

Date of Hearing: July 10, 2019

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Patrick O'Donnell, Chair

SB 419 (Skinner) – As Amended July 3, 2019

**SENATE VOTE:** 30-8

**SUBJECT:** Pupil discipline: suspensions: willful defiance

**SUMMARY:** Prohibits the suspension of any pupil in kindergarten or grades 1 to 5, inclusive, and the expulsion of any pupil in kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade inclusive, who disrupts school activities or otherwise willfully defies the valid authority of supervisors, teachers, administrators, or school officials, beginning on July 1, 2020; prohibits, from July 1, 2020, until July 1, 2024, the suspension of any pupil or grades 6 to 8, inclusive, for that same act; and applies these provisions to charter schools. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Extends the permanent ban on suspension of pupils enrolled in kindergarten through 3<sup>rd</sup> grade, to kindergarten through 5<sup>th</sup> grade, who disrupted school activities or otherwise willfully defied valid authority of supervisors, teachers, administrators, school officials, or other school personnel as of July 1, 2020, and prohibits, from July 1, 2020, until July 1, 2024, suspensions for that act in grades 6 to 8, inclusive.
- 2) Prohibits, permanently, the recommendation for expulsion of any pupil in kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade, who disrupts school activities or otherwise willfully defies the valid authority of supervisors, teachers, administrators, school officials, or other school personnel engaged in the performance of their duties.
- 3) Applies the provisions in (1) and (2) to pupils enrolled in charter schools.
- 4) Encourages, rather than only authorizes, a superintendent of the school district or principal to provide alternatives to suspension or expulsion, using a research-based framework with strategies that improve behavioral and academic outcomes, that are age appropriate and designed to address and correct the pupil's specific misbehavior.
- 5) Retains the authority of teachers to suspend pupils from class for the day and the following day who disrupt school activities or otherwise willfully defies the valid authority of supervisors, teachers, administrators, school officials, or other school personnel engaged in the performance of their duties.
- 6) States that it is the intent of the Legislature:
  - a) To provide teachers and school administrators with the means to foster safe and supportive learning environments for all children in California;
  - b) To ensure that pupils who transfer between multiple classrooms, taught by multiple teachers, be allowed to attend all remaining classes from which they have not been removed for disciplinary reasons; and

- c) That the Multi-Tiered System of Supports, which includes restorative justice practices, trauma-informed practices, social and emotional learning, and schoolwide positive behavior interventions and support, may be used to help pupils gain critical social and emotional skills, receive support to help transform trauma-related responses, understand the impact of their actions, and develop meaningful methods for repairing harm to the school community

**EXISTING LAW:**

- 1) Prohibits a pupil in kindergarten through 3<sup>rd</sup> grade from being suspended for disrupting school activities or otherwise willfully defying the valid authority of school personnel, and prohibits these acts as grounds for any pupil from kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade to be recommended for expulsion. (Education Code (EC) 48900 (k)(2)).
- 2) Prohibits a pupil from being suspended from school or recommended for expulsion, unless the superintendent of the school district, or the principal of the school, determines that the pupil has committed any of the following offenses:
  - Causing, attempting to cause, or threatening to cause physical injury to another person, or willfully using force or violence upon another person, except in self-defense;
  - Possessing, selling, or otherwise furnishing a firearm, knife, explosive, or other dangerous object, unless the student had obtained prior written permission to possess the item;
  - Unlawfully possessing, using, selling, or otherwise furnishing a controlled substance;
  - Unlawfully offering, arranging, or negotiating to sell a controlled substance, alcoholic beverage, or an intoxicant of any kind;
  - Committing or attempting to commit robbery or extortion;
  - Causing or attempting to cause damage to school property or private property;
  - Stealing or attempting to steal school property or private property;
  - Possessing or using tobacco, or products containing tobacco or nicotine products;
  - Committing an obscene act or engaging in habitual profanity or vulgarity;
  - Unlawfully possessing or unlawfully offering, arranging or negotiating to sell drug paraphernalia;
  - Disrupting school activities or otherwise willfully defying the authority of supervisors, teachers, administrators, school officials or other school personnel engaged in the performance of their duties; (Grades 4-12 only)

