

# The Student Advisory Board of Education

Wednesday, November 8, 2017, Item #1

Topic: Restorative Justice

Speaker: Mindy Jun, Troy High School, Fullerton

Writer: Chuofan Yu, Middle College High School, Stockton

Group Members: Gopika Yallapragada, Torrey Pines High School, San Diego; Joseph Scariano, Imperial High, Imperial; Camille Hermosillo, Jerupa Valley High, Jerupa Valley; Christopher Pak, Sierra Vista Middle School, Irvine; Killian Carter, Beaumont High School, Beaumont; Arvin Hariri, Berkeley High School, Berkeley

---

## **I. PRIORITY**

The Student Advisory Board on Education, a program of the California Association of Student Council, has come to a consensus that in California, standard disciplinary actions in education, such as suspension or expulsion, do not serve their initial purposes, especially in underdeveloped areas. In addition, offenses such as the ones listed in Education Code Section 48900 Subsections (a) through (r) are being over-punished by the school administrators through the use of suspension and expulsion.

---

## **II. RECOMMENDED SBE ACTION**

The Student Advisory Board on Education strongly suggests the State Board of Education to recommend the implementation of restorative justice programs in all school districts as the foremost alternative measure prior to issuing standard disciplinary actions. We also suggest that the State Board of Education, as the primary influence to the California education system, recommends the use of restorative justice programs even in the offenses included in Education Code Section 48900 Subsections (a) through (r) regarding suspension and expulsion criteria.

---

## **III. STATEWIDE IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS**

### **Policies**

The State Board of Education recommends programs of restorative justice to be

implemented in all school districts in California as the primary and foremost alternative measure prior to suspension or expulsion. Each district is able to select one or more variations of restorative justice to best cope with the disciplinary situations within the district. The district is also able to revise and change the restorative justice programs if necessary. Forms of restorative justice include:

- Restorative discussions - discussions led by peer mentors or other facilitators to mediate minor student worries, minor disruptions, interpersonal conflicts, challenging situations, and etc.
- Dialogue circles - circles consisting of entire classes, school council, and other staffs available to resolve class issues and problems affecting students as a whole
- Peer Jury - a jury system led by restorative justice coordinators, peer jurors, and staffs that handles staff or student-related conflicts or any harm regarding any persons or properties
- Mediation and Conferencing - Meetings led by professional facilitators or family members to resolve student conflicts, staff-student conflicts, minor issues involving harm to persons or properties, and etc.

The State Board of Education also recommends all school districts to explore the use of restorative justice even in the offenses listed in the Education Code Section 48900 Subsections (a) to (r). Offenses listed in Section 48900 include but are not limited to:

- Profanity
- Caused or threatened to cause physical injury to another person
- Willfully exercised violence
- Possession of firearm or lethal weapon
- Possession of controlled substance
- Robbery and vandalism
- Bullying or harassment

---

#### **IV. KEY ISSUES**

- In California, the rate of youth recidivism, or the rate at which youth offenders return to prison, is as high as 90%.

- Suspensions and expulsions deprive students of their educational opportunities and reduce the amount of funding received by the school district
- Students who experience out-of-school suspension or expulsion are ten times more likely to eventually drop out of high school
- Students who experience suspension or expulsion are much more likely to go through the juvenile justice system at some point in their educational career
- Schools in California are required to try alternative measures, including restorative justice, before issuing any disciplinary actions, but the eligibility to be exempt from these alternative measures covers essentially all conflicts that require any disciplinary actions. Therefore, many schools are free to not explore alternative measures before discipline.
- An s3 grant from the federal government has been given to improve the school climate of fifty-nine California schools by forming School Climate Teams (SCT) consisting of the principal of the school, two student support members, two parents, and two students. However, in the year of 2013-2014, only 54% of the SCT completed their roles. Some schools reported that their SCTs did not meet whatsoever.

---

## V. **PROVEN RESULTS**

- The California Conference for Equality and Justice has found that the implementation of restorative justice has greatly decreased the number of fights, bullying, suspension, and expulsion.
  - A study by *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* found that the implementation of restorative justice reduces the number of youth recidivism from 50% to 31%.
  - Schools in Peoria, Illinois, have implemented dialogue circles as a form of restorative justice and now has a result of 35% decrease in referrals to detention
  - In Merced, California, six schools have implemented restorative justice and experienced a decrease in suspension ranging from 20% to 40%.
  - In California, youth recidivism is proven to be lowered by restorative justice from 90% to approximately 10-30%.
  - Restorative justice has been proven to lower dropout rates, which decreases the chances of students becoming financially troubled or conducting a crime. This will save schools countywide approximately \$120,000 per year.
-

## **VI. FISCAL ANALYSIS**

The State Board of Education will not bear any cost since the State Board is simply recommending the districts to adopt the system of restorative justice before taking any disciplinary actions. However, the individual districts will need to allocate funds for hiring and training restorative justice coordinators, and paying for staffs that work overtime for restorative justice programs. Transportation and venue can also be potential costs.

