

Post Fiscal Cutoff – Unfunded Mandate Bills¹

Bill Number	What it does	Fiscal cost to districts (OSPI FN)	Comments
SHB 1295	<p>Beginning September 1, 2027, requires school districts to meet specified requirements when updating or purchasing early literacy, and reading or writing literacy curricula for use with students in grades K-4. Requires teachers holding endorsements with literacy-related competencies to complete literacy-related competencies to complete literacy-focused continuing education as part of certificate renewal for renewals occurring on or after September 1, 2030.</p> <p>By December 1, 2032, OSPI must submit a report to the Legislature regarding levels of compliance with the requirements of the bill, changes made to literacy screening assessments, student proficiency rates, and recommendations for further changes.</p> <p>Requires that OSPI, subject to appropriations, partner with ESDs or educator prep programs to develop or</p>	<p>Non-zero but indeterminate costs.</p> <p>“The legislature has not provided enough materials, supplies, and operating costs in the basic education funding formula to ensure districts can update curriculum on a regular basis. The legislature also provides no funding for materials, supplies and operating costs in the learning assistance program. OSPI cannot reasonably determine when districts would update their curriculum and whether the updates would occur within the six-year fiscal note period.”</p> <p>For training, once the program of structured literacy is adopted: \$1,000 per teacher x 34,283 elementary teachers = \$34.2 million in FY27.</p> <p>There’s also an annual license fee for structured literacy, at \$381 per teacher. Based on 34,283 teachers, the cost is \$13 million in FY27, and \$13 million every year thereafter.</p>	<p>Since the Legislature continues to underfund MSOC, and most districts have been spending their state MSOC allotment to pay for utilities and insurance costs, districts have been putting off purchasing new curriculum, textbooks and supplementary materials on a number of subjects.</p> <p>Unless the Legislature chooses to significantly close the MSOC gap in the 2026 session, this will become a serious unfunded mandate for years to come.</p> <p>In addition, the Legislature is contemplating a 25% reduction to the current level of 7,200 Transition to Kindergarten (TTK) slots. TTK is one tool where early intervention and services to support student literacy is identified. With fewer students eligible to participate in TTK, more students will need higher levels of interventions in literacy when they enter kindergarten.</p>

¹ This list is a 1st cut at bills before the 2026 legislature post-February 9 fiscal cutoff. It is not a commentary on the intent of the bill, but an attempt to identify possible unfunded mandates and share that there is a cumulative effect when the legislature adds new programs and school year requirements without fully funding basic education or adding appropriations and staffing for implementation of new laws. The list may not include all bills that may have a fiscal impact on school districts. It will continue to be refined as information is reviewed.

Bill Number	What it does	Fiscal cost to districts (OSPI FN)	Comments
	<p>deliver training to support implementation is repealed.</p>	<p>For the intensive reading improvement strategy, the estimate is \$33.14 million.</p> <p>The purchase of the textbook recommended for use is \$1.87 million in FY27, and every year thereafter at another \$1.87 million.</p>	
<p>SHB 1289</p>	<p>Requires ESD to create and publish a voluntary online survey to determine how satisfied the families of current and former students are with the public education system. The ESDs are required to include the statewide student identifier for at least one student who is in or was recently enrolled in a public school.</p> <p>Beginning August 1, 2027 (if amendment is adopted), it requires school districts and public schools to share a link to the online survey annually with parents or guardians of enrolled and recently disenrolled students, either through their website or in existing materials that are shared annually, with families, students and school employees. Existing materials might be welcome packets, orientation guides, newsletters and the model student handbook.</p> <p>Requires ESDs to share anonymized and disaggregated survey responses with the public schools and school districts, and to collaborate with OSPI</p>	<p>The fiscal note shows a cost of \$277,500 for the Washington School Information Processing Cooperative (WSIPC) to develop the tool.</p> <p>The fiscal note also says that there is an increase in regular data sharing and management costs, as well as personnel, infrastructure, data management, security and validation costs.</p>	<p>Not every school district is a member of WSIPC.</p> <p>The cost of ongoing data sharing, management, IT infrastructure, data management, etc., is not considered and is not paid for in apportionment or in MSOC.</p>

