

Date of Hearing: June 23, 2021

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
Patrick O'Donnell, Chair
SB 767 (Becker) – As Amended May 20, 2021

SENATE VOTE: 38-0

SUBJECT: Educational technology: Digital Education Equity Program: regional consortia: State Digital Equity Plan

SUMMARY: Establishes the Digital Education Equity Program (DEEP), to be administered by the California Department of Education (CDE), to provide a regionalized network of technical assistance to schools and school districts on the implementation of education technology as set forth in policies of the State Board of Education (SBE) through 11 regional consortia of county offices of education (COEs), requires the CDE to develop a State Digital Equity Plan (SDEP), and school districts to develop an educational technology plan. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Defines the following terms:
 - a) “Educational technology” means technology-based materials, equipment, systems, and networks used for an educational purpose.
 - b) “Local educational agency” means a county office of education (COE), school district, or charter school.
- 2) Establishes the DEEP, to be administered by the CDE, to provide a regionalized network of technical assistance to schools and school districts on the implementation of education technology as set forth in policies of the SBE. Requires the DEEP be comprised of 11 regional consortia of COEs that will work collaboratively with school districts and the existing 58 COEs to meet locally defined educational needs that may be effectively addressed with the use of technology, including, but not necessarily limited to, all of the following areas:
 - a) Professional development for teachers, school administrators, and technical support staff;
 - b) Establishing effective distance learning to include hybrid strategies combining school and home;
 - c) Digital resource selection and use for school or for online instruction, or for both;
 - d) Digital network infrastructure and needed bandwidth for schools and homes;
 - e) Technical assistance to school districts in developing a support system to operate and maintain an education technology infrastructure, including improving pupil recordkeeping and tracking related to pupil instruction;
 - f) Planning and coordination with, and support for, the local funding and implementation of federal, state, and local programs;
 - g) Accessing and using a variety of funding sources for instructional technology;

- h) Technical assistance and information to support access, planning, and the use of high-speed telecommunications networks;
 - i) Technology planning and implementation assistance to rural and technologically-underserved school districts and COEs;
 - j) Assistance in the use of online instruction to replace or supplement classroom instruction when necessary, and to establish online and hybrid learning proficiency for teachers;
 - k) Helping to ensure that online and hybrid instruction is aligned to the state's academic content standards and incorporates related pupil learning assessment;
 - l) Assisting school districts in developing an instructional technology component integrated into the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP); and
 - m) Collaboration with the CDE in the development and implementation of a comprehensive SDEP.
- 3) Requires the SBE, with recommendations from the CDE, to authorize grants to fund a COE in each of the 11 existing regional consortia of COEs to act as the lead agencies to administer the services, as needed, to school districts and COEs located within that region. Requires the term of a grant awarded not to exceed three years. Authorizes grant funding to be awarded and received for subsequent three-year terms. Authorizes budget allocations for each region be adjusted based on the annual Budget Act. Requires the lead agency for each region to be chosen based on the extent to which it provides a plan that clearly documents or describes each of the following:
- a) Knowledge of technology to improve teaching and learning;
 - b) Technology planning and technical assistance;
 - c) Proven success in providing professional development in technology and curriculum integration;
 - d) An ability to work collaboratively with school districts, COEs, and businesses in the region;
 - e) The ability to deliver specified services to all school districts and COEs in its region;
 - f) The support of school districts and COEs for the regional lead agency application in the region;
 - g) Specific strategies for documenting and addressing the needs of rural schools and technologically underserved school districts and COEs;
 - h) A plan for evaluating the implementation of, access to, use of, and local impact of, the services provided by the region;
 - i) The capacity to assist in the use of online instruction to replace or supplement classroom instruction when necessary;

