COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EDUCATION COMMITTEE HEARING

STATE CAPITOL HARRISBURG, PA

MAIN CAPITOL BUILDING
ROOM 140

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2012 11:05 A.M.

PRESENTATION ON HB 2464
BULLYING AND CYBERBULLYING
PREVENTION LAW

BEFORE:

HONORABLE PAUL I. CLYMER, MAJORITY CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE JIM COX

HONORABLE THOMAS J. QUIGLEY

HONORABLE WILL TALLMAN

HONORABLE DAN TRUITT

HONORABLE H. SCOTT CONKLIN

HONORABLE PATRICK J. HARKINS

HONORABLE MARK LONGIETTI

HONORABLE MICHAEL H. O'BRIEN

HONORABLE KEN SMITH

HONORABLE JAKE WHEATLEY

* * * * *

Pennsylvania House of Representatives Commonwealth of Pennsylvania COMMITTEE STAFF PRESENT:

DUSTIN E. GINGRICH

MAJORITY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

EILEEN R. KRICK

MAJORITY LEGISLATIVE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

JUDITH M.D. SMITH

MAJORITY RESEARCH ANALYST

CHRISTOPHER S. WAKELEY

DEMOCRATIC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

MARLENA M. MILLER

DEMOCRATIC LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT

TIMOTHY KELLER

DEMOCRATIC INTERN

I N D E X

TESTIFIERS

* * *

<u>NAME</u> <u>PAGE</u>
REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS J. QUIGLEY PRIME SPONSOR OF HB 24648
SEAN A. FIELDS SENIOR ASSOCIATE COUNSEL, PA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION
FAYEZ EL-GABALAWI, MD PRESIDENT, REGIONAL COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF CHILD AND ADOLESCENT PSYCHIATRY OF EASTERN PA AND SOUTHERN NJ54; 71
NANCY BARON-BAER ASSOCIATE REGIONAL DIRECTOR, ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE'S EASTERN PA/ SOUTHERN NJ/DELAWARE REGIONAL OFFICE
SHARON GIAMPORCARO DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY, MONTGOMERY COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE; CHIEF, JUVENILE DIVISION
MICHAEL J. CROSSEY PRESIDENT, PA STATE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION91
JOAN DUVALL-FLYNN, ED.D. CHAIR, EDUCATION COMMITTEE OF THE PA STATE CONFERENCE OF BRANCHES OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE
LUIS MEDINA BOARD OF DIRECTORS, PA STUDENT EQUALITY COALITION
BAYLIE SAPPIR STUDENT TEACHER, BLOOMSBURG UNIVERSITY122
JASON LANDAU GOODMAN EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PA STUDENT EQUALITY COALITION

	4
TESTIFIERS (cont.'d):	
<u>NAME</u>	PAGE
TAMMY SIMPSON MOTHER OF BRANDON BITNER, SUICIDE VICTIM DUE TO BULLYING	127
SUBMITTED WRITTEN TESTIMONY	
* * *	
PA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION	

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	* * *
3	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Well, good morning,
4	everybody. We welcome you to this, the House Education
5	Committee public hearing on bullying and cyberbullying
6	prevention, and we have legislation that we're going to be
7	considering, HB 2464.
8	Before the prime sponsor gets to that, I'm going
9	to have the Members of the committee introduce themselves
10	so that our testifiers know who we are, and we'll start all
11	the way to my right with Jake Wheatley. Jake.
12	REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Thank you,
13	Mr. Chairman.
14	Jake Wheatley from Allegheny County, the city of
15	Pittsburgh.
16	REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Good morning.
17	Mike O'Brien, Philadelphia.
18	MR. GINGRICH: Dustin Gingrich, Education
19	Committee staff.
20	REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: Good morning.
21	Mark Longietti from Mercer County.
22	MS. SMITH: Good morning.
23	Judy Smith from the Education staff.
24	REPRESENTATIVE QUIGLEY: Representative
25	Tom Quigley from the 146 th District in Montgomery County.

REPRESENTATIVE COX: Representative Jim Cox from 1 2 the 129th District, western Berks County. REPRESENTATIVE TRUITT: I'm Dan Truitt from the 3 156th District in Chester County. 4 5 REPRESENTATIVE HARKINS: Good morning. Pat Harkins, Erie, 1st District. 6 7 REPRESENTATIVE TALLMAN: Will Tallman, the 193, York and Adams Counties. 8 9 REPRESENTATIVE CONKLIN: Scott Conklin, the 10 77th District, Centre County. 11 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: And Eileen Krick is 12 with us, my Administrative Assistant. Well, she was here. 13 I'm not sure -- oh, she's in the back there. 14 I'm Paul Clymer, the Chairman of the House 15 Education Committee. 16 I want to thank everyone who has taken the time 17 to join us today on an important discussion on bullying and cyberbullying in our public school system. Students face a 18 19 lot of challenges and situations as they grow, socialize, 20 and become young adults. However, one challenge no student 2.1 should have to endure is being the target of bullying. 2.2 In the past several years, we have seen 23 headline-making cases of students being tormented and even driven to suicide as a result of cruel and systematic 24

bullying through physical encounters, gossip, photographs,

25

and harassment through e-mails, social media, and texting. In fact, nearly -- and some of these facts I'm sure you'll hear through our testifiers, but it doesn't hurt to be repetitive on this issue. In fact, nearly 12 percent of all students in grades 6, 8, 10, and 12 across Pennsylvania said they have been bullied through the use of the Internet and their cell phones. That's according to the 2009 Pennsylvania Youth Survey, the most recent statistics compiled by the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency. The survey indicated that nonphysical forms of bullying are the most prevalent among our youth, as more than one-half of Pennsylvania students reported that other students tell lies about them or spread false rumors, 43 percent have been called names or teased, and more than 30 percent have been left out of things on purpose.

media sites and carry their own cell phones, which provide gateways to new methods of bullying. That's why cyberbullying is the new approach, since individuals don't have to do it face to face. Our public schools should be a place where children can learn in a safe and nurturing environment, and we as Legislators need to do all we can to make sure that type of environment is supported.

You know, in my generation, I think we had tougher moral standards and guidelines, and though we

didn't have the sophisticated technology as today, I think those moral guidelines kept a number of my generation's classmates in line. But as we slip this slippery slope and we don't have those strong guidelines as we did, bullying is going to become more of a problem.

I look forward to a healthy discussion today on HB 2464, which seeks to amend the Public School Code to require schools to enhance their bullying policies and addresses this growing and quite alarming trend which is taking place in our schools.

And having said that, I'd like to turn the microphone over to Representative Tom Quigley, who is the prime sponsor of HB 2464, for his remarks. Representative Ouigley.

REPRESENTATIVE QUIGLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I want to thank you for conducting this hearing today on this important legislation. I want to thank my colleagues for taking the time out of their schedule to come out here today to address what I think is a growing and important issue that, as you mentioned, with each passing day, it seems there is another story out there about some type of incident or situation that should cause all of us concern as it relates to our children.

You know, this bill -- and I have worked with a number of the stakeholders in crafting this bill and

working through a couple different drafts. I know some of my colleagues, Representative O'Brien and Representative Truitt, also have legislation out there. So it's my hope that today, through this hearing, we can hear from the various stakeholders and craft a product that incorporates all of the important aspects of these various legislations so that we can be ready early in the next session to have something meaningful passed.

2.2

I know that we have a number of testifiers today who are going to share their feedback with us -- what they like about this bill; what they think can be improved upon the bill -- and I really think that's the main focus of this hearing today, is to gather as much information as we can to work with this product but also incorporate the ideas of our colleagues and the different groups so that when we come back in 2013, we'll have something teed up and ready to go in short order next session.

So again, I thank everyone for coming out and taking the time to share their testimony and their ideas, and certainly we'll be working in the coming months to have something crafted that we think can be passed and put into law.

Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks the gentleman for his remarks.

And our first testifier today is Sean A. Fields,
Senior Associate Counsel for the Pennsylvania School Boards
Association.

Mr. Fields, it's a delight to have you with us this morning, and you can begin. Your testimony has been passed out.

MR. FIELDS: Thank you.

2.1

2.2

Good morning. My name is Sean Fields. I'm Senior Associate Counsel with the Pennsylvania School Boards Association.

First of all, I'd like to thank the committee for the opportunity to testify on HB 2464, and I would also like to thank you for the opportunity to be the first one to testify at this hearing this morning.

Rather than read the explicit contents of my testimony, what I'd like to do is just summarize some of the main points and answer any questions that the committee might have about our explicit testimony.

I thought it might be helpful, before I get into the specific contents of the bill, to explain what PSBA has done so far on this issue and our perception on behalf of our members on what's being done in the public school community.

It's important to note that the last amendment to this particular section of the School Code was Act 61 of

2008, and that's important because PSBA gave extensive feedback into that bill. That bill is important because it explicitly required a policy relating to bullying for school districts and school entities and also sets some very definitive parameters for what needed to go into that policy.

2.1

2.2

Subsequent to that, as the Chair really emphasized, there has been a lot of attention given to this issue of bullying in the public schools, and in that spirit, PSBA has always promoted and supported efforts to prevent and eliminate bullying where it can be done.

In keeping with that objective, PSBA actually developed an informal instrument called "Ten Questions a Public School Entity Should be Asking About Bullying Prevention," and the purpose of this informal instrument was to challenge school leaders to ask questions about what they were doing in their policies and procedures to identify bullying, specific bullying issues; to develop prevention programs; and to also provide training, and training not only at all levels of employees within a particular school district but also educating students on the hazards and the problems related to bullying.

We followed up those efforts with a joint participation in the 2011 Safe Schools Conference by appearing with Representatives from the Pennsylvania Human

Relations Commission, the Office for Civil Rights for the U.S. Department of Education, and the Parent Information and Resource Centers. Anecdotally I can say that you'd be hard-pressed to come across a school administrator or school board member or school leader who isn't concerned about this issue. Safety issues and creating a positive school climate are frequently paramount and a baseline thing that needs to be established so that students can take full advantage of an opportunity to get a good public education.

Now I'll shift my comments to some specific concerns related to this bill.

One of the concerns PSBA has -- and again, I want to emphasize that we're certainly supportive of any efforts that would enhance or give school administrators, school leaders, the ability to prevent and eradicate bullying where it occurs. But in terms of some specific concerns related to this bill, this bill would expand the scope of the existing version of Section 1303.1 by including not only "bullying" as defined in the bill but also things like "harassment," "intimidation," and "cyberbullying." It lumps these concepts together without providing a specific legal definition of what those terms mean, and there are a number of problems or a number of concerns related to that.

In terms of harassment, it's important to note that harassment actually has a meaning under Federal law as well. I neglected to say in my testimony that there's a criminal codes definition as well. But in terms of the Federal law, in 2010, specifically October 26, 2010, the Office for Civil Rights issued a "Dear Colleague" letter that reminded schools, public schools, of what they should have already been aware of, and that's that a lot of the conduct when we refer to "bullying" in the context of Pennsylvania State law or even our lay understanding of what we think bullying is, depending on who's being bullied, a lot of this conduct is actually already prohibited by Federal law as illegal harassment, as illegal discrimination. This "Dear Colleague" letter reminded us of that.

So, for example, under Title VI of the Civil
Rights Act of 1964, you are prohibited from discriminating
against a student on the basis of race, color, or national
origin. Under Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of
1972, you cannot discriminate against an individual student
on the basis of sex. Under Title II of the Americans with
Disabilities Act and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act
of 1973, it's illegal under Federal law to discriminate
against a student on the basis of their disability status.

How does that come into play with bullying?

Well, the "Dear Colleague" letter went on to remind us of not only what is in Federal regulations but also what the case law supports, the Federal case law, and that's that if student-on-student harassment rises to the level that it creates a hostile environment and such harassment is encouraged by a school district, is not adequately addressed, or is not adequately ignored, that's illegal discrimination under Federal law.

2.2

So what is a hostile environment under those legal standards? Well, "hostile environment" has been defined by the case law and the regulations as when conduct is "sufficiently severe, pervasive, or persistent" that it basically interferes with the student's rights, their ability to access the benefits of the educational program.

So the reason I raise this issue is "harassment" has a very specific definition and meaning under Federal law, because if a student discriminates against another student on the basis of protected class status, that's illegal discrimination and schools have to respond appropriately to that, not only from a risk management liability perspective, but obviously the goal of these Federal laws is to make sure that students have a positive school climate.

I should also add in talking about this issue of harassment that this kind of conduct is also regulated

under the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act. That's one of the reasons that the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission has also had an interest in this.

Another aspect of the scope of this particular bill that PSBA believes should be given some consideration is the inclusion of "intimidation" in one of the conducts that is prohibited, and as I stated when talking about harassment, because it's lumped in with the other potential offenses, it's not clear exactly what would rise to the level of intimidation when we're dealing with student-on-student bullying.

That's a concern for a couple of issues. First of all, whenever we work with our members in the development of school board policy at the district level, you always have to be concerned that if the conduct that you're prohibiting or that you're going to discipline for is too vague, that increases the likelihood of a successful challenge to that school board policy.

The other thing, on a practical level, if you're looking at enforcement at the building level, I mean, typically school principals are the front line in student discipline as well as teachers. If you don't have a clear definition of what "intimidation" is, it's going to be hard for those school administrators and teachers to know what conduct falls within intimidation and how to enforce that

at the building or the classroom level.

One of the other concerns that PSBA has about some of the provisions in this bill are a couple of sections that create some enhanced liability for school entities, like school districts and intermediate units. One provision of the bill, specifically it's Section 1303.1-A(5), actually creates a new legal duty for a designated school staff person to ensure that a bullying policy is implemented.

PSBA and school solicitors have encouraged school districts and intermediate units and career techs to do is make sure that your implementation happens from a top-to-bottom perspective. In other words, successful implementation isn't simply going to happen if you hold one school employee, designated school employee, responsible.

Successful implementation is actually going to require the entire school community, and in some aspects the parent community and others, to successfully carry out bullying prevention. So PSBA has some concerns about the enhanced liability for those specific individuals.

There's also a section of the bill that requires a statement that is very well intended, and this bill would require a school entity to have language in their policy that states that "...no student shall be subjected to

harassment, intimidation, bullying or cyberbullying in any public educational institution.... The eradication of bullying completely and an incident never occurring, that would be, I think, the goal of anyone in the school community. However, I would urge the committee and this body to be mindful of the fact that even the most proactive school district or intermediate unit or career tech, if you have an entity that has done a very good job identifying specific bullying problems in their school -- if they have a good prevention program; if they're educating their students at all levels, starting in kindergarten and going up through 12th grade; and having a process in place to investigate allegations of bullying and follow through on those allegations to figure out what the next step is -you could have a district or an intermediate unit or career tech with the best program around and those entities would not be able to ensure that no student was ever bullied or harassed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, what they should make sure of, they should do their dead-level best to put in place policies and procedures to prevent such conduct, and they should also make sure that they have an adequate procedure in place for parents and students to report incidents of bullying and follow through on that. But a school district is not going to be able to ensure that these incidents never occur, so

we have a concern about the enhanced liability, although as I said at the outset, the intent is to prevent and reduce bullying to the extent the school entity has the power to do so.