Bill Number	What it does	Fiscal cost to districts (OSPI FN)	Comments
	to publish a “sortable” summary of the survey data annually.		
2SHB 1634	Requires OSPI and ESDs to collaborate to develop a technical assistance and training framework to be used by school districts and public schools for assistance in supporting student behavior health.	According to the fiscal note, “Section 2(7) states that this section does not impose additional duties on school districts or public schools beyond those otherwise required by law.”	<p>The prototypical schools funding model does not staff schools to meet the behavioral needs of students.</p> <p>Using local and federal funds (when available) most school districts hire more school psychologists, counselors, nurses, social workers, special education teachers and paraeducators, and behavioral health support staff than the state pays for to meet the increased social, emotional and behavioral needs of their students.</p> <p>Providing a behavioral support framework doesn’t mean that those unfunded costs go away. In fact, it is possible the framework may require additional resources, even if the bill says that it doesn’t impose new duties.</p> <p>Appears to be applicable to the 2026-27 school year, although it doesn’t say when OSPI and the ESDs must make the framework available to school districts.</p>
SHB 1795	Beginning in the 2026-27 school year, specifies that isolation may not be used as a planned behavioral intervention, and that restraint may be	The costs to school districts are indeterminate. Section 2(3)(a)(i) states that a licensed health care provider	The state legislature has invested in training and pilot projects the past few years to reduce the incidence of restraint and isolation of students.

Bill Number	What it does	Fiscal cost to districts (OSPI FN)	Comments
	<p>planned only under specified circumstances.</p> <p>States that when a student’s individual needs require more specific advanced educational planning and the parent or guardian agrees, staff members of school districts and other providers of public educational services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May not use isolation as a planned behavior intervention; and • May use restraint as a planned behavior intervention only if a licensed health care provider documents medical necessity in writing and parent or guardian provides informed, voluntary written consent. <p>In addition, restraint or isolation is permitted only when reasonably necessary to control spontaneous behavior that poses an imminent likelihood of serious harm to the student or to another person, such as another student or staff member.</p> <p>Prohibits a school district or other provider from designing, construction, remodeling, reconfiguring, repurposing, or otherwise establishing any room or other enclosed area for the primary purpose of student isolation, regardless of how the space is labeled.</p>	<p>must document in writing that the intervention is medically necessary.</p> <p>School districts are required to provide medical evaluations if a family does not have access to healthcare.</p> <p>The cost for evaluations could range from \$300-\$500 and up to \$6,000-\$10,000 depending on a student’s needs.</p> <p>According to OSPI, about 143,000 eligible students receive special education and related services.</p>	<p>School districts that have been recipients of that funding are finding the dollars have been critical for them to minimize restraint and isolation of school districts.</p> <p>In the 2025 session, the 2025-27 operating budget included grant funding for 20 pilot schools for a total of \$4 million or \$200,000 each.</p> <p>This bill does not contemplate expanding funding to all schools that would be required to adopt the changes.</p>

Bill Number	What it does	Fiscal cost to districts (OSPI FN)	Comments
	Adds definitions.		
SHB 2262	<p>Beginning with or before the 2027-28 school year, requires every school district that operates a high school must, within their one-half credit stand-alone civics course, include instruction in producing a legible, repeatable official cursive signature, and how signatures are used by election officials in election, initiative, referenda, and recall processes.</p> <p>Allows that the student’s signature can be a personalized, handwritten signature or mark that aligns with the student’s primary language or culture.</p> <p>Requires instruction to include a historical overview of signatures in a civics context, including how signature practices and exclusions have limited civic participation in historically marginalized communities.</p> <p>Allows the development of curriculum to be coordinated with the Secretary of State or county auditors.</p>	<p>OSPI has not updated the fiscal note based on the substitute bill that passed out of the House Education Committee.</p> <p>The original fiscal note claimed that there was no fiscal impact on school districts because the bill doesn’t designate how much time must be dedicated to this requirement and the Fiscal Note writer assumed the instruction would be embedded into current curriculum.</p> <p>It said there are many free, online cursive writing courses available and the cost to implement the requirements of the bill should be minimal.</p>	<p>The main costs will be to the teachers who have to add this into their existing curriculum, find the resources, create lesson plans, and identify lessons that are not just in the practice of cursive writing, but find evidence-based curriculum that includes how signature practices and exclusions have limited civic participation and explanations of how signatures are used in voting.</p>
SHB 2360	<p>Beginning in the 2027-28 school year, school districts are authorized to maintain a district-supplied, undesignated supply of albuterol at each school in a designated location.</p>	<p>Because this bill does not require a school district to maintain a supply of albuterol, OSPI estimates no fiscal impact.</p>	<p>Like previous epinephrine bills, this bill does not require school districts to stock a supply of albuterol.</p> <p>However, it does create an expectation by students and parents that schools will stock albuterol,</p>

