2021 Sex Ed State Legislative Mid-Year Report

Updated August 2021



Table of Contents

This document is interactive. Click on the page numbers below to jump to that page, and click the three-line menu button in the top right corner of any page to return here.

I.	State of Sex Ed Across the Country				
II.	State Legislative Round Up: Legislative Trends				
	1. Legislative Trends Advancing Sex Ed				
	2. Legislative Trends Restricting Sex Ed				
ш.	A Deeper Dive: Enacted Bill Summaries				
IV.	Implications for the Future of Sex Ed				
V.	State Bill Table				

VI. Endnotes

Suggested citation: SIECUS: Sex Ed for Social Change. (2021). 2021 Sex Ed State Legislative Mid-Year Report. https://siecus.org/resources/2021-sex-ed-state-legislative-mid-year-report/

3

8

13

16

23 28 43

State of Sex Ed Across the Country

The sex education that young people receive nationwide is shaped by policy decisions at every level. The infusion of new conservative hostility surrounding sex education is raising new awareness of the importance of local school boards and their influence on the curriculum being taught. Simultaneously, the ability of the federal government to enact sweeping sex education requirements continues to be a focal point of advocacy efforts.

THE ALL AND DO THE SAME

PHOTO BY REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH SUPPLIES COALITION

Ι.

The lack of any national mandate means that state legislation and local policy efforts continue to play an increasingly critical role in advancing sex education and sets a precedent for determining how comprehensive instruction may be implemented statewide. Similarly, state legislation influences how accessible reproductive health care services are for minors. Without access to affirming reproductive health care providers, even the most comprehensive sex education (CSE) is limited in its impact. Access to both comprehensive sex education and affirming reproductive health care work is critical for the work to support young people in making informed decisions about their sexual and reproductive health and future.

As of July 15, 2021, legislative sessions in <u>38</u> of the 50 states had adjourned for the year. While the COVID-19 pandemic and new variants of the virus continue to impact communities globally, legislatures in the United States pushed forward to tackle their ambitious policy agendas. With <u>over half</u> of the country having received at least one dose of a COVID-19 vaccine, legislators capitalized on the opportunity to consider a wide array of legislative issues impacting their constituents while continuing to address the implications of the evolving virus.

At the mid-point of 2021, SIECUS: Sex Ed for Social Change compiled notable activity related to sex education policy.

Highlights from state sex education legislation in 2021:

bills were introduced (or carried over from the prior session) related to sex education instruction in schools.

- bills were enacted in **11** states:
 - 5 new laws advance sex education.
 - 8 new laws restrict sex education.
 - 2 new laws have a **mixed** impact on sex education.
 - 1 new law has a **neutral** impact on sex education.



bills (68%) introduced sought to advance the quality of sex education.



bills sought to restrict the quality of instruction and undermine the rights of young people. **8** of these bills have passed thus far.



bills would have a neutral impact on the quality of sex education.



bills would have a mixed impact on the quality of sex education, with portions of the proposed legislation advancing and portions restricting sex education.

While we celebrate the legislative victories won this year through the hard work of advocates, continuous advocacy is necessary to improve the quality of sex education in schools across the United States. On average, **less than 43%** of US high schools and **18%** of middle schools taught all 20 topics identified by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) as critical pregnancy, HIV, or STD prevention topics in 2018.¹

While it is largely the responsibility of each state to meet this standard, the amount of federal funding directly influences the quality of sex education taught. More than **\$2 billion**² has been wasted on failed³ federal abstinence-only-until-marriage (AOUM) programming, which has since been rebranded as "sexual risk avoidance" programming. Under the Trump administration, AOUM/SRA funding more than doubled.² While advocates had high hopes that the Biden administration would reverse this damaging trend, the President's FY 2022 budget included a disappointing \$35 million allocated toward AOUM/SRA programming. Such increases in AOUM/SRA funding can impact states' abilities to provide quality adolescent sexual health programs by giving schools no other choice than to accept AOUM/SRA funding and teach an abstinence-only or abstinence-based program. Further, they may embolden state legislatures to advocate for AOUM/SRA programming to take advantage of federal funding despite the harmful impact of such programming on young people, especially girls, LGBTQ+ youth, and Black youth in particular.³

