Technical Report] Getting Down to Facts III. Accessed at <https://gettingdowntofacts.com/sites/default/files/Governing%20for%20Improvement%20Transparency%2C%20Alignment%2C%20and%20Accountability%20in%20CA%20Education.pdf>

Some questions to consider include:

- Are state accountability and federal accountability aligned in their goals and outcomes?
- What are the reporting or data requirements that do not inform state or federal accountability?
- What is a reasonable amount of time for administrators to spend on accountability to promote transparency and guide student achievement? How can the State enact guidelines and guardrails to maintain efforts within that time?
- How should districts focus their efforts when multiple priority areas or student groups are identified as needing improvement?

We call on the State to revise California’s accountability standards into systems that are coherent and aligned with state priorities, less burdensome to schools, and provide higher-quality information to families and the community.

Adequacy of Funding

California ranks 31st out of the 50 states and the District of Columbia in current spending on education when accounting for labor costs.²¹ While education funding in California has substantially improved over the past decade, it has been outmatched by rising costs for staff salaries and benefits, increased operational costs, increased student needs and special education identification, and declining student enrollment.

Student enrollment declines are particularly acute in Los Angeles County. In the 2025–26 school year, Los Angeles Unified saw a decline of 4.5 percent – far greater than the county average of 2.6 percent or the statewide average of 1.3 percent.²² This decline is driven by declining birth rates and the high cost of living, and exacerbated by aggressive immigration enforcement in Los Angeles County. At the same time, special education identifications, especially those for students with moderate and severe needs, have increased.

We urge the Administration and Legislature to increase the State’s investment in public education and honor the vision of Proposition 98 as a floor, not a ceiling. California should consider how it can make additional investments in public schools beyond the constitutional minimum when revenues and state resources allow. We also call on the State to continue with the spirit and intention of the Local Control Funding Formula with the core principles of local control, equity, and accountability, and identify where funding can be leveraged or augmented to support equity and close achievement gaps.

Additionally, as a result of the fiscal challenges school districts are facing, there is an opportunity for the State to reassess existing statutory provisions that are restrictive and take away from local control. This includes providing flexibilities school districts have been afforded during past

²¹ Hill, L. and Lafortune, J. (2026). “What California’s next governor needs to know about PK-12 education.” [Blog post] Public Policy Institute of California. Accessed at <https://www.ppic.org/blog/what-californias-next-governor-needs-to-know-about-pk-12-education/>

²² California Department of Education. “District Enrollment Multi-Year Summary by Grade.” [Data Run] *DataQuest*. Accessed at <https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>

economic downturns, such as granting them authority to place proceeds from the sale of assets or surplus property in their General Fund.

California faces an opportunity as enrollment declines across the state. Proposition 98 establishes a minimum funding guarantee for K–12 public education that is influenced by state revenues and economic conditions, rather than being tied solely to the number of students. As a result, declining enrollment could create a significant funding “dividend” – potentially billions of dollars – that the State will have an opportunity and responsibility to invest strategically in public education.

Below we offer suggestions for how the State should address the adequacy of education funding, both by growing tax revenues and by more equitably distributing any increases arising from the available resources or growth in Proposition 98. We believe these suggestions will promote more sustainable and equitable school funding, improve student outcomes, and strengthen California’s investment in its future workforce and the next generation of contributing members of society.

PROTECT PROPOSITION 98

Since 1988, the California Constitution has protected education funding. Proposition 98 funding is designed as a floor, rather than a ceiling, representing the minimum funding that the voters felt should be allocated to educating the next generation.

Despite the clear standard laid out in the Constitution, in recent years, the Governor and Legislature have withheld funding under Proposition 98 to balance priorities outside of TK-14 education. Not only are these Proposition 98 maneuvers or withholdings not consistent with the constitutional provisions and counter to the will of the voters, but they also come at a time when schools are challenged with the costs associated with declining enrollment, increased absenteeism, and greater student needs in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. Additionally, schools are required to adopt three-year budgets, a requirement that is made substantially more difficult when funding is very volatile or required funds are withheld.

We call upon the new Administration to commit to fully funding Proposition 98 every year, starting by repaying the \$3.9 billion withholding that is owed in the 2026–27 budget. We ask the State to permanently reject the practice of balancing the General Fund on the backs of students, teachers, and other school personnel, and fully fund Proposition 98 entitlement in the year it is allocated.