Bill Number	What it does	Fiscal cost to districts (OSPI FN)	Comments
	<p>Allows that while albuterol may be acquired from donation sources, it must be accompanied by a prescription.</p> <p>Authorizes only a school nurse to administer albuterol for a student without a prescription. For a student with a prescription, a school nurse or designated trained school personnel may administer the drug.</p> <p>Authorizes school districts to adopt policies regarding use of albuterol.</p>		<p>which will require them to use levy funds, philanthropic funds, or some other source to pay for the medication for each school and to take on field trips, with a school nurse or the appropriate trained personnel accessible to administer albuterol.</p> <p>Many small rural school districts only have a nurse on site at a school once a week.</p>
<p>SHB 2534</p>	<p>Beginning in the 2026-27 school year, school districts must make changes to requirements for enrolling children of military families, transferring their education records – including an IEP or 504 plan – and providing students with services and accommodations to meet their physical or academic needs.</p>	<p>Section 1(3) is new language stating if the enrolling child of a military family is transferring with an Individualized Education Program (IEP) or plan developed under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the school district shall take the necessary steps to accept the transfer of records and any prior evaluations. Upon enrollment, the school district shall ensure that the child of a military family receives the appropriate services and accommodations, consistent with the child of a military family's existing IEP or section 504 plan without unreasonable delay. If a reevaluation is deemed necessary, the reevaluation must occur within 30 calendar days after the date of arrival, subject to the informed parental consent of the parent.</p>	<p>While the Legislature made a significant investment in the 2025 session in special education funding, gaps still remain between what it costs to serve students with disabilities and what the state pays.</p> <p>It is expected that when a child of a military family transfers into a new school district that the district would be responsible for covering necessary services and a re-evaluation (if needed), regardless of whether funding is provided by the state or not.</p>

Bill Number	What it does	Fiscal cost to districts (OSPI FN)	Comments
		<p>Borrowing from the FN on SHB 2557 (below) related to evaluations, the following should be a parallel construct:</p> <p><i>Large school districts may need up to a 1.0 FTE Psychologist to complete the evaluations, while smaller districts would require less time.</i></p> <p><i>The cost of a 1.0 FTE Psychologist is \$135,900 per year. OSPI says it does not have a way to estimate how many evaluations will be conducted per district, so the fiscal impact is indeterminate with an estimated cost of up to \$135,900 per year per district.</i></p>	
SHB 2557	<p>Beginning in the 2026-27 school year, requires school districts to provide a student’s parents or guardian with a copy of the special education evaluation report at least five days prior to a meeting between the school and the parent/guardian to discuss or determine the student’s eligibility or continuing eligibility for special education services.</p> <p>Requires the school district to reschedule the eligibility meeting if the evaluation report cannot be provided with at least five days’ review time unless the parent or legal guardian has provided a written waiver of this requirement.</p>	<p>OSPI’s fiscal note states that depending on each school district’s evaluation workload, additional staff time may be required to complete evaluation reports to ensure that parents or guardians are provided with at least five days to review the report in advance of their meeting with the school.</p> <p>Large school districts may need up to a 1.0 FTE Psychologist to complete the evaluations, while smaller districts would require less time.</p> <p>The cost of a 1.0 FTE Psychologist is \$135,900 per year. OSPI says it does not have a way to estimate how many evaluations will be conducted per district, so the fiscal impact is</p>	<p>Under the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), a school district must conduct an initial evaluation to determine whether a student has a qualifying disability within 60 calendar days of receiving consent to evaluate the student from the student’s parent or guardian, unless the state has established a different timeline.</p> <p>Washington state already requires that within 25 days of receiving a request for an initial evaluation, a school district must determine whether to evaluate the student.</p> <p>If the district decides to evaluate the student, it must fully evaluate the</p>

