

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
Senator Thomas Umberg, Chair
2023-2024 Regular Session

AB 2046 (Bryan)
Version: June 6, 2024
Hearing Date: June 18, 2024
Fiscal: Yes
Urgency: No
AWM

SUBJECT

Educational programs: single gender schools and classes

DIGEST

This bill extends the sunset on provisions allowing the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) to maintain single-gender schools or classes, as specified, from January 1, 2025, until January 1, 2032, and clarifies that a single-gender school or class must enroll students based on the pupil's gender identity.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2017, the Legislature enacted AB 23 (Ridley-Thomas, Ch. 654, Stats. 2017), which expressly authorized schools in LAUSD to operate as single-gender schools or with single-gender classes until January 1, 2025.¹ At the time AB 23 passed, there were already single-gender schools and schools with single-gender classes serving students in LAUSD, with more planned; yet there was ongoing uncertainty over whether these single-gender schools and classes were permissible under state and federal law, including the federal Title IX² and state and federal equal protection guarantees.

AB 23 established a firmer legal foundation for these single-gender schools and classes, by, among other things, establishing guardrails for how single-gender schools and classes may operate. At the same time, however, AB 23 reflected Legislative ambivalence about the value of single-gender education. Stakeholders raised doubts about the actual impact of single-gender education; questioned whether single-gender education served to reinforce, rather than dispel, gender-based stereotypes; and noted

¹ The bill did not specifically name LAUSD, but limited its application to schools with an average daily attendance of 400,000 pupils or more, a criterion that only LAUSD satisfied. AB 23 (Ridley-Thomas, Ch. 654, Stats. 2017.) The daily pupil attendance requirement was subsequently lowered to 250,000, in recognition of reduced pupil attendance rates during the COVID-19 pandemic; LAUSD is still the only school district that qualifies for the single-gender program. (See SB 913 (Hertzberg, Ch. 920, Stats. 2022).)

² 20 U.S.C. §§ 1681 et seq.

that single-gender education could exclude pupils who identify as nonbinary or agender. In light of these concerns, AB 23's permission for single-gender schools and classes was given a sunset date of January 1, 2025. AB 23 also requires LAUSD to compile a biannual report evaluating the effectiveness of the single-gender classes and schools, including assessments of whether the single-gender aspect is based on genuine justifications that are not reliant on stereotypes and of the impact of single-gender education on LGBTQ students.

The AB 23 single-gender program is set to sunset at the end of this year. According to the author, LAUSD, and supporters of the bill, however, the COVID-19 pandemic – which wrought havoc on education at all levels – was so disruptive that the data gathered under AB 23 will not provide an accurate assessment of the merits of single-gender education. This bill, therefore, extends the sunset on the single-gender program until the 2030-2031 school year, giving LAUSD six more school years in which to experiment with single-gender education. The bill also makes minor clarifying changes, including specifying that a pupil may attend a single-gender school or class based on the student's gender identity.

This bill is sponsored by LAUSD and is supported by the California Charter Schools Association and the Charter Schools Development Center. This Committee has not received timely opposition to this bill. The Senate Education Committee passed this bill with a vote of 5-1.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAW

Existing constitutional law:

- 1) Prohibits a state from denying to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. (U.S. Const., 14th amend., § 1.)
- 2) Provides that a person may not be denied equal protection of the laws; provided that nothing in the California Constitution imposes upon the State of California or any public entity, board, or official any obligations or responsibilities which exceed those imposed by the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution with respect to the use of pupil school assignment or pupil transportation. (Cal. Const., art. I, § 7.)
- 3) Provides that the state shall not discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment to, any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting, except that bona fide qualifications based on sex which are reasonably necessary to the normal operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting are permitted.

- a) Nothing in 3) shall be interpreted as prohibiting action which must be taken to establish or maintain eligibility for any federal program, where ineligibility would result in a loss of federal funds to the state.
- b) "State" includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the state itself, any city, county, city and county, public university system, school district, special district, or any other political subdivision or governmental instrumentality of or within the state. (Cal. Const., art. I, § 31.)