2.2

I'd like to shift my comments to provisions of the bill that require community involvement in the adoption of a bullying policy. PSBA has always supported and encouraged community engagement in the endeavors of a school district or an intermediate unit, and certainly we've encouraged that kind of community engagement when it comes to the implementation of the policy.

When it comes to the specific adoption of policy,
I think it's important to note that because policy at the
school district level has the force and effect of local
law, because it's analogous to an ordinance that a
municipality would pass or a different board would pass,
because of that reason and the fact that school districts'
boards pass policies in consideration of a number of
factors, including the financial costs, school district
operations, and legal considerations, it's possible that
this language could be overly burdensome in the district
actually passing these policies.

The other thing I would note is that another section of the bill requires the Department of Education to adopt a model policy, and that would seem somewhat

inconsistent with the notion that you would have the community provide or actually be a part of the adoption process. Certainly we would encourage as a best practice that kind of community engagement to identify specific bullying problems. You might have a particular group of students within a particular school district who are being targeted. You might have a particular part of the building where you're having specific problems, and that community feedback is going to be key to that, but we need to be careful about where we put the community-engagement piece in the process of actually adopting the policy.

In terms of another issue -- and this was mentioned by the Chair, and it's one of the things that has changed significantly in the school community within the last 10 years, 10 to 15 years -- is the issue of electronic communications. This particular bill would require a school entity's policy to be applicable to electronic communications "whether or not the act originated on school property or with school equipment." This is a concern for a number of reasons, and this is an area that, in all candor, is a topic of frustration for school officials who want to discipline for electronic communications, and part of the challenge for Pennsylvania public school districts is the scope of authority that we have to discipline for such things and some open questions related to the scope of

our authority to regulate cyberbullying or cyber speech.

authority under Section 510 of the School Code, Section 510 of the School Code gives school districts the authority to discipline students while they are under the supervision of teachers and principals. So at school-sponsored events, when coming or going from school or during class hours, we have clear authority to discipline for that kind of conduct, and arguably that extends to the use of a district's server or district's computer equipment.

Under Section 510 of the Pennsylvania School

Code, there is case law that supports the proposition that this authority extends to those instances where there is a nexus or connection between conduct that occurs off campus and conduct that occurs on campus. A classic example of this, in this case that's cited in my written testimony, is the J.S. v. Bethlehem Area School District, and this was a Pennsylvania Supreme Court case where a student targeted a teacher, created a Website called "Teacher Sucks" targeting the math teacher, and also said some pretty ugly things about the teacher — had an image of the teacher morphing into Hitler; suggested that a contract should be taken out to kill this teacher. And in that case, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court affirmed the district's ability, their authority, to discipline for that kind of off-campus

conduct, even though that was created during nonschool hours outside of the school.

A couple of recent cases, however, have called our authority as public school entities to discipline for that kind of conduct into doubt. The Layshock v. Hermitage Area School District and the J.S. v. Blue Mountain School District were cases that involved students who created social media profiles on MySpace. No one uses MySpace anymore, so that shows how fast these things change. But what the students did is they created mock profiles of these administrators, holding them up to ridicule. In the Layshock case, the Layshock profile suggested that the principal might be a drug user, might be a marijuana user, and the J.S. v. Blue Mountain profile was even uglier in that it implied that the school principal might actually be a pedophile.

Obviously a lot of school administrators would take the position that you could discipline for that kind of conduct. And in both of those cases, by the way, those profiles were created off campus. These cases had a very long procedural history, but at the end of that tunnel what happened is, the U.S. Third Circuit Court of Appeals heard these cases through oral argument before the full court, and the court concluded that the district did not have the authority to discipline these students for this kind of

conduct. Even though, arguably, this kind of language was lewd, vulgar, and offensive, these are the kinds of things you would typically be able to regulate, a student's speech. If a student engaged in this kind of speech in the school, there's U.S. constitutional authority, Supreme Court authority, that tells us that we have the authority to discipline for that kind of conduct. But the Third Circuit said, in this particular instance, districts don't have the authority to discipline for that kind of speech when it's created off campus.

Now, even though those cases involved school administrators as the target and didn't involve student-on-student bullying, unfortunately, that leaves an open question with respect to the scope of our authority to discipline for this kind of conduct. And for this reason, a district that wants to step into the realm of regulating cyberbullying, they have to consider that legal framework and whether or not the district's policy is going to hold up to a constitutional challenge.

And that was one of the important considerations with Act 61 of 2008. If you look at the current version of that section of the School Code, what you will see is that districts have the option of regulating that kind of conduct that would originate outside of the campus, and that's important, because you will inevitably have some

school entities that will be willing to regulate that conduct, even with the kinds of legal questions that exist. You will have others, on the advice of their solicitors, that may decide, we need to see what happens in the case law; we need to see if there might be legislation down the road that might be able to correct this.

So those are some real concerns, because as has been stated already, technology has changed a lot. It's a major issue. There was a time when if a student was a target, that student could at least seek solace in going home, leaving the school day outside of school hours, and we know with the advent of technology -- and the students are usually much better than we are at using the technology in creative ways -- that you can't get away from it if you're a student. So this is an area that school entities would very much like to discipline and regulate, but there are some real questions about our limitations.

The other piece of this legislation generally that I'd like to address is the enhanced reporting requirements. There are a couple of places that require school entities to report incidents involving bullying, intimidation, and harassment, specifically in the criminal context, and PSBA thinks it's important to note that if we look at Section 1303-A, there are already a number of incidents that school entities are already required to

report. In that particular section of the School Code, the chief school administrator has to provide an annual report of specific enumerated incidents to the Office of Safe Schools. And in terms of reporting to police or having cooperation with local law enforcement, that section also requires the chief school administrator, which would include folks like superintendents, to assure that the school entity enters into a memorandum of understanding with local law enforcement related not only to cooperation with local law enforcement but specifically reporting.

So when we're considering additional reporting requirements, PSBA thinks it's a good idea to take a look at Section 1303-A, make sure or consider any duplication that might exist between the proposed language and what's already there, and also make sure there isn't any undue confusion in what the school entities might be required to report.

I'd like to close with just a couple of brief comments, and then I'd be more than happy to take the committee's questions.

PSBA applauds this committee and any efforts to combat bullying and harassment in the public schools. We believe a lot of good work is already being done to advance those efforts. However, we do have a number of specific technical concerns with the legislation, and we'd be more

than happy to work with this committee or any legislative staffers on giving our feedback on that language.

So once again I'd like to thank you, and I'd be more than happy to take any questions.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks the gentleman for his very good testimony.

A couple of thoughts. You did mention that the school boards have their solicitors and that's the direction they should go. If there is a problem here, they could always go to the Pennsylvania School Boards

Association, but their local solicitor would also be an important resource for defining whether they're within the law or not.

One of the issues, just an observation, is students within the school itself, whether it be at a college, university, or secondary school, they could form their own group -- not form their own group, but an organization wearing pins or ribbons and opposing school bullying that would indicate that that is something that they oppose, and they could be making a statement. And the reason I say that is because in the past, I've worked with Students Against Underage Drinking, and they're very effective in their own organization trying to reach out to students and say, you know, this is something you need to be very careful about. So that is another tool, if

necessary. I'm sure some students are already doing that,
and I see in the audience we have a group of students who

At this time, the Chair recognizes Representative Longietti for questions.

6 REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: Thank you,
7 Mr. Chairman.

have undertaken that.

2.1

2.2

So yesterday I had a phone call from a student in my district who stated that she has been the victim of bullying and felt that the school district did not act appropriately in terms of sanctions in that case. So that poses the question of, you know, what do we do if a school district doesn't act appropriately under the circumstances, and how far do we go legislatively?

I mean, she actually advocated the idea that legislation should actually spell out sanctions when certain types of bullying occur. You know, there are obviously some pitfalls to trying to do that. And, you know, we went down that road a little bit before I was here with the weapons policy and then made exceptions to it. But what are we to do, if anything, legislatively to address the issue of that occasional school district that perhaps doesn't act appropriately when bullying is brought to their attention?

MR. FIELDS: Well, there are a couple of

considerations. I think the current version of Section 1303.1-A already went a long way in 2008 with making certain that districts had to have a policy relating to bullying.

2.1

I think it's important in the abstract that districts have adequate reporting procedures for students and a procedure in place for the district to investigate, follow through, and come to some kind of conclusion.

Unfortunately, I don't think, regardless of whatever language you might come up with, you're never going to be able to completely satisfy every student or parent or eradicate every instance.

But it's also important to note, particularly if you're dealing with one of the categories of protected classes under Federal law, that students could also take legal action that's short of initiating litigation against a district if they didn't do what they were supposed to do. But they could also go through the Office for Civil Rights. There's a complaint process there. Now, that only applies to those instances where the student is the target based on protected-class status.

But in terms of general concepts that might help advance the ball in terms of combating bullying, I would just say that districts already are required to have a policy in place. Districts need to have a complaint

procedure and a follow-through procedure for investigations.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

In terms of the issue of specific penalties for specific kinds of activities, one of the things we have to keep in mind is that usually the perpetrator is another student, and it may in fact be a student who was the victim of bullying at some point in time. I'm not a social scientist, but there is research to indicate that. So when a school administrator is considering discipline against an individual student or if it rises to the level where the superintendent thinks it might warrant expulsion and the school board would have to decide that, they're typically going to make the decision with respect to penalty based on a number of different factors. They're going to base it on the degree of the conduct: How egregious was it? Has it been a repeated kind of thing? What does the student's discipline record look like: Is this the first time the student has been in trouble?

And one of the pitfalls with doing an enumerated set of penalties like you would find in the Crimes Code is you would take that latitude away from school administrators, and we've seen that in instances -- you mentioned weapons. You know, the current state of the School Code with respect to weapons essentially says if a school administrator catches a student with a weapon,

there's a mandatory expulsion for 1 year unless the superintendent makes a recommendation for a lesser penalty. So what we've seen with that as an example are situations where boards don't have the ability to exercise any judgment, so if a student inadvertently happens to have an item -- that is obvious to everyone was a mistake -- that is a weapon, they don't have any latitude to exercise any judgment. So that would be one of the pitfalls, but certainly our organization would work with this committee or any staffers on any ideas related to that.

2.2

REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. And it is a difficult issue to deal with.

Your responses were similar to what I told the student.

Civil rights claims could be available. That certainly is an imperfect system. And obviously it's difficult for school districts, particularly in a cyberbullying situation.

The Layshock case was in my legislative district, and the complaint that I got was in regard to the same school district. So school districts are trying to sort out what they're supposed to do to avoid lawsuits on both ends, and I certainly appreciate the need for discretion. But it shows you, I think all of us here could identify situations where, for whatever reason, bullying is not being appropriately addressed, and I think that's why

```
1
       you're seeing legislation not only from Representative
 2
       Quigley but from Representative O'Brien and others.
 3
                 Thank you.
 4
                 MR. FIELDS: Thank you.
                 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair recognizes
 5
 6
       Representative Wheatley for a question.
 7
                 REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Thank you,
      Mr. Chairman.
 8
 9
                 And I'm over here, Mr. Fields, hiding in the
10
       corner.
11
                MR. FIELDS: I'm sorry. Good morning.
12
                 REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Good morning.
                                                          How are
13
       you doing?
14
                 MR. FIELDS: Doing well. Thanks.
15
                 REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Thank you for your
16
       testimony. I have a couple of questions, and I'm not sure
17
       if you'll be able to respond to them all here.
                 One is, does your organization track or is there
18
19
       some system that's tracking just how frequent this is
20
       occurring in school? How frequent is bullying or
2.1
       cyberbullying or some of this occurring out here?
2.2
                MR. FIELDS: Our organization does not
       specifically track the incidents of bullying, and one of
23
24
       the things you'd have to do is make sure you have it
       defined adequately, whether or not you're defining it in
25
```

terms of the statutory definition in the School Code or whether or not you're going with a more research based. If you look at the research, Olweus provides a lot of training and resources. They have a specific definition. Patchin and Hinduja are a couple of researchers that have another definition. So you need to make sure that you had a definition that you could track.

The Office of Safe Schools, as I mentioned during my testimony, collects statistics, but those statistics, to the best of my knowledge, relate more to conduct that's going to rise to the level of criminal incidents. But the short answer to your question is, our organization does not collect data.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: And according to you, you mentioned earlier in your testimony that in Act 61, we further expanded some authority for the boards, the districts out there, and we define "bullying" in there. The definition of "bullying" that was defined in there, is that somehow different than what the research defines "bullying" as?

MR. FIELDS: Well, if you just give me just a moment, I think I actually have the definition here.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: And you can forward that.

MR. FIELDS: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: You don't have to take up -- you can forward it.

MR. FIELDS: Well, I think it's like anything you deal with. In most statutes, you're going to have a specific legal definition that has ramifications for how a student is disciplined and what is required to go into the policy.

There are characteristics that are very similar. If you look at a lot of the research, and again, I'm not a social scientist; I'm a school attorney, but "bullying" tends to be defined as something that is repeated conduct that targets another student. Usually there's a power indifference involved, and it includes a lot of different kinds of things, including physical bullying and obviously things like verbal bullying, and we've had lots of discussions about cyberbullying being included. So frequently, the legal definition is different than what the researchers might identify from a social science or even an education perspective.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: And the reason I'm asking that is because what kind of prompted me to ask you a question, you kept referring to what's already in law, Federal law, for protected classes. So it was making me think that your organization or some organization out there is tracking the amounts of incidents, and maybe your data

is showing you that students who are in these protective classes are the ones who are more likely to be bullied.

Otherwise, I guess, where would the student who is not in a protected class but is being bullied or intimidated by another student who is not of a protected class, where would they turn? And so I think I heard you answer part of that saying, depending on the level of that bullying, that it may be something that could essentially be, you know, of a physical nature or something that could be of a criminal nature that could be turned over.

But I'm saying the atmosphere of bullying; again, the Chairman mentioned back in the day when he was coming through. And I will tell you, when I was growing up, I'm just glad that we're even talking about this subject, because when I was growing up, there was no person you could turn to for bullying except, you know, either taking the occasions of being a bully or figuring out how you were going to defend yourself at some point, and that was just the way it was. You didn't have a safe school advocate; you didn't have a teacher or anything else. So where would that student turn to now? Is that a standardized process in these school districts that everyone knows? And you talked about, I think some of it you were saying your organization directs to districts, kind of like how they can monitor their polices to make sure they have polices

that will meet the law of requirement. But who actually monitors to make sure that environment is being one that is created?