Bill Number	What it does	Fiscal cost to districts (OSPI FN)	Comments
		indeterminate with an estimated cost of up to \$135,900 per year per district.	<p>student and arrive at a decision within 35 school days after receiving the consent to evaluate or a different time period agreed to by the parent or guardian.</p> <p>Current requirements include providing the parent or guardian with a copy of the evaluation report; this bill would require that the parent or guardian get the copy of the report at least five days in advance of the meeting with the district.</p>
SHB 2593	Beginning in the 2026-27 school year, requires school districts that are placed in formal financial monitoring to report monthly to OSPI.	<p>Districts have reported that if they are required to submit reports manually each month, the additional time may be 1 hour per month. Districts have also reported that if OSPI were to provide an electronic submission method that allowed direct upload of this data from district financial reporting systems, the reporting cost would be zero.</p> <p>OSPI assumes that an electronic submission system will be created that 250 districts will use.</p> <p>OSPI assumes that 60 entities will report manually. The monthly cost of 1 hour per month for the 60 entities will be \$72,000.</p>	<p>While declining enrollment is one reason school districts have experienced financial instability in the past few years, another is the fact that the Legislature has not fully funded the number of staff needed to meet the needs of students, nor has it provided sufficient funding for special education, MSOC, or transportation.</p> <p>One could also argue that over the past 9 sessions, the legislature has imposed more than 100 new school year requirements and programs on school districts with no direct-line appropriations to support the time, staffing or implementation of the requirements.</p>
SHB 2594	Beginning in the 2026-27 school year, establishes state-based requirements	According to the OSPI fiscal note, there is no fiscal impact to school districts.	Codifying federal McKinney-Vento protections into Washington state

Bill Number	What it does	Fiscal cost to districts (OSPI FN)	Comments
	<p>for ensuring homeless children and youths have equal access to the same free, appropriate public education as is provided to other children and youth.</p> <p>Codifies the federal McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act in state law.</p>	<p>The fiscal note states that school districts currently meet the requirements of the McKinney-Vento homeless assistance act, 42 U.S.C. Secs. 11431 – 11435, as it exists on January 1, 2026, therefore they will meet the requirements established in sections 101 through 901 of this act.</p>	<p>law would shift these requirements from a “conditional” federal mandate to a permanent state obligation.</p> <p>While the substitute removed duplicative provisions for OSPI, RCW 28A still contains provisions related to school districts and their responsibilities for students who are homeless. In other words, this bill does not remove, repeal, or align overlapping requirements for school districts.</p> <p>School districts do not receive federal or state funding to support students who are homeless or the requirements under McKinney-Vento, so the underlying state requirements are already an unfunded mandate.</p> <p>For example, RCW 28A.320.142 requires every K-12 public school to establish a building point of contact who is responsible for identifying homeless students and connecting them with the district homeless student liaison. It also charges the district liaison with the responsibility of training the building-level contact. RCW 28A.320.145 requires the liaisons to attend state-provided trainings to ensure students are properly identified and served.</p>