Fortunately, the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies (LHHS) funding bill that was passed by the <u>House</u> <u>Appropriations Committee</u> on July 14 included **\$130 million** for the Teen Pregnancy Prevention program, an increase of \$29 million from the FY21 budget. Further, it included no funding for AOUM/SRA programming, and eliminated the <u>Hyde Amendment</u> by removing restrictions on accessing reproductive health care from federal funds. Further, the LHHS bill increased funding to the Title X Family Planning Program to **\$400 million**, an increase of \$113.5 million from the FY21 budget. These historic wins will, if enacted, significantly improve access to critical reproductive and preventative health care services, and advance gender and health equity across the nation.

Comprehensive Sex Education

Programs that build a foundation of knowledge and skills relating to human development, relationships, decision making, abstinence, contraception, and disease prevention. Ideally, schoolbased CSE should begin in kindergarten and continue through 12th grade. At each developmental stage, these programs teach age-appropriate, medically accurate, and culturally responsive information that builds on the knowledge and skills that were taught in the previous stage.⁴ Further, comprehensive sex education addresses topics such as violence prevention, mental and emotional health, personal skills such as communication and personal safety, reproductive health, sexual behavior, topics related to sexual orientation and gender identity, race and ethnicity, ability, and society and culture.

.

Positive Trends in 2021

Many positive trends emerged regarding sex education advancements during state legislative sessions in 2021 Bills that mandate instruction on consent, sexual violence prevention, dating violence prevention, and abuse prevention make up **33%** of introduced bills. Bills that include quality requirements for sex education, such as mandating medically accurate, evidence based, or culturally responsive curriculum, made up **21%** of introduced bills. Bills mandating comprehensive sex education (CSE) made up **14%** of introduced bills.

Positive trends in provisions concerning minors' access to sexual and reproductive health care emerged as well. Bills designed to increase the ability of minors to consent to preventative STI treatments as well as reproductive health care services (including access to abortion care, prenatal health care, contraceptives, and health care more broadly) were prominent across **7** states (Colorado, Hawaii, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, South Dakota, Texas) and the District of Columbia.

Characteristics of Comprehensive Sex Education⁴

- Is research-based, medically accurate, and developmentally appropriate;
- Provides functional knowledge that is basic, accurate, and directly contributes to health-promoting decisions and behaviors;
- Addresses individual values, attitudes, beliefs, and group norms that support health-enhancing behaviors;
- Focuses on increasing personal perceptions of risk and harmfulness of engaging in specific unhealthy practices and behaviors, as well as reinforcing protective factors;
- Addresses social pressures and influences;
- Provides age- and developmentally appropriate information, learning strategies, teaching methods, and materials;
- Incorporates learning strategies, teaching methods, and materials that are trauma-informed, culturally responsive, sex positive, and grounded in social justice and equity;
- Encourages the use of technology to access multiple valid sources of information, recognizing the significant role that technology plays in young people's lives; and
- Includes teacher information and lesson plan for professional development and training to enhance effectiveness of instruction and student learning.





124 bills introduced:

- 84 advance
- 6 neutral
- 10 mixed
- 24 restrict



17 bills passed:

- 6 advance
- 1 neutral
- 2 mixed
- 8 restrict

Negative Trends in 2021

While the number of restrictive sex education bill introduced were a mere quarter of the number of bills that sought to advance sex education, the number of enacted restrictive sex education bills surpassed the number of progressive bills. Similar to the 2020 state legislative session, trends include **12** <u>"opt-in"</u> provisions that were introduced across eight states (Arizona, Idaho, Iowa, Massachusetts, Minnesota, North Dakota, Ohio, Texas) and **eight** abstinence instruction requirements were introduced across four states (Alabama, Florida, Texas, Mississippi). ■

Key:

- Advance = Move us closer to our goal of CSE
 Neutral = No positive or negative impact on our goal of furthering CSE
 Mixed = Include a combination of advancing
 - or restrictive provisions related to furthering CSE
 - **Restrict** = Take us further from our goal of CSE

II. State Legislative Round Up: Legislative Trends

While efforts to implement regressive sex education legislation were relatively minimal, new attacks on access to reproductive health care services for minors, efforts to limit education on systemic racism, and attacks on LGBTQ+ youth significantly outnumbered efforts to advance the quality of education and medical care for young people.