Existing federal law and regulations:

- 1) Provide that no person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance. (20 U.S.C. §§ 1681 et seq. (Title IX).)
- 2) Establish an exception to Title IX's general prohibition on discrimination on the basis of sex for the operation of single-sex elementary or secondary schools, provided that the school operating the single-sex school provides students of the excluded sex a substantially equal single-sex school or coeducational school.
 - a) If the school is a charter school that is a single-sex school local educational agency, it does not need to provide a substantially equal school to members of the excluded sex.
 - b) In determining whether members of the excluded sex have been provided with a substantially equal alternative, the Department of Education will consider a number of factors, including: the policies and criteria of admission, the educational benefits provided, including the quality, range, and content of curriculum and other services and the quality and availability of books, instructional materials, and technology, the quality and range of extracurricular offerings, the qualifications of faculty and staff, geographic accessibility, the quality, accessibility, and availability of facilities and resources, and intangible features, such as reputation of faculty. (34 C.F.R. § 106.34.)

Existing state law:

- 1) Provides that it is the policy of the State of California to afford all persons in public schools, regardless of their disability, gender, gender identity, gender expression, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or any other characteristic that is contained in the definition of hate crimes set forth in Penal Code section 422.55, including immigration status, equal rights and opportunities in the educational institutions of the state. (Ed. Code, § 200.)
- 2) Provides that no person shall be subjected to discrimination on the basis of disability, gender, gender identity, gender expression, nationality, race or ethnicity,

religion, sexual orientation, or any other characteristic that is contained in the definition of hate crimes set forth in Penal Code section 422.55, including immigration status, in any program or activity conducted by an educational institution that receives, or benefits from, state financial assistance, or enrolls pupils who receive state student financial aid. (Ed. Code, § 220.)

- 3) Provides that it is the policy of the state that elementary and secondary school classes and courses, including nonacademic and elective classes and courses, be conducted without regard to the sex of the pupil enrolled in these classes and courses; and that a school district shall not prohibit a pupil from enrolling in any class or course, or require a pupil to enroll in a particular class or course, on the basis of the pupil's sex. (Ed. Code, § 221.5(a)-(c).)
- 4) Provides that a pupil shall be permitted to participate in sex-segregated school programs and activities, including athletic teams and competitions, and use facilities consistent with their gender identity, irrespective of the gender listed on the school's records. (Ed. Code, § 221.5(f).)
- 5) Finds and declares that there are existing single-gender schools and classes in California that may assist the state in evaluating whether or not single-gender education aligned with Title IX is beneficial to pupils. (Ed. Code, § 232.)
- 6) Permits, notwithstanding 2) and 3) as they relate to discrimination on the basis of gender, a school district with an average daily attendance of 250,000 or more pupils to maintain any single-gender schools and classes that were enrolling pupils as of July 1, 2017, provided that the governing board of the school district has adopted a policy that addresses how the school district will ensure compliance with Title IX regulations as they read on October 25, 2006. (Ed. Code, § 232.2(a)(1).)
- 7) Permits, notwithstanding 2) and 3) as they relate to discrimination on the basis of gender, a charter school authorized by a school district with an average daily attendance of 250,000 or more pupils to be maintained as a single-gender school or to maintain single-gender classes when the school operated as a single-gender school or offered single-gender classes as of July 1, 2017, provided that the governing board of the school district has adopted a policy that addresses how the school district will ensure compliance with Title IX regulations as they read on October 25, 2006. (Ed. Code, § 232.2(a)(2).)
- 8) Provides that a school that continues to operate as a single-gender school pursuant to 6) or 7) shall not have a total pupil enrollment exceeding 700 pupils, and that a coeducational school maintaining existing single-gender classes pursuant to 6) or 7) shall not have a total pupil enrollment exceeding 1,000 pupils, unless the single-gender classes are authorized under other existing state or federal law. (Ed. Code, § 232.2(a)(3).)

