



Legislative Policy Committee BILL REVIEW MEETING

Tuesday, April 20, 2021 | 9:00AM – 1:00PM
Via Webex

Gina Potter, Ed.D., Chair
Edgar Zazueta, Ed.D., Senior Director, Policy & Governmental Relations

Minutes

I. **Welcome** | (9:00AM)

Dr. Gina Potter, Chair, Legislative Policy Committee

Dr. Edgar Zazueta, Senior Director, Policy & Governmental Relations, ACSA

- Dr. Potter welcomed everyone to our second to last LPC meeting for the year. It's been quite a year, but we are at a turning point where many of us have been able to reopen our schools safely and have hope of fully reopening our schools in the fall.
- Edgar and Gina, in planning the agenda, wanted to allow our advocates more time to review bills in this meeting – focus of the meeting will be around studying the bills and providing positions.
- Edgar welcomed everyone as well, we know we have asked for a significant amount of your time coming off of Legislative Action Day last week.
 - Two issues that Governmental Relations wanted to discuss as a full group
 - **Retention and AB 104 (Gonzalez)** – Iván Carrillo
 - Has 3 different affected policy areas
 - Retention for K-12 students – doesn't require student to be retained but requires policy to be provided by LEAs
 - Grading – giving current HS students option to replace letter grades with pass/no pass grades with no limitation on type/number of courses – must be granted to any student who requests
 - UC has given no indication if they will accept these grades without prejudice
 - Local Graduation Requirements that are above statewide requirements – any current junior or senior in HS would be exempt from local grad requirements above state requirements. Any students at risk must be given this option.
 - Bill has urgency clause and has flown through the Assembly with unanimous support – Not yet set for hearing in Senate

- Senate has already heard a retention bill (SB 545 – Wilk)
- Concerns from ACSA members is being heard particularly regarding the retention component
 - ACSA will look into changing our advocacy approach of laying out our concerns
- Question: If my district already has a retention policy, would AB 104 supersede individual board policies?
 - Would not supersede your existing policy, but you are required to meet the retention policies laid out in the bill. If not, current policy needs to be updated
 - Written notice required to be sent to families and guardians
- Question: You mentioned consultation, is that update to all parents prompted by any parent? Correct.
- Question: Does language specify if group meeting can happen? Language states meeting would need to lay out risk of retention and make sure it's clear for parent to make informed decision. Discussion of risk and benefits of retention.
 - IEPs do not contain retention information. Retention is a function of the general education system and IEP teams cannot recommend retention as part of an IEP meeting
 - Disappointing that weight and evidence of research around the negative correlations and outcomes for retention are not holding more weight here – results of early retention dissipate after 3rd grade and long-term, negative impacts are well-documented
 - This piece of the bill applied to K-12, however pass/no pass is applied only to 9-12th
- Question: Is the basis for the bill because of COVID they think kids may need more time? Assumption is that every school has been in distance learning for a long time so the policy is needed, however that is not the case. So, why is there not a caveat for districts who have been in person for a majority of the year?
- Amendment language of SB 545 replaced automatic retention if parent requested and added language that if there is a request to retain a student, LEAs must do three things
 - Offer intervention and support to student that are aligned with extended opportunities grant (AB 86)
 - Offer student access to prior semester courses which the student received a D/F or offer some sort of credit recovery

- Provide parents with information about research on effects of student retention developed by the Department of Ed and types of intervention/support documented to be beneficial
- Iván asked attendees to either email or drop in the chat examples of what they've been using to help students
 - State requires a Response to Intervention (RTI) model with a multi-tiered system of support

II. **Subcommittee Bill Breakouts** | (9:10AM)

- Please review the spreadsheet for the positions taken and rationale of each Subcommittee breakout room

III. **Subcommittees' Report Out on Hot Topics** | (11:45AM)

- **Subcommittee 1:**

- **AB 104 (Gonzalez):** Pupil instruction: retention, grade changes, and exemptions
 - Landed on a support if amended position
 - Concern being the retention policy – will focus on amending this portion to address the raised concerns
 - Amendments put into SB 545 – will seek similar amendments for AB 104
- **AB 22 (McCarty):** Childcare: preschool programs and transitional kindergarten: enrollment: funding
 - Took a watch position – group felt the current early education programs are already robust and should focus on those programs

- **Subcommittee 2:**

- **SB 335:** Would put a huge burden on employers and increase cost of workers comp – took an oppose position
- **SB 681 (Ochoa Bogh D):** Child abuse reporting, expands to who you report to include school police and security – took an oppose position

- **Subcommittee 3:**

- **AB 967 (Frazier):** COVID-19 Special Education fund. Great bill of funds available to LEAs to utilize for students with IEPs and impacts from COVID. This bill will incentivize districts and parents to come to an agreement about additional or replacement services, as early and quickly as possible, without attorneys. Large reimbursement fund. No dispute resolution. Co-sponsors from SELPA and disability rights groups
 - Very hopeful this will be rewarded a large amount of money – current ask is \$1 Billion
 - Dr. Potter thanked LPC rep Anjanette and ACSA advocate Laura for their work on this bill
- **AB 563 (Berman):** School-based health programs – CASC Co-sponsored bill
 - This bill would create an office of school-based health at CDE to aid schools and LEAs with on-site health programs
 - Currently CA is one of the worst states in Medi-cal reimbursements for on-site student program funding

- This bill has been reintroduced for many years and think this year it may be the first year it gets through
 - LPC is taking a watch position on this bill
 - **AB 610 (Kalra):** School safety: mandatory notifications (removal)
 - LPC takes a Support (with comments) position on this bill
 - Support all these things applied to students, but need to know how schools can still impact or control behavior of adults
 - This work aligns with the anti-racism/equity work ACSA is doing about reducing police on campus
- Dr. Potter wrapped up the meeting and provided the date for our next meeting (below) and offered to stay behind with advocates for a few minutes to answer any specific questions.

IV. **Adjourn** (12:21PM)

MEETING DATES

Date	Meeting Location	Time
Tuesday May 18, 2021	LPC Bill Review Meeting <i>WebEx</i>	9:00 AM - 12:00 PM