> PHOTO BY LOGAN WEAVER

2021 is already <u>one of the worst</u> anti-abortion legislative sessions in decades due to the increasing number of abortion ban attacks.

At least 67 bills were introduced in half of the states to ban all or most abortions, with an additional 69 bills introduced that sought to impose further restrictions on accessing abortion care, resulting in an overwhelming 137 **bills** that sought to restrict abortion access alone. Additionally, **eleven** states (Florida, Indiana, Iowa Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Montana, North Dakota, Texas, Virginia) introduced legislation designed to increase parental consent requirements regarding minors' access to sexual and reproductive health care and gender affirming care. Eleven states (Alabama, Connecticut, Mississippi, Montana, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Illinois, Iowa, Washington, West Virginia) introduced provisions that sought to establish parental notification requirements regarding

minors' access to sexual and reproductive health care services, joining **twelve** states (Arkansas, Arizona, California, Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, Missouri, Minnesota, Montana, Ohio, Tennessee, Texas) that introduced bills to increase sex education parental notification requirements.

During the 2021 state legislative session, legislators also launched a coordinated effort to limit the rights of transgender Americans, and focused these attacks on trans youth. One way this manifested was through the overwhelming effort to limit the ability of health care professionals to provide gender affirming care to transgender minors. Despite these ageappropriate practices, which are recognized by leading health care organizations such as the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP), at least 32 bills were introduced across 16 states (Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, lowa) to prohibit this practice.



Legislative Trends Advancing Sex Ed

At least **82** bills were introduced across **30** states that would advance sex education instruction. Legislative topics include CSE mandates, CSE for foster youth, quality requirements, consent education, abuse prevention, teacher training, communication skills, and repealing adverse instruction requirements on sexual orientation and gender identity. **14** bills would increase access to reproductive health care services for young people.

CSE Mandates

While the majority of sex education provisions introduced in 2021 have focused on advancing specific elements of sex education such as mandating instruction on healthy relationships and sexual violence prevention and advancing sex education quality requirements, **16** bills were introduced in Arkansas, Arizona, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, and Pennsylvania with the goal of mandating comprehensive sex education in public schools and/or charter schools. Seven bills (MA SB 318, NY A 2584, NY A 6616, IL HB 1736, HB 3071, SB 818, IN HB 1366) aligned the comprehensive sex education requirements with the National Sex Education Standards and highlighted this compliance within the bill text.

Abuse Prevention

During the 2021 state legislative sessions, legislatures nationwide have continued to grapple with ways to make abuse prevention education more comprehensive. These efforts have been informed by ongoing conversations around sexual assault and abuse in popular media, the entertainment industry, the workforce, higher education, among politicians, and across social media platforms. Making up nearly a third of the total sex education bills introduced, 41 bills across 19 states (Arizona, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah) required additional education regarding dating and sexual violence prevention, abuse prevention, or healthy relationships to be added to existing health education curricula. Further, 14 of these bills mandate instruction on consent or expand on current consent education requirements. A notable amount of abuse and violence prevention mandates received increased bipartisan support when compared to other sex education topics, marking a significant opportunity for advocates to advance legislation regarding abuse prevention instruction.

Quality Requirements

Bills advancing sex education quality requirements were a common strategy used to make incremental advancements to sex education curriculum in 2021. 25 bills required that sex education be medically accurate, age-appropriate, evidence-based, and/or culturally-appropriate. Bills that mandated advancements to the quality of sex education were introduced across 12 states (Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, New York, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas). Notably, the majority of bills that mandated advanced guality requirements also contained provisions concerning other topics such as abuse prevention and communication skills.

Encouraging Communication Skills

Teaching young people to safely communicate their sexual wants, desires, concerns, and boundaries, both digitally and in-person, is an essential component of sex education. **Ten** bills introduced across **six** states (Florida, Illinois, Kentucky, Tennessee, Texas, Utah) addressed teaching the skills to effectively and safely communicate with parents and partners, as well as communicating through digital means.