- 9) Requires a policy adopted pursuant to 6) or 7) to include, at a minimum, all of the following requirements:
 - a) The single-gender aspect of the school or classes will serve an important school district or charter school objective to either (1) improve the educational achievement of its pupils through the school district's or charter school's overall established policy to provide diverse educational opportunities, provided that the single-gender nature of the school or classes is substantially related to achieving that objective; or (2) meet the particular, identified educational needs of its pupils, provided that the single-gender nature of the school or classes is substantially related to achieving that objective.
 - b) The school district or charter school will implement its objective in an evenhanded manner.
 - c) Pupil enrollment in a single-gender school or classes will be voluntary.
 - d) The school district or charter school will provide to pupils of both genders a substantially equal coeducational class, extracurricular activity, or program in the same subject, unless the school is a nonvocational charter school that is a single school that is not part of a network or chain of charter schools or a charter school management organization that has more than one school. (Ed. Code, § 232.2(b).)

- 10) Requires a school district or charter school that maintains an existing single-gender school or classes shall conduct the following evaluations at least once every two years:
 - a) An evaluation of whether the single-gender aspect of the school or classes is based upon genuine justifications and does not rely on overly broad generalizations about the different talents, capacities, or preferences of either gender and that the single-gender nature of the school or classes is substantially related to the achievement of the important objective for the school or classes.
 - b) An evaluation that examines whether the single-gender school or class has been effective as compared to coeducational schools.
 - c) An evaluation of the impact of the single-gender school or class on pupils who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, questioning, or gender nonconforming. (Ed. Code, § 232.4(a).)

- 11) Requires the metrics used to evaluate the single-gender school or class to be included in the policy adopted pursuant to 9), and for the evidence in the evaluation to include, at a minimum, the evidence described in the United States Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights "Questions and Answers on Title IX and Single-Sex Elementary and Secondary Classes and Extracurricular Activities" of December 1, 2014. (Ed. Code, § 232.4(b).)

- 12) Requires the school district or charter school to submit the findings of the evaluations required pursuant to 9) to the Senate Committee on Education, the

Assembly Committee on Education, the Assembly Committee on Judiciary, the Senate Committee on Judiciary, and the California Department of Education (DOE). In the event that the DOE finds that one or more of the single-gender schools or classes fails to comply with the requirements of Title IX regulations as they read on October 25, 2026, the DOE shall order corrective action up to and including requiring that the school or classes become coeducational. (Ed. Code, § 232.4(c).)

13) Provides that, except as set forth in 5)-12) or as otherwise provided in Education Code section 221.5 or Title IX, no public elementary or secondary school, including a charter school, shall operate as a single-gender school or with single classes. (Ed. Code, § 232.4(d).)

14) Provides that 5)-13) will sunset on January 1, 2025. (Ed. Code, § 232.6.)

This bill:

- 1) Eliminates the requirement that, in complying with federal Title IX regulations, a single-gender school or class comply with those regulations as they read on October 25, 2006.
- 2) Clarifies that a school operating a single-gender school or class must enroll pupils in the class or school based on the pupil's gender identity.
- 3) Requires a school district or charter school to make its biannual evaluations of the single-gender school or class publicly available on its website.
- 4) Extends the sunset on single-gender schools and classes so that it will become inoperative on July 1, 2031, and be repealed as of January 1, 2032.
- 5) Makes nonsubstantive and technical conforming changes.

COMMENTS

1. Author's comment

According to the author:

In 2017, AB 23 paved the way for single-gender classes and schools as a pilot program in Los Angeles. This innovative approach expanded educational opportunities and aligned with community goals by creating focused school programs. These programs aimed to enhance the representation of women and minorities in critical fields such as science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and leadership – for both boys and girls. Unfortunately, during the years 2020-2022, the pilot program was affected by the COVID-19 pandemic.

AB 23 initially allowed single-gender schools to operate until January 1, 2025, with evaluations conducted at least once every two years. The evidence from these independent evaluations demonstrates great results. GALA students consistently outperform their peers on standardized assessments, BALA students achieve higher GPAs, and both GALA and GALS LA foster an inclusive environment where LGBTQ+ students feel accepted. Student surveys reveal higher levels of happiness and belonging within these schools compared to other co-ed schools in the district. AB 2046 will continue to empower students, promote diversity, and contribute to educational excellence by providing the pilot program more time to collect data.

2. Background on single-gender schools and AB 23

The value of single-gender education is a hotly debated issue. As explained by the Senate Judiciary Committee's analysis of AB 23:

The impact of gender segregated schooling has been studied extensively. It is possible to find results that support the idea that gender segregated schools lead to better outcomes for female students. The National Coalition of Girls Schools, for example, points to three studies that it claims found, among other things, that students attending girls' schools are "more likely to have an experience supporting their learning," more likely to report higher aspirations and motivation, and have more "favorable outcomes" in math, science, and computer skills, than girls in coed schools.