UPDATING THE LOCAL CONTROL FUNDING FORMULA

In recent years, several reports have considered the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) and ways it could be amended to improve student outcomes. The Learning Policy Institute stated that “More than a decade after its enactment, a growing body of research indicates the LCFF has helped to improve student outcomes, especially in K–12 school districts that enroll large shares of students with greater educational needs. However, as might be expected with a policy reform as ambitious as the LCFF, research also points to challenges in its fiscal design and opportunities to strengthen it.” In particular, the report highlights how the supplemental grants, designed to support students with higher needs, do not provide enough funding to support the necessary services, and that students with multiple, intersecting needs receive the same funding as a student with only one need

category.²³ The Public Policy Institute of California in its review of the issue offered a list of possible reforms that could be considered with the funding resulting from declining enrollment.²⁴

Some ideas proposed in the reports that Los Angeles Unified believes hold particular promise include:

- Increasing the supplemental grants to increase services to higher-need students.
- Providing additional funding “weight” within the supplemental grant to students with multiple needs (i.e., both low-income and English Learner). This proposal may be combined with adding additional risk factors to consider in the “unduplicated” formula. For example, adding “homelessness” as a countable population within LCFF, as proposed in Assembly Bill 1204 in 2026, makes the most sense if this provides an adjustment beyond that for simply being low income.
- Changing the current funding formula to enrollment-based funding instead of relying on daily attendance (see more in the following section).
- Instituting a regional cost adjustment to account for the widely varying costs of labor and housing in different regions of California.
- Establishing a minimum cost of living adjustment or revising the cost-of-living adjustment formula to better account for the rise in costs specific to the education sector in California. This revised adjustment could specifically include increases in healthcare costs and pension costs, which have risen dramatically higher than general inflation in the last two decades.
- Raising the base rate to provide increased funding for all districts, with augmented funding for the districts serving students with the most needs.

To this end, we encourage the new Administration and Legislature to continue these conversations. Los Angeles Unified looks forward to actively engaging in efforts to advance necessary reforms that uphold the core principles of LCFF: equity, local control, and accountability.

ENROLLMENT-BASED FUNDING

California is one of only six states nationwide to fund schools based on average daily attendance.²⁵ This funding model does not recognize that schools’ most significant costs, in staff salaries and operations, are fixed regardless of how many students attend on a given day. The current attendance-based funding system also does not account for absences due to circumstances beyond the control of the school district, such as heightened immigration enforcement activities.

Attendance-based funding is inherently inequitable – students with the greatest need are those most likely to struggle with consistent attendance, circumstances that require greater, rather than fewer, resources to address. If a student is habitually absent or truant, the school does not receive funding

²³ Kaplan, J. (2025). “California’s local control funding formula: Next steps towards equity.” [Report]. Learning Policy Institute. Accessed at https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/media/4575/download?inline&file=Local_Control_Funding_Formula_Evolution_REPORT.pdf

²⁴ Lafortune, Ugo & Guinan. (2025).

²⁵ Hahnel, C., & Baumgardner, C. (2022). “Student count options for school funding: Trade-offs and policy alternatives for California.” [Report] Policy Analysis for California Education. Accessed at <https://edpolicyinca.org/publications/student-count-options-school-funding>

despite providing the resources and services needed to engage the student and encourage them to attend school. For example, the Los Angeles Unified iAttend program, which has demonstrated great success in raising student attendance since the return to campuses after the COVID-19 pandemic, involves phone calls and staff visits to student homes to identify and address the issues that prevent regular attendance, and ongoing data monitoring at the school site to determine which students are most likely to need attendance interventions.

The challenges with the average daily attendance funding model are exacerbated by policy choices made over the last three decades, as California stopped providing funding for excused absences in 1997.²⁶ Since ceasing to reimburse excused absences, the Legislature has expanded the allowable types of excused absences thirteen times, sometimes explicitly providing multiple days of approved absences. These excused absences impact schools both financially and in their chronic absenteeism metrics on the California School Dashboard, which reflects all absences regardless of whether they are excused or not.