Teacher Training

Teacher training has been proven to be the most significant indicator in determining the quality of sex education instruction and confidence and comfort with teaching sex education.⁴ Because of this, provisions that mandate increased funding and time dedicated to ensuring educators are trained to the <u>National Teacher Preparation</u> <u>Standards for Sexuality Education</u> are critical to advancing comprehensive sex education across the country.

In 2021, **17** bills mandated teacher training on topics concerning human sexuality. **Eight** of these bills included training requirements specifically for sex educators, while nine bills mandated teacher training on topics related to sexual abuse prevention, dating violence prevention, or abuse prevention. For example, **Arkansas's** <u>SB 655</u> requires the Division of Elementary and Secondary Education to require minimum education and training qualifications for sex education instructions in addition to mandating comprehensive sex education. In comparison, **Nebraska LB 281** mandates professional training for administrators, teachers, or other school personnel regarding communicating child sexual abuse prevention techniques in addition to mandating instruction on child sexual abuse prevention in kindergarten through fifth grade.

Reproductive Health Care

Legislation introduced with the goal of expanding access to reproductive health care services to minors is essential in ensuring young people have the means to make decisions about their reproductive and sexual health. In 2021, **14** bills addressed the ability of minors to consent to preventative STI treatment or reproductive health care services. This included bills such as **Texas <u>HB 4389</u>**, which sought to repeal restrictive provisions related to abortion care and permit minors 16 years of age or older to consent to the full spectrum of pregnancy related care, including abortion.

Inclusive Instruction and Access to Care for LGBTQ+ Youth

In 2021, we saw an uptick in legislative efforts to amend state sex education requirements that require discriminatory instruction on sexual orientation and/or gender identity. Seven bills were introduced in Alabama and Texas that sought to repeal this instruction. The ultimately unsuccessful effort to repeal Texas code regarding teaching on sexual orientation and gender identity follows the recent revision of sex education standards, in which advocates pushed for more inclusive and culturally responsive instruction. While the updated curriculum failed to include topics related to sexual orientation and gender identity, educators are now required to provide instruction on contraceptive options beyond abstinence to middle school students. Six additional bills introduced across Arizona, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York sought to mandate LGBTQ+ inclusive instruction in general curriculum standards, joining the **two** bills introduced in Hawaii and Arizona that sought to prohibit discriminatory instruction on sexual orientation and gender identity in sex education instruction. In addition, 20 bills were introduced across ten states (Delaware, Illinois, Maryland, Michigan, North Carolina, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, Vermont, and West Virginia) that sought to prohibit discrimination against LGBTQ+ people in both school settings and through the inclusion of sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI) under civil rights protections. An additional 42 bills were introduced across 22 states (Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, West Virginia and Wisconsin) that sought to prohibit or expand upon laws which already prohibit conversion therapy.

Topics breakdown:



- 17 CSE Mandates
- 41 Abuse Prevention and Consent
- 25 Quality Requirements
- 10 Communication skills
- 17 Teacher Training
- 14 Increased Access to Reproductive Health Care
- 22 Additional Positive Content Requirements

Positive LGBTQ+ policy proposals:



- **7** remove discriminatory mandates regarding SOGI instruction in sex education
- **6** require LGBTQ+ inclusive instruction in general curriculum standards or
- **2** prohibit discriminatory SOGI instruction within sex education
- 20 anti-discrimination bills
- 42 bills prohibiting conversion therapy

Legislative Trends Restricting Sex Ed

23 bills were introduced across **13** states (Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, Florida, Idaho, Iowa, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Tennessee) that sought to restrict sex education. Legislative topics included abstinence requirements, "opt-in" policies, and prohibiting abortion education or advocacy. In addition, **172** bills were introduced to restrict access to reproductive health care services for minors.