- Knowingly receiving stolen school property or private property;
  - Possessing an imitation firearm;
  - Committing or attempting to commit a sexual assault or sexual battery;
  - Harassing, threatening, or intimidating a pupil who is a complaining witness or a witness in a school disciplinary proceeding in order to prevent the pupil from being a witness or retaliating against that pupil for being a witness, or both;
  - Unlawfully offering, arranging to sell, or negotiating to sell the prescription drug Soma;
  - Engaging in or attempting to engage in hazing; and
  - Engaging in the act of bullying, including, but not limited to, bullying committed by means of an electronic act. (EC 48900)
- 3) Authorizes a teacher to suspend a pupil from that class for any of the acts identified in (2) above, for the day of the suspension and the day following, and to refer a pupil to the principal for consideration of a suspension from the school. (EC 48910)
- 4) Specifies additional grounds for suspension or recommendations for expulsion:
- Committing sexual harassment (grades 4 through 12 only);
  - Causing or attempting to cause, threatening to cause, or participating in an act of hate violence (grades 4 through 12 only);
  - Engaging in harassment, threats, or intimidation against school district personnel or pupils that have the effect of disrupting classwork, creating substantial disorder, and invading the rights of either school personnel or pupils by creating an intimidating or hostile educational environment (grades 4 through 12 only); and,
  - Making a terroristic threat against school officials or school property, or both. (EC 48900.2, 48900.3, 48900.4, 48900.7)
- 5) Requires that a suspension only be imposed when other means of correction fail to bring about proper conduct. Specifies that other means of correction may include, but are not limited to, the following:
- A conference between school personnel, the pupil's parent or guardian, and the pupil;
  - Referrals to the school counselor, psychologist, social worker, child welfare attendance personnel, or other school support service personnel for case management and counseling;

- Study teams, guidance teams, resource panel teams, or other intervention-related teams that assess the behavior, and develop and implement individualized plans to address the behavior in partnership with the pupil and his or her parents;
- Referral for a comprehensive psychosocial or psychoeducational assessment;
- Enrollment in a program for teaching prosocial behavior or anger management;
- Participation in a restorative justice program;
- A positive behavior support approach with tiered interventions that occur during the schoolday on campus; and,
- After school programs that address specific behavioral issues or expose pupils to positive activities and behaviors. (EC 48900.5)

**FISCAL EFFECT:** This bill has been keyed non-fiscal by the Office of Legislative Counsel.

**COMMENTS:**

**Purpose.** This bill would extend the permanent prohibition on the suspension of kindergarten through third grade students, to kindergarten through fifth grade students, on the basis of willful defiance, beginning on July 1, 2020, and would extend the ban on recommendations for expulsion on this basis for students from kindergarten through twelfth grade. The bill also prohibits the suspension of students in sixth through eighth grade on the basis of willful defiance from July 1, 2020, to July 1, 2024. All of these provisions would apply to charter schools, as well as to schools operated by school districts. The bill encourages the use of research-based alternatives to suspension or expulsion to improve behavioral and academic outcomes.

The bill would not alter the authority of a teacher to suspend a student of any age from that particular classroom for the current day and the following day. Existing law also authorizes the suspension or expulsion of a pupil in grades four through twelve if the pupil has intentionally engaged in harassment, threats, or intimidation, directed against school personnel or other pupils, that is sufficiently severe or pervasive to have the effect of materially disrupting classwork, created substantial disorder, or invaded the rights of school personnel or pupils by creating a hostile educational environment.

**Need for the bill.** According to the author, “An overwhelming body of research confirms that suspending students at any age fails to improve student behavior and greatly increases the likelihood that the student will fail, be pushed out of school, or have contact with the juvenile justice system. SB 419 helps keep students in school, increases student success rates, and increases high school graduation rates. Students in grades 4 through 12 may be suspended from school for minor misbehaviors, such as refusing to take off a hat, talking back, or falling asleep in class. These needless suspensions are referred to as willful defiance and often occur without consideration of the root of the students’ actions.”

