Date of Hearing: April 22, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
Darshana R. Patel, Chair
AB 2008 (Patel) – As Introduced February 17, 2026

SUBJECT: Legislature: local educational agencies: reporting requirements: repealer

SUMMARY: Requires a bill that would require a local education agency (LEA) to complete a plan or report with an unspecified date to include a provision that repeals the reporting requirement four years after it goes into effect, unless the author directs otherwise. **Specifically, this bill**:

1) Defines an LEA as a school district, county office of education (COE), or charter school.

2) Requires a bill that, as introduced or amended in either house of the Legislature, would require an LEA to complete a plan or report with an undefined end date, to include a provision that repeals the reporting requirement four years after the bill becomes operative or four years after the due date of any report required every four or more years.

3) Exempts routine reporting requirements, including but not limited to reporting requirements for the local control funding formula (LCFF) or the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS).

4) Requires the Office of Legislative Counsel, in drafting a bill that would impose a reporting requirement on an LEA, to include a provision that repeals the reporting requirement, or makes the reporting requirement inoperative, four years after the date on which the requirement becomes operative, unless the person requesting the bill or amendment directs the Legislative Counsel to do otherwise.

EXISTING LAW:

1) Requires LEAs to submit numerous reports to the California Department of Education (CDE) on an annual basis. (Education Code (EC))

2) Requires the CDE to conduct a report on the number and types of reports that LEAs are required to submit on an annual basis on or before March 1, 2025. (EC 33318.2)

3) Requires any bill that would require a state agency to submit a report to the Legislature to include a provision that repeals the reporting requirement, or makes the requirement inoperative, no later than a date four years following the date upon which the bill becomes operative, or four years after the due date of any report required every four or more years. (Government Code (GOV) 10231.5)

4) Requires the Office of Legislative Counsel, in drafting a bill that would impose a reporting requirement to include a provision that repeals the reporting requirement, or makes the reporting requirement inoperative, four years after the date on which the requirement becomes operative, unless the person requesting the bill or amendment directs the Legislative Counsel to do otherwise. (GOV 10231.5)

5) Requires the governing board of each school district to adopt a local control accountability plan (LCAP) and update it every three years. (EC 5260)

6) Requires the CDE to contract for the development of CALPADS, which shall be used to accomplish the following goals:

   a) Provide school districts and the department access to data necessary to comply with federal reporting requirements;

   b) Provide a better means of evaluating educational progress and investments over time; and

   c) Provide LEAs with the data needed to improve pupil achievement, including college and career readiness. (EC 60900)

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown

COMMENTS:

Need for the bill. According to the author, "California's schools administer an ever-growing number of state and federal programs that help them operate. However, each program requires schools to submit plans and reports on how the money is used. While individually these requirements appear reasonable, their cumulative impact is overwhelming. And while the State often adds new requirements, old ones are rarely removed, even when they become outdated.

AB 2008 would add an automatic sunset to school planning and reporting requirements, making them inoperable four years after they go into effect. This common-sense provision, which already exists for other state government agencies, will allow schools to submit a reasonable amount of data without being bogged down by perpetual requirements.

School administrators from across the state have been asking for 'permission to focus.' They want to spend their time on improving student success, not filling out endless reports. AB 2008 would give them that permission. By automatically sunsetting outdated reporting requirements, AB 2008 would give much-needed time back to school administrators and allow them to better serve our students."

Balancing accountability and evaluation with opportunity costs. State reporting requirements serve important purposes, including safeguarding public funds and evaluating policy initiatives.

However, according to the California School Boards Association (CSBA), the cumulative impact of mandated state and federal reports, data submissions, and planning documents draws resources away from critical tasks and responsibilities of LEA staff. This is especially true in California's smaller districts and COEs, which have fewer administrative staff. In a 2024 report, *Drowning in Documentation*, CSBA notes the following effects of overly burdensome reporting requirements:

- High price in time, human capital, and cost: Administrators' planning and reporting efforts are so extensive that they cut into time available for instructional leadership, school improvement, school climate, and other critical functions.