Abstinence Requirements

"Sexual risk avoidance" programming, also known as abstinence-only-until-marriage programming, overwhelmingly inhibits educators from teaching young people about the benefits of contraception and utilizes biased, morally charged instructional materials about sexuality. Further, it fails to respond to the needs of young people who are sexually active, are survivors of sexual abuse, and/or are LGBTO+. The inclusion of instruction on abstinence as an option young people have to avoid unplanned pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections (STIs) is necessary within any sex education program, and included within all comprehensive sex education curricula. However, teaching abstinence to the exclusion of other materials and contraceptive options not only disregards decades of research demonstrating the ineffectiveness of abstinence programming, but also fails to address and often shames young people's lived experiences. Such disregard for the experiences of young people creates a harmful environment in which students are routinely stigmatized based on their identities or experiences, rather than affirmed. In 2021, nine provisions emphasized abstinence programming across three states (Florida, Mississippi, and Texas).

"Opt-In" Policies

Policies that mandate written permission from a parent or guardian before a student can participate in sex education or a specific portion of sex education, also known as "opt-in" policies, present another barrier to young people receiving comprehensive sex education. Additionally, they provide an opportunity for parents opposed to sex education to involve themselves in efforts to diminish the reach of advanced instruction. They establish additional steps before a young person can participate in sex education, overlooking the fact that parents and guardians have a say under **both** opt-in and opt-out policies. Further, these requirements further stigmatize sex education as a topic that requires additional surveillance. In 2021, 12 bills sought to mandate opt-in requirements across eight states (Arizona, Idaho, Iowa, Massachusetts, Minnesota, North Dakota, Ohio, Texas).

Abortion Education or Advocacy

Young people have a right to medically accurate and unbiased information on the full range of sexual and reproductive health care optionsincluding abortion. Five bills considered in 2021 would limit the ability of educators to provide accurate information concerning abortion and inhibit the ability of certain health educators, such as employees of Planned Parenthood, to provide advanced sex education due to their affiliation with abortion services. These legislative efforts also seek to penalize educators and other school employees who assist young people in accessing abortion care, creating a school culture in which employees avoid providing further information about reproductive health care services to students in fear of losing their jobs.

Reproductive Health Care Restrictions

Provisions designed to partially or completely limit access to reproductive health care services for young people were among the most prominent trends in 2021. While the 67 near or total abortion bans introduced across 25 states (Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wyoming) states target all people who need abortion care, they have a particularly harmful impact on young people who face additional barriers to accessing reproductive health care. An additional 69 bills were introduced that sought to limit abortion based upon the method, gestational age, reason for obtaining an abortion, or in response to defining fetal personhood.

Further, it is imperative that young people can make sexual and reproductive health care decisions in confidence with their health care providers. This year, **11** bills sought to increase parental consent requirements for minors to obtain reproductive health care, while **14** bills sought to implement parental notification requirements.

Barriers for LGBTQ+ Youth

2021 also marked a historic year regarding the overwhelming number of provisions designed to limit access to inclusive instruction, school activities, and affirming medical care for LGBTQ+ youth—with the majority of efforts aimed at transgender youth in particular. **Two** bills introduced in Tennessee (<u>HB 800/SB 1216</u>) sought to prohibit textbooks and instructional materials that "promote, normalize, support, or address lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender issues or "lifestyles", joining Tennessee's enacted <u>HB 529</u> that requires parental notification regarding instruction on sexual orientation and gender identity and further permits parents from opting their children out of such instruction. The largest coordinated effort to harm transgender youth came in the form of anti-transgender sports bans that were introduced through 75 bills across 34 states. This harmful effort to limit the ability of transgender youth to participate in sports according with their gender identity was closely followed by the devastating effort to limit the ability of medical professionals from providing gender affirming care to minors. A devastating **32** bills that sought to limit this practice were introduced across 18 states. Gender-affirming care is supported as a medical necessity by leading health professionals, including the American Medical Association, and the American Academy of Pediatrics. Young people have the right to participate in decisions concerning their own bodies, and affirmation of their identities inside and outside of the classroom is essential for their well-being and provides the opportunity to make informed decisions.

"

A devastating **32** bills that sought to limit gender-affirming care for minors were introduced across **18** states.