**Impacts of school suspensions.** A research paper, *Educational and Criminal Justice Outcomes 12 Years After School Suspension*, (Rosenbaum 2018) notes that “school suspensions aim to

obtain better behavior from the punished student and maintain school norms by removing students. Suspension removes disruptive students from schools temporarily and may improve school climate by reducing peer influences to engage in deviant behavior.” The study goes on to note that a body of research has found that suspended students are more likely to:

- Engage in antisocial behavior;
- Have involvement with the criminal justice system;
- Be arrested both during the month of suspension and within a year of suspension; and
- Use marijuana and tobacco.

The study also cites various longitudinal research findings, including:

- Youth suspended in ninth grade were less likely to graduate high school, graduate on time, and enroll in postsecondary education; and
- Twelve years after suspension, suspended youth were less likely to have earned degrees or high school diplomas, and were more likely to have been arrested or on probation.

Some researchers conclude that “suspensions may act more as a reinforcer than a punisher for inappropriate behavior. Other research raises doubts as to whether harsh school discipline has a deterrent value. Frequent use of suspension alone has no measureable positive deterrent or academic benefit to either the students who are suspended or to non-suspended students.” (Losen, 2011). The American Academy of Pediatrics states, “Without the services of trained professionals, such as pediatricians, mental health professionals, and school counselors, and without a parent at home during the day, students with out-of-school suspensions and expulsions are far more likely to commit crimes.”

Researchers have pointed out that “many suspended students find school to be challenging and experience suspension from school as a reward. Suspensions may be reinforcing and even incentivizing the very behavior they are meant to correct.” (Rumberger, 2017).

***Disparities in the rate of school suspensions.*** The disproportionate incidence of suspensions and expulsions among certain populations of students, including African American students, has gained nationwide attention in recent years. A 2018 report by the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO), *K-12 Education: Discipline Disparities for Black Students, Boys, and Students with Disabilities*, found that black students, boys, and students with disabilities were disproportionately disciplined in K-12 schools, based upon their analysis of Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC) data. They found this was the case regardless of the type of disciplinary action, level of school poverty, or type of public school the students attended, (see table below).

**Percent of public school students who received out-of-school suspensions by student sex and race, 2013-14**

| All students | Boys | Black boys | American Indian/Alaskan Native boys | All students with disabilities | Boys with disabilities | Black students with disabilities | American Indian / Alaskan Native with disabilities |
|--------------|------|------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| 5.7%         | 7.7% | 18.0%      | 8.3%                                | 12.0%                          | 13.8%                  | 23.2%                            | 20.1%  |

(Source: Civil Rights Data Collection)

The GAO report review of research on the topic of disproportionate disciplinary actions suggest that “implicit bias on the part of teachers and staff may cause them to judge students’ behaviors differently based on the students’ race and sex. Teachers and staff sometimes have discretion to make case-by-case decisions about whether to discipline, and the form of discipline to impose in response to student behaviors, such as disobedience, defiance, and classroom disruption.”

“Research on student behavior, race, and discipline has found no evidence that African American over-representation in school suspension is due to higher rates of misbehavior.” The author notes that “African American students were referred more often for behaviors that seem to require more subjective judgement on the part of the person making the referral (e.g. disrespect, excessive noise, threatening behavior, and loitering).” (Losen, 2011)

***California suspensions have declined, but disproportionality remains.*** The California Department of Education (CDE) data shows that there were a total of 363,406 suspensions of K-12 students in 2017-18. Of these, 59,808 or 16% of all suspensions were for “defiance only.” Suspensions for “defiance only” have dropped significantly since 2015-16 when there were 96,421 suspensions in this category, representing 24% of all suspensions.