- Ever-growing burden: While new programs and mandates add to the long list of reporting requirements, state and federal governments rarely phase out requirements, even when they become duplicative or are no longer actively reviewed by their respective agencies.

- Too much data to digest: Some districts, particularly smaller ones, lack the time and capacity to use the required data for their own purposes. State agencies often lack the staff capacity to analyze required plans, reports, and data submissions, or to provide constructive feedback and technical assistance to LEAs.

- Disproportionate burden for smaller districts: Large districts might have dozens of staff to meet these requirements. Small to medium districts might have a handful to more than a dozen staff available to complete reports, plans, and data submissions. Very small districts might rely on the superintendent, principal, or superintendent/principal to meet these requirements, taking time away from their other administrative and educational leadership responsibilities. Alternatively, very small districts may have to hire outside consultants to do this work, consuming valuable resources that could be spent on student support and instruction. A significant amount of public funding is only available through discretionary grants that require additional time for applying, planning, and reporting. Smaller and less-resourced districts often cannot take on this additional workload, creating opportunity gaps for students, staff, and schools.

How do LEAs report information to the state? A full account of the number and types of reports that LEAs must complete each year has been difficult to produce, in part because there is not a single submission platform that processes all reports. A 2025 report by the CDE identified 59 examples of data they collect, which schools report across 39 different submission portals. This does not include federal requirements. The required plans, applications, and reports LEAs submit to the state fall into some of the following categories:

- Accountability;
- Safety and Transportation;
- State Block Grants and Special Funds;
- Special Education;
- Pandemic Recovery programs; and
- Discretionary Grants.

A report by Fresno COE identified over 204 reporting requirements, which must be submitted through 36 different collection systems to 17 divisions of the CDE. They report that individual school administrators spend 30% of their time each week on reporting requirements. According to one Fresno County school administrator:

> One of the most important aspects of accountability is an administrator who goes into classrooms, not all the documents we have to fill out. Those repetitive reports pull me away from the most important part of my job, the kids in the classroom… all we want to do is get back in the field. Let us be part of the very ‘game’ we spend the majority of our jobs now writing about.

The 2025/2026 Master Calendar created by Fresno County Superintendent of Schools includes a non-exhaustive list of 28 reports that required data submissions that year. Some examples of reports and plans submitted to the state include:

- A-G Completion Improvement Grant Program;
- Arts and Music in Schools (Proposition 28);
- Arts, Music, & Instructional Materials Discretionary Block Grant;
- Additional Targeted Support & Improvement;
- Attendance Recovery Program;
- California Community Schools Partnership Program;
- Comprehensive Support & Improvement;
- Comprehensive Schol Safety Plan;
- Educator Effectiveness Funds;
- Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief Expenditure Plan;
- Expanded Learning Opportunities Program (LO-P);
- Home to School Transportation Plan;
- Independent Study; and
- Earning Recovery Emergency Block Grant.

This is a non-exhaustive list, and does not include federal requirements or multiyear reporting requirements. In order to help expediate and simplify the reporting process for LEAs, ***staff recommends the bill be amended*** to require the CDE to develop, with stakeholder input, a standardized reporting template that could be used by LEAs to complete programmatic and expenditure reports for a variety of grants.

The auto-repeal of government reports. In 2010, the State enacted a measure to remove obsolete reports and require an automatic sunset provision be added to all future reports required of state agencies (AB 1585 (Committee on Accountability and Administrative Review), Chapter 7, Statutes of 2010). The Assembly Committee on Business and Professions analysis of the bill noted that, at the time, there were more than 1,200 obsolete reporting requirements in statute. These obsolete reports were identified by examining the list of reports maintained by the Office of Legislative Counsel. This list of reports spanned 60 government agencies; those related to education included:

- The California State Librarian;
- Joint Committee to Develop a Master Plan for Education;
- K-12 High Speed Network Advisory Board;
- Legislative Analyst Office;
- Office of Education and the Environment;
- Office of the Secretary for Education;
- Quality Education Commission;
- State Board of Education;
- State Department of Education;
- State Teachers' Retirement System;
- Superintendent of Public Instruction; and
- Working Group to Undertake Major Teacher Credential and Accreditation Reform.