- j) A commitment to help ensure that online and hybrid instruction is aligned to the state's academic content standards and incorporates related student learning assessments; and
 - k) The capacity to assist school districts in developing an instructional technology component that is integrated into the LCAP.
- 4) Requires, in order to receive funding for the second and subsequent years of a grant, the lead agency to submit an annual report to the SBE for approval that describes the services provided, and persons served, and the funds expended for those services in the prior year. School districts and COEs within a DEEP region are required to have an opportunity to comment on the report.
- 5) States the intent of the Legislature that each school district develop an educational technology plan as a component of its LCAP.
- 6) Requires on or before an unspecified date the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) to develop guidelines and criteria for including the educational technology plan as a component of a LCAP.
- a) Requires the guidelines and criteria to include, but not necessarily be limited to, units designed to educate pupils and their teachers about all of their following:
 - i) Strategies designed to equip pupils with the skills necessary to succeed in distance learning;
 - ii) The appropriate and ethical use of technology tools in the classroom;
 - iii) Internet safety;
 - iv) The manner in which to avoid committing plagiarism; and
 - v) The concept, purpose, and significance of a copyright.
 - b) Requires the educational technology plan to also include a documented needs analysis that leads the school district to providing teachers with training and support on effective online and hybrid learning strategies, addresses pupil and teacher connectivity, digital citizenship for pupils and staff, data privacy implications, cybersecurity and online safety, and information documenting the total cost of ownership or replacement of appropriate technological devices.
 - c) Strategies for increasing parent engagement and digital literacy for families.
 - d) Documentation of the need for establishing equity of digital access by families to enable pupils to complete schoolwork at home through online distance learning.
 - e) Increasing digital leadership capacity for school district and school administrators.
- 7) Requires the CDE to establish an Office of Educational Technology with sufficient staff. Requires funding for the Office of Educational Technology be provided through the annual Budget Act for a minimum of three full-time equivalent staff to plan, coordinate, and

support, as needed. Requires the duties of the CDE to include, but not necessarily be limited to, all of the following:

- a) Preparing a comprehensive SDEP that reflects the overall needs and priorities related to the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the access and use of technology to support teaching and learning in California schools. Requires the plan be prepared with input from LEAs and other stakeholders, and be submitted to, and approved by, the SBE.
 - i) Requires the focus of the SDEP to be on how best to meet locally defined educational needs that can be effectively addressed with the use of technology. In order to prepare the plan, requires the CDE to collect data on the technology needs of LEAs, including, but not necessarily limited to, their digital infrastructure needs and the estimated needs of their pupils for computing devices and for internet connectivity adequate for at-home learning.
 - ii) Requires the plan to include, but not necessarily be limited to, specified findings and recommendations.
 - iii) Requires, on or before January 31, 2022, the SPI to submit the plan to the SBE for adoption, and the SBE to adopt the plan on or before March 31, 2022.
 - b) Providing for the statewide coordination, planning, and evaluation of education technology programs and resources.
 - c) Providing sufficient staff to provide ongoing support, direction, and coordination of the regional and statewide educational technology services.
 - d) Advancing the use of technology in the curriculum and in the administration of elementary and secondary schools.
 - e) Providing ongoing planning, funding, and policy information to the directors for planning and distribution to school districts served by the region.
 - f) Coordinating educational technology planning, policies, and information with other divisions of the department to include, but not necessarily be limited to, curriculum, assessment, technical support, budget, and professional development.
- 8) Requires funding be provided through the annual Budget Act to the SPI to provide centralized statewide educational technology services that address locally defined needs and are more efficiently and effectively provided on a statewide basis. Authorizes the CDE to contract with a COE to provide specific educational technology services that may include, but are not necessarily limited to, any or all of the following:
- a) Review of electronic learning resources, including, but not necessarily limited to, software, online resources, and video, for alignment with the content standards adopted by the SBE and for the results of reviews to be accessible online, as needed by all public educators in the state;

- b) Professional development focused on digital school leadership for educational administrators in the areas of data-driven analytics, equity, and accessibility, integrating technology into standards-based curriculum, technology planning, professional development needs of staff, digital citizenship and privacy, and financial planning for technology; and
 - c) Access for schools to training, support, and other resources for technical professionals in the state.
- 9) Requires the SPI to annually submit a written report to the SBE and the Legislature on the services provided, persons served, and funds expended for purposes of this article, and the extent to which the objectives of the SDEP were attained in the immediately preceding year.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Requires that, for the 2020–21 school year, an LEA that offers distance learning comply with the following requirements:
- a) Confirmation or provision of access for all pupils to connectivity and devices adequate to participate in the educational program and complete assigned work;
 - b) Content aligned to grade level standards that is provided at a level of quality and intellectual challenge substantially equivalent to in-person instruction;
 - c) Academic and other supports designed to address the needs of pupils who are not performing at grade level, or need support in other areas, such as English learners, pupils with exceptional needs, pupils in foster care or experiencing homelessness, and pupils requiring mental health supports;
 - d) Special education, related services, and any other services required by a pupil’s individualized education program with accommodations necessary to ensure that individualized education program can be executed in a distance learning environment; and
 - e) Designated and integrated instruction in English language development for English learners, including assessment of English language proficiency, support to access curriculum, the ability to reclassify as fully English proficient, and, as applicable, support for dual language learning.
 - f) Daily live interaction with certificated employees and peers for purposes of instruction, progress monitoring, and maintaining school connectedness. This interaction may take the form of internet or telephonic communication, or by other means permissible under public health orders. If daily live interaction is not feasible as part of regular instruction, the governing board or body of the LEA is required to develop, with parent and stakeholder input, an alternative plan for frequent live interaction that provides a comparable level of service and school connectedness. (Education Code (EC) 43503)
- 2) Requires LEAs offering in-person instruction for the 2020-21 school year to include all prioritized pupil groups. Prioritized pupil groups include all of the following:

- a) Pupils at risk for abuse, neglect, or exploitation;
 - b) Homeless pupils;
 - c) Foster youth;
 - d) English learners; and
 - e) Pupils without access to a computing device, software, and high-speed internet necessary to participate in online instruction, as determined by the LEA. (EC 43521)
- 3) Requires governing boards of school districts and county boards of education to adopt an LCAP and an annual update which establish annual goals and identify specific actions, in eight state priority areas.
 - 4) Requires charter schools to annually adopt an LCAP to update the goals and annual actions to achieve the goals identified in the charter petition.
 - 5) Requires the SBE to adopt LCAP templates to be used by school districts, county superintendents of schools, and charter schools.

FISCAL EFFECT: According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

- While the provisions of the bill would be contingent upon an appropriation, it could lead to Proposition 98 General Fund cost pressure in the millions to low tens of millions of dollars for the state fund them.
- The CDE estimates General Fund costs of approximately \$918,000 over a four-year period for various administrative activities necessary to comply with the bill's requirements.

COMMENTS:

Need for the bill. According to the author, “Over the past 20 years, there has been a rapidly evolving use of technology in all aspects of our society. This has created an increased need to support and prepare educators to offer state-of-the-art instruction to support State curriculum, digital literacy standards, and effective remote or distance learning. However, educators in many schools lack access to sufficient information and professional development to cost-effectively plan for and implement current and emerging technology to support instruction. Without a coordinated State and regional focus on policy, programs, and funding, many districts do not have equal access to the resources needed to select, access, and implement technology in classrooms effectively and to provide students access to these resources from homes. This need was clearly articulated by ACR 268 (Thurmond) and the California Blueprint for Educational Technology initiative by past Superintendent for Public Instruction Tom Torlakson.

SB 767 creates the Digital Education Equity Program (DEEP) to provide equitable educational technology and network support to all California public school districts. SB 767 is a step toward closing the digital divide in California schools. Furthermore, with the significant increase in broadband access to schools and homes proposed by Governor Newsom's budget and in

President Biden’s Infrastructure legislation as well as AB 14, the Internet for All Legislation, there is an even greater need for teacher and administrator-assistance in making use of this increase digital connectivity resource.”

Key provisions of the bill. This bill includes four primary components: 1) establishment of a network of lead agencies to meet locally defined educational needs that may be effectively addressed with technology, 2) a requirement that the SPI to develop guidelines and criteria for a local educational technology plan as a component of a LCAP, 3) establishment of an Office of Educational Technology within the CDE in order to prepare a SDEP that reflects the overall needs and priorities related to the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the access and use of technology to support teaching and learning in California schools, and 4) a requirement that funding be provided through the annual Budget Act to the SPI to provide centralized statewide educational technology services that address locally defined needs.

Regional consortia. This bill proposes to establish 11 regional consortia, chosen by the CDE and operated by COEs, to meet locally defined educational needs that may be effectively addressed through the use of technology. The consortia would be chosen by the CDE and operated through three-year grants to COEs.

A system of educational technology support services previously existed at both the state and regional levels, known as the Educational Technology program, including the California Technology Assistance Project (CTAP) and Statewide Education Technology Services (SETS). Funding for these programs, projects and services were “flexed” and subsumed into the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF); they are no longer directly funded. As the LCFF was being implemented and program funding was flexed, former SPI Torlakson formed the Education Technology Task Force in 2012, which submitted recommendations to the SPI to begin the process of preparing an education technology blueprint. The resulting blueprint from this and other task forces, Empowering Learning: A Blueprint for California Education Technology 2014-2017 was released in 2014. Many of the recommendations of the Blueprint are included in this bill. The proposed regional consortia system for the DEEP closely mirrors the previous categorical programs.