African American students made up approximately six percent of total statewide enrollment, but represented 16% of the total number of suspensions for willful defiance-related offenses in 2017-18. *Get Out! Black Male Suspensions in California Public Schools*, (Wood, 2018), reports the following findings:

- The statewide suspension rate for Black males is 3.6 times greater than the statewide rate for all students;
- Black male students are 3.3 times more likely to be suspended for defiance-only;
- The highest suspension disparity by grade level occurs in early childhood education (kindergarten through grade three) where Black boys are 5.6 times more likely to be suspended than the state average;
- Black male students who are classified as “foster youth” are suspended at noticeably high rates at 27.4%, with black foster youth in seventh and eighth grades at 41%;
- The highest total suspensions occurred in large urban counties; and

- The highest suspension rates for Black males occur in rural counties that have smaller Black enrollments.

***Alternatives to suspension and expulsion.*** According to the U.S. Department of Education: “Teachers and students deserve school environments that are safe, supportive, and conducive to teaching and learning. Creating a supportive school climate—and decreasing suspensions and expulsions—requires close attention to the social, emotional, and behavioral needs of all students. Evidence does not show that discipline practices that remove students from instruction—such as suspensions and expulsions—help to improve either student behavior or school climate.” Schoolwide strategies employed by school districts include the following:

1) ***Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS).*** Schools are increasingly adopting PBIS as alternatives to more punitive disciplinary policies. PBIS is a schoolwide approach to discipline that is intended to create safe, predictable, and positive school environments. When PBIS is practiced, schools see fewer students with serious behavior problems and an overall improvement in school climate. The key PBIS practices include:

- Clearly defining behavioral expectations of the school community;
- Proactively teaching what those expected behaviors look like in various school settings, on a regular basis;
- Frequently recognizing students who comply with behavioral expectations;
- Administering a clearly defined continuum of consequences for behavioral violations; and
- Continuously collecting and analyzing data to assess students’ responsiveness to the behavioral supports provided.

Implementation of PBIS follows a multi-tiered response to intervention model:

- Tier 1 – Universal support is provided to all students by being exposed to explicit instruction on behavioral expectations;
- Tier 2 – Students who do not respond sufficiently to Tier 1 receive additional support, often in the form of a check-in/check-out program;
- Tier 3 – Students with significant behavioral challenges receive individualized support by a behavioral support team, or are referred for additional services.

2) ***Restorative Practices.*** According to a 2014 publication sponsored by the Advancement Project, the American Federation of Teachers, and the National Education Association, *Restorative Practices: Fostering Healthy Relationships & Promoting Positive Discipline in Schools*, “Restorative practices are processes that proactively build healthy relationships and a sense of community to prevent and address conflict and wrongdoing. This allows individuals who may have committed harm to take full responsibility for their behavior by addressing the individual(s) affected by the behavior. These practices are not intended to replace current initiatives and evidence-based programs like PBIS or social and emotional

learning models. Restorative practices work when they are implemented schoolwide and integrated into the fabric of the school community.”

Restorative practices in schools are considered a nonpunitive approach as an alternative to harsh zero tolerance policies. A number of studies suggest positive outcomes of implementing restorative practices in schools, including lower suspension rates, improved school climate, and improved student attendance. However, some question the validity of the studies as many failed to use experimental methods.

Recent research has raised questions about the effectiveness of the practice. A study of the use of restorative practices in the Pittsburgh School District (Rand, 2018), found that although suspensions fell at schools implementing restorative practices, the academic performance of middle school students fell, particularly for Black students. A 2019 study on a restorative justice program in Maine found no difference in school climate between middle schools that tried restorative justice and those that did not. Researchers note that restorative practices require a high degree of student buy-in as students cannot be forced to talk about their grievances face-to-face.

Oakland Unified School District (OUSD), San Diego Unified School District (SDUSD), and Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) offer restorative justice programs in their schools. OUSD is considered a nationwide model for restorative justice, having successfully operated their program since 2006. The school district employs a restorative justice coordinator, four coordinators based in the central district office, and approximately 24 restorative justice facilitators who are on staff in various schools. In light of recent financial difficulties, the OUSD school board voted to defund the program at the end of the 2018-19 school year. The City of Oakland and philanthropic organizations have pledged funds to continue the program for one additional year. LAUSD budgets over \$10 million annually for their restorative justice programs, while SDUSD budgets \$900,000 per year for the program.