On the other hand, restorative justice brings long-term financial benefits. It has the ability to boost school attendance, which will in turn increase the funding received by the school district. It also reduces incarceration rates and rates of youth entering the juvenile courts, which will save tax revenues allocated to fund these programs. Lastly, more students will become motivated in life and academia through restorative justice programs. In essence, more students will become economically capable and less funds will be needed to fund juvenile courts and juvenile incarceration due to a decrease in the demand for them.

---

## **VII. RATIONALE**

In areas where restorative justice have been implemented, results of decreases in detention, fights, recidivism, and etc. are consistently appearing. For example, it has been found that youth who undergo restorative justice have a 10-30% recidivism rate, in contrast to the normal 90% youth recidivism rate. In one case, a student from Oakland Unified School District had a 0.77 GPA and severe anger mismanagement. After being legally charged with assault with firearms, the student underwent restorative justice programs. As a direct result, the student became more motivated and eventually graduated with a 3.27 GPA and departing to the University of Florida to pursue a career in marine biology. This definitely shows the potential of restorative justice programs and the ability of it to change one's attitude for the better. In addition, an educational restorative justice program adopted in 2014 in California has shown to help reduce incarceration rates, saving the county \$120,000 in one year. Clearly, restorative justice programs in all school districts will reduce recidivism rate, dropout, detention rate, suspension rate, and other negative indicators in education while providing a long-term financial benefit for the community.

---

## **VII. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATEWIDE DISCUSSION AND ACTION**

- A. Previous California Association of Student Council Recommendations:
  - a. Discipline, SABE 2016
  - b. Discipline, SABLE 2017
- B. Previous Pertinent Regulations and Policy:
  - a. Education Code Section 48900 - directly states all misbehavior that can result in suspension or expulsion
- C. Previous Legislations:
  - a. SB 607 (Skinner) (2017) - Eliminates the authority to suspend or recommend to expel students in kindergarten or grade one to five for the reasons of class disruption or willful defiance.
  - b. AB 576 (Levine) (2017) - School employee is required to make an effort to contact the student's parent or guardian to schedule a conference before the student's suspension. The parent or guardian must be informed about the suspension before it takes effect.
  - c. AB 667 (Reyes) (2017) - At the informal conference before a student is suspended, the student should be informed about alternative measures available before the suspension is imposed.
  - d. AB 420 (Dickinson) (2014) - Eliminates the authority to suspend a student in kindergarten to third grade for disrupting school activities or willful defiance.
  - e. Proposition 47 (2014) - Reduce penalty for less-serious drug or property crimes. The money that the state saves from the reduce in penalty will fund mental health and drug programs, K-12 education, and crime victims.

# The Student Advisory Board of Education

Wednesday, November 8, 2017, Item #2

Topic: Student Representation

Speaker: Christine Kim, Leigh High School, Santa Clara County

Writer: Angel Duan, Edison High School, Orange County

Group Members: Connor Gusman, C. K. McClatchy Senior High School, Sacramento County; Quincy Johnston, C. K. McClatchy Senior High School, Sacramento County; Sierra Hurson, Corona Del Mar High School, Orange County; Payton Fuller, West Valley High School, Shasta County; Bennett Thompson, Berkeley High School, Alameda County; Karen Vo, Middle College High School, San Joaquin County

---

## I. PRIORITY

The Student Advisory Board on Education, a program of the California Association of Student Councils, has identified the Student Board Member's current lack of sufficient input from the diverse student population of California.

---

## II. RECOMMENDED SBE ACTION

The Student Advisory Board on Education recommends that a Youth Advisory Council be created featuring an array of students who hail from various backgrounds with differing perspectives as a resource for the Student Board Member.

---

## III. STATEWIDE IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

The Student Advisory Board on Education recommends the creation of a statewide committee that serves the Student Board Member by better representing the diversity of the state.