MR. FIELDS: Other than at the local district level, I mean, the first responsibility is the responsibility of the school district to make sure that they have a policy that complies with existing law, but also, even more importantly, to make sure that they're actually carrying out that policy. We're aware of a number of instances with our members in some cases where if the district doesn't actually follow through and carry through the policy, sometimes that's worse than not having the policy at all. So it has to start at the district level.

Beyond that, in terms of any regulation, for the protected classes you might possibly have some intervention by the Office for Civil Rights or the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission. But other than that, to the best of my knowledge, there isn't some super authority that's making certain that districts are carrying out their policies.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: And then my last question, so just I'm clear on what you are testifying today, you are testifying today to say the current bills that we have before us or this particular bill that we have before us doesn't really help the districts do the ultimate

job of what we want them to do, one, because of some definition questions, one, because of some clarity questions -- or I'm sorry -- some litigation questions that may open the districts up to further litigation without some specificity to them, but you are not against -- or maybe again I need your clarity -- you are not against the State saying to districts that you have a responsibility to not only have a policy but to have some mechanism to monitor that policy's effectiveness to make sure we are actually eliminating the occasions and incidents of bullying.

2.1

2.2

MR. FIELDS: I think our organization would have to see specific language and analyze the ramifications of that.

And in response to another point you made, even though there are going to be some students who are not going to fall into one of those categories of protected classes, the current definition of "bullying" in the School Code would cover a lot of those students. And in addition to this, districts do have the authority to pass rules and regulations at the district level, certainly in instances where those students are under the supervision of teachers and administrators.

So again, I think any effect of measures that enhance elimination or reduction of bullying, they're

ultimately going to have to start at the school district level, because that's really ground zero in the battle. That's where it starts; that's where it begins.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Sure.

2.1

MR. FIELDS: And it's not just -- a lot of the times we read the press reports, and we have a number of examples of this happening in the middle school and high school levels, but it starts with educating kindergarten students on nice words and not-so-nice words.

And I'll also add that one of the benefits of having a district-based approach is you have professional educators at that level, and so while I can tell you a lot about school law, I couldn't begin to tell you what would be an effective education program for a second grader to educate them on bullying.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Sure.

MR. FIELDS: Because if I talk to my 7-year-old twins and I say, "Well, don't engage in conduct that is severe, persistent, or pervasive against Johnny," they're not going to understand that.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Right.

MR. FIELDS: But if you talk to them about bullying and generally what it means to respect other people, they understand that. So it's not only an issue of discipline and enforcement, but there's a resource at the

1 district level that you can utilize.

2 REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes Representative Cox for questions.

REPRESENTATIVE COX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Like Representative Longietti, and I think probably other Members of the committee and other Members of the House, I, too, hear from parents and students regarding bullying. I don't hear from them as much about cyberbullying. I think the media has taken some of these things, and so that has become the focus. And I think on some levels that's unfortunate that that appears to be the primary focus, and it kind of takes the focus off or the attention off of the fact that more traditional bullying is still taking place on an everyday basis. And, you know, some of these instances that I hear about are straight out of, you know, a poorly made 1980-something made-for-TV movie about bullying, but these things are happening and they're continuing to happen on a daily basis.

I know there are parents and students who don't come to me, but what I hear frequently is that they understand, and you mentioned it a moment ago, you know, that they have a policy in place, and the parents look at the policy and they say, okay, this is what's supposed to

happen and this is what you're supposed to do when this happens and when I report the behavior, and nothing happens, and so we essentially have a policy that either isn't being enforced or it's a policy that has no teeth.

And I'm finding that this is not just, you know, one school district within my legislative district. I have three entire school districts and two others, and I'm hearing it from all of them. So it's not isolated, I don't think, to a handful of school districts, and I've talked to other Representatives who have said, hey, we're hearing some of the same things.

I have seen a correlation as well. I don't think the younger ages, at least in my district I'm not seeing the younger ages as being the problem. Most of my school districts, the parents will come in and give rave reviews about the types of behavior that is acceptable and how bullying is dealt with on the younger grade levels.

My daughter had an incident in fourth grade. She told her teacher about it. The world of the little girl who bullied my daughter, her world came crashing down. She had to apologize. She had to stand up in front of the class and talk about types of behavior that are acceptable and not acceptable. I think she had a partial -- she had some sort of extra work assignments. I mean, her world vastly changed, and as a result, this girl's behavior

toward my daughter changed and there was never anything else. I can't say they're best of friends, but there has not been any incident since then.

2.2

But parents have told me that the incidents as they reach middle school start to increase, and then in high school it goes back to, like I said, the more traditional bullying -- sports teams picking on nonsport individuals. The "geeks," whatever you want to call them, whatever terminology that kids are applying to the kids today that don't fit their mold, they're still being bullied, and I have a real problem with that.

think is, you know, that the entire school community is supposed to work together to report these things? I just submit that the cooperative effort is exactly what failed in the Penn State scandal. There was, you know, "You were supposed to report"; "You were supposed to report"; "No, I reported it here." You know, everybody was able to pass the buck because there was not one individual or one office where you could say, I went there; they dropped the ball; and increased liability or not, they knew about it and did nothing.

To me, that's where parents are telling me they don't feel like they have anywhere to go. They don't have the ability to point the finger and say, "I told him on

this day, this day, and this day and nothing happened." So making a legal case or whatever becomes a mish-mosh of "he said, she said," "I thought I told him," and it's a mess.

We need a law with teeth. I don't think we should go down the road of the zero tolerance where the first time a kid bullies, he gets, you know, suspended for a week. I defended students who brought nail clippers to school under the zero-tolerance weapons policy in a previous job, and so I know the dangers of, you know, the zero tolerance, the school board having no authority whatsoever. But at the same time, we've got to have something with teeth. Parents are sick and tired of their children feeling helpless.

I don't think it's any coincidence that cyber schools have become available opportunities and alternatives to traditional schools, traditional public schools, or private schools for that matter. I pulled my son out of a private school. He actually asked to come home. It was a private school, and bullying was happening. I talked to the administration: "Oh, yeah, we'll do this; we're going to put a policy in place." They didn't even have to put a policy in place necessarily. And time and time again I went to them. Ultimately, my son is at home. He's being cyber-schooled. And guess what? My wife is not bullying him, neither are his siblings.

But I do think that there's a lot to be said for why we're seeing parents looking for alternative forms of education or of educating their children. They don't -- they're tired of it. And a lot of the people that I've interacted with in the cyber school movement, bullying is a key factor. It is huge, and so we have got to address it. I'm all for cyber-schooling if that's what parents want, but it should be a choice they make because it works for them, not because they feel like they don't have another choice.

So I'll go back to the idea that a single person or an office that has that full responsibility, that's key. That's one of the reasons I like this bill. There is a consolidation, if you will.

Anonymous tips, things like that, are very important. We use them in other areas, child abuse reporting and things like that; why can't we use them when a child himself feels he's being abused? Why does he not have the ability to say "I'm being abused" anonymously if that's his only comfort level?

So I made more of a statement. I would like you to comment on the cooperative effort thing, because how do you feel that a cooperative effort is going to somehow work here when it has failed in other scenarios?

MR. FIELDS: Well, I don't want to overreach or

engage in any puffery on the cooperative-effort portion of my statements. The area where we have particularly encouraged a cooperative effort is the identification of specific bullying problems, and the way it incorporates the entire school community in terms of enforcement is ensuring that you have that reporting process in place and that investigative process in place and, more importantly, that students and parents are aware of that -- you know, what do you do? Who do you report it to? And in referring to the entire school community, we would include not only parents but employees at every level.

2.2

defend the cooperative effort in a specific sense, our organization still believes that that's going to be the key to any effective efforts to deal with this issue. And that's reflected in my testimony, that you can make one designated person specifically responsible for implementation, but implementation within a school entity that consists of, in some cases, thousands of students and in some cases thousands of employees, if you don't have a systematic effort that's district based, I'm not sure how much that's going to advance the ball in terms of combating bullying.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks the gentleman for his question and turns to

Representative Tallman for a question.

2 REPRESENTATIVE TALLMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Sean, for being here this morning.

And I want to compliment you, because when I read the bill,

I had the same questions on "intimidation" and "harassment"

-- what is the actual definition of those terms? -- and I

think we need to define those, because I think that could

lead us down a wrong path.

So let me ask you, and I think Representative Wheatley kind of asked this question; I want to ask you direct: Are the current statutes and regulations we have in place, are they adequate to take care of bullying and cyberbullying, because you've cited several instances in your testimony where, hey, it's already there.

MR. FIELDS: My belief is that with what currently exists, and if a district has a policy that addresses those concerns that I have articulated this morning, that a district would have an adequate policy in place. Now, that presupposes that they're actually executing what's in policy, because what I mentioned during one of my comments is that you could have the best policy in the world, and if it's not implemented and executed, it's really not doing the students or the teachers or the administrators very much good. But I think what you currently have in place, between the directives we've been

given by OCR with respect to Federal law and what currently exists in the School Code, may be adequate to address it systemically.

Could more be done in terms of prevention programs? Could more be done in terms of education programs? We haven't collected data on how many districts actually have programs in place, but I can tell you anecdotally, it's pretty hard to run into a district or an administrator where a district is not doing these kinds of things, not doing extensive prevention and education efforts for students. I mentioned my sons earlier. It started in kindergarten; it continues.

So I think the scheme you have currently likely is effective to address this. And moreover, there was a lot of input into Act 61 by various interests, not just PSBA, but the Department of Education analyzed that, and there were also, I believe, some student-rights advocates who also looked at the constitutional ramifications that I mentioned during my testimony this morning.

REPRESENTATIVE TALLMAN: Thank you.

Just, you know, Representative Cox said that the few -- I haven't had near that many -- the few that have received this, the school district hasn't done anything.

They have a policy on the books, but they don't do anything. So that may be the issue.

Let me ask one more question, and we have Hannah present here, and we may need to ask her. But anyway, this bill puts procedures in place, policies, requires personnel to do things that haven't been done before, and I'm always concerned about putting mandates on school districts and the costs involved. Do you have an estimate? Because we've also established some legal liability under this bill as it's currently written. Would you give an estimate on what the impact on cost would be to the school district to implement this?

2.2

MR. FIELDS: I appreciate your concern about the cost, because that's obviously always a concern in the current climate. To the best of my knowledge, we have not collected any estimates on the cost from a personnel perspective of carrying this out. We have identified the litigation concerns.

And that's not always just a financial decision.

I think we always have to be mindful whenever we take on additional statutory or policy responsibilities. If those come with an additional cost, there is a chance that we end up actually taking away resources from education program efforts to combat bullying or some prevention program. A number of districts have gone with programs like Olweus or things being offered by Patchin and Hinduja. There are a number of different programs out there that are being

offered for a fee, and a number of districts are spending money on those programs to combat the problem, so I think we always have to be concerned about that. But the short answer to your question is, we have not estimated the cost of this.

REPRESENTATIVE TALLMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes Representative Smith for a question.

Thank you, Mr. Fields, for your testimony today.

As I listened to your testimony and the opinion

of, I guess the opinion of PSBA, my thought in my head was

this was a very bureaucratic response, convoluted response

to a situation in our schools throughout this Commonwealth.

It is very serious and is at the level of epidemic.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My hope is, moving forward, that we would take a more commonsense approach and listen to the parents and listen to the students so that we could, at the end of the day, use their ideas and their testimony and less input from the bureaucrats and less input from the lawyers and sometimes their paralyzing process. And you spoke about how on the Federal level there are many laws already put into place. Well, here's an answer from somebody that hears from the school districts and the parents every

single day: It's not working. It's broken, and it needs to be fixed.

Now, my hope is that after listening to you, you had referenced the Federal level. Well, if we have to wait for the Federal level, whether it be, let's just say

Congress to get their act together, this is going to be a long journey that's going to outlive most of us in this room, because it just doesn't seem to happen there.

But in hope, I think I heard from you that it is better to do this on a local level, and my question to you is, do you feel and is PSBA comfortable with allowing the local level to do what they need to do, because they're in the trenches and they see it. Each school district is their own entity and has their own needs. Do you understand what I'm saying?

MR. FIELDS: Is the question whether or not PSBA is comfortable with the authority remaining at the local level? Is that your question?

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Yes.

MR. FIELDS: Well, to the extent that the decisions are being made at the local level in compliance with existing laws, and I don't want to sound like a bureaucrat, or I certainly don't want to sound convoluted, but you're looking at a piece of legislation that's going to have not only an impact on students and teachers and

implications. And the nature of public school, public education, is that it's a highly regulated environment currently. That is the terrain we find ourselves on. And if you talk to any teacher or school administrator, they didn't go to school to become a teacher or an administrator to become a legal scholar, but now we're in a situation where we have to actually offer them that training, including in an area like bullying.

2.2

So I think we would take the position that, again, this can be more effectively combated at the local level, but it does require those local school districts and our other members to be aware of what exists in current State and Federal law, to adopt a policy that's consistent with that, and more importantly, to execute that.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Good. I'm happy with that, and I think that this piece of legislation by Representative Quigley and the piece of legislation by Representative O'Brien, I think it's a step in the right direction. I just hope that we take the roadblocks down and allow us to move forward through the parents, through the students, and the local school districts. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FIELDS: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks the

gentleman and recognizes Representative O'Brien for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You finished your testimony by saying "I can tell you a lot about the law," but I've got to tell you,

Mr. Fields, you don't know a lot about the pain of kids.

You don't know a whole lot about a young fellow frail of frame who spends years and years with questions of his sexuality. You don't know the pain of someone of bulk, of girth -- me -- and the years of the jibes.

And when I was a kid in school, you could find solace with a friendly teacher, with your friends, but now in this day and age it goes on and it goes on and it goes on through social media.

But, you know, it's very interesting that

New Jersey came up with a bill, and I have no shame in

saying that the bill I introduced modeled heavily upon it,

and I see elements of it in Representative Quigley's bill.

Interestingly enough, in the first year of the New Jersey

bill being in effect, 12,244 cases of bullying, harassment,

were reported up through the chain. But do you know what

was even more interesting than that? There was a

reciprocal drop in cases reported in these schools of

assaults, fights, criminal threats. Isn't that

interesting? Isn't that interesting? And it seems the

simple good was achieved by establishing a central chain of command, if you will.

Now, maybe I'm picking on Mark, and Mark goes to the bully person in the school. Maybe all it requires is "Yo, Mike, knock it off." Perhaps it requires what was experienced by Representative Cox's daughter. But you lay out this lengthy bureaucracy, but it's not helping the kid. It's not protecting the kid. This is a very simple, direct way to reduce these incidences of bullying. So do me a favor, stop playing the lawyer for one second and tell me why we can't, and tell me from your point of view how we can.