If districts were to be funded based on enrollment, accountability for maintaining student attendance would continue to be monitored through the California School Dashboard and the Local Control Accountability Plan processes. The current system of using attendance funding as a cudgel to ensure high attendance works directly against the philosophy and spirit of the Dashboard and Differentiated Assistance systems, which were a deliberate move against punitive models and towards greater funding and support for students facing greater challenges.

A 2022 report from the Policy Analysis of California Education (PACE) found that switching from attendance to enrollment could help school districts achieve fiscal stability, redistribute resources to schools with the greater student needs, and provide more flexibility on how to serve students instructionally.²⁷ Given the ongoing challenges of declining enrollment combined with the expanded role that schools now play in offering early learning, after school care, universal nutrition, and mental and behavioral health services, schools require consistent, predictable funding more than ever.

For these and other reasons, Los Angeles Unified urges the Governor and Legislature to change the current funding model to one based on student enrollment.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

The proportion of students with severe disabilities continues to increase in California, even during a period of overall declining enrollment.²⁸

As state and federal sources do not fully fund these services, local educational agencies must make a significantly higher contribution from their General Fund to meet this obligation. At Los Angeles Unified, special education services are supported with 25 percent attributed to state funding, 6

²⁶ Legislative Analyst's Office. (2026). "Assessing a shift to enrollment-based school funding." [Report] Accessed at <https://lao.ca.gov/reports/2026/5100/Assessing-Shift-to-Enrollment-Based-School-Funding-010626.pdf>

²⁷ Hahnel, C., & Baumgardner, C. (2022).

²⁸ Krug O'Neill, M. (2026). "Special education in California. Growth, capacity, and equity." [Technical Report] Getting Down to Facts III. Accessed at <https://gettingdowntofacts.com/research-briefs/special-education-california-growth-capacity-and-equity>

percent to federal funding, and the remaining 69 percent paid by Los Angeles Unified's General Fund. The recent requirement to screen all students for reading difficulty and the newly passed requirement for a "diagnostic assessment" in math will likely drive additional special education referrals, without any accompanying augmented state funding to serve these students.

While the State provided in the 2026–27 Budget Act a historic increase of \$2.4 billion in ongoing funding to increase the base funding allotted through the AB 602 formula, this funding does not equitably address the costs that districts like Los Angeles Unified incur for serving a disproportionate number of students with higher needs. We urge the State to increase its investments in special education funding to more adequately reimburse school districts for the costs associated with serving the needs of students with moderate to severe disabilities.

More broadly, we advise California to reassess its funding formula philosophy and shift from a one-size-fits-all model to a needs-based formula. The needs of a student with a speech delay whose issue is resolved after a year of small group sessions are profoundly different from those of a student who requires continuous, dedicated support from a paraprofessional or nurse in order to attend school. Yet, the existing funding mechanism for these two students is identical.

For those with the greatest needs, California's Extraordinary Cost Pool program reimburses the cost of non-public school placements as well as special education and related services for students who reside in a licensed children's institution for the costs that exceed the annual threshold of \$104,175.40. This means school districts like Los Angeles Unified first must spend \$104,175.40 per student before they can receive reimbursement. Due to many excluded costs, districts are rarely able to access the Extraordinary Cost Pool, even for students whose needs exceed \$100,000 per year.

We request dedicated, increased funding for students with moderate and severe special needs, who will typically require costly support for the duration of their educational career to succeed. For students requiring residential care, we request that the reimbursement threshold for the Extraordinary Cost Pool program be lowered, and allowable expenses be expanded, to ease the incredible financial obligations of school districts.²⁹

FUNDING HEALTHCARE AND PENSION COSTS

Healthcare and pension costs for educators and other school personnel have risen far above the rate of inflation over the past several decades and greatly outstrip the increase in teacher salaries. Health and welfare benefits costs rose 46 percent over the last twenty years, and pension spending increased 239 percent in the same period.³⁰ The State is in a unique position to contain these costs. One solution is for the State to provide a state-level health insurance plan for public entities, where

²⁹ Menlove Doutré et al. (2021). "California state special education system study part 2: findings, implications, and considerations for improving special education funding in California." [Report]. WestEd. Accessed at <https://www.wested.org/resource/ca-state-special-education-funding-system-study-part-2-findings-implications-and-considerations-for-improving-special-education-funding-in-california/>

³⁰ Bruno, P. (2026). "District dollars 3: Recent patterns in California school district finances, trends in teacher compensation, and within-district, between-school spending." Getting Down to Facts III. Accessed at <https://gettingdowntofacts.com/sites/default/files/District%20Dollars%203.pdf>

the size of the State as a buyer may allow for unique cost containment opportunities.³¹ Additionally, we support efforts to ensure that large corporations provide adequate healthcare to employees, which we believe can bring down costs in the market for employer-funded insurance by bringing a pool of younger, healthier workers into the system. The State can also carefully consider any legislative proposals that would increase pension costs and consider using surplus state revenues to pay pension obligations.