- Students are selected through application by their qualifications through an application process that places an emphasis on the distinct economic and geographical backgrounds.
- The number of student representatives on the Youth Advisory Council range from fourteen to sixteen members. A limitation is placed on the amount of representatives from a given district in order to maximize the variety of the group.
- Members of the Youth Advisory Council serve for one term, or one year.

- The House Bill 446 Chapter 620 from Maryland’s Education Code outlines the selection of their Youth Advisory Council, which is a proven method. The selection process divides members to different sub-committees: the advisory member, the social media coordinator, the student outreach coordinator, and the chief staff. This delegates tasks to maximize efficiency.
  - This council is a resource for the Student Board Member. They, by no means, are established to directly influence the Student Board Member. Instead, they simply relay a multitude of perspectives for the Student Board Member to consider when making decisions.
  - This council would serve as a resource to the Student Board Member but would not share the Student Board Member’s powers.
  - The Youth Advisory Council has access only to open session materials.
- 

#### **IV. KEY ISSUES**

- The need for a greater variety of representatives to encompass all the socio-economic backgrounds of students in California, in addition to the one Student Board Member.
- The need for equity in the representation of students of diverse backgrounds.
- The need for a liaison between the local and state level to provide diverse student groups a platform to advise the Student Board Member. This is to ensure the Student Board Member is well informed to make decisions that truly represents all students.
- There is currently no consistent system of communication between the Student Board Member and representatives of districts across California.
- The Student Board Member lacks outreach and jurisdiction to the entire state as he or she is limited to the time and resources of a single person.
- The need for an established, permanent council to provide long-term involvement and insight for the Student Board Member.
- Senate Bill-516 (2010) was vetoed by Governor Schwarzenegger because “There are numerous organizations, entities and communications in which youth can be engaged in our legislative process.” However, this assessment has proved to be less than satisfactory as organizations are inadequate in regards to providing an accurate picture of the needs of California students.

---

## **V. PROVEN RESULTS**

Maryland established a committee called the Youth Advisory Council two years ago [House Bill 446 Chapter 620]. This council provides the Student Board Member the support needed to reach his or her fullest potential through the different ideas and perspectives portrayed by the diverse group of students. Through a rigorous application process, students from roughly 8-12 counties are represented on the Youth Advisory Council. The Student Board Member, Kyle Smith, stated that the advisory council provides him with a fresh perspective and helps him make more informed decisions. It is clear that additional student input provides Student Board Members with a better understanding of their constituents and already has a positive impact.

---

## **VI. FISCAL ANALYSIS**

The creation of a Youth Advisory Council as a resource for the California State Student Board Member entails minimal costs for the recruitment and transportation of committee members to six council meetings.

---

## **VII. RATIONALE**

- Recognizing that the California State Board of Education is progressive enough to validate student voice through a full voting student member, we believe that there is still space for improvement.
- The Youth Advisory Council is a council that better accounts for the diversity of students and offers the Student Board Member new perspectives that would allow for a more accurate depiction of the desires of California students.
- The Youth Advisory Council aides the Student Board Member in maximizing his or her potential to serve the students of California.
- The State Board of Education and the California Department of Education has the jurisdiction, legitimacy, and title to provide the Student Board Member with authentic student voice effectively through the creation of the Youth Advisory Council.
- With the backing of the State Board of Education, the current and future student board members will have a sustainable and constant resource for generations to come. Thus, the State Board of Education will provide the Student Board Member with an extensive



network that includes all socioeconomic backgrounds for an alternate perspective that would be unattainable by the Student Board Member.

---

## **VIII. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATEWIDE DISCUSSION AND ACTION**

### **A. Previous Pertinent Regulations and Policy:**

- a. EDUCATION CODE - 35012: (2016) Education Code 35012 dictates the policies for student board members and their ability to preferentially vote.