MR. FIELDS: With all due respect---

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Yeah; I have to interrupt here and say, Representative O'Brien, the gentleman is here to give his testimony on HB 2464.

REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: I withdraw, Mr. Chair.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: All right. He withdraws the question. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes Representative Truitt.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUITT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Sean, for your testimony.

As usually happens to me, Representative Tallman took my question. But I just want to pinpoint and establish very clearly, I'm hearing conflicting things in

your testimony in that you're saying, you talk a lot about existing law and so forth. And it's no secret I have introduced a similar bill, and on my Facebook page, one of my constituents wrote back something to the effect of "We already have enough laws to bury the bullies. What about..." and then he went into other areas that he was more concerned about.

So my question is similar to what Representative Tallman said. To put a very fine point on it, do you think the current laws are working?

MR. FIELDS: That's obviously a bit of a loaded question, because---

REPRESENTATIVE TRUITT: It's really a "yes" or "no" question. Do you think they're working?

MR. FIELDS: Well, if you're the victim of this kind of conduct and you don't feel like your district has adequately addressed it, you're going to feel like the current laws aren't working. But in terms of just focusing on the statutory scheme that's in place, I think you have, what you at least have is a baseline for a current structure that could effectively work if a district has an effective policy. And it's not just simply a matter of a bureaucratic overlay. The reason you would have a policy in place with reporting procedures and investigation procedures is not only to comply with the law but to

effectively deal with that.

And, you know, when we use these terms, we think in terms of some kind of government or bureaucratic investigation, but it's frequently an informal way for an administrator to find out what happened to a student by talking to students. So I think you currently have a framework that could be effective in any school district, and certainly PSBA is willing to continue to provide its feedback and work with this committee and work with any staffers on any proposed language that might improve this.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUITT: I'll take that as a no, it's not working.

And, you know, frankly what we do as a Legislature, we pass laws to give certain abilities to local governments or our school districts or whatever, and if they don't work, you know, then we have to go back and fix them. If we give school districts a certain amount of latitude to deal with bullying and after a few years we decide it's not working, then obviously we have to tighten it up a bit.

So the point that I'm simply trying to make is,
we do have all these laws in existence, but they're not
working, and so now we have to go back and revisit it. And
I just want to make sure that my colleagues understand -and I think everybody's in agreement or we wouldn't be

1 | having this hearing -- that something needs to be done.

And I do appreciate your input. I think there are things that can be done to address the specific concerns that you raised, but in the end, we have to come up with something new and we've got to get it passed.

Thank you.

2.1

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Attorney Fields, thank you very much for your testimony here today. It was very helpful, and this is just the beginning. You're the lead-off man, along with Representative Quigley here, to testify as we broaden our scope and find ways that we can deal with this issue.

And there are many things that we can enter into.

I'm not going to get involved in those, because we want to

bring in our next testifiers, but thank you very much for

joining us today.

MR. FIELDS: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Next on the panel of testifiers is the Anti-Defamation League panel, and the Chair welcomes to testify Nancy Baron-Baer, the Associate Regional Director of Eastern Pennsylvania/Southern

New Jersey/Delaware of the Anti-Defamation League;

Sharon Giamporcaro, Deputy District Attorney,

Montgomery County District Attorney's Office; and

1 Dr. Fayez El-Gabalawi, President of the Eastern 2 Pennsylvania-Southern New Jersey Regional Council of Child 3 and Adolescent Psychiatry. Dr. Fayez, did I do it right or---4 5 DR. EL-GABALAWI: Very close. 6 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Very close? Well, 7 would you like to---DR. EL-GABALAWI: Yes. It's Fayez El-Gabalawi. 8 9 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Gabalawi. 10 DR. EL-GABALAWI: Yes; that's correct. 11 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Okay. Not bad. 12 So we have your testimony, and if 13 Nancy Baron-Baer would like to start the testimony, you may 14 begin. 15 MS. BARON-BAER: Thank you, Chairman Clymer, and 16 thank you to the entire panel for convening this hearing 17 today. It's such an important issue, and we appreciate the time that you took out of your schedules to be here. 18 19 As we heard, my name is Nancy Baron-Baer, and I 20 am the Associate Regional Director at the Anti-Defamation 2.1 League, and we are here today to present testimony in favor 2.2 of bill 2464. For nearly 100 years, the Anti-Defamation League 23 24 has fought anti-Semitism and prejudice and bigotry on all

fronts. We have long been at the forefront of national,

25

State, and local initiatives and efforts to deter and to counteract all kinds of hatred and intolerance. Our diversity and our anti-bias education programs have reached over 56 million youth and adults across the world. We have seen firsthand through our work the effects that bullying can have, both around the country and here locally in the State of Pennsylvania.

The passage of anti-bullying legislation is critical so that we can secure a safe learning environment for all of our students. Forty-nine States plus the District of Columbia have bullying laws in place. We have a bullying law in place, but it is not as comprehensive, it is not as thorough or as effective as it can be.

We have developed curricula and programming for teachers, students, and the community at ADL on how to respond to bullying and how to respond to cyberbullying, and we have developed model bullying legislation that has been introduced throughout the country. This bill that we are discussing today is based on that model legislation, and we believe that any comprehensive anti-bullying bill should have, as part of its components, the following:

- A strong definition of bullying and cyberbullying;
- Two, notice requirements for students and parents where there are clear reporting procedures;

• Three, make sure that we have training for our teachers. To pass a bill that does not include training is toothless. We cannot expect all personnel at schools, we can't expect the teachers, the custodians, the people who work in the cafeteria, to know automatically what to do without proper training;

 And also, we need to make sure that we develop, introduce, and implement curriculum that is age-appropriate for the students in our schools.

HB 2464 would require the Pennsylvania Department of Education to develop a model policy as well as training materials that will help the schools to implement the policies. It would require that each school district tailor its policies particularly to their needs in their particular community. It would require, unlike before, that districts work with many aspects of their community — the parents, the students, law enforcement, other stakeholders — so that we create the most effective policy we can.

Children today have ready access at almost any time of the day or the night to the Internet, and we have to deal with that and we have to deal with the issue of off-campus bullying when there's a connection to the school

1 environment. The bill addresses that in particular. School officials will be able to respond to cyberbullying 3 when there is a nexus -- and again, there must be a nexus -- between the off-campus actions and what happens in 4

school with school learning.

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The bill encourages schools to create bullying prevention task forces, and you'll hear a little bit more from some of the other individuals that are here about where we can partner with our parents and community members to work together.

School policies will not only include strategies for providing counseling but also referral services, but not only to the victim, because there are other parties involved here. We need to educate the bystanders. We need to make sure that we help the perpetrators of bullying, too, and all of their family members. The bill does not discuss or provide for criminal penalties for any offense committed, but it does require that there be a procedure in place for reporting to the proper authorities anything that may constitute criminal activity.

We believe that bullying can produce very devastating effects and consequences and is often a precursor to much more serious kinds of criminal behavior. There was an Associated Press survey in 2009, and in that survey, 60 percent of young people that have been bullied

reported that destructive behavior such as smoking cigarettes, drinking alcohol, using illegal drugs, or shoplifting was something that they engaged in. Children who are bullied are also much more likely to suffer from depression, anxiety, loneliness, lower self-esteem, and most importantly, thoughts of suicide.

That same survey from the Associated Press said that targets of digital abuse from our cyberbullying are twice as likely to report having received treatment from mental health professionals. Again, we will hear more about this in a minute.

That same survey found that bullied students were three times more likely to consider dropping out of school. If our students can't concentrate on the material they are given in school and have to consider dropping out, how will we in Pennsylvania advance the learning process?

In 2009 there was a study by the Cyberbullying Research Center, and it found that students who were bullied were one and a half to two times more likely to have attempted suicide. The children who actually do the bullying — the perpetrators — are more likely than their peers to engage in physical violence, vandalism, smoking, drinking, school absenteeism. Increases in youth violence, school harassment, and bullying pose significant threats to school safety and the academic achievement. It is well

1 known that if you do not feel safe, you cannot learn.

Unfortunately in Pennsylvania, we have not been immune to the tragedies that come from violence and suicide due to bullying. Unfortunately, we have a number of examples of students in recent years from all over the State who have been victims.

For instance, Nadin Khoury -- this was national news a little over a year ago -- is a 13-year-old boy from Upper Darby. It happens that he comes from Liberia. He was bullied by children in his school, he said perhaps because he was a little bit smaller and perhaps because he came from Liberia. But one day after school, they grabbed him; they hung him from a fencepost until someone could take him down.

We have South Philadelphia High School -- also national news; I'm sure all of you have heard about that -- where the Asian students were repeatedly bullied over many years within the school system. They were attacked; they were kicked; they were beaten.

And then we have the suicides -- Brandon Bitner. He was a 14-year-old high school freshman who came from Snyder County. This young man went to Perry County, stood in front of a truck, and was run over because he wanted to end his life. His suicide note explained that he didn't think he could tolerate 4 more years of being bullied.

There's Tiffani Maxwell, who was a 16-year-old junior from Slippery Rock. She shot herself in the head. Her parents said it was because of bullying, and I could go on.

Teachers and school administrators cannot be expected to tackle the issues alone, not without training, and therefore the bill, 2464, provides for annual training of those individuals who have significant contact with students. We believe training is critical if we want to make any real progress in trying to protect our students.

In addition, many students and their parents remain ill-informed about how they can prevent, identify, and respond to any incidents of bullying. So therefore, HB 2464 provides for school policies to include educational programs, educational information, to be provided to parents and students.

Today, our young people consider e-mailing and texting and instant messaging and blogging as a vital means of their way to self-express. While the Internet brings substantial value to these young people, both educationally and socially, it can also bring trouble. An increasing number misuse online technology. As opposed to what many parents, including me when I grew up, experienced on the playground, today's bullies use the Internet to target their victims. And what is different from the bullying

that many of us may have felt when we were younger is the fact that cyberbullying can spread a simple comment about a student over and over thousands if not millions of times to reach people throughout the country and throughout the world.

Students, parents, teachers, and administrators must be prepared to handle what's going on in the age of the new technology. We're not necessarily all trained, parents or teachers, in how to handle these issues.

Parents frequently have limited involvement in and oversight of online activity, because young people generally don't discuss what they're doing.

One constant we have is that schools are a focal point for bullying and cyberbullying. Schools are where "bullies" learn and are taught and convene. Our HB 2464 requires schools to develop strong policies in both of these areas. Any anti-bullying legislation today that does not include cyberbullying would be totally ineffective.

The United States Department of Education

Office for Civil Rights recently published provisions from various State laws throughout the country that represent best practices. Among the States that they chose were New York, their Dignity for All Students Act, which has strong language on monitoring and transparency. They also mentioned Ohio and Iowa for adopting similar kinds of

approaches. Pennsylvania was not mentioned as one of the premier States to watch and observe and follow.

2.1

2.2

We believe that accountability is a very important component here. Data collection and reporting is critical so that we can ensure compliance with the law.

HB 2464 requires the Department of Education to become a central repository for that information. In addition, all acts of harassment and bullying covered under the bill would be reported to the State semiannually.

We believe HB 2464 plays a very critical role in providing our children with access to safe schools, free from forms of bullying and harassment. We urge you to please support this bill so that Pennsylvania can join the vast majority of other States that have comprehensive laws protecting their students. This bill and protecting our students, who will be our leaders of the future, should be a priority for every Member here.

Thank you for your time and for your attention.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks
Nancy Baron-Baer for your testimony.

And now Sharon Giamporcaro, it's your turn to share your testimony.

MS. GIAMPORCARO: Thank you, Chairman Clymer, and good morning, Members of the committee.

My name is Sharon Giamporcaro. I'm one of the

Deputy District Attorneys in the Montgomery County District Attorney's Office, and I'm also the Chief of the Juvenile Division. I am here today on behalf of District Attorney Risa Vetri Ferman to provide testimony in support of HB 2464.

And I have submitted the written testimony.

Rather than go through that today, I'd like to spend my

time highlighting a few of the features of this bill which

I support from a law enforcement perspective.

Just beginning, in my discussion as a Juvenile Court prosecutor, I can tell you that bullying behavior is an underlying conduct in numerous juvenile delinquency proceedings. It doesn't have to be charged. It's a conduct from both the victim's standpoint and from the offender's standpoint.

The current law that we have is certainly an important initial step in combating bullying, but in reality, student safety is contingent on the strength of an anti-bullying policy, and that is, I think, a fundamental reason why HB 2464 is important. It puts procedures into place that would address and prevent bullying. From a law enforcement perspective, it holds people accountable and it helps to prevent crime.

To begin with, it sets forth some certain minimum requirements, giving schools somewhat of a roadmap --

requiring schools to have reporting protocols, notification procedures; requiring schools to have things such as intervention measures, safety plans, and whatnot. And in addition to that, it also designates a person or persons by job title responsible for certain tasks -- receiving the reports, investigation, notifying a parent/guardian, notifying law enforcement -- and intervention measures designed to target both the bullies and the victims.

And part of the importance of having these specific parameters is it does help educators, parents, and students to know, how do you go about reporting a bullying complaint? Who do you go to, where do you go, and how do you get help? These are important procedures to have in effect and to be documented, and it sheds light on this topic for everyone involved.

Being, you know, in the law enforcement and as a prosecutor, a veteran prosecutor, actually for a little over 20 years now, I've seen bullying take many forms, and one of the good components in this bill is that it does provide a more expansive definition of "bullying." It includes harassment, intimidation, bullying, and cyberbullying, but I'd like to concentrate on the importance of the cyberbullying piece.

I do recognize that the term "cyberbullying" is in fact included in our current law. What's missing is the

definition of "electronic communication." And this current bill before you does define "electronic communication," and it encompasses all modalities of communication through digital devices. You know, it's important for students to understand that prohibited conduct can in fact occur through text messaging and blogs and pagers and e-mails and Internet Websites and online games and whatnot. From a law enforcement perspective, investigating cyberbullying incidents are one of the most difficult types of cases that law enforcement faces in terms of investigating, because naturally what you have are victims and witnesses that are reluctant to come forward to report incidents. They're reluctant to provide information.

One of the key features of this bill before you is that school policies will have to have a statement included prohibiting the retaliation or false accusation against anyone that comes forward with reliable information, and that's important. That's going to help school educators, victims; that will help law enforcement investigation.

You know, the bottom line is when kids get bullied, the chances increase for kids to drop out of school and, hence, crime going up. This is a bill before you that can be looked at essentially as a crime prevention tool. You know, in the long run, it saves tax dollars

because it's a crime prevention tool and it's promoting public safety.