***The State has invested in alternatives to suspension and expulsion.*** In recent years, the Legislature has allocated resources specifically designed to improve school climate and reduce exclusionary disciplinary practices. These include the following:

- 1) ***Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS).*** Since 2015, the Legislature has appropriated a total of \$45 million to encourage LEAs to establish and align schoolwide, data-driven systems of academic and behavioral supports to more effectively meet the needs of California’s diverse learners in the most inclusive environment.

In 2015, the CDE conducted a competitive grant process and awarded \$10 million of the initial round of funding to the Orange County Department of Education (OCDE) for their Scaling Up MTSS Statewide (SUMS) Initiative. The focus of the SUMS Initiative is to develop resources for MTSS within an LEA that align the academic, behavioral, and social-emotional supports in an LEA in order to serve the whole child. It involves family and community engagement, administrative leadership, integrated education frameworks, and inclusive policy and practice.

The OCDE has provided subgrants to LEAs to engage them in a process to assess their strengths, coordinate supports to their Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAP) and align their MTSS efforts with the eight state priorities. The OCDE has distributed the grant funding into three separate cohorts with up to \$6 million awarded in each round of



applications. For the third and most recent funding phase of the SUMS grant, the OCDE and the BCOE will partner with the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Center for the Transformation of Schools to expand the State's MTSS framework. Through this collaborative effort, they will develop evidence-based tools and training for educators and school systems. Their work will expand restorative justice, bullying prevention and positive behavior interventions and minimize the use of emergency interventions. Their joint effort will also establish a pilot program to help LEAs to promote positive school climates by improving student-teacher relationships, increasing student engagement, and promoting alternative discipline practices.

- 2) ***Learning Communities for School Success Program.*** California voters passed Proposition 47 in November, 2014, which reduced the penalties for certain non-violent, non-serious drug and property crimes. State savings resulting from these changes are to be spent on mental health and drug programs, kindergarten through twelfth-grade students, and crime victims. Subsequent legislation requires that 25% of the funds available through criminal justice system savings to be allocated to the CDE for administration of a grant program to reduce truancy and support pupils who are at risk of dropping out of school or who are victims of crime. Co-joined legislation, AB 1014 (Thurmond) and SB 527 (Liu), established the Learning Communities for School Success Program, which will be funded through the savings in the criminal justice system.

A total of \$37 million was appropriated for the first round of funding in 2016-17. LEAs with high dropout, suspension, and Free and Reduced Meal Program rates were given priority. Approved LEAs received \$50 per student for each year of the three-year grant, with minimum three-year grants of \$15,000 and maximum LEA grants of \$2 million. In the second cohort for the 2018-2021 cycle, a total of \$13.6 million was allocated, and for the third cohort for the 2019-22 cycle, \$19.9 million will be available.

***Increasing use of alternatives to suspension and expulsion in California.*** A number of school districts, including some of the largest in the state, have adopted board policies that prohibit the use of willful defiance as the basis for suspension or expulsion and are committing resources to effectively implement alternative models of correction, including restorative justice, PBIS, and other evidence-based approaches. For example:

- San Francisco Unified School District: “Beginning in the fall of 2014, updating district policy to provide that no student shall receive a suspension or recommendation for expulsion solely on the basis of disruption/willful defiance.”;
- Los Angeles Unified School District: “Beginning Fall 2013, no student shall be suspended or expelled for a willful defiance offense.”; and
- Oakland Unified School District: “Effective July 1, 2016, no student enrolled in grades T-Kindergarten through twelve grades may be suspended or expelled for disrupting school activities or willfully defying the authority of school personnel.”