### **B. Previous Legislative Action:**

- a. SENATE BILL - 532: (2015) Senate Bill-532 mandates that within 60 days of a receipt of a petition for pupil representation or at least the next regularly scheduled board meeting that the governing board order the inclusion of at least one non-voting pupil member.
- b. ASSEMBLY BILL - 261: (2017) The intention of AB-261 is for a pupil member of the governing board of a school district shall have preferential vote.
- c. SENATE BILL - 468: (2017) This bill mandates that Student Board Members are to receive all open meeting materials at the same time the materials are presented to the board members, and requires governing boards to invite the student member to staff briefings provided to board members or provide a separate briefing within the same timeframe as the briefing of board members.
- d. SENATE BILL -596: (2017) This bill would establish the Student Empowerment Commission program, under which a public school, including a charter school, and a private school may choose to participate in the program and each year elect a pupil in grade 9, 10, or 11 to participate in regional and statewide conferences and to prepare proposals addressing legislative solutions to public policy issues, as specified. The bill would require the Superintendent of Public Instruction, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to solicit proposals and select one or more qualified nonprofit organizations to assist in the administration of the program. The bill would require the Secretary of State to divide the state into 12 regions and would require the program administrators to conduct regional conferences and a statewide conference for participating pupils each year and to set forth procedures for the preparation, discussion, and vetting of issues at the conferences.

# The Student Advisory Board of Education

## Wednesday, November 8, 2017, Item #3

Topic: Career Readiness

Speaker: Teoman Tezcan, Berkeley High School, Berkeley

Writer: Cathy Sun, University High School, Irvine

Group Members: Juan Flores, Valley High School, Sacramento; Alyssa Escamilla, San Marino High School, San Marino; Zafirah Khan, Northwood High School, Irvine; Aaron Gelberg, Academy of the Canyons, Santa Clarita; Brandon Dela Cruz, Newark Memorial High School, Newark; Isaac Hasan, Beaumont High School, Beaumont; Dorian Becerra, Caliber: Beta Academy, Richmond; Amber Flores, Caliber: Beta Academy, Richmond

---

### **I. PRIORITY**

The Student Advisory Board on Education, a program of California Association of Student Councils, has identified the lack of career readiness courses and pathways in schools as a critical issue facing the state of California.

---

### **II. RECOMMENDED SBE ACTION**

The Student Advisory Board on Education recommends the application of the College and Career Indicator (CCI) on the dashboard for the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) in measuring the state priority of college and career readiness in schools. Application of the CCI will guide the State Board of Education in recommending increased implementation of Career and Technical Education (CTE) courses in school districts.

---

### **III. STATEWIDE IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS**

The State Board of Education will apply the CCI on the LCAP dashboard to identify districts that lack implementation of CTE courses which prepare students for future careers and professions. Using the CCI, the SBE can:

- Identify schools falling from “median” to “very low” levels, as represented by the yellow to red indicators;
- Endorse CTE courses as a way to increase college and career readiness; and
- Recommend a numerical percentage increase, as determined by the SBE, in the addition of CTE courses for these identified schools.

---

#### **IV. KEY ISSUES**

- Though career readiness is a state priority for California education, the students of the Student Advisory Board on Education observed a disproportionate emphasis on academic instruction over career and technical skill-based instruction.
- Experts project 47 million job openings in the decade ending in 2018 (*CTE Fact Sheet, California Department of Education*). About one-third will require an associate’s degree or certificate and nearly all will require real world skills that can be mastered through CTE.

---

#### **V. PROVEN RESULTS**

Bonita High School in La Verne is a comprehensive high school offering the Hospitality Foods ProStart program, a two-year program of study in the hospitality and culinary arts industries. It partners closely with the California Restaurant Association's Education Foundation (CRAEF) and the Culinary Institute of America to offer experiential learning opportunities to students participating in the program. Students who successfully complete will earn a ProStart certification--a credential that is nationally portable and recognized by the restaurant industry. Moreover, Bonita High School partners with a number of postsecondary institutions to offer the

opportunity to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. The data speaks to the program's immense success to date-for the 2012-2013 graduating class: 90 percent of participating students earned an industry-recognized credential, 95 percent graduated from high school and all of those students earned some form of postsecondary credit while enrolled.

95 percent of non-college attending CTE students were employed within two years of high school graduation, according to the California Department of Education's College and Career Readiness and Success study. Additionally, though some may be concerned that allocating funding towards CTE and Practical Arts Education could detract from student ability to become college-ready, according to the California Department of Education's CTE Fact Sheet, students enrolled in CTE programs reap the following benefits: 79 percent of students enroll in a postsecondary program within 2 years of their graduation from high school; students maintain a higher GPA throughout college; and students are more inclined to stay in their undergraduate programs.

---

## **VI. FISCAL ANALYSIS**

As a result of applying the CCI on the LCAP dashboard to the recommendation of CTE course implementation, the State Board of Education is not likely to incur any direct costs.