There are a number of other areas that this bill addresses which are very important. Some of the areas include remedial measures. And other areas on this bill, I would say safety strategies. In effect, it has academic intervention, guidance for both bullies and the victims. There are also provisions for mandated training for the educators. There's educational programming for parents and students, and there is ongoing oversight for compliance purposes — periodic annual reviews and making reports to the Department of Education.

One of the key features is also the fact that a school's anti-bullying policy would be actually incorporated into the school curriculum, not just the Code of Student Conduct, as our current law has, so that students will be very familiar with the policy and the procedures and they'll be learning about that, that it would still be accessible on available Internet and posted prominently throughout the school.

The Department of Education does have some responsibilities. They're not overly burdensome. They have one responsibility to create a model policy, and that's an important feature. It will give a roadmap for school entities on how to develop a good policy, what is

expected from the policy. Schools aren't asked to put into effect certain procedures and policies, they're asked to develop a procedure that suits their own means. So here you have a bill that is flexible with each of the counties and yet specific in giving them proper guidance. The Department of Education also will have to develop training materials and a list of preventive programs in addition to having a central repository so that the reports from the schools, they can assess the levels and nature of bullying.

One of the most unique features of this current House bill before you is the fact that it permits school entities, as they deem appropriate, to develop task forces. I'm from Montgomery County, and we currently already have a bullying and cyberbullying countywide task force. There are some 40 or 50 members on this task force, and they comprise members from all different disciplines -- law enforcement, social workers. There's a representative from the District Attorney's Office, a representative from the Attorney General's Office, Juvenile Probation, the Office of Children and Youth. We have parents. We have community volunteers, mental health workers.

The task force has just been wonderful. It's recommendations, the purpose of the task force is to develop recommendations based on best practices in preventing, responding, and ultimately combating bullying.

And it also acts as a key resource for everyone, not just the various stakeholders and interdisciplinary people but for students and parents. So far, it has been extremely valuable.

2.1

2.2

So I think that the bill as a whole has a lot of checks and balances and has just the key core ingredients to put the meat on the bones of a current law that we already have that does an important aspect for us in raising awareness to prevent bullying.

And still, as I've looked at the bill from a law enforcement perspective, I have included in my written notes, the testimony, certain recommendations -- three, to be exact.

On page 3 in the bill, the bill suggests that there should be immediate notification to the parents/guardian of both the victim and the bully, and certainly I would agree to the immediate notification procedure to the parents/guardian of victim. I would suggest that the notification to the parents or guardian of the bully be after consultation with law enforcement, because it is law enforcement's job to ensure a victim's safety. Furthermore, they will be doing some initial investigation, and as I said before, witnesses are reluctant to give reliable information. They're reluctant to come forward with that information, to give written

statements, oral or written, or even to testify. So I would ask that consultation be with law enforcement before notification to the parent or guardian of the bully.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The second recommendation concern is also on page 3, and it talks in terms of applying the bullying policy for electronic communications on or off school property, and what it does is say that that policy would be applicable when there is "substantial disruption or interference with the orderly operation of the school," giving the nexus to the school environment. I might note that in our current law right now, it does indicate that schools are not prohibited from defining "bullying" on or off school property as long as it substantially disrupts or interferes with a student's education, creates a threatening environment, or substantially disrupts or interferes with the orderly operation of the school. is the current law right now. It's giving a trifold threshold triggering, a nexus for the school to reach its arm out and be able to have those electronic communications that are bullying conduct come within their realm.

What I'm suggesting with our current law and when it's referring to "electronic communications," rather than just have the threshold of "disruption or interference with the orderly operation of the school," to add the threshold of "disruption or interference with a student's education."

It is a nexus to the school environment, and it is an easier triggering threshold to demonstrate, because bullying does disrupt a student's education. Sometimes it may not disrupt the orderly operation of a school, but it certainly disrupts a student's education.

Finally, the third recommendation that I've noted is on page 6 of 9 under Section 1(d), and it also concerns defining "bullying" in a way outside of school property.

It actually refers to a couple of subsections that the bill seems to have deleted, so it creates a little confusion.

But because it concerns the very same topic of encompassing acts outside of school property, again I would ask that the "disruption or interference with a student's education" be added to that provision, just insert the same definition as previous so that there are two thresholds, either "disrupting the orderly operation of a school" or "interfering with a student's education."

I think with those recommendations and the bill as a whole, this really is flexible for every county. It provides a lot of specifics and a good roadmap for school entities to follow. It prevents crimes; it protects victims; it holds people accountable, and I think in the end what you'll have is a good law, a policy that fortifies the safety of the children for our Commonwealth.

Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks you
for your testimony and now recognizes Dr. Gabalawi--
DR. EL-GABALAWI: That's good.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: --for his testimony.

DR. EL-GABALAWI: I'm Dr. El-Gabalawi.

I'm the President of the Regional Council of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry for Eastern Pennsylvania and Southern New Jersey, and on behalf of the council, I'm endorsing HB 2464.

Thank you, Chairman and Members of the committee.

I also, just like any other child psychiatrist, see patients and teenagers and children in hospitals and inpatient units and outpatient clinics, and we deal with the clinical aspect of bullying and the psychological and psychiatric consequences of the bullying behavior. We see victims. We see perpetrators and their families, bystanders. We see the whole process of bullying as it unfolds in the schools.

I'm going to read the testimony, but I'll be glad to answer any questions regarding the clinical aspect that we see of the bullying behavior.

The mission of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry is to promote the healthy development of children, adolescents, and families. Bullying is a major health concern for children and, as such, is a focus

of attention for the Regional Council of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry.

2.1

2.2

A student is being bullied or victimized when he or she is exposed repeatedly and over time to negative actions on the part of one or more other students. Now, that's just a clinical definition, but as you heard from previous testimonies, really the definition of "bullying" is not well established yet. It is almost a spectrum where you see different kinds of bullying with different degrees of severity.

Bullying can take many forms, including verbal communication, physical intimidation or aggression, texting, e-mailing, Facebook postings, and YouTube clips.

These modern forms of communication have enlarged the scope of the problem so that children and teens cannot escape bullying, even in their own homes.

In the United States, the prevalence of bullying is about 14 percent in elementary schools, 11 percent in middle schools, and 10 percent in high schools. However, many victims refrain from reporting bullying for the fear of threats and retaliation, and some recent surveys indicated that over 40 percent of Pennsylvania students have been bullied.

Now, the literature shows a wide range of prevalence of bullying in the schools, and I heard the

question earlier and first this morning. There is no real consistency in those surveys yet, because again, the definition is hard, really, to agree on totally, and there's a reluctance of many victims of actually reporting it. So that area needs more work even to have consistent results of the surveys and of the prevalence.

Bullying has major implications for children and their families who are victims or perpetrators of bullying. Bullies are likely to be referred to an outside agency by a State agency or court and will include children diagnosed with attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder, oppositional defiant disorder, conduct disorder, bipolar disorder, and impulse control disorder.

Victims of bullying, on the other hand, are typically referred by child protective agencies and child welfare services and parents. Victims often include children diagnosed with anxiety, mood disorder, or posttraumatic stress disorder who suffer from serious mental health problems, low self-esteem, and even suicidal thoughts and behaviors.

Suicide is the third leading cause of mortality for adolescents in the United States. That's following accidents and homicides. Epidemiologic studies suggested that in 1 year almost, 19 percent of high school students had serious suicidal ideation, 15 percent made a specific

plan to attempt suicide, 8.8 percent reported suicidal attempts, and 2.6 percent made a serious suicidal attempt that required medical attention.

For children at greater risk for suicide, perceived peer rejection, being bullied, and being a perpetrator of bullying were associated, directly and indirectly, with major depression, substance use, and antisocial behavior with severe suicidal ideation.

The strongest associations between all types of bullying and suicidal risks were found in victim-perpetrators. There are victims who become perpetrators -- and that phenomenon exists widely, actually -- both in the general population of children and adolescents and also in populations with special needs such as behavioral problems or LGB sexual orientation.

Bullying behavior and the ensuing feelings of humiliation and alienation among vulnerable students have been implicated in many tragic school-shooting incidents.

News reports have highlighted cases of suicide following a particularly pervasive form of bullying -- cyberbullying.

Now, studies conducted among Internet-using adolescents indicated that within a year, 72 percent of respondents reported at least one online incident of bullying,

85 percent of whom also experienced bullying in the school.

Repeated school-based bullying experiences increased the likelihood of repeated cyberbullying, and about two-thirds of cyberbullying victims knew their perpetrators. However, 90 percent -- 90 percent -- reported they do not tell an adult about cyberbullying, and that's just an inherent dilemma in the bullying phenomenon, where kids really are reluctant for a period of time to divulge any information about bullying.

2.1

2.2

Youth who are the victims of bullying can become bullies themselves, further propagating the problem of victimization in school. Youth who develop mental health problems from bullying place even more stress on already overburdened mental health systems.

Children who are bullied also place more stress on their families who are already struggling to raise healthy children in a culture that must deal with the modern problems of drugs, violence, economic stress, among other challenges. Additionally, children who are bullied are often resistant to attend school and may suffer from academic failure. Youth who refuse to attend school are considered truant and increase demands on truancy court caseloads as well.

HB 2464 would address harassment, intimidation, bullying, and cyberbullying in public educational settings, and the Regional Council of the Child Academy supports the

1 Anti-Bullying Coalition's efforts to eradicate bullying and

- 2 to provide a safe learning environment for children.
- 3 Therefore, we support HB 2464.

Thank you.

2.1

2.2

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks the gentleman for his testimony and recognizes Representative Quigley for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE QUIGLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Sharon, I had a question for you with regard to

-- and I appreciate the feedback here. I know I spoke with

District Attorney Ferman a couple weeks ago and she

indicated that you would be coming up, and I appreciate the

feedback and the input.

On the one suggestion you had for the notification of law enforcement first, before the bully's parents would be notified, is that for like all instances, or would there be some -- like, for example, if it was just, I can't even think of an example, but, you know, some type of verbal bullying or something like that where, and I guess I mean "in all instances," is there any differentiation of where it wouldn't rise to the level where law enforcement would need to be involved, or are you saying that we should go to law enforcement first and let them say whether or not it arises to that occasion?

MS. GIAMPORCARO: Actually, that's a very good

point that you're making there, and not all bullying gets to the law enforcement level, and some of it may be at a level where law enforcement decides not to even charge.

Certainly when bullying is at the chargeable level or it gets to the level where the school believes that it's prudent to notify law enforcement because it could escalate, the conduct could escalate, then the recommendation in the bill is recommending that there be consultation with law enforcement before notifying the parents of the bully.

And along the lines of what you're suggesting here, when it's not at the level of law enforcement, there should be some mechanism in place, in my own opinion, at the school level in terms of assessing the type of conduct and the nature of it before immediately notifying the parents of the bully as far as having a safety strategy and for the victim's benefit.

REPRESENTATIVE QUIGLEY: Okay.

MS. GIAMPORCARO: At the very least -- and making sure that certain initial investigatory moves are made on the school's part. If they want to get statements from students and create narrative reports or only speak to certain witnesses, that would be prudent before going to the parents of the bully.

REPRESENTATIVE QUIGLEY: Okay.

And right now, so do you think there would need to be, you know, additional training or guidelines perhaps for school districts to do just that, or can you give instances where that's happening like right now?

2.1

MS. GIAMPORCARO: I think what might help is language within the bill itself that when a bullying conduct does not rise to the level of notification to the law enforcement authorities, that school's designated individuals should ensure the victim's safety first and complete an initial investigation on the bullying report prior to notifying the parents of the bully.

REPRESENTATIVE QUIGLEY: Okay. All right. Thanks for that clarification.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes Representative Wheatley for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to say this question is probably for both Ms. Baer and the District Attorney. Before we heard from the School Boards Association that the current law, basically the definition of "bullying" is defined, and that at the Federal level there is a current definition for "harassment" and other legal terminology that in this bill we're not well defining it, and so it leaves the districts

or it could leave the districts up for possible further litigation. And in your testimony, I think reading through some and trying to listen to what all you were saying, what you are saying is our current law doesn't necessarily cover — and by the way, his testimony said that our current law pretty much gives the policy, I want to get his statement right, but basically the policies are in place now and set the framework for good enforcement of this bullying issue. More can be done, but we certainly have the policy in place. We don't necessarily need to create something more at the State level.

And then what I heard from you all is currently, it might have been a good step what we did in Act 61, but it's not enough in that we need to go further and that you believe that this bill actually -- and I think it was your testimony, District Attorney, that talked about the defining, that it gives better definitions or will define these other things and allow for law enforcement and others to better enforce the law.

So can you help me understand where I think I'm hearing conflicting -- maybe I'm just not clear, but I think I'm hearing conflicting testimony, or if we have currently a law that's in place and that if we change it with this current bill, that we will open them up for more liabilities, the districts. What I'm hearing you saying is

no, our current law is not covering everything, and if we were to pass 2464, it would do more to help not only the victims and their families but also to help in the persecution of anyone that might be engaging in this bullying behavior.

MS. BARON-BAER: I can begin.

The definition in the act where we describe
"intimidation, harassment, bullying and cyberbullying," the
belief is that on the one hand, people sometimes use the
word "bullying," sometimes they use the word "harassment,"
sometimes they may use the word "intimidation," but when
they meet the definition for any of those four words that
are very explicitly described in the bill, they will be
subject to the contents of the bill.

We don't want it such that someone says, well, I wasn't bullying; it was harassment. The idea is, if it's any of these things and it fills all of the definitions required, all of the statements in the act, it should be covered.

As far as what I think is the second part of your question as to whether or not the policy in place is sufficient, if we thought it was sufficient, obviously we would not have come forward with a bill that looks much more detailed, much more in-depth, and we believe much more effective than what's in place.

If we do not pass the current bill or something very similar, there will be no training mandated. There will be no insistence on having groups within the community come together to try to both determine policy and to implement programs, provide educational opportunities, and the like.

It was a very, we'll call it a very basic initial bullying law. While 2008 is only 4 years ago, it is almost a lifetime ago when it comes to this subject of bullying and cyberbullying. So much has been learned in the last 4 to 5 years that we need to stay up with where society and what we have learned should take us.

MS. GIAMPORCARO: In my testimony I indicated that I thought it was a great idea that the bill specifically defines the term "electronic communication," and that's because I think the laws need to be innovative and they should be keeping pace with what's going on in our schools and in our courtrooms and in our world today.

In terms of those particular words "harassment and intimidation" and the fact that they're defined in Federal law -- I mean, they're also in the Pennsylvania Crimes Code, "harassment" under Section 2709 and "intimidation" in the 5700s, I believe -- I understand and agree with the intent that Nancy was just speaking about that the school needs to get the word out to students that

these are things that would encompass a bullying policy.