***Holding schools accountable for suspension and expulsion rates.*** California’s Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) and Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) requirements include school climate as one of the eight state priorities. All California school districts, county offices of education, and charter schools, are required to report and examine pupil suspension

and expulsion rates on their LCAP and annual updates. It has been suggested that this requirement to clearly report disciplinary actions, in the aggregate as well as by subgroup, will increase pressure on schools to employ alternatives to suspension and expulsion.

***Concerns expressed about lack of support and insufficient training on effective alternatives.***

Teachers, administrators, and school board members have at times expressed concern with the extension of the prohibition on suspension and expulsion for willful defiance, particularly in the case of high school students. Although most agree that suspensions and expulsions are not necessarily the most effective approach and should only be used as a last resort, some object to removing the option without full implementation of effective alternative strategies.

Many California educators and youth advocates report that restorative justice has transformed school environments and led to significant reductions in suspensions and expulsions. However, critics note that it has not been a sufficient replacement for punitive approaches and that classrooms have become more chaotic without the threat of traditional discipline. It is generally acknowledged that districts have yet to allocate the necessary resources to provide schools with enough training and personnel to undergo the fundamental changes required to fully implement restorative practices and transform school climate.

The California School Boards Association (CSBA) notes that “CSBA has long supported finding alternatives for suspending and expelling students. However, by wholly deleting one of the “tools” in the list of actions available to addressing student behavior without providing another alternative or training to address student behavior the bill hamstring teachers and administrators in dealing with students. In order to fully address the issue of willful defiance and using it to suspend students, teachers and administrators must be trained in how to communicate and work with students who are in crisis and being disruptive. Restorative justice type programs are slowly being implemented throughout the state but without consistent funding to get them started and integrated into each school’s culture it will be years before we can see wholesale progress.”

***Recommended Committee Amendments. Staff recommends that the bill be amended to*** correct a drafting error and extend the date of the sunset for the prohibition on suspensions for students in sixth through eighth grade to July 1, 2025, to allow for a full five year period.

***Arguments in support.*** The Alliance for Boys and Men of Color, a co-sponsor, states “SB 419 would eliminate disruption/defiance as grounds for suspensions for all grade levels and keep more students in schools. If SB 419 is not passed, students will continue to be subject to suspension based on disruption/defiance, which means students will be suspended from school and denied valuable learning time for anything from failing to turn in homework, not paying attention, refusing to follow directions, or swearing in class—including suspensions for just one isolated incident. Because it is so subjective, suspensions based on Section 48900(k) raise serious concerns about their disproportionate impact on students of color and other vulnerable student groups—including students with disabilities and/or those who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender (LGBT), and/or gender non-conforming. Research confirms that there is even greater disproportionality for students in these groups suspended for low level, subjective offenses, like defiance/disruption, compared to higher level, more objective offenses. SB 419 and the elimination of suspension for disruption/defiance will result in an overall reduction in suspensions and an increase in positive outcomes for students and the communities in which they live.”

**Arguments in opposition.** The Charter Schools Development Center states, “Charter schools were created to be public schools exempt from most sections of the California Education Code. Imposing unnecessary restrictions on these schools of choice is counterintuitive to the original intent of the legislature. Charter law requires each school’s petition to address issues of expulsion and this law would effectively overwrite the language of 1,300 charter petitions causing significant disruption at the local level. Further, this bill is based on no credible evidence of an expulsion problem in California charter schools. To the contrary, charter schools often serve as a school of last resort of students who have been expelled from traditional schools and these pupils thrive in a charter school environment.”

**Related legislation.** SB 607 (Skinner) of the 2017-18 Session would have permanently prohibited the suspension of any pupil in kindergarten or grades 1 to 5 commencing July 1, 2019, and the expulsion of any pupil in kindergarten or in any of grades 1 to 12, inclusive, who disrupted school activities or otherwise willfully defied valid authority of supervisors, teachers, administrators, school officials, or other school personnel engaged in the performance of their duties; prohibits, until July 1, 2023, the suspension of any pupil or grades 6 to 8, inclusive, for that same act; and made these provisions applicable to charter schools. This bill was vetoed by the Governor, with the following message:

Teachers and principals are on the front lines educating our children and are in the best position to make decisions about order and discipline in the classroom. That's why I vetoed a similar bill in 2012. In addition, I just approved \$15 million in the 2018 Budget Act to help local schools improve their disciplinary practices. Let's give educators a chance to invest that money wisely before issuing any further directives from the state.