Education technology plans. The bill states the intent of the Legislature for each school district to develop an educational technology plan (ETP) as a component of their LCAP, and requires the SPI to develop guidelines and criteria for including the ETP as a component of the LCAP. The bill requires the SPI developed guidelines to include: strategies to equip pupils with the skills necessary to succeed in distance learning, the appropriate and ethical use of technology tools in the classroom, among others. Further, a needs analysis that leads the school district to providing teachers with training and support on effective online and hybrid learning strategies, addressing pupil and teacher connectivity, digital citizenship for pupils and staff, data privacy implications, cybersecurity and online safety, and information documenting the total cost of ownership or replacement of appropriate technological devices.

Local Control and Accountability Plan. The LCAP is a three-year plan that describes the goals, actions, services, and expenditures to support positive student outcomes that address state and local priorities. The LCAP provides an opportunity for LEAs to share their stories of how, what, and why programs and services are selected to meet their local needs. LEAs are required to use the SBE-developed LCAP template, which includes several sections and components including, but not limited to: goals and actions, expenditure tables, and a budget overview for parents. *The*

Committee may wish to consider, is the LCAP the most effective and feasible location for an ETP, given the existing LCAP components?

CDE Office of Technology and State Digital Equity Plan. This bill requires the CDE to establish an Office of Educational Technology with sufficient staff to administer the provisions of this bill, and provides that funding for the Office is to be provided through the annual Budget Act for a minimum of three full-time equivalent staff to plan, coordinate, and support, as needed, the provisions of this bill. Prior to the “flexing” of technology programs in to the LCFF, the CDE had an Office of Technology, which served a similar purpose. Included in the proposed duties of the Office of Technology is the development of a SDEP that reflects the overall needs and priorities related to the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the access and use of technology to support teaching and learning in California schools. The bill requires the SDEP be prepared with input from LEAs and other stakeholders, and be submitted to and approved by the SBE by March 31, 2022. *The Committee may wish to consider*, are the SDEP adoption timelines realistic?

Many schools in California closed for in-person instruction as a result of COVID-19. On March 4, 2020, Governor Newsom proclaimed a State of Emergency in California as a result of the threat of the COVID-19 virus. An Executive Order (EO) issued on March 13, 2020 authorized, but did not require, LEAs to close schools for in-person instruction as a result of the threat of COVID-19. The state subsequently began using a color-coded tiered system to determine when schools could reopen for in-person instruction. Except for LEAs located in the highest tier of virus spread, the decision regarding whether to close or re-open schools was left to each LEA, in consultation with local public health officials.

The vast majority of California public schools were closed for in-person instruction through the end of the 2019-20 school year, and many also began the 2020-21 school year by offering only or mostly remote instruction. As of January 2021, due to increasing surges in the rates of COVID-19, many schools throughout the state, including those in the largest school districts, remained closed for in-person instruction. As of this writing, most school districts have re-opened in the spring.

According to a nationally representative survey of teachers and district leaders by the EdWeek Research Center, published in the June 2, 2020 article, *How COVID-19 is Shaping Tech Use*, teachers reported in the spring of 2020 huge emerging tech-equity issues. For example, students living in poverty are much more likely to share devices with family members to complete schoolwork than their wealthier peers. As online instruction and distance learning systems were being established, the wide range of approaches showed a significant divide in the quality of instruction.

Students’ access to the internet. According to the Public Policy Institute of California (2021), in the spring of 2020 more than 25% of California students did not always have internet access available. The share was larger among children in low-income (43%), African American (39%), and Latino (33%) families. A third of all households did not always have a device available for learning, including half of low-income households. In spite of efforts to improve access, PPIC noted, “internet access remains a widespread problem. More than 30% of Latino students still lack reliable home internet, as do nearly 40% of low-income students—essentially unchanged from the spring.” According to a national study of teachers conducted by the RAND Corporation in Spring 2020, only 30% of teachers in high-poverty schools thought “all or nearly all” of their

students had access to the internet at home. Without accurate information about students' access to devices and the internet, California will never fully understand the unmet need, nor be able to calculate the cost to close the gap in access.

In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the CDE now voluntarily posts information related to free and low-cost internet service provider plans, as well as a listing of technology companies with available computing devices. As the pandemic comes to an end it is unclear if this information will continue to be updated for the use of LEAs and the public.