And I would suggest that there wouldn't be the conflict that the prior speaker was referring to if a bill was particular in terms of the wording of that policy such that it might say, the terms "harassment," "intimidation," and "bullying" are defined only insofar as this school policy is concerned; in other words, isolating those terms to be owned by the school policy, because those terms have separate definitions under the Pennsylvania criminal code as they have separate definitions under the Federal law.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: And -- I'm sorry. Yes?

MS. BARON-BAER: If I can just add one thing.

We also need to be careful, because the Federal laws, in some cases, some of the Federal protections are only for certain classes or they were put together at certain times to address certain particular situations, and this would cover all students in the Commonwealth.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: And to your point around the electronic communications, cyberbullying, because one of the things I think I picked up in your testimony was it really was expanding now the role that the district would have as it relates to oversight around this nexus you refer to when the communication happens. I think you used the example of a student might be being intimidated on a Facebook page but comes to school and

can't learn because of that situation that is transpiring on Facebook, that now the districts would have to have a policy of somehow rectifying that situation. And we heard from the prior speaker talking about case law that basically said to districts, you're not necessarily responsible for those things that are done outside of the campus and not on systems that you totally control.

2.2

So help me -- and I guess this gets to the other point of the liability question -- help me understand, are we then forcing districts to do things that they really don't have control over, and will that cost them in the long term? I'm just trying to figure out from the case law that was cited earlier, from the statements that were made earlier, from this new terminology that we obviously are trying to include into this language, how we make sure that they are on legal firm ground and able to control those things even when that is not happening on their system or under their supervision.

MS. GIAMPORCARO: Well, what I tried to communicate earlier in my testimony is the current law as it stands already has those triggers in effect.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Okay.

MS. GIAMPORCARO: Although there might be some case precedent discussing those triggers, according to the current law, it says that a school shall not be prohibited

1 from defining "bullying" on or off of school property if 2 it.---3 REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Okay. 4 MS. GIAMPORCARO: ---does A, B, and C, or whatever, I could read them out of the law---5 6 REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Okay. 7 MS. GIAMPORCARO: --- and it either disrupts the student's education, creates a threatening environment, or 8 9 interferes with the orderly operation of the school, and 10 that is our current law. So that is giving the school the 11 authority, statutorily---12 REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Okay. 13 MS. GIAMPORCARO: ---to overcome, you know, to 14 reach their hand out for those types of electronic 15 communications. 16 REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Okay. 17 MS. GIAMPORCARO: And what I was indicating with respect to this particular bill is, because it didn't 18 19 include all those three triggering factors that our current 20 law has, in essence, it's making it harder. It's lessening 21 -- it's making the threshold higher for us, and what it 2.2 should do is include what the current law already has. 23 REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: 24 MS. GIAMPORCARO: At least two of them, because 25 that's already in effect and has not been challenged.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Sure.

2.1

2.2

MS. BARON-BAER: I think in addition we need to be mindful of the current cases. They have been very few and far between, both here in Pennsylvania and nationally, and the cases that were discussed previously for the most part concerned very unfortunate, very horrendous conduct toward school officials. The cases did not involve student-on-student conduct where the protections would be different than what was discussed, and I think they all concerned off-hours kind of activity, and there can be cyberbullying that occurs also in school. So we don't want to throw the baby out with the bathwater, so we need to look at these court decisions in a precise and limited kind of fashion.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Thank you.

And I know the Chairman is about to cut me off, so I just wanted to ask if you could point me in the direction, you talked about 49 other States plus the District of Columbia have statutes, already comprehensive statutes, I'm assuming with the "electronic communication" components in them. So if you could just point me in that direction.

MS. BARON-BAER: I will gladly, after the hearing. I can provide you with a paper that shows what each State, how far they have come in their bullying

1 | efforts. You know, it's a wide variety across the country.

So we have a bullying law. It's not comprehensive. Some of the States have much more

comprehensive, some of the States have a little bit more comprehensive, and some are where we are.

6 REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Okay. Thank you.

2.1

2.2

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes Representative Longietti for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to follow up on Representative
Wheatley's last point, because I'm concerned, and maybe my
concern is misplaced. But the language "substantial
inference" with either a student's education or the orderly
operation of the school that's being recommended, and I
understand and maybe it would serve me well to read what
currently is law, but I'm concerned about that statement,
because as I sat here in this hearing and I listened to the
doctor and I listened to the testimony, I can't think of
too many instances, if any, where conduct would not
substantially interfere with a student's education.

So, you know, if somebody is electronically off campus making statements on media saying "Mark is dumb.

Mark is a dumb person," on and on, that's probably going to

affect me in my education. But are the courts going to go there?

I'm just worried, being familiar with the Layshock case, and I understand it's school officials and not students, but as that case unfolded, one would have thought that the courts, even in that case, would have said that was a substantial disruption with the school operation. Because here is the principal being significantly ridiculed, and they've got to go to school and they've got to administer the rules of the school district and not be undermined, and yet the courts have said no, no, this is free speech; free speech overrides. So even when we put it in law, we know as lawyers that the Constitution is higher than whatever we pass here and tells us that we cannot prohibit free speech.

And I'm just concerned, I believe in the intent of that language, I believe in my heart that it makes sense, but I wonder whether or not the courts are going to say that's a sufficient nexus. Have they said that in case law? Have they used the language "substantial interference with a student's education"? I know they've used the language "orderly operation of the school," and they've interpreted that in much nicer -- granted -- times. But do we know, have they used that language?

MS. GIAMPORCARO: I'm not an education attorney

so I would not know that case law, as familiar as I am with the criminal case law. But in terms of your question as far as you're hard-pressed to find an instance where a student's education is not substantially interfered with, I think the flip side of that coin is, it's quite difficult to find an incident where the orderly operation of the school is disrupted, and perhaps that calls upon Legislatures to come upon some wording that in some way compromises and meets in the middle between those two bases.

REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: I agree with that assessment. I guess the problem that I have is that the Federal courts haven't given us that standard, that they've said "orderly operation of the school," maybe much to your chagrin and my chagrin. That's where they've left us, and I'm just worried about putting schools in a spot where on the one hand, if they don't do X, they're violating State law that we've now passed; on the other hand, if they do do X, the Federal courts say, you violated the Constitution and free speech rights.

MS. GIAMPORCARO: Well, free speech would not -when you commit a crime, obviously your First Amendment
rights are not going to be a forefront if in fact the words
coming out of a particular student's mouth amount to
something that is a chargeable offense. So at the very

least, those cases of bullying, I would think the schools could certainly---

REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: Sure, and I agree with you on that; it's just when it doesn't rise to the level of the crime. Clearly in the *Layshock* case no crimes were charged; it didn't rise to that level, and yet the courts did say free speech.

Thank you.

2.1

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes Representative Tallman.

REPRESENTATIVE TALLMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Representative Wheatley had already asked my question, an obvious contradiction with our District Attorney and the school board attorney. So I'm going to ask the doctor a question, and you may not have this, but is there any differentiation on the amount of bullying by gender?

DR. EL-GABALAWI: Well---

most likely by today's definition, bullied, and we handled it different ways back then. But, I mean, I have an assumption, but can you direct me which way you think it goes.

DR. EL-GABALAWI: Yeah. Actually, there is a difference between the bullying and gender, but it's not

necessarily the quantity of it, sometimes it's the quality or characteristics of bullying.

2.2

So females, female bullying usually targets social network defamation of the other girls, ostracizing other girls and so on. And boys, male bullying tends to be intimidation and even physical aggression more. But the outcome can be psychologically or psychiatrically still the same, where they both just can be devastated and can lead still to psychiatric problems, suicidal tendencies, and so on.

So it's just a different kind of bullying, although we see sometimes they cross to each other. We see also -- I mean, that's not necessarily a rule, just a tendency. But we see aggressive girls and vice versa with boys. But that's really the difference. It exists really in both.

Interestingly also, it exists actually more in younger children, which is very unusual, like elementary schools. But when it goes to middle school and high school, it becomes more ominous and devastating and takes on aggression and so on. So there's not really quantitative differences in gender.

REPRESENTATIVE TALLMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair thanks our testifiers today. It has been very informative, very helpful, as we have discussed the many issues and many definitions to date.

We're going to continue now with our next testifier, and that is Michael J. Crossey, who is President of the Pennsylvania State Education Association, and we welcome Mr. Crossey to give testimony.

We have your written testimony, sir, and so when you get yourself seated, you may begin your testimony.

MR. CROSSEY: Thank you.

2.1

2.2

Good afternoon, Chairman Clymer, Chairman Roebuck, and Members of the committee.

My name is Mike Crossey, a teacher in the

Keystone Oaks School District with more than 34 years of

classroom experience, and I am currently on leave from my

district while serving as the President of the Pennsylvania

State Education Association, PSEA.

On behalf of our 187,000 members, I thank you for the opportunity to talk with you today about the critically important issue of preventing bullying and, in particular, the provisions of HB 2464.

PSEA appreciates the committee's efforts to review current law and to determine whether it provides the necessary protections for students to prevent bullying.

This hearing certainly is timely, given that October is

National Bullying Prevention Month. But bullying prevention must occur each and every day. Any type of bullying is unacceptable, and any incident must be taken seriously by students, educators, staff, administrators, parents, and members of the community. Ideally, we must all work together, not only to intervene when incidences of bullying occur but to create safe and caring school environments that prevent such incidences in the first place.

The nature of bullying has changed over time, and its prevalence is increasing. Bullying can involve direct contact, physical contact such as hitting, but it can also include verbal aggression in the form of threats, name calling, or spreading rumors intended to cause emotional harm. And in recent years, students faced cyberbullying, which elevates bullying to a new level of intensity. Using interactive technologies such as text messages or social media, cyberbullying can occur around the clock, and the text or images can be widely disseminated well beyond school grounds.

Students who have been bullied report feeling depressed, anxious, and isolated. Many will experience academic, interpersonal, physical, and mental health problems such as a consequence of their being victims of bullying. And in some cases, as the nation and

Pennsylvania has recently seen, some students are so tormented that they have taken their own lives or the lives of their tormentors. This clearly demonstrates a need for quality, consistent bullying-prevention efforts in our schools across the country.

2.1

2.2

PSEA has a long history of supporting efforts to reduce bullying. We do this through education and through advocacy. PSEA shares resources with our members and with the public about bullying to increase the awareness and its detrimental impacts on students and on their ability to learn and what we can all do to help reduce and prevent incidences of bullying.

For example, we recently shared a bullying prevention toolkit with thousands of interested parents and community members who have joined with PSEA as Partners for Public Education in recognition of October as Bullying Prevention Month.

In addition to our communication efforts, PSEA offers trainings to our members. The trainings are often in conjunction with partners such as the Pennsylvania Parent Education Network and PACER, the Parent Advocacy Coalition for Educational Rights, focused on best practices for preventing and reducing bullying in our schools.

But we recognize that awareness and education alone is not enough. PSEA believes that it is important

that our State policies assert positions that will help reduce the incidences of bullying in Pennsylvania schools.

Because of that belief, we were one of the primary stakeholders in 2008 seeking improvements to Pennsylvania's bullying statute, including establishment of a more comprehensive definition of bullying that includes "electronic communications"; requiring school districts to enact policies providing for bullying prevention, intervention, and awareness of the problem; and three, requiring districts to delineate discipline for bullying. Yet while these changes have been helpful in increasing awareness and most likely reducing incidences of bullying in Pennsylvania, we can and should do more to address this critical issue.

As discussed before, bullying is disruptive to learning and harmful to the development of our students into confident, respectful adults. These behaviors can be addressed and modified by helping our school communities implement commonsense policies and strategies proven to be effective.

PSEA's "Solutions that Work" proposal, which I believe you all have a copy of, released in June 2011, includes a number of these strategies, several of which are also incorporated in HB 2464 sponsored by Representative Quigley. While PSEA does not have a formal position on the

bill, we support many of its provisions, particularly those that mesh with our research-based approaches contained in "Solutions that Work." These include:

• Additional training for school employees. In order to better identify, respond to, report, and prevent bullying, school staff training is essential. According to a national survey of thousands of school employees conducted by the NEA, 98 percent of educators believe it is their job to intervene when they see bullying happening in their school, but many do not feel equipped to do so.

2.2

Any training that occurs should include all school personnel, including school bus drivers and food-service workers. Locations in schools like the cafeteria are often not monitored by teachers but by food-service workers, paraprofessionals, volunteers, or parents. These individuals also need to learn the tools for recognizing and intervening in student-to-student bullying situations, not just educators.

According to the NEA survey referenced above, more than two-thirds of food-service workers

2.2

reported that they needed additional training on how to address different forms of bullying -- physical, verbal, and relational -- and in situations involving children being bullied because of sexual orientation, race, gender, and religion.

As the committee considers HB 2464, you may want

requiring school districts to use high-quality

to include parameters for training such as

training models such as national models like the

trainings offered by NEA, the Anti-Defamation

League, PACER, and others. This way, schools are

not duplicating efforts and will help to ensure

that the individuals receiving the training are

being provided the tools necessary to implement a

successful bullying prevention program in their

school community.

• Anonymous tips regarding bullying. HB 2464 and PSEA's "Solutions that Work" proposal call for school districts to establish a procedure to allow an anonymous tip about bullying. This can be accomplished in a number of ways such as a hotline or a suggestion box. Some schools have

even created a "cyberbullying" box as part of the school Website for reporting incidences of bullying, making it easier for parents as well as 3

children to make a report.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1

2

PSEA also agrees with the bill that no formal disciplinary action should be taken solely on the basis of an anonymous report. We would suggest that students and parents be encouraged to use the anonymous "hotline" or "suggestion box," not only to report possible incidences of bullying but to provide ideas and strategies that could be used to create a more positive school climate.

14

15

16

17

18

19

• PSEA's "Solutions that Work" calls for the creation of a school safety committee, and HB 2464 calls for prevention task forces. Ιt doesn't really matter what the groups are ultimately titled, but the concept of involving a diverse group of the school community -- parents, teachers, support professionals, administrators, law enforcement, volunteers, and students -- in an ongoing effort to identify ways to improve the school climate is an important one to establish. We would again, as I just mentioned, recommend

20 21

22

23

24

25

1 that the bill be updated to add students as 2 members of that task force, given how important 3 it is for peers to identify, report, and help 4 prevent bullying. 5 6 HB 2464 references "school staff" as part of any 7 task force created, and we wholeheartedly support that inclusion. According to NEA's national 8 survey on bullying, school bus drivers, 9 10 food-service workers, and other education support 11 professionals often see incidences of bullying or 12 have students report incidences to them, but they 13 do not feel adequately trained, if at all, to 14 appropriately respond to prevent bullying. 15 16 A number of them also report that they are not 17 invited to participate in any formal bullying prevention efforts in their schools, whether it 18 19 be a task force, a committee, or other prevention 20 program. It is important that this staff, this 21 level of staff that live in the community and 2.2 have daily and direct contact with students, be 23 included in all bullying prevention efforts.