STATE REVENUE SOLUTIONS

Under Proposition 98, approximately 40 percent of every dollar in state tax revenue is dedicated to public education. Policies that expand state tax revenues will directly increase the support available to schools. We encourage the State to consider supporting options to raise state revenue that would enhance California's tax system and support the ability of school districts and state and local governments to provide critical services to constituents.

Below is a non-exhaustive list of examples of revenue solutions the State has been urged to explore. Additional details and recommendations may be accessed in the cited research from the Legislative Analyst's Office,³² the California Budget and Policy Center,³³ and the Policy Analysis for California Education through its 2026 Getting Down to Facts III studies.³⁴

- Closing corporate tax loopholes, such as the Water's Edge election, which divert resources away from California's public schools.
- Modernizing the property tax system and taxing high-value commercial and industrial properties according to market value.
- Leading a shift in taxation in line with the state's increasingly digital economy, such as creating a digital excise tax that places a levy on corporations' use of personal data for profit.
- Establishing a graduated corporate tax rate that applies higher tax rates to highly profitable corporations, as over a dozen other states have instituted.
- Ensuring accountability and evaluation of business tax credits and other tax expenditures.

While this is only a short list of proposals, we urge the next Administration, state lawmakers, and other stakeholders to assess other revenue solutions that are deemed appropriate to augment

³¹ Saenz-Armstrong, P. (2024). "Affording to stay healthy: the costs of health insurance for teachers." [Blog] National Council on Teacher Quality. Accessed at [https://www.nctq.org/research-insights/affording-to-stay-healthy-the-costs-of-health-insurance-for-teachers/#:~:text=In%20terms%20of%20dollars%2C%20the,to%20\\$162/month%20in%202023](https://www.nctq.org/research-insights/affording-to-stay-healthy-the-costs-of-health-insurance-for-teachers/#:~:text=In%20terms%20of%20dollars%2C%20the,to%20$162/month%20in%202023).

³² Legislative Analyst's Office. (2026). "Comparing options to raise and lower taxes." [Report] Accessed at https://lao.ca.gov/reports/2026/5170/Comparing_Options_to_Raise_and_Lower_Taxes_032426.pdf

³³ Kaplan, J & Mercado, E. (2026). "California schools' revenue sources and constraints." [Technical Report] Getting Down to Facts III. Accessed at <https://gettingdowntofacts.com/sites/default/files/California%20Schools%20Revenue%20Sources%20and%20Constraints.pdf>

³⁴ Kitson, K. (2025). "How corporations reduce their California tax bill." [Fact Sheet] California Budget and Policy Center. Accessed at <https://calbudgetcenter.org/resources/how-corporations-reduce-their-california-state-tax-bill/>

funding to support the needs of students.

Artificial Intelligence and Technology

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has the potential to usher in a new framework for teaching and learning. We live in a digital world and with the recognition that AI will be a part of our children's future, schools must continue preparing students to be digital citizens with the AI literacy skills needed to thrive beyond the classroom.

In recognizing the significance of AI, and generative AI in particular, Los Angeles Unified has established an ad hoc committee to convene independent experts, review relevant research, hear from educators, families, students, and the community, and develop recommendations for best practices and guardrails.

Recognizing that AI is not without risk, the state must continue the journey it started to develop meaningful guardrails to keep students safe. As this technology proliferates, unregulated chatbots pose significant risks to vulnerable users such as children, who are still developing the critical and analytical faculties adults take for granted. Because chatbots mimic human interaction, children may perceive chatbot interactions as having human-like knowledge, intentions, and authority, which can lead them to trust and follow recommendations even when those systems produce inaccurate or harmful responses. The risks of prolonged chatbot interactions by children threaten the physical and mental health of our students, and policy guardrails are necessary to ensure the dangers of these powerful tools are reined in.