Currently, LEAs may enter into agreements with internet service providers to either: 1) connect students in households without broadband access with ISPs for low-cost plans (with the household paying for the internet service), or 2) provide internet access at no cost to the household without broadband access (with the LEA paying for the internet service). In doing so, LEAs must follow applicable information and privacy laws. Although there is no formal data collection of the number of LEAs participating in these two types of agreements, it is very likely that there has been an increase in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, and due to the increase in funding made available through the LLMF and other sources. The rates and terms of agreements between an LEA and an ISP also likely vary, and there may be a benefit to a state entity entering into a sponsored service agreement on behalf of an LEA to ensure the terms and costs remain fair and reasonable.

For the 2021-22 school year, in-person instruction will be default format for LEAs, therefore the need for devices and access to the internet will likely decline. Many LEAs report that some families would like to continue with distance learning in the 2021-22 school year.

Internet access in California. According to a presentation given by the Legislative Analyst's Office at a Joint Informational Hearing of the Assembly Communications and Conveyance and Education Committees in August 2020, more than 97% of households in California have access to broadband internet, defined as having download speeds of 6 megabits per second (mbps) and upload speeds of 1 mbps. Using the benchmark standard speed of 25/3 mbps, rural availability decreases to 67%. The majority of unserved households are in urban areas: using the 25/3 mbps benchmark, California has 263,000 unserved households in urban areas and 227,000 unserved households in rural areas.

According to the CPUC, California has an 80% broadband adoption rate, defined as the share of households with available broadband internet that subscribe to a broadband internet service. There is a high correlation between household income and adoption rates: a 53% adoption rate in the Census tracts with a median annual household income less than \$20,000, and an 86% adoption rate in census tracts with a median annual household income greater than \$80,000. Latino and limited English-speaking households have lower adoption rates.

Technology support for LEAs in response to COVID-19. Although the distance learning statute for the 2020-21 school year requires that a participating LEA confirm or provide access for all pupils to internet connectivity and devices adequate to participate in the educational program and complete assigned work, current law does not require data collection regarding students' home internet access, or access to computing devices. In the spring of 2020, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the CDE collected survey data and among the 800 LEAs that reported information, they reported a need for over 400,000 mobile hotspots for students. The CDE also assisted in the coordination of donations and deliveries of technology equipment and materials to

schoolsites. There was no statewide plan or regional system of support in place to serve as a basis for this work. Additionally, the SPI formed the Closing the Digital Divide Task Force in spring 2020 to identify needed resources, strengthen partnerships to support distance learning, and equip all California students with computing devices and connectivity.

In the months following the initial outbreak of COVID-19 and the transition to distance learning, several state and federal funding sources and programs were expanded or introduced to meet the technology needs of LEAs and students.

- **Learning Loss Mitigation Funding (LLMF):** The LLMF established in Section 110 of SB 98 (Chapter 24, Statutes of 2020), as amended by Section 59 of SB 820 (Chapter 110, Statutes of 2020), as amended by Section 4 of AB 86 (Chapter 10, Statutes of 2021); appropriates \$5.3 billion of state and federal funds to be allocated to LEAs in order to support pupil academic achievement and mitigate learning loss related to COVID-19 school closures. Funding is authorized for activities that directly support pupil academic achievement and mitigate learning loss related to COVID-19 school closures, including the purchase of devices or connectivity for the provision of in-classroom and distance learning.
- **In-Person Instruction Grants and Expanded Learning Opportunities Grants:** In March 2020, the Legislature adopted AB 86 (Chapter 10, Statutes of 2020), the COVID-19 relief package that appropriates \$6.5 billion from the General Fund to the SPI of which \$4.5 billion is apportioned to school districts, county offices of education, charter schools, and state special schools, for Expanded Learning Opportunities (ELO) Grants. The appropriation is for certain activities, including offering supplemental instruction and support.
- **California Teleconnect Fund (CTF).** The CTF is a universal service program which provides discounted rates to qualifying K-12 schools, libraries, community colleges, government owned hospitals and health clinics, community based organizations (CBOs), and healthcare CBOs. In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) made \$25 million available from CTF for hotspots and internet service for student households. School districts were eligible to apply to receive 50% discounts on the cost of hotspot devices and on monthly recurring service charges. Offers applied to rural and small schools and medium school districts only.
- **California Advanced Services Fund (CASF).** The CASF is a universal service program created to encourage the deployment of broadband services to unserved areas of the state. The program provides grants to applicants to promote the deployment and adoption of broadband. The CPUC made \$5 million from CASF available to school districts in response to COVID-19. The CDE reviews requests from schools and school districts and determines whether the needs of the school district would have priority for funds. Awarded funds may only be for computing devices and hotspot devices.