Bill Number	What it does	Fiscal cost to districts (OSPI FN)	Comments
			<p>The state does not provide funding to school districts to support this existing requirement of the building-level designated staff, training for the designated staff, or a substitute teacher or other staff, if needed, when the building point of contact is in training during the school year.</p>
<p>SSB 5240</p>	<p>Beginning in the 2026-27 school year, allows a school nurse or designated trained school personnel to use any available epinephrine on school property to respond to an anaphylactic reaction.</p> <p>Requires the school district to reimburse the cost of the epinephrine to the owner if it is not school-owned or owned by the individual who received the epinephrine.</p> <p>Back in 2008 when this legislation was first put in place, it required OSPI and the Department of Health to develop policy guidelines and content for a training course, and school districts to adopt a school district policy for each school to follow in the district.</p> <p>This bill adds a new requirement that the entity that conducts the training must issue a certificate, in the form decided by DOH, which then has to be kept on file at the school.</p>	<p>The OSPI fiscal note says no fiscal impact.</p> <p>However, the bill would create a new mandate that if a school employee uses "any available epinephrine" (e.g., a dose belonging to another student or a staff member) for an emergency, the district must reimburse the owner for the cost of that medication.</p> <p>The fiscal note does not provide a statewide cost estimate for these reimbursements because the frequency of use is unpredictable.</p> <p>In addition, while the Department of Health can develop the training forms with existing resources, districts face localized administrative burdens:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certification Tracking: Training entities must issue certificates of completion to every trained staff member. • Record-Keeping: Districts are required to keep these certificates on file at each school. The labor 	<p>While the bill’s intent is life-saving, it introduces several specific fiscal and administrative obligations that school districts must absorb without a dedicated funding stream. And while the bill “allows” districts to maintain a “stock” supply of epinephrine, this bill effectively increases the pressure to do so by expanding the locations (e.g., field trips or sanctioned excursions) where it can be used.</p> <p>The MSOC allocation does not include funds for health supplies, which have been growing over the years; for example, in the past few sessions, the legislature has required school districts to carry Naloxone, provide menstrual products, offer epi pens and autoinjectors, provide AEDs and bleed control equipment, training regarding these prescriptions or requirements, and much more – all at the school district cost.</p>

Bill Number	What it does	Fiscal cost to districts (OSPI FN)	Comments
		<p>required to manage these records and ensure training is current for "designated trained personnel" is an unfunded local administrative expense.</p>	<p>The bill says that when a school nurse or trained staff member uses "any available epinephrine" that belongs to another student or staff member, the district must reimburse the owner for the cost of that medication. High-quality epinephrine autoinjectors can cost hundreds of dollars. There is no state funding for this, so districts will need to pull the reimbursement from their existing general funds or local enrichment levies.</p> <p>In addition, the bill would expand who can administer epinephrine and would now require formal certification. Districts would need to ensure that designated trained school personnel (not just nurses) are trained and that their certificates of completion are kept on file at the school. Providing the training for non-medical staff (e.g., teachers, bus drivers, coaches) will require paid professional development time or hiring outside trainers (which could be subject to the live presentations tax of ESSB 5814).</p>
SSB 5574	<p>Requires school districts to adopt a policy ensuring that instruction in Asian American and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Latino American, and Black American history is included in one or more required social studies courses</p>	<p>Fiscal impact is non-zero but indeterminate.</p> <p>Required curriculum is unknown and therefore any costs are indeterminate, however if existing or future curriculum</p>	<p>OSPI will start reviewing the social studies learning standards in January through July 2026, with final adoption in January through July 2028.</p>

Bill Number	What it does	Fiscal cost to districts (OSPI FN)	Comments
	<p>when the district reviews or adopts its social studies curriculum during its regular review cycle.</p> <p>Beginning in the 2029-30 school year, requires school districts to provide instruction in grades K-12 on this history, particularly when the topic aligns with existing frameworks for U.S. and Washington state history.</p> <p>Directs school districts to submit an annual report to OSPI, the State Board of Education (SBE) and WSSDA that this instruction is planned, ongoing and systematic.</p>	<p>is applicable and available to school districts under RCW 28A.300.112 and RCW 28A.345.130 via Washington Open Educational Resources (OER) Hub and in the form of a module that could be added to current curriculum, there would be limited fiscal impact.</p> <p>If this is not the case, we estimate the initial cost for individual districts to purchase or develop their own curriculum to meet guidelines and implement teacher training to be \$4,000 per school for curriculum and \$3,000 for History instruction training for an estimated cost of \$53,000 for an average school district of 7.56 schools, or \$15.165 million based on 337 school districts starting in FY28.</p> <p>For reporting requirements under section 3(4) there is an indeterminate fiscal impact to school districts as the detailed requirements of the report as well as who all would be required to contribute information to said report is not known, however an estimate based on 20 hrs of labor for school administrative staff would be \$1,000 per report per school district per year or \$337,000 based on 337 districts starting in FY29 and ongoing.</p>	<p>The 2025 legislature required school districts, within available materials, to adopt inclusive curricula and select diverse, equitable, inclusive, age-appropriate instructional materials that include the histories, contributions, and perspectives of historically marginalized and underrepresented groups. This was not funded with a direct appropriation or increase to MSOC related to the new requirement.</p> <p>With this bill, the Legislature is not increasing the amount of MSOC for curriculum to comply with updated textbooks or online courses, nor does it provide additional professional development training in the new standards, regardless of what is adopted.</p>
SB 5841	Beginning in the 2026-27 school year, requires that the universal High School and Beyond Plan (HSBP) must import	The fiscal note has not been updated for the substitute bill.	As a reminder, all school districts are required to provide students with access to the new universal online