The Legislature has considered important bills to establish a comprehensive framework for mitigating a broad array of potential chatbot-linked harms to minors and instituting meaningful guardrails, including age verification technology, parental controls and oversight, and restrictions on targeted advertising through conversational chats. We continue to advocate for protections to ensure that technological interventions are working as intended and for independent human oversight to be required, backed by enforceable legal oversight by state and local entities.

Emergencies

Whether there are fires, earthquakes, floods, pandemics, extreme heat, or dangerous air quality, Los Angeles has seen an increase in the frequency of natural disasters with the potential to massively disrupt regular school operations. Los Angeles Unified has developed the experience and capability to respond immediately to the given situation when these emergencies arise. Emergency response actions often require a formal emergency declaration by the Governor for a local educational agency to be temporarily exempt from certain statutes or regulations. However, the State's administrative tools are not designed to respond with the necessary speed or urgency, causing district leadership to divide energy between direct operational solutions and advocating in Sacramento for administrative flexibility.

We encourage the State to explore ways to standardize how certain flexibilities may be automatically triggered in the event of a declared emergency, so that local decision-makers have the appropriate powers to address the emergency in real time.

These flexibilities could be effectuated through legislation or regulations and would increase the efficiency and effectiveness of local emergency response. The State may wish to consider the benefits of creating automatic triggers for the following flexibilities when a Governor or local elected official declares a state of emergency:

- Hold harmless for average daily attendance.
- Ability to shift to remote schooling without signed authorization forms.
- Advocate to Congress to ensure the automatic waiver authorization remains streamlined in times of crisis for student meal distribution outside of school.

School Facilities

School facilities are a major investment and expense to districts. Given current enrollment trends, Los Angeles Unified's priority is on updating and modernizing existing facilities, particularly those with limited green space or in need of resiliency improvements to address the impacts of climate change.

As in many parts of California, Los Angeles is prone to extreme heat which can be dangerous to vulnerable populations, including children, who lack access to cooling or shade. In response, Los Angeles Unified has undertaken a district-wide effort to build shade structures over playgrounds and to replace heat-retaining schoolyard surfaces with green space. With the increased number of emergency events such as wildfires and pollution affecting air quality, the District's Know Your Air network monitors air quality in real time, to provide schools with data for better-informed decisions at individual sites. We have also undertaken improvements to build resiliency and energy efficiency into school buildings to address the impacts of climate change and reduce our carbon footprint.

Over 60 percent of Los Angeles Unified's schools are more than 50 years old, and we estimate that we have over \$80 billion in unfunded school facilities needs identified districtwide. School facilities construction projects must be reviewed by the Division of the State Architect (DSA) to ensure projects meet various building codes and safety standards. Plan review timelines are often lengthy and sequential, rather than concurrent, creating bottlenecks even for straightforward or repeatable projects. The typical review timeline is eight to nine months for most facility projects, which contributes to cost escalation, slows construction, and delays access to new or modernized facilities for students. Although collaborative/phased review tools exist, they are not consistently applied across regions.

We encourage the State to increase DSA staffing to expedite the review of facility plans and adopt concurrent or milestone-based review processes that allow plans to be reviewed in phases rather than strictly sequentially. This would build on the collaborative review process used for community college projects since 2006, and more recently applied to post-disaster projects, notably in response to the Palisades fires of 2025. We urge DSA to continue the engagement practice between DSA and district design teams to resolve code and interpretation issues during the design phase to more effectively resolve issues early in the process and shorten review timelines.

Standardizing and expanding this phased review model statewide for qualifying K–12 projects could reduce review timelines from eight or nine months to approximately four months, supported by existing tools.

Finally, as school districts across the state continue to grapple with the impacts of declining enrollment and the effects on student programming, funding, and the efficient use of school facilities, the State may wish to consider what its role is, if any, in supporting school districts in the local decision-making process for consolidation and reconfiguration of schools.

Student Homelessness

According to a recent report by the UCLA Center for the Transformation of Schools, nearly 300,000 of California’s K–12 students experienced homelessness in the 2024–25 school year.³⁵ Los Angeles Unified serves the largest population of students experiencing homelessness in California and provides critical frontline support to students and families navigating housing instability.