In general however, the data seems to be more mixed or inconclusive, particularly when the studies attempt to isolate the effect of gender segregated schooling alone. A 2014 meta-analysis that took into account numerous studies done on gender segregated education summarized its conclusions as follows:

Overall, does [single-sex] schooling confer the advantages claimed by its proponents? According to this meta-analysis, the answer appears to be no, or not much. When one looks at the results for the controlled studies (i.e. those that used the best research methods), [single-sex] schooling generally produced only trivial advantages over [coeducational] [...]. There is little evidence of an advantage of [single-sex] schooling for girls or boys for any of the outcomes."³

In the face of this ambiguity, California launched the Single-Gender Academies Pilot Program in the 1990s. It didn't go so well:

³ Sen. Com. on Judiciary, Analysis of Assem. Bill No. 23 (2017-2018 Reg. Sess.) as amended May 30, 2017, p. 8 (footnotes omitted).

As originally envisioned, the program was to have 10 pairs of gender segregated schools, each consisting of one boys' school and one girls' school. Only six proposals materialized, however, so only 12 gender segregated schools were ever established under the program. Later proposals to extend further funding to the schools failed and within a few short years, all of the gender segregated schools had closed or converted to coeducational formats.⁴

The issue of single-gender education came back to the Legislature in 2017. At the time, there were two LAUSD schools operating as single-gender schools or offering single-gender classes, with one more in the works, and the California Department of Education had ordered one of those schools to integrate all but its STEM classes.⁵ Faced with uncertainty about whether any of the single-gender LAUSD schools could continue to operate, the Legislature enacted AB 23, which granted "school districts with average daily attendance of 400,000 or more pupils" – meaning only LAUSD – to operate single-gender schools or schools offering single-gender classes.⁶

AB 23 was not an unconditional endorsement of single-gender education, however. AB 23's authorization for single-gender schools and classes is set to sunset on January 1, 2025, so that the Legislature could revisit the authorization.⁷ In addition to the sunset, AB 23 imposed a number of restrictions on single-gender schools and classes, including requiring policies to ensure compliance with Title IX, requiring that the single-gender aspect of the school or classes serve an important objective related to educational goals, and requiring that pupil enrollment in single-gender schools or classes be voluntary.⁸ AB 23 also imposed a reporting requirement on LAUSD, requiring biannual evaluations of all of the following:

- (1) An evaluation of whether the single gender aspect of the school or classes is based upon genuine justifications and does not rely on overly broad generalizations about the different talents, capacities, or preferences of either gender and that the single gender nature of the school or classes is substantially related to the achievement of the important objective for the school or classes.
- (2) An evaluation that examines whether the single gender school or class has been effective as compared to coeducational schools.
- (3) An evaluation of the impact of the single gender school or class on pupils who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, questioning, or gender nonconforming.⁹

⁴ *Id.* at p. 9.

⁵ *Id.* at p. 7.

⁶ AB 23 (Ridley-Thomas, Ch. 654, Stats. 2017).

⁷ Ed. Code, § 232.6.

⁸ *Id.*, § 232.2.

⁹ *Id.*, § 232.4.

3. Status of the AB 23 project

There are currently four schools operating within LAUSD pursuant to the AB 23 pilot: the Boys Academic Leadership Academy (BALA), the Girls Academic Leadership Academy (GALA), the Girls Athletic Leadership School Los Angeles (GALS LA) and Young Oak Kim Academy (YOKA).¹⁰ BALA, GALA, and YOKA are public schools, and GALS LA is an independent charter school authorized by LAUSD.¹¹ BALA and GALA are campuses with pupils in grades 6 through 12 and focus on STEM.¹² YOKA is a sixth-to-eighth grade middle school focused on STEAM which serves pupils of all genders but separates them by gender for math, science, English, history, and physical education classes.¹³ GALS LA is a sixth-to-eighth grade middle school with a focus on college prep for girls.¹⁴ YOKA and GALA already existed when AB 23 was passed, while BALA and GALS LA opened shortly thereafter.¹⁵ In the 2022-2023 academic year, there were 1,787 pupils – 487 boys and 1,300 girls – enrolled in the four schools combined.¹⁶

Based on the most recent evaluation conducted pursuant to AB 23, it is difficult to draw broad conclusions about all four schools.