Bill Number	What it does	Fiscal cost to districts (OSPI FN)	Comments
	<p>financial aid application data maintained by the Washington Student Achievement Council to provide an easy way to view the student’s progress on financial aid applications.</p> <p>Adds the requirement that school districts tell students about the Washington Opportunity Scholarship when they brief students about the list of programs for postsecondary financial assistance.</p>	<p>This initial fiscal note claimed no fiscal impact.</p>	<p>platform. And as an additional reminder, the High School and Beyond Plan (HSBP) now must go into the 7th and 8th grades. No additional MSOC for grades 6-8 or even 9-12 was increased to support this new requirement. And under Governor Ferguson’s proposed 2026 supplemental budget, OSPI would hold back 1.9% of the MSOC allocation for grades 9-12, deepening the unfunded mandate.</p> <p>For example, school districts will have costs associated with use of the new online, universal HSBP: for licensing fees; professional development for school counselors; additional family engagement coordinators (which aren’t funded at the middle or high school level in the prototypical school funding model); staff time for meetings with students and parents or guardians related to completion of the HSBP, which is a requirement for graduation; counseling about financial assistance from the state or federal government; data integration or data sharing with the WSAC (which could require manual imports); and technical upgrades that will cost districts and IT staff time.</p>
<p>SSB 5906</p>	<p>Beginning in the 2026-27 school year, prohibits school district employees</p>	<p>The OSPI fiscal note states no fiscal impact.</p>	<p>When the Legislature passed the Keep Washington Working Act in</p>

Bill Number	What it does	Fiscal cost to districts (OSPI FN)	Comments
	<p>from collecting information about the immigration statuses of students or their family members.</p> <p>Prohibits school districts from allowing immigration enforcement officers to enter the nonpublic areas of those locations without a warrant or court order.</p> <p>Beginning in the 2027-28 school year, requires each school district board of directors to adopt or amend a policy and procedures for limiting immigration enforcement in schools.</p>	<p>However, some fiscal notes from others covered by the bill do point out the potential for fiscal impact, including the need to post signage for nonpublic areas.</p>	<p>2019, it required the Attorney General to develop a model policy and directed school districts to adopt the policy or share what they adopted with the Attorney General.</p> <p>SSB 5906 would ask School Boards to adopt or amend a policy and procedure to limit immigration enforcement in non-public areas of schools. Individual districts must spend administrative and legal time customizing and implementing these policies locally without specific reimbursement.</p> <p>In addition, districts must prohibit immigration enforcement officers from entering "nonpublic areas" without a judicial warrant or court order. A "nonpublic area" may be established through signage, mapping, and key entry systems. While the bill <i>encourages</i> these methods, districts that currently lack clear signage or secure key entry in certain zones may face unbudgeted capital or maintenance costs to comply with the bill's privacy expectations.</p> <p>Finally, school districts are expected to ensure that staff understand the new restrictions on collecting immigration status documents and education records. Providing "know</p>