As LEA reports are not submitted to the Office of Legislative Counsel, most LEA reporting requirements were not examined in this cleanup process. Similarly, the sunset provision that this statute applied to future reports from state agencies does not apply to LEAs. AB 2008 would remedy this, providing LEAs with the same protections against obsolete reports that are currently afforded to state agencies.

As there is not currently a comprehensive list that documents all reports required of LEAs, it may be difficult to retroactively apply a sunset provision to all existing LEA reporting requirements. ***.Staff recommends the bill be amended*** to apply the auto-repeal provision to all future plans and reports, and not to existing ones.

Arguments in Support. According to the Association of School Administrators, "Our organizations strongly support transparency and responsible stewardship of public funds, and we recognize that planning and reporting are essential components of California's education accountability system. At the same time, local educational agencies (LEAs) face an opportunity cost in redirecting limited staff that would otherwise support teachers and students to complete planning and reporting requirements. One way the state can carefully balance these two interests is by considering the appropriate duration of any new reporting and planning requirements it chooses to enact.

Over the last several years LEAs have experienced a significant increase in reporting requirements, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic. This reporting burden seems to grow with each new program and mandate, which come from both the state and federal government. Small schools feel a disproportionate burden, as they must comply with the same planning and reporting requirements as the largest schools with extremely limited staff. The burden also affects the state, which may similarly lack staff to analyze plans and reports or provide constructive feedback and technical assistance. If reports are submitted but never meaningfully reviewed or acted upon, the work invested by LEAs produces no benefit for students – making an already burdensome process not just costly, but potentially without purpose.

AB 2008 is an important and common-sense step in addressing this issue and balances the interests of policymakers with those of students."

Recommended Committee Amendments. Staff recommends the bill be amended as follows:

1) Include planning requirements in the scope of the bill.

2) Clarify that these provisions only apply to future Legislation, and not to existing plans and reports.

3) Require the CDE, in consultation with relevant stakeholders, to create a standardized reporting template for use by LEAs that includes the minimum information needed to ascertain administrative information, programmatic and expenditure outcomes, sustainability plans, and required certifications, and exclude information that is already reported to the State to avoid duplicative reporting. Require the CDE to submit the template and a report detailing its development to the Legislature, and post it on its website, by October 1, 2027.

4) Beginning January 1, 2028, require the Office of Legislative Counsel to reference the standardized reporting template developed by the CDE when drafting a bill amendment that would impose a reporting requirement on an LEA, unless directed to do otherwise.

Related Legislation. AB 2303 (Muratsuchi) of the 2025-26 Session would create a task force to evaluate and provide recommendations related to the necessary components of a single, centralized statewide LEA data reporting system.

AB 2496 (Solache) of the 2025-26 Session would consolidate, truncate, or eliminate duplicative or obsolete reports in order to reduce the reporting burden of local educational agencies.

House Resolution 81 (Muratsuchi) of the 2025-26 Session would urge lawmakers to consider specified questions when enacting new reporting requirements.

Senate Bill 1315 (Archuleta), Chapter 468 of the Statutes of 2024, requires the CDE to conduct a report on the number and types of reports that local LEAs are required to submit on an annual basis.

AB 1585 (Committee on Accountability and Administrative Review), Chapter 7, Statutes of 2010, revises the procedure for mandatory and voluntary reporting requirements and deletes obsolete reports.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

Association of California School Administrators
California Association of School Business Officials
California Association of Suburban School Districts
California Charter Schools Association
California School Boards Association
California Federation of Teachers
Enterprise Elementary School District
Fresno County Office of Education
Kern County Superintendent of Schools Office
Legislative Action Committee - Santa Clara County School Boards Association
Los Angeles Unified School District
Office of the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools
Oxnard Union High School District
Small School Districts Association

Opposition

None on file.

Analysis Prepared by: Sarah Cate Hawthorne / ED. / (916) 319-2087