- GALA is so popular that it has a waiting list, and its pupils' test scores in math and science match or exceed pupils' scores at peer schools; on the other hand, GALA students are significantly more economically advantaged than LAUSD as a whole.¹⁷
- BALA is experiencing lower-than-desired enrollment and its pupils' test scores generally match the test scores of pupils at peer schools; yet BALA's students' grade point averages tend to be higher than their peers', and BALA has been applauded for its work with pupils with individualized educational programs (IEPs) and special education resources.¹⁸
- GALS LA is also below its desired enrollment, though it is in the process of moving to a standalone facility which might attract more students.¹⁹ GALS LA students in all grades performed better than their peers on some metrics, but were still not up to grade level.²⁰ GALS LA also reports, however, that its single-gender approach has been beneficial in providing increased attention to girls with learning disabilities – studies have shown that boys are referred to support

¹⁰ LAUSD Single Gender Classes & Schools Evaluation, AB 23 Evaluation Report #3 (Oct. 11, 2023), p. iv.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Id.* at p. 1. "STEM" stands for science, technology, engineering, and mathematics; "STEAM" is STEM plus art.

¹³ LAUSD Single Gender Classes & Schools Evaluation, *supra*, at pp. 1, 11.

¹⁴ *Id.* at p. 1.

¹⁵ *Id.* at p. 4.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *Id.* at pp. 9, 14, 17-18.

¹⁸ *Id.* at pp. 12-14.

¹⁹ *Id.* at p. 13.

²⁰ *Id.* at p. 19.

for learning disabilities at twice the rate of girls, even though they experience learning disabilities at the same rates – and that the school is able to give support to pupils who should have previously received speech or other forms of therapy but were not recognized in the coeducational environment.²¹

- YOKA has “a relatively low percentage of students who meet or exceed” specified academic standards, as compared to pupils at peer schools, when examined at the schoolwide level.²² YOKA has noted that its staffing model, which requires teachers to teach single-gender core classes and co-educational elective classes, raises “consistent challenges...in terms of understanding and preparing teachers with effective approaches to classroom behavior exhibited in the different settings.”²³ YOKA is planning to offer professional development for staff but has no current plans to change its structure.²⁴

The report also notes that the schools vary in terms of providing LGBTQ-accepting environments. GALS LA has begun to call itself “a school serving ‘Girls+’ ... serv[ing] students who are gender fluid, transgender, students who identify as girls, nonbinary students, and ‘everything in between.’ ”²⁵ GALA reports a much higher rate of students reporting that LGBTQ students are accepted at their school than the LAUSD average; YOKA’s reported rates are also higher than the LAUSD average, though by a slimmer margin.²⁶ “BALA’s approach to inclusion of [LGBTQ] students was not outrightly visible.”²⁷

4. This bill extends the sunset on LAUSD’s single-gender schools and classes pilot project, allowing single-gender schools and classes to be maintained through the 2030-2031 school year

The single-gender school and classes program in LAUSD is set to sunset at the end of this year.²⁸ According to LAUSD, the sponsor of the bill, the program and the ability to evaluate the success of the single-gender classes and schools was “substantially impacted by the disruptions of the COVID-19 pandemic.” This bill, therefore, extends the sunset on the single-educational program in LAUSD to allow it to run through the 2030-2031 school year. The bill also makes technical amendments, including clarifying that a single-gender school or class must enroll a pupil based on the pupil’s gender identity.

The Senate Education Committee considered this bill from an educational standpoint and passed the bill with a vote of 5-1, with amendments. The amendments shortened

²¹ *Id.* at p. 20.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *Id.* at p. 16.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ *Id.* at p. 25.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ Ed. Code, § 232.6.

the extended sunset date in the bill – from July 1, 2035, to July 1, 2031 – and added the clarifying language regarding students’ gender identities. According to the author, the schools in the pilot already admit students based on their gender identity, so these amendments simply codify existing practices.