Bill Number	What it does	Fiscal cost to districts (OSPI FN)	Comments
			your rights" guidance and training staff on how to respond to warrantless enforcement requests will require professional development time. Districts must typically fund this by reallocating existing training budgets or using local levy funds.
SSB 5951	<p>Beginning in the 2027-28 school year, authorizes school districts to maintain a district-supplied, undesignated supply of albuterol at each school in a designated location.</p> <p>Specifies that if a student does not have a prescription on file, only a school nurse may administer the school's albuterol.</p> <p>Specifies that while albuterol may be acquired from donation sources, it must be accompanied by a prescription.</p>	<p>The fiscal note has not been updated to the substitute bill.</p> <p>The original fiscal note said no fiscal impact because the bill does not require a district to maintain a supply of albuterol.</p>	<p>Like SHB 2360, this bill would require OSPI and the Secretary of Health to update the student asthma policy by January 1, 2027.</p> <p>Districts that choose to stock albuterol must then adopt these "uniform procedures," which include training and record-keeping costs that are not specifically funded by a new state appropriation.</p> <p>As mentioned above, this bill will create an expectation that school districts will stock albuterol in every school and possibly for every field trip and sanctioned school event, as shared in the bill.</p> <p>Districts will need to seek grants or use local funds or levies to offer albuterol.</p>
SSB 5952	Beginning with the 2026-27 school year requires school districts to recognize and accept a waiver from the physical health education credit requirement	The fiscal note says no fiscal impact.	Likely school districts with high schools would need to update their model student handbook, any information about crediting or their

Bill Number	What it does	Fiscal cost to districts (OSPI FN)	Comments
	when a student has had the PE credit waived by one school district and then transfers to another school district.		own PE waiver policy and make sure that school counselors who are tracking credit requirements are aware of the new law.
SSB 5956	<p>Beginning with the 2026-27 school year, prohibits certain decisions and actions related to student discipline and school safety based on automated decision systems, school surveillance technology, biometric data, and facial recognition services.</p> <p>By the 2027-28 school year, allows school districts to adopt or adapt WSSDA’s model policy to implement the bill’s requirements.</p>	The fiscal note assumes that OSPI can update its guidance but does not account for the time school districts may need to spend ensuring compliance.	<p>The effective date is 90 days after the end of session, which makes it a new school year requirement for next school year.</p> <p>Some potential costs might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School districts are prohibited from entering into any contract with a vendor or school service provider that requires or authorizes the provider to engage in prohibited AI activities (such as generating "risk scores" or using biometric data to infer emotional states). That means districts will need to review their current and future contracts with educational technology vendors to ensure compliance. • There are new data privacy and disclosure requirements to law enforcement which will require developing internal protocols to ensure staff do not inadvertently violate these disclosure rules, which will require training and oversight. • Since AI is still a “new” concept in schools, there may be some lead time considering how this factors

Bill Number	What it does	Fiscal cost to districts (OSPI FN)	Comments
			<p>into current school safety procedures or processes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Just by where this will sit in the RCW, the State Board of Education will add questions about compliance to its annual Basic Education Compliance report.
SSB 5985	<p>Directs UW, in collaboration with WSU and other stakeholders, to establish an online resource center regarding the awareness, incidence, and prevalence of endometriosis by July 1, 2028.</p> <p>Directs OSPI to incorporate information related to menstrual health, including differentiating between typical menstrual discomfort and severe symptoms that may require additional medical attention such as endometriosis, when revising the health and physical education state learning standards.</p>	<p>OSPI did not produce a fiscal note for school districts regarding this bill.</p>	<p>While the bill does not specifically require school districts to do anything, it does require an update to the state health learning standards to incorporate the information regarding endometriosis which, in turn, could require school districts to ensure that their curriculum, textbooks or other supplementary educational materials incorporate the information during the instruction of menstrual health.</p>
SB 6052	<p>Requires the Washington School Information Processing Cooperative (WSIPC) to develop, maintain and govern a statewide digital transcript file standard and a secure, platform-independent environment for the exchange of transcript data between school districts and postsecondary institutions.</p>	<p>The cost impacts to implement the requirements of this bill are indeterminate.</p> <p>OSPI assumes WSIPC membership would not be required for non-member districts to participate in the exchange of transcript data.</p> <p>OSPI expects that WSIPC member school districts won't require additional</p>	<p>Not every school district is a member of WSIPC, but even if they were, this bill creates an unfunded mandate because it places the implementation burden directly on local school districts without providing a state appropriation.</p> <p>For example, this isn't a pilot program but instead is a mandatory requirement to participate by the next</p>