Recommended committee amendments. Staff recommends that the bill be amended as follows:

- Align references of LEAs to be inclusive of school districts, COEs and charter schools.
- Update language to reflect the end distance learning after the 2020-21 school year. For the 2021-22 school year, in-person instruction will be default format for LEAs, references to distance and hybrid learning are no longer necessary.
- Rename the educational technology plan as the Local Education Technology Equity Plan (LETEP).
- Expand references to equity of technology planning and implementation assistance in DEEP activities, criteria for DEEP lead agency selection, SDEP, and LETEP to include technologically underserved student groups. Access to appropriate technology and internet access adequate to participate in distance learning has been challenging for many student populations beyond rural communities. Language referencing technically underserved student groups provides greater inclusivity while addressing unmet needs.
- Require LEAs to adopt a LETEP and post on their LEA website, and include a one-page summary of the LETEP in LCAP.
- Establish a phased in implementation timeline
 - On or before January 2023: SPI submits the SDEP to the SBE for approval
 - On or before March 2023: SBE adopts the SDEP
 - On or before January 2024: CDE, in consultation with the SBE, authorizes grants to 11 regional technology lead agencies to establish the DEEP
 - On or before March 2024: SPI develops guidelines and guidelines and criteria for LETEP, and one-page summary template of LETEP for the LCAP
 - On or before July 2025: SBE adopts guidelines and criteria for LETEP, and one-page summary template of LETEP for the LCAP
 - On or before December 2024: LEAs adopt LETEP
- Align LETEP to Model School Library standards.

Arguments in support. The San Mateo County Office of Education writes, “While there has been collaboration throughout the state between teachers, administrators and educational technology professionals regarding the digital learning opportunities and challenges presented by the pandemic, a centralized, regional approach to addressing these issues presents the most effective and efficient way for districts and COEs to share knowledge and further build capacity. DEEP could also help in addressing cybersecurity and student data privacy issues that have been highlighted during COVID-19.”

Related legislation. AB 1176 (E. Garcia) of this Session would establish the California Connect Fund in the State Treasury. The bill, until January 1, 2031, would require the CPUC to develop, implement, and administer the California Connect Program to ensure that high-speed broadband service is available to every household in the state at affordable rates.

AB 1560 (Daly) of this Session would require the SPI to collect information about pupils' access to computing devices and residential broadband service, and would authorize the Department of Technology to enter into a sponsored service agreement on behalf of a LEA with a broadband service provider for providing free or reduced-cost residential broadband service to eligible pupils.

SB 732 (Bates) of this Session would require the CDE to develop and implement a program for COEs, school districts, and charter schools to issue no-cash value vouchers to be distributed to households with eligible pupils, to be used during the 2021–22 fiscal year to assist those households with the impacts of distant or remote learning due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The bill would establish the Rural Broadband Infrastructure Fund as a continuously appropriated fund in the State Treasury in order to provide high-quality broadband service to rural areas that are unserved.

AB 82 (Committee on Budget) Chapter 14, Statutes of 2020, in pertinent part, allowed the CPUC to provide matching funds through the CASF to broadband providers as they pursue funding through the federal Rural Digital Opportunity Fund.

AB 570 (Aguiar-Curry) of the 2019-20 Session would have made numerous changes to CASF, to encourage deployment of broadband technology to all areas of the state. This bill was held on the Senate Floor.

SB 1130 (L. Gonzalez) of the 2019-20 Session would have made numerous changes to CASF, to encourage deployment of broadband technology to all areas of the state. This bill was held on the Assembly Floor.

ACR 268 (Thurmond) Resolution Chapter 221, Statutes of 2018, resolved that the Legislature considers education technology of the highest priority and that the Legislature convene a state level summit conference to address improvements in education technology and related topics.

AB 1665 (E. Garcia), Chapter 851, Statutes of 2017, revised the goal of the CASF to approve funding by December 31, 2022 for infrastructure projects that will provide broadband access to no less than 98% of California households in each consortia region, as identified by the PUC, among other provisions.

AB 1761 (Sweeney), Chapter 801, Statutes of 1997, required the CDE to establish the California Technology Assistance Project of regional consortia to administer a "regionalized" network of support to schools and school districts. Required the SBE to issue grants to LEAs to serve as lead agencies in each region.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

Marin County Office of Education
Napa County Office of Education
San Mateo County Office of Education
Santa Cruz County Office of Education
2 individuals

Opposition

None on file

Analysis Prepared by: Marguerite Ries / ED. / (916) 319-2087