For purposes of this Committee’s jurisdiction, the bill generally presents the same legal issues that were present in AB 23. The legal landscape has shifted somewhat since 2017, however: in April 2024, the United States Department of Education announced that it was adopting new regulations to clarify that Title IX prohibits discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity.²⁹ The regulations are set to take effect on August 1, 2024,³⁰ though 26 states have sued to block their implementation.³¹ If the regulations take effect, they will not modify the regulations permitting single-gender schools and classes under specified circumstances,³² so it does not appear that the new federal regulations are intended to prohibit single-gender education. The new Title IX regulations do, however, make it imperative for the LAUSD schools to ensure that they are not discriminating against transgender, nonbinary, agender, or other gender-expansive pupils; the amendments made by the Senate Education Committee appear consistent with these requirements. If the bill passes and the program is extended through 2031, the Legislature may wish to closely examine the schools’ success in providing educational opportunities to LGBTQ pupils when deciding whether to permit single-gender education schools and classes on a permanent basis.

5. Arguments in support

According to LAUSD, the bill’s sponsor:

In 2017, Los Angeles Unified first sought approval from the Legislature to offer single-gender educational opportunities to our students through the passage of AB 23 (Ridley-Thomas). AB 23 supported the diverse families Los Angeles Unified serves, some of which prefer a single-gender educational environment for their children. It also offered the opportunity to increase the representation of

²⁹ U.S. Dept. of Education, Press Release: U.S. Department of Education Releases Final Title IX Regulations, Providing Vital Protections Against Sex Discrimination (Apr. 19, 2024), <https://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/us-department-education-releases-final-title-ix-regulations-providing-vital-protections-against-sex-discrimination>; see U.S. Dept. of Education, 4000-01-U, Amendments to 34 C.F.R. pt. 106, § 106.10 (unofficial version), available at <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/t9-unofficial-final-rule-2024.pdf>. (All links in this analysis are current as of June 13, 2024.)

³⁰ U.S. Dept. of Education, 4000-01-U, Amendments to 34 C.F.R. pt. 106, *supra*, p. 1.

³¹ Miranda, *More than half of states sue to block Biden Title IX rule protecting LGBTQ+ students*, Virginia Mercury (May 21, 2024), <https://virginiamercury.com/2024/05/21/more-than-half-of-states-including-virginia-sue-to-block-biden-title-ix-rule-protecting-lgbtq-students/>.

³² See generally U.S. Dept. of Education, 4000-01-U, Amendments to 34 C.F.R. pt. 106, *supra*; 34 C.F.R. § 106.34.

women and students of color in the areas of science, technology, engineering, math, and leadership.

Among those provisions of AB 23 was the requirement for regular reports to the Legislature assessing the ongoing justification for offering a single gender school, the effectiveness of single-gender schools compared to their co-educational counterparts and the impact of single-gender schools on LGBTQIA+ students. While the results from these reports are promising, the evaluations were substantially impacted by the disruptions of the COVID-19 pandemic. For this reason, we believe it is appropriate to extend the authorization until 2035 to allow for a longitudinal assessment.

SUPPORT

LAUSD (sponsor)
California Charter Schools Association
Charter Schools Development Center

OPPOSITION

None known

RELATED LEGISLATION

Pending Legislation: None known.

Prior Legislation:

SB 913 (Hertzberg, Ch. 920, Stats. 2022) among other things, reduced the attendance threshold for school districts that may maintain single-gender public schools, from an average daily attendance of 400,000 to an average daily attendance of 250,000.

AB 23 (Ridley-Thomas, Ch. 654, Stats. 2017) expressly authorized public schools in school districts with an average daily attendance of 400,000 or more to establish gender segregated schools and instructional programs, provided that the school district (1) adopts policies addressing compliance with federal prohibitions on gender-based discrimination, and (2) submits biannual evaluations to the Legislature relating to the single-gender schools. AB 23 is discussed in greater detail in Part 2 of this analysis.

PRIOR VOTES:

Senate Education Committee (Ayes 5, Noes 1)
Assembly Floor (Ayes 72, Noes 0)
Assembly Appropriations Committee (Ayes 14, Noes 0)
Assembly Education Committee (Ayes 7, Noes 0)