AB 420 (Dickinson), Chapter 660, Statutes of 2014, eliminated the authority to suspend a pupil enrolled in kindergarten through 3rd grade, and the authority to recommend for expulsion a pupil enrolled in grades kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade, for disrupting school activities or otherwise willfully defying the valid authority of school personnel engaged in the performance of their duties. These requirements sunset on July 1, 2018.

AB 1729 (Ammiano), Chapter 425, Statutes of 2012, reaffirmed that superintendents and school principals have the discretion to implement alternatives to suspension and expulsion and expanded the list of other means of correction that must be implemented prior to suspension or expulsion to address most student misbehavior.

AB 2242 (Dickinson) of the 2012-13 Session would have prohibited pupils who are found to have disrupted school activities or otherwise willfully defied the authority of school officials from being subject to extended suspension, or recommended for expulsion. This bill was vetoed by the Governor with the following message:

I cannot support limiting the authority of local school leaders, especially at a time when budget cuts have greatly increased class sizes and reduced the number of school personnel. It is important that teachers and school officials retain broad discretion to manage and set the tone in the classroom. The principle of subsidiarity calls for greater, not less, deference to our elected school boards which are directly accountable to the citizenry.

**REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:**

**Support**

Alameda County Office of Education  
Alliance For Boys And Men of Color  
Alliance For Children's Rights  
American Academy of Pediatrics, California  
American Civil Liberties Union of California  
Anti-Defamation League  
Asian Americans Advancing Justice - California  
Association of California School Administrators  
Bay Area Legal Aid  
Black Parallel School Board  
Brothers, Sons, Selves Coalition  
California Public Defenders Association  
California School-Based Health Alliance  
California State Council of Service Employees  
California State PTA  
Californians United For a Responsible Budget  
Children NOW  
Children's Defense Fund-California  
Community Asset Development Redefining Education  
Community Coalition For Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment  
Compton Unified School District  
Courage Campaign  
CRLA  
Disability Rights California  
Disability Voices United  
Dolores Huerta Foundation  
East Bay Community Law Center  
Educators For Excellence - Los Angeles  
Ella Baker Center For Human Rights  
Empowering Pacific Islander Communities  
Equal Justice Society  
Fair Chance Project  
Fathers & Families of San Joaquin  
Fight Crime: Invest In Kids  
Initiate Justice  
Innecity Struggle  
Khmer Girls In Action  
Law Foundation of Silicon Valley  
Lawyers Committee For Civil Rights of The San Francisco Bay Area  
Learning Rights Law Center  
Legal Services For Children  
Long Beach Forward  
Los Angeles County Office of Education  
Los Angeles Unified School District  
MILPA (Motivating Individual Leadership For Public Advancement)

Movement 4 Peoples' Democracy  
National Action Network Los Angeles  
National Center For Youth Law  
National Juvenile Justice Network  
Pacific Juvenile Defender Center  
Peace Over Violence  
Project Knucklehead  
Public Counsel  
Restorative Schools Vision Project  
San Diego County District Attorney's Office  
San Francisco Unified School District  
San Francisco Unified School District Community Advisory Committee For Special Education  
Sigma Beta Xi Inc.  
Southeast Asia Resource Action Center  
Special Needs Network, Inc.  
The Education Trust - West  
The Mentoring Center  
The W. Haywood Burns Institute  
Women's Leadership Project  
Youth Alive!  
Youth Forward  
Youth Justice Coalition  
Youth Law Center  
Numerous individuals

**Opposition**

Charter Schools Development Center

**Analysis Prepared by:** Debbie Look / ED. / (916) 319-2087