24

25

As you consider this legislation, the committee

may also want to include specific suggestions for the roles and responsibilities for the task forces. These could include, but not be limited to, conducting an annual initial and future tracking school climate survey focused on gathering data to demonstrate which strategies are working for a positive school climate and which may need to be revised or improved; and two, promptly reviewing suggestions for improving school climate as provided through the anonymous "hotline" or "suggestion box" and developing plans for implementation as appropriate.

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

• HB 2464 requires that school districts establish an educational program for students and parents in preventing, identifying, responding to, and reporting bullying. PSEA fully supports such an initiative. In fact, the NEA has developed an excellent program that seeks to engage adults, including parents, more directly, since research tells us that one caring adult can make all the difference in a bullied student's life.

24

25

The "Bully-Free: It Starts With Me" campaign

identifies caring adults in our schools and communities who are willing to stand up and pledge to help bullied students. These caring adults agree to listen carefully to the bullied student who comes to them. They also agree to take action to stop the bullying. NEA, in turn, provides these caring adults with the resources they need to provide solace and support to a bullied student and to take the appropriate actions needed to stop the bullying.

In addition to the strategies already contained within HB 2464, PSEA would encourage the committee to consider one more: the implementation of a School-Wide Positive Behavior Supports program in our schools.

Research continues to reinforce the idea that teaching behaviors, reinforcement of appropriate behaviors, and using data to inform actions actually reduces bullying and time away from academic instruction. PBS, Positive Behavior Supports, is a research-based, highly effective approach to creating, teaching, and reinforcing students' social, emotional, and academic learning skills that improves and sustains academic achievement and mental and emotional well-being for all students. PBS works with all school partners to serve as effective-change agents to

implement a uniform and positive approach in all school settings so that there is a predictable, consistent, and positive school culture for all students and staff. PBS schools focus on prevention and consistently and frequently reward students who do the right thing.

2.1

2.2

PSEA is a part of the statewide alliance for Pennsylvania Positive Behavior Supports and would be happy to provide the committee more in-depth information on the program if you are interested in further exploring its potential to increase student achievement and create safer schools.

PSEA supports the strategies contained within
HB 2464 and additional ones such as Positive Behavior
Supports, but we would be remiss if we did not note our
serious concern about whether or not our school districts
have the resources they need to move forward and implement
these strategies on a consistent and ongoing basis. Our
districts continue to suffer from the \$860 million loss in
funding with over 20,000 positions eliminated these last
2 years and the dramatic cuts that have resulted to student
programs.

HB 2464 references the possible distribution of "safe schools funds" to school districts whose plans are approved by the State Board of Education and reporting is in compliance with the required procedures. We agree with

these qualifications to be eligible for funding targeted at bullying prevention, but we question whether these funds even exist. The question of resources and capacity in our schools is an important one to consider as the committee continues to deliberate and debate about the best methods for providing our students with positive and safe school climates.

In closing, PSEA supports the committee's efforts to protect the students of Pennsylvania from the detrimental impacts of bullying. As a Commonwealth, we know the problems that we have and the research to show us the solutions. Now it takes all of us working together to support safe and supportive learning environments for our students and prevent bullying. PSEA stands ready to work with you as a partner and to achieve this laudable goal.

And if I may, outside of my testimony, make one suggestion. As I read the definition in the bill, I noticed that the bill defines "harassment, intimidation, bullying and cyberbullying" as "...any written, verbal or physical act, or any electronic communication...to:
...physically harm a student or damages the student's property...," and then it goes on to delineate a few more parts of the definition. I would suggest that that says "physically or emotionally harm a student or an educator," because there are incidences in our schools where educators

1 | are also bullied or intimidated in some situations.

Thank you, and I'll be glad to answer any questions you might have.

2.2

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes Representative Longietti for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Actually, just a quick comment on behalf of Chairman Roebuck, who, due to a schedule conflict, was unable to be here this morning and afternoon. And he issued a statement that was distributed to all the Members of the committee and in that statement emphasized that he supports a comprehensive effort to establish safe and more positive school cultures and specifically stated that he supports the School-Wide Positive Behavior Supports that Mr. Crossey just testified about.

So I just wanted to draw that attention to Chairman Roebuck's statement. Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: And I do appreciate the fact that in your comments you mentioned students, because I think students can play a very important role.

Leadership is so important, no matter where it's at -- in a retail store, in government. If you have responsible leadership willing to step out and say, you know, it's

wrong to do this, to bully other students, and provide a role model, that's so important, especially among the peers. But you know what peer pressure can do. If one student begins to bully a student, then everyone thinks, well, to be cool, I've got to get onboard and bully that same student, and that's not the way we want to see these things go. That's the purpose of these hearings.

MR. CROSSEY: Thank you.

2.1

2.2

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair recognizes Representative Truitt for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUITT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Thank you, Mr. Crossey.

MR. CROSSEY: Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUITT: I'm delighted to hear that PSEA is onboard with the concept to do something in here, and I was thinking of one of the questions that came up earlier and I was curious as to where your organization would stand in terms of, I see it as an essential component, that there has to be somebody at each building that is the point person or the person who is responsible in making sure that this gets done versus when we had the conversation with the gentleman from the PSBA. They were talking more about a community approach.

I mean, do you have an opinion on that? Would your organization be okay with there being a designated

person at each facility that bears some additional responsibility for ensuring that a program is properly implemented and followed up upon?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CROSSEY: Absolutely. There has got to be a schoolwide program. We believe in a schoolwide. If you have the same discipline plan all the way through the school, everybody understands it, everybody works with it. It goes along, and, you know, you actually hear students quoting the discipline plan.

And in our case, you know, not only should there be one point person and that person should include everybody else in their process and in the thing, but everything should go to one person. And while we're doing that, it needs to be one of those ones that discipline, in my mind as a teacher, isn't always necessarily punitive. It may come to the point where there's something punitive, but discipline should be instructive. Discipline, you know, if there's a minor incidence of bullying, it can be handled as a teachable moment, and we can take that student and teach them, no, this isn't the way you behave, and we can also teach our students how not to be victims. And so every time we have an incident, if it's a small incident, we take care of that inside the school, and there should be a standard approach as much as possible to doing that, even though we know that most incidences of bullying, you know,

1 | can vary widely, especially now with cyberbullying.

2.2

But we have to teach our students what's right and what's wrong and involve the parents in that, because that's not necessarily our role. But in the school setting, we need to take an active role in making sure of including the parents and administrators and everybody in the school community.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUITT: I agree. I see a big component of your eventual result of anti-bullying legislation could be to have the effect of teaching kids to be more civil to other kids or other human beings and treat people with respect. So I see it as an educational kind of thing. So I'm really glad to hear some of the opinions that you expressed here.

MR. CROSSEY: Thank you. You're exactly right.

I mean, our schools need to be more inclusive. They need
to be more accepting. And, you know, tolerance is not just
-- tolerance itself is not acceptable. You need to be
accepting and inclusive.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUITT: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks the gentleman.

And we thank Mr. Crossey for being with us today, for your very important testimony, and we may be back again as we continue these hearings.

1 MR. CROSSEY: I thank you. I look forward to the opportunity of working with you in the future.

2.1

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Thank you.

Our final testifier today is no stranger to many of us: Dr. Joan Duvall-Flynn, Chair of the Pennsylvania

State NAACP Education Committee. She had been working with us on issues in the past, and we are so glad to see her again this afternoon.

Dr. Duvall-Flynn, we enjoy your presence, and I know your testimony has also been spread, so you may begin whenever you want.

DR. DUVALL-FLYNN: Thank you.

I want to thank the committee for hearing from the NAACP on what might be one of the most important issues to children at school. And you have my testimony. I will just highlight some of the observations that I make.

I make my observations from inside the school culture where I spent 40 years. I make my observations in support of supportive school discipline after the fashion of teaching children how to be civil and live in proper relationship with each other.

I want us to reflect on the fact that this is an epidemic, that "epidemic" is a medical term, and it implies a contagious, spreading condition. And as that is substantiated by the doctor who mentioned that people who

bully have probably been bullied, that in itself supports the suggestion in the legislation that there be an opportunity for intervention, for referral to therapeutic services. I think that's the strongest notion in the bill.

I think it's the strongest notion in the bill because of the amount of trauma that children bring to school that acts itself out in bullying behaviors, in truancy, in drug use, in alcohol use and promiscuity and those things that are just destroying the lives of children. It is the role of the school to develop human potential, and school is the first-line advocate for so many of these children.

I want you to remember when you write this law in its final form that you are creating rules that pertain to children, and we don't want to criminalize them if we don't have to. So I want you to step back and look at it and just weigh it out in ways to understand what the doctor taught us today, that most bullying happens in elementary school. So let's keep light fingers. Children are very precious.

We are looking at, I'm on page 2 where I say "PA NAACP supports the notion that disciplinary consequences in local school codes provide prevention, intervention and education programs." And in the proposal it says that a school "may," but we think that language would be more

appropriate if it said a school "shall."

2.1

When I look at page 3 where we talk about we hold that to stop bullying behaviors, the abuser must be healed? We sincerely are convinced. But all the research we are now doing in traumatized children, in the hearings that Attorney General Holder held across this country with his defense of children task force, that 60 percent of our country's children have been traumatized and trauma behaves in the ways that the doctor described, a part of that is going to school and picking on someone else.

When we think about the trauma that goes on in elementary school -- and I'm talking off script, because I'm talking out of the hallways that I lived in all my life. When we talk about bullying in the middle school hallway, it is emotionally and psychologically devastating to the victim, but we now see that it's being perpetrated by children who have been emotionally and psychologically devastated themselves. So the intervention and the therapeutic model all suggested in this bill are probably the only way we'll ever get rid of bullying in the school system.

And think about all that you know about what has happened to children. We have statistics that we speak of but we don't reflect on. Consider the number of children who have been sexually abused, the statistics. They're

walking these halls. They are wounded and angry and looking for someone to hurt. Just consider all the physical abuse, the exposure to violence, the chaos in communities, the depravation of hunger and poverty, all of those burdens that those children carry into the schoolroom, and as you flesh out the final version of your bill, just remember that.

2.1

We look at the section -- I'm on page 4 -- that

"PA NAACP recommends that language at Section 1303-1-A

which mandates the makeup of the committee to create or

revise school policy...." We look at a different lineup of

participants, and I would just call that to your attention.

We think that parent participation, school staff

participation, and community representation must reflect

the ethnic makeup of the students being educated by the

district, and we suggest that to you because different

cultures have different morals. And in my lifetime, so

many times I've seen children reported and chastised for

behaviors that in their culture are not assigned certain

guilts, so that needs to be a part of the conversation in

the district when districts are composing their codes.

We say "that school staff assigned to the committee must include counselors and school psychologists," because you're dealing with something that has psychological and emotional and cognitive implications.

We've looked at the way trauma impedes learning, and the way it impedes learning behaves in the classroom and ties what is necessary in order to learn. It impedes the capacity to recall, to process language, to access the executive functions. You can't organize yourself. You can't organize tasks. This is the work of learning, and here we are, with all these children in a medical condition, that will not allow them to do those things.

And then in a broader way, we look at the scores of students in Pennsylvania; we have all these wounded children trying to do things they can't do, and we're seeing it display itself in many ways. I'll just leave that for your thought.

We suggest that the community representatives that participate on the group to design policy include local mental health agencies.

And finally, we shift away from law enforcement.

As you think of the executive branch and law enforcement,

we shift this notion over to having that group include a

family court judge or a juvenile court judge, because they

come with a different perspective on what outcomes for

children should be. And we find that is in line with the

new direction that the Department of Justice and the

Department of Education together, finally talking to each

other, call a supportive school discipline initiative. And

that is research based, and I think if you think about that and look at the ramifications of that, that might be a very wise shift.

When I look at page 5 where we propose that "...Section 1303-1-A(v) would be greatly improved if it were adjusted in terms of developmental appropriateness," there are ways kids learn, so we suggest it would be good to include that "The policy needs to be distributed in print to each student's household and in the first language of the parents." I don't know how many languages are spoken in Pennsylvania, and many of the parents who need to understand what the discipline code is need access to that in a language that they can interpret and even read the nuances of.

"There should be a process for documenting that every student's caregiver has received and read the policy," and in some schools, it is just a very compulsive way of saying, everybody takes it home on Tuesday, of course except the kids who are absent; everybody brings it back by Thursday; the teacher checks it in; someone calls the parents who didn't return it in a consistent way until they get that back and it is demonstrated that the parent has read that, because we're talking mostly about juveniles here. And the parents do need to have read it, because ultimately they're accountable for their child's behavior.

"The policy should be reviewed with students within the first five days of...school...." Bullying does not wait 90 days to start. The kids who come to school may have been doing it all summer, you know? They hit the hallway; they carry on their behaviors. And so that first 5 days of school where kids are being acclimated to the school, rules and all of that -- what it looks like in the school, depending on how old the kids are; if they're in a group and an adult, whether it's their teacher or the administrator or counselors, talks to them about it and explains it to them in age-appropriate terms and asks if there are any questions, and it is training -- it needs to happen immediately.

2.2

"The policy should be reviewed with the school population specifically and systematically four times per...year." You know, public school runs on a set of four 9-week periods. At the beginning of every 9 weeks, sit them down and tell them again. Why? Because kids should get stuff. It gets used to them. They move away from it in its immediacy, and so you bring them back to it and you say, hey, look, this is how it goes here; this is how we live.

We suggest -- I'm on page 6 -- that

Section 1303.1-A should be more appropriate to school

culture and school setting. So you have a recommendation

kids are just too smart today; you can't wait that long.

So at the end of every year, we suggest the school needs to

that a school look at their policy every 1,000 days. Well,

look and say, did it get any better? If it didn't get any better, where is the space? Where are the gaps? What didn't we catch? Let's tighten it up.

Kids are smart, and technology changes every day. You could have a policy that works today, and the kids will be in there bumping and thumping and telepathing and everything else, you know, within 2 months. So tighten that up, I would suggest.

And I agree with the President of PSEA, and we question the limitation on bullying being specifically against students, and we question that because of the way children learn. If it's a rule, it's a rule. If it's not a rule, it's not a real rule. And so if I cannot mess with a kid, you didn't say I couldn't mess with the principal, and this needs to be consistent. All behavioral scientists agree that the way to change behavior is to have consistent and specific expectations and consistent and specific consequences. It's like putting a box and there's no door out. If you don't say you can't do this to anybody, then there's a door out, and children will take it.

Then we looked at that part of the bill that refers to the fact that some schools in Pennsylvania don't

have to report incidences of bullying, and we just have a question about that, and we question that because children are killing themselves. They don't all go to public school, and so we ask you to think that through and see what you think is wise in that area. Because this is so dangerous and life threatening, shouldn't everyone have to protect the children over whom they take charge?