---

## **VII. RATIONALE**

Applying the CCI on the LCAP dashboard keeps schools accountable for the state priority of college and career readiness. Using the CCI to endorse CTE courses for schools lacking in college and career readiness creates an incentive for schools to support career and technical education, which incorporates both college and career standards. CTE courses correspond to the standards of College Preparatory and Advanced

Placement classes, as outlined by the National Association of State Directors of Career Technical Education and College Board. Additionally, students are not only able to gain skills and experience in their career of choice, which reflects the economy and workforce of state and local agencies, but also are able to experience Student Professional Development, through which they are prepared for the processes in seeking their chosen occupation.

---

## **VIII. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATEWIDE DISCUSSION AND ACTION**

### **A. Previous Pertinent Policy:**

- CTE Pathways Program: The 2016-17 state budget appropriated a one-time increase of \$48 million to the CTE Pathways Program, which supports local linkages between education and workforce development from middle school through community college.
- Proposition 51: In 2016, California voters approved Proposition 51, which authorized \$500 million for facilities for CTE programs.

### **B. Previous State Board of Education Action:**

- Approved a new accountability system, adopting a college-and career-readiness indicator in 2016. The indicator allows schools to count students completing a CTE pathway in college and career readiness, although the overall score will not differentiate these students from those meeting other college and career-readiness indicators such as earning a passing score on an Advanced Placement exam.

# The Student Advisory Board of Education

## Wednesday, November 8, 2017, Item #4

Topic: Student to Counselor Ratio  
Speaker: Britney Wong, Lincoln High School, Stockton  
Writer: Emily Stenzler, Lincoln High School, Stockton  
Group Members: Gema Cardenas, LIFE Academy of Health and Bioscience, Oakland; Arien Hernandez, Chaparral HS, Temecula; Judy Min, Troy High School, Fullerton; Veronica Phen, Middle College High School, Stockton; Avery Reed, Credo High School, Rohnert Park; Crystal Sung, Classical Academy HS, Escondido; Jayden Woodruff, Beaumont High School, Beaumont

---

### **I. PRIORITY**

The Student Advisory Board on Education, a program of the California Association of Student Councils, has identified that the high student to counselor ratio in high schools followed by the lack of a regulatory mandate has had a negative impact on the futures and careers of California students after they exit high school .

---

### **II. RECOMMENDED SBE ACTION**

The Student Advisory Board on Education asks that the State Board supports the idea of the creation of a mandate determining the student to counselor ratio in legislation to further the process of student voice and involvement through this process. The Student Advisory Board acknowledges that creating mandates is not in the jurisdiction of the State Board, but asking for support is.

---

### **III. STATEWIDE IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS**

#### **Policies**

- The State Board of Education will support students with resources from surveys that have already been administered, as it assists students implementing a limit set by districts statewide to encourage the decrease of student to counselor ratios for high schools in California.

---

#### **IV. KEY ISSUES**

- Due to high student to counselor ratios, counselors are overwhelmed to the detriment of students trying to reap the maximum benefits from their counselors in regards to careers and futures.
- Due to the disproportionate student to counselor ratios, counselors have limited personal connections and only provide help to certain students, but not all.
- The inability of counselors to sufficiently provide attention to individual students has resulted in schedule conflicts that negatively impact the students' futures and careers.

---

#### **V. PROVEN RESULTS**

- A student at the Academy of the Canyons in Santa Clarita feels he has a personal relationship with his counselor and is actively engaged in the steps towards his future, the direct result of the student to counselor ratio at this school (300:1).
- In Chaparral High School in Temecula, the high student to counselor ratio has resulted in a lack of response to parent outreach (791:1).
- At Middle College High School in Stockton, high school students feel that counselors know them as people due to their 240:1 student to counselor ratio.

---

#### **VI. FISCAL ANALYSIS**

Supporting the creation of a mandate for a statewide student to counselor ratio would incur limited fiscal costs of providing the surveys and staff time.

---

#### **VII. RATIONALE**

Establishing a cap on the student to counselor ratio in California will promote the general welfare of students and allow California to shine alongside the national average. Currently with an average ratio of 760:1, California ranks 49 out of 50 for the highest student to counselor ratio. This high ratio leads to a lack of strong student to counselor relationships, as counselors are

constantly overwhelmed by the sheer number of students they are responsible for. These personal relationships are critical in motivating students to stay engaged in pursuing their academic aspirations. It is imperative for students to be introduced to their counselors and work on a plan towards reaching their goals starting freshman year, leading to impactful relationships. Counselors play a unique role in guiding students through their high school experience. All students should receive equity in terms of working towards their desired career and future. Other issues arise from the high student to counselor ratio such as errors on the part of counselors due to their inability to effectively distribute their assistance to students. A mandate on the student to counselor ratio would lessen the effects of these problems and allow counselors to maximize their impactfulness in the lives of students.