California has made a historic investment in addressing student homelessness, including \$116 million in funding over three years in the 2026–27 State Budget. While this investment represents an important step forward, continued reliance on one-time and competitive funding creates uncertainty for school districts and makes it difficult to sustain the staffing, services, and partnerships needed to support students and families experiencing homelessness. We urge the State to consider ways to provide ongoing funding to support the needs of homeless students through the Local Control Funding Formula, either as a distinct unduplicated pupil group, or as an adjustment factor to the existing supplemental grant for socioeconomically disadvantaged students.

While local educational agencies are uniquely positioned to identify student needs and connect families to services, school districts cannot address homelessness alone. We urge the State to explore ways to strengthen collaboration and coordination between local and state agencies and school districts, creating a stable, integrated system of support for housing-insecure young people.

Whole Child Wellness

The role of schools in California continues to evolve beyond being purely academic institutions. In addition to traditional academics, arts, and athletics, schools must now provide critical mental health services to ensure student success. Moreover, for our students to thrive in our schools and fully engage in their academic experience, we must also commit to creating environments where they feel safe, welcome, and excited to learn. Los Angeles Unified embraced this charge to serve the whole child and endeavors to strengthen the social, emotional, and physical health of students so they may attend school prepared and energized. To that end, Los Angeles Unified currently provides a continuum of mental and physical health services for students and families at 14 mental health clinics, 19 wellness centers, 56 school-based health clinics/well-being centers, and via telehealth options.

³⁵ UCLA Center for the Transformation of Schools. (2026). “State of crisis 2026: A deepening crisis of students experiencing homelessness across California.” [Report] Accessed at <https://transformschoools.ucla.edu/research/state-of-crisis-2026-a-deepening-crisis-of-students-experiencing-homelessness-across-california/>

While we are proud of our District's efforts to meet student needs, the State remains an important partner in ensuring the successful implementation of the Children and Youth Behavioral Health Initiative (CYBHI) and committing to make adjustments, as necessary, to help schools maximize reimbursements through the CYBHI fee schedule. The rates of these reimbursements remain much smaller than the cost of services. Last year, Los Angeles Unified received less than two-thirds of the amount we billed for in reimbursement. Two clear actions that would be beneficial for Los Angeles Unified and school districts providing services to students include allowing services that wellness coaches provide to parents of students to be billed through the fee schedule, and resolving ongoing delays in claims processing. Delays in reimbursements result in funding irregularities and impact budgeting projections and planning, exacerbating existing fiscal pressures and uncertainties school districts manage.

With the School-Based Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (SMAA) and Local Education Agency Billing Option Program (LEA BOP), federal dollars are drawn down through Medi-Cal and funneled to school districts to reimburse expenses for a wide range of medical services rendered, as opposed to strictly behavioral and mental health services reimbursable through the CYBHI fee schedule. Los Angeles Unified provides these services to students regardless of reimbursement, but the delta in cost comes directly from our District's general fund. Los Angeles Unified, in partnership with other educational institutions and partners, has worked with the State for many years to optimize these processes and secure timely and appropriate reimbursements; however, there is still much more that must be accomplished to ensure the reimbursements are expedient and sufficient.

With the recent Meta settlement wherein Meta agreed to resolve claims by several States alleging the harmful application of its social media platforms, California gained access to \$2.1 billion that can be used to help school districts mitigate some of the costs for health and wellness services schools provide. We urge the state to prioritize allocating these funds to local educational agencies first with the authority for school districts to determine how to best leverage these one-time funds to address the impacts of social media, as the intent of the settlement stipulated. Los Angeles Unified remains an interested party to help inform how the state best allocates these resources.³⁶

Conclusion

The State's elected leaders have unprecedented opportunities to shape the future of education in California, while continuing to provide the necessary financial investments and holding local educational agencies accountable for meeting the needs of California's diverse student population. We hope that the next Administration, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Board of Education, and Legislature will focus not only on improving and expanding existing services, but also on critically examining ways that systems can be changed or improved to meet the needs of the 21st century. As the largest school district in California, Los Angeles Unified stands ready to be a thought partner and active participant in upcoming policy and funding conversations as we and California endeavor to graduate all students ready for the world.

³⁶ <https://oag.ca.gov/news/press-releases/attorney-general-bonta-secures-transformative-17-billion-settlement-meta>