Bill Number	What it does	Fiscal cost to districts (OSPI FN)	Comments
	<p>Beginning in the 2026-27 school year, requires all school districts to participate in the statewide digital transcript data-sharing environment.</p>	<p>technical assistance, so participation in transcript data-sharing would not lead to additional expenses.</p> <p>OSPI assumes non-member school districts (15 total) may incur costs for vendor coordination, integration development, data verification, and evaluation.</p> <p>OSPI estimates it could cost up to \$75,000 per school district, for an estimated total of \$1.125 million FY27.</p> <p>School districts may also incur costs associated with staff time related to transferring transcripts from their current stand-alone process to the shared platform. Staff time and position type may vary by district and current file format.</p> <p>For cost estimating purposes, OSPI assumes that it would take a 0.5 FTE Registrar to complete the task, with projected annualized compensation of \$85,000, totaling \$638,000 in FY27 (15 non-member school districts x \$85,000 x 0.5 FTE).</p> <p>OSPI assumes school districts would use existing consent procedures to obtain the necessary permissions from students and parents, with revocable transcript data-sharing permissions</p>	<p>school year (effective date is 90 days after the end of the session). Districts are required to align their data systems with the new statewide digital transcript file standard, which means dedicating staff time to data cleanup, system mapping, and ensuring their local data flows correctly into the state exchange.</p> <p>Small districts may not have an IT staff member or “Registrar,” which means the burden will fall on their small district central office staff or reliance on an ESD for support, which could result in additional administrative fees to ESDs.</p> <p>In addition, there is a “permission” requirement for disclosure of the digital transcript data by a student or the student’s parent or legal guardian, which means districts will need to have a way of tracking these permissions. OSPI assumes districts already have these protocols in place which may or may not be the case.</p> <p>And while some funding to get the system up and running may be available through private sources, there will be a need for ongoing costs as the data sharing isn’t static or one-time. Districts must ensure their data meets evolving standards or new state legislative requirements,</p>

Bill Number	What it does	Fiscal cost to districts (OSPI FN)	Comments
		integrated into the process. As a result, OSPI does not foresee the need for additional staffing costs to administer these permissions.	making sure that transcript notations (e.g., Seal of Biliteracy, competency-based courses, etc.) are correctly coded to the new digital file standard.
SB 6130	<p>Beginning in the 2026-27 school year, directs public high schools to observe National Voter Registration Day as the third Tuesday of September (or the following Tuesday) and to coordinate voter registration events in history or social studies classes on National Voter Registration Day and for a two-week period before or after that date to accommodate school schedules, as resources allow.</p> <p>Requires teachers to make voter sign up and registration available to all students.</p> <p>Requires public high schools to coordinate a voter registration event in January in alignment National Voter Registration Day, with the primary focus to support eligible students who missed the opportunity to become future voters or registered voters earlier in the school year.</p>	<p>The OSPI fiscal note claims no fiscal impact but does not take into account that the initial requirement to offer a Future Voters voting registration during high school history or social studies classes was an unfunded mandate.</p> <p>However, the fiscal note points out high school history and social studies teachers will need to adjust their instruction on the new implementation schedule (moving registration in January to September) and that school districts will be responsible for determining which students had access to instruction (and registration) in September and which students will need to be ensured access in January.</p> <p>The note reads, “the impact to districts is minimal, up to five hours per year per school.”</p>	<p>This is an unfunded mandate that was originally passed in 2018 (HB 1513), because it added new, mandatory instructional duties and class time set aside for coordinating a voter registration event in each history or social studies class without a specific, recurring funding stream, to the existing (and unfunded requirement of) Temperance and Good Citizenship Day.</p> <p>In 2018, the law required teachers to make voter sign-up and registration available to all students who are 16 years of age or older, and the events must include adequate time for students to complete the registration process during their history or social studies classes. The law also required schools to offer both online registration options and paper forms for students who cannot use the online system.</p> <p>OSPI is required to report on voter registrations, and a 2022 report shared challenges and recommendations, particularly with implementation in smaller districts.</p>