---

## **VIII. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATEWIDE DISCUSSION AND ACTION**

### A. Previous State Board of Education Recommendations:

- There has been no previous discussion on the matter of student to counselor ratio.

### B. Previous Pertinent Regulations and Policy:

- There has been no previous or current pertinent regulations and policy.

### C. Previous State Board of Education Action:

- There has been no previous State Board of Education Action.



# The Student Advisory Board of Education

Wednesday, November 8, 2017, Item #5

Topic: Mental Health

Speaker: Camille Batiste, The Athenian School, Oakland

Writer: Brandon Plowman, West Valley High School, Cottonwood

Group Members: Annie Hu, Diamond Bar High School, Diamond Bar; Rebecca Zamora, Sylmar Charter High School, Sylmar; Denise Virgen, Soledad High School, Soledad; Zachary Patterson, Standley Middle School, San Diego; Lauren Kong, Palos Verdes Peninsula High School, Palos Verdes; Richard Alonso, Beaumont High School, Banning

---

## **I. PRIORITY**

The Student Advisory Board on Education, a program of California Association of Student Councils, has identified the lack of perceived value of mental health in the education system when compared to academic success due to the fact that there is little curriculum for mental health education as a critical issue facing the state of California.

---

## **II. RECOMMENDED SBE ACTION**

We recommend that the California State Board of Education urge the state legislatures to require one semester (.5 unit) of health education, including the current mental health standards, as a state minimum course requirement for graduation.

We also recommend that the California State Board of Education encourage local districts to adopt health classes that follows curriculum that meets the current mental health standards as a requirement for students to graduate high school.

---

## **III. STATEWIDE IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS**

The Student Advisory Board on Education recommends the members of the California State Board of Education and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction express public support for the addition of a health course as a state minimum course requirement.

---

#### **IV. KEY ISSUES**

- There is a lack of effective statewide standardized curriculum regarding mental health in California public education.
- Academic success is valued in schools, whereas mental health in schools is not valued enough.

---

#### **V. PROVEN RESULTS**

- Seahawk Sessions—mandated schoolwide sessions regarding mental and behavioral health—have decreased referral rates from 1600-1800 referrals per year to 300 referrals per year over the course of 3 years, as well as a noticeable increase in students seeking help from the administration regarding their own or their peers' mental health.
- Connecticut, Illinois, Alabama, Arkansas, and 24 other states have adopted health curriculum as a requirement for graduation. A large portion of states feel that health curriculum is important to be a graduation requirement, so why not California?

---

#### **VI. FISCAL ANALYSIS**

- As a result of the individualization of health curriculum district-by-district, the State Board would not have to incur any costs.

---

#### **VII. RATIONALE**

- Schools have vastly different standards for mental health education; some include mental health as a key part of a health class that is required to graduate, some hold awareness assemblies, and some do not address it at all. To ensure equal access to support and resources across the diverse state, a mandatory health class that covers mental health curriculum is crucial.
- A statewide health requirement will demonstrate that the state values mental health, encourage discussion about mental health in school, and provide a space for students of all backgrounds to explore relevant issues with their peers.

- By addressing mental health in statewide policy, we can combat stigma associated with mental health issues, prioritizing and legitimizing the struggles of students.
  - Without a statewide mandate, it's clear that schools are choosing not to provide mental health education, and students of the Student Advisory Board report that they and their peers are suffering because of it.
  - A health course that encompasses mental health demonstrates to students that physical health, mental and other forms of health are equally important and allows a comprehensive understanding of wellness
  - A mandated course provides a uniform place for students to access information about resources that are available to them for addressing mental health issues, which students of the Student Advisory Board report students are often unaware of.
- 

## **VIII. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATEWIDE DISCUSSION AND ACTION**

### **A. Previous State Board of Education Recommendations:**

- Mental Health regarding the Student Mental Health Policy Workgroup, 2015
- Supplementing current mental health educational framework through the Instructional Quality Commission, 2016

### **B. Previous Pertinent Regulations and Policy:**

- Health curriculum framework in AB 114

### **C. Previous State Board of Education Action:**

- Introducing a student position on the Instructional Quality Commission which oversees curriculum, including health curriculum. "AB 1204"