We like the capacity -- I'm on page 7 -- for children to report things anonymously, and we call to your attention how children learn, and so these signs need to be in all the common places and in every classroom. They need to be in the library, the lunchroom. Not just what the rules are -- they should be everyplace -- but also what you do if you know someone is being bullied. That should be posted, too.

There is no way to describe how children take in information or where they'll be when it clicks. You just don't know. It's the same thing with training significant people. There's no way to predict who will be significant to a child. And so we agree with PSEA, and we are happy to have had them say it before us, this needs to be universal training.

If you think back to your days in elementary, middle, and high school, it wasn't the person you spent the most time with who was necessarily significant to you. It

could have been a lady in the lunchroom with whom you clicked because you knew her in the neighborhood. It could have been the custodian or a facilities person. It could have been anyone who was significant. And so everyone who works with children needs to be equipped to participate in their protection. They need to know the rules, how to report, when to report, how to recognize. So that needs to be universal training.

I'm thinking of the training model from the International Institute for Restorative Practices where the first thing they do is train every adult in the building. West Philadelphia High School, who has that program, found a 57-percent decrease in aggressive behaviors the first year and a 42-percent decrease the second year. When you add that together, it came out to like a 97-percent decrease in aggressive behaviors. Well, that's almost zero, and so it demonstrates that all adults need to know how to interact with children, how to recognize the problem, and how to report it up line.

I think pretty much those were the issues that we wanted to address. We did go, on page 9, looking at the definition of what bullying or cyberbullying or intimidation or harassment is "intended to...." We would join PSEA in saying "physically, emotionally or socially harm a student or school personnel, or damage the

property...." And we would include "emotionally or socially," because we've walked the halls with children where pretty little girls with ribbons and all the physical accoutrements will gather in a circle around another little girl and just have at her emotionally -- or threaten. I have seen children come into school and say to a victim, "Today we're going to tell everyone you're a lesbian." I have taken children into my mentoring program and just protected them during those open spaces in the hall so that they were not violated in those ways. I've seen children become school-phobic. I've seen them become depressed.

And so I think it's important that you include "emotionally or socially" in that definition.

We're also intrigued by the suggestion that some consideration is being given to the school's response to outside forces. The NAACP takes calls when people feel threatened and they don't know where else to go. So we've had instances where hate groups in Delaware County put up racist material on a Website, had all the children in school in a hubbub -- nothing could happen at school -- and the recourse we had, we reported it to the FBI as a hate crime, and the response we got back was, there are adults, you know, who have done this. I remember when a student at a terminal in the Philippines released a virus that crashed pretty much international finance, and Janet Reno found

that kid, so I know they can find out who did that. But what I'm thinking of today is that it is important for you to figure out how to handle that kind of situation; what can the school do. And I know that you have to look at laws, Federal, State, and weigh that out, but I want you to know it's an issue and that schools would be strengthened in their capacity to protect kids if there is a way for them to address it.

So those were our reflections on this piece of legislation, which we were pleased and happy to see. And I know that as you work to refine this and make it the best it can be, that you have a wide eye across a State that has varying populations from different cultures and that you will do your best to make sure that this is something that keeps kids safe and helps to develop their human potential. We don't need to criminalize them.

Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks

Dr. Flynn for your very informative testimony. That was

excellent, and we'll try to integrate that into our public

policy issue on bullying as we move forward on this issue.

There is a question by Representative Truitt and recognizes Representative Truitt.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUITT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It isn't so much a question as a comment. But

between listening to you and Mr. Crossey earlier, I hadn't even thought about the direction that this legislation could go in terms of protecting adults from children, because you don't typically think of kids bullying adults. Then I just remembered that story that was on the news not too long ago about the volunteer on a bus and a bunch of kids tormented this poor lady to the edge of tears. So I appreciate your input on how we can improve the bills and thank you for taking the time to come out here today.

DR. DUVALL-FLYNN: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair recognizes Representative Quigley for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE QUIGLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you for your testimony and some of the feedback. As I said, we are hoping to gather as much input as we can as we craft a comprehensive bill for the next session.

As it relates to the law enforcement aspect of it, though, I guess it's your point that that should be a last resort as far as the involvement of them? I mean, clearly if something of a criminal nature happens, we need to get law enforcement involved. But I just wonder if you could just clarify where you think how far should we go or not go with the involvement of, you know, a law enforcement component of that.

DR. DUVALL-FLYNN: I think including a judge from family court or juvenile justice court brings to you a full knowledge of the law with a view for redemption and restoration.

When children get into the law enforcement component, that has to go a different -- it has to go down a certain avenue, and so what we would want is for children not to have to be criminalized. We think that the term that should be required is "mental health" as opposed to "criminalization." Certainly we want to restore as many young people to a balanced and productive citizenship as is possible, and that will only happen if they are healed.

It's traumatizing for a child to have the police come and put handcuffs on them. I don't know that they will ever get past that trauma. It is a different thing to have a counselor take them aside and find out, what happened to you, because the rest of us aren't doing this, and so surely it's obvious this isn't the acceptable way for people to interact with each other. So something has happened to cause this to be the choice of this child and find out what it is and help the child to balance out and be in right relationship with the community. That's what we want. Schools develop human potential.

REPRESENTATIVE QUIGLEY: Okay. Thank you.

DR. DUVALL-FLYNN: Okay.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Well, again, the Chair thanks Dr. Flynn for being with us today.

DR. DUVALL-FLYNN: Thank you.

2.1

2.2

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: There is a group that has been sitting with us very patiently, and I believe it's the Pennsylvania Student Equality Coalition. Is that correct? They're here, and they have their signs, which we have been seeing all day, and that's fine; we certainly appreciate that. They've been very good.

And Jason Goodman is one of the students. We have a few seats there, so if you and some of your colleagues would want to sit there. We are recorded, you know, across Pennsylvania on this hearing, so if you want to sit down and just say a few comments.

I'm not going to ask the Members of the committee to ask questions. We just want to hear from you. Is there anyone else who wants to sit in there and make a few statements? You have this opportunity to do so.

I would just ask that -- we have four seats there, so if you want to squeeze another person in. We just ask you to take a few minutes, introduce yourselves, and we are more than welcome to hear what you have to say.

We'll start to my right over here. If you would introduce yourself and make some comments about the issue of bullying.

MR. MEDINA: Thank you. Can everybody hear me?

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: We can hear you.

MR. MEDINA: Okay.

I'm Luis Medina. I'm a recent graduate from

Bloomsburg University. I've been involved with PSEC over

2 years now, and the issue of bullying is personal to me

because I experienced it myself.

Although I did not go to a Pennsylvania school -I was raised in Puerto Rico -- I, too, have experienced the
same experiences that other students had. It came to a
point where I was sexually harassed; I was verbally
harassed. And a lot of things were happening, and I didn't
know who I could turn to, who could help me.

It was so emotionally draining, so mentally draining, that it came to a point where I thought that the only option was to take a knife to my wrist and my life.

And I have thought of that many times, and having the conversation of bullying and having these bills passed is important, and I'm glad and I'm thankful that this is going to, because no one should have the need or think that they have to end their own life just because they see no other option and not being protected.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks you, and we'll go to the next person.

MS. SAPPIR: Hi. I'm Baylie Sappir, and I am a

current graduate student at Bloomsburg University, going for my master's in deaf education. My undergrad was in special education and elementary education, so I have, you know, a personal connection as a teacher and as part of the LGBT community a huge passion for bullying. You know, being in the forefront of the classroom and seeing it happen through my own eyes, you know, it's very sad.

You know, during student teaching, I saw it every day. And I tried very hard to, you know, stop it in the classroom or address it within the students, but, you know, being only the student teacher, it is very hard. And seeing the policies that are in place in the school districts now, you know, they're very weak and they're not very strong.

You know, in the one school district I was student teaching in, they had it in every classroom, you know, like postered on the wall, a sheet of paper that said the outline, you know, their bullying policy. But to the extent that they followed that, I have no idea, because I didn't see any repercussions taken or any actions, you know, based off of this sheet of paper that was hanging on the wall. I think it was just there for show and tell to say that, yeah, we have something in place and here it is. But, you know, did we actually follow it? I don't think that they did.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks the gentlelady and goes to Jason.

MR. GOODMAN: Hi, Chairman Clymer. Thank you so much again for giving us the opportunity for a couple of minutes to give a student perspective on the issue.

I'm going to keep my comments very brief, and then I think it's really wonderful that we'll end with Tammy Simpson, who is Brandon Bitner's mother, who was mentioned in earlier testimony.

My name is Jason Landau Goodman. I'm the

Executive Director of the Pennsylvania Student Equality

Coalition. You heard from some of our student leaders from northern Pennsylvania. We are a statewide, entirely youth-led organization representing thousands of students at over 50 chapters in support of the Pennsylvania Safe

Schools Act, Representative Truitt's HB 2636.

We are the students with the pins, and we strongly support this legislation. We know that if we're not protected, we can't learn.

HB 2636 has 30 cosponsors and supporting organizations such as domestic violence shelters, suicide prevention organizations. We have Mayors for Safe Schools in support of the Pennsylvania Safe Schools Act, known as the PASS Act, such as Mayor Ravenstahl of Pittsburgh, Mayor Stock of Butler, and Mayor Nelson in Milton.

The PASS Act was written by students, for students. We had about 2 years of input from educational stakeholders and Legislators, many of whom are on this committee, over the past year. It's obvious that the current system does not work.

In 2008, those amendments were great, but they were very vague, essentially stating, as we heard in earlier testimony, that, you know, they have to have a policy at the school districts but not necessarily what needs to be in them. This is the legislation that we need that has teeth.

The Pennsylvania school board associations need reporting, investigations, and follow-through, and that's exactly what the PASS Act does with the timeline, accountability, and follow-through.

Also, just a quick thing about the Pennsylvania
Safe Schools Report, which has been compiled by PDE since
1999. That report is done annually in January and has
about 40 checkboxes on the form. Bullying was added in the
past 5 years, not by statute, just by the department.

In the Philadelphia School District, there were only 52 cases of bullying reported in the past year. We know that bullying is widely unreported and that we really need to make sure that students don't fall through the cracks. So we really need something with definitions in

reporting, not that bullying and incidents "should be" followed through with but that there "must" be accountability and there "must" be support.

In the past 2 weeks, there have been four student suicides in northeastern Pennsylvania in Luzerne County related to bullying. At a community forum in Pittston we were at just about a week ago, there was so much pain from the community. Administrators, parents, teachers, and students -- no one really knew what the bullying policy was. They knew they had to have one but not necessarily what needed to be in it.

So this is a very important issue that truly takes, you know, all the community stakeholders to get together. The PASS Act represents the best practices from the New Jersey law that was passed really unanimously and signed by Governor Christie last year. We really, truly hope that the students that we represent across the State can count on your support for the PASS Act, as it's our best chance for real change, to make that change underground in our schools. So thank you.

 $\mbox{\sc MAJORITY}$ CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks the gentleman.

We're going to go to our next testifier, and I think he introduced you, but would you like to introduce yourself?

MS. SIMPSON: Yes. Hi. My name is

Tammy Simpson. I'm the mother of Brandon Bitner, who

committed suicide November 5, 2010. That's a picture of

Brandon there.

2.1

2.2

Brandon committed suicide due to the bullying that he endured for the past 5 years at Midd-West School District. Brandon pointed that out in his 3-page suicide note that he left behind. He walked 7 miles in the cold and dark and stepped out in front of a tractor-trailer to end his life at 3 a.m. that morning.

I looked up our school's bullying policy. It was so vague. And so many parents looked it up; nobody understood it. It was so vague. We attended a school board meeting. They basically did not want to hear from us. They put us on a timer, gave us like 10 minutes to speak. We actually had one of the school board members get up and use the restroom in the middle of us talking. They said that they had in place this bullying policy and that's all they needed to have in place; they needed nothing more. They did not want to hear from us, even though parents were there in attendance with us. They just wanted us out of there. They wanted nothing to do with us.

I keep in contact with students from that school.

I get contacted by parents daily. I see everything

firsthand. I lost my son, okay? You guys hear the

stories, but you don't live my life. My only son, my life,
he's gone. I don't get him back. I'll never see him
graduate high school. He didn't attend the prom. He

4 didn't turn 16 to drive a car. He died at 14, you know?

It's imperative we get a bill across here. We need to protect the kids that are still in these schools. I am sick of hearing statistics. I'm sick of hearing, you know, percentages. Walk in my shoes once. For 2 years I waited for something to be done, for somebody to step up to the plate and do something in these schools, and nothing, nothing has happened -- at all.

It is time for you guys to work with us and do something to protect our kids. We do not need more suicides, and it was the bullying that pushed my son to the limit. He was a distinguished honor-roll student. He was an accomplished violinist. He was going to go to Juilliard. This wasn't a kid that was flunking school, you know, doing drugs. This kid had the biggest heart ever, you know?

We need to come together, you know? You need to push something through, because every day I live with the fact that I don't have my son. I don't have him anymore. You guys still have your children or your grandkids or your nieces and nephews. I don't have him anymore. So please, look at the PASS Act. It's probably the best one we have.

I know we're looking at this bill now, but the PASS Act, it's better; it's stronger; it's what we need in our schools. So let's just all work together and do something for our kids.

Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Well, I thank you for your very good testimony, and it gives us an incentive to really push forward.

We will work in a collaborative way as Members of the General Assembly to put together the very best legislation that would protect people like your son, who very, very sadly and tragically and unfortunately took his life because of bullying. That's the purpose of this hearing, to stop it in all its forms as much as we possibly can, and we will continue our efforts until we get this mission accomplished.

You need to know that our session is coming to an end and we're not going to be able to put the bill through this year, but we have created the groundwork. From this day forward, we will now move until we get a bill in that will do some of the things that you four have and others that are seated around here have labored and worked so tirelessly. And I know Jason keeps knocking on my door all the time. It's getting worn out.

But in any event, thank you for your testimony,

```
130
     and we appreciate your coming here---
1
               MS. SIMPSON: Thank you.
2
3
               MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CLYMER: --- and listening to
4
     all the testimony from all our testifiers.
5
                This meeting is now adjourned. Thank you very
6
     much for everyone being here.
7
               MS. SIMPSON: Thank you.
8
9
                (The hearing concluded at 2:20 p.m.)
```

		131
1	I hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings	
2	are a true and accurate transcription produced from audio	
3	on the said proceedings and that this is a correct	
4	transcript of the same.	
5		
6		
7	Debra B. Miller	
8	Committee Hearing Coordinator/	
9	Legislative Reporter	
10	Notary Public	
11		
12	Diana Sharbaugh	
13	Transcriptionist	