Many LGBTQ+ youth, especially LGBTQ+ youth who are Black, Indigenous, or other youth of color, still do not have access to sex education that is representative of their identities and needs. Continued advocacy for proactive legislation regarding LGBTQ+ inclusivity and nondiscrimination is necessary in order to counteract dehumanizing trends that aggressively target the autonomy of young people and dismiss expert advice on what is best for their well-being. Alongside these actions must be a push for LGBTQ+-inclusive and affirming health care, as education is most impactful when these resources are also available to and accessible by youth. The updated report, A Call to Action: LGBTQ+ Youth Need Inclusive Sex Education, provides guidance for supporters on how they can effectively advocate for LGBTQ+ inclusive sex ed and enact progressive policy changes in their communities.

Topics breakdown:



- 9 Abstinence Requirements
- 12 "Opt-in" Policies
- **5** Abortion Education or Advocacy
- **5** Additional Negative Content Requirements
- **169** Additional Reproductive Health Care Restrictions

Anti-LGBTQ+ policy proposals:



- 2 prohibit instruction on LGBTQ+ identity
- **1** opt-out of SOGI instruction
- 75 sports bans
- 32 medical care bans

III. A Deeper Dive: Enacted Bill Summaries

Across the United States, at least **36 bills** passed related to sex education and access to reproductive health care for young people, a significant uptick from the **14 bills** that passed regarding sex education and access to reproductive health care for young people during states' 2020 legislative session.

> PHOTO BY E<mark>MMANUEL IKWUEGBU</mark>

The 36 provisions differ greatly in their positive or negative impact on young people:

- Alabama's <u>HB 385</u>, Colorado's <u>SB-21-016</u>, Illinois's <u>SB 818</u>, North Dakota's <u>SB 2311</u>, Oklahoma's <u>SB 89</u>, Rhode Island's <u>HB 5083</u> and <u>HB 6469</u>, and Tennessee's <u>SB 1360</u> will **advance** sex education requirements and access to reproductive health care services.
- Florida's <u>HB 519</u> and <u>HB 545</u>, North Dakota's <u>SB 2265</u>, and Tennessee's <u>HB 577/SB 1392</u> will have a **mixed impact** on sex education requirements.
- Arkansas's <u>HB 1570</u>, <u>HB 1592</u>, <u>HB 1646</u> and <u>SB 6</u>, Arizona's <u>HB 2035</u> and <u>SB 1457</u>, Florida's <u>HB 241</u>, Idaho's <u>H 366</u>, Indiana's <u>HB 1577</u>, Kentucky's <u>HB 91</u>, Montana's <u>HB 136</u>, <u>HB 171</u>, and <u>SB 99</u>, Ohio's <u>HB 110</u>, Oklahoma's <u>HB 1102</u>, <u>HB 2441</u>, and <u>SB 918</u>, South Carolina's <u>S 1</u>, South Dakota's <u>HB 1110</u>, Tennessee's <u>HB 529</u>, <u>HB 1027</u>, and <u>SB 1229</u>, and Texas's <u>HB 1280</u>, <u>HB 1525</u>, and <u>SB 8</u> will **restrict** access to sex education and reproductive health care services.







A. Sex Education

Alabama enacted <u>HB 385</u> on April 20. Introduced by Representative Laura Hall (D-19), the law requires sex education instruction to be medically accurate and amends course material's emphasis on self-control and ethical behavior to instead emphasize the importance of delaying sexual activity and discouraging risky sexual behavior. Further, the law removes the requirement for materials to emphasize stigmatizing and false information regarding the acceptability and criminality of LGBTQ+ identities.

Arizona enacted <u>HB 2035</u> on July 9. Introduced by Representative Gail Griffin (R-14), the law requires parents to opt their children into sex education instruction. Further, the law prohibits schools from providing sex education prior to grade 5, and implements additional curriculum approval requirements before sex education may be taught.

Florida enacted HB 241 on June 29. Introduced by Representative Erin Grall (R-54), the law establishes the Parent's Bill of Rights, mandating that school districts enact a policy that establishes a procedure for a parent to object to instructional materials on the basis of morality, sex, religion, or that the materials are harmful. Further, the law requires the development of a procedure for parents to opt their children out of sex education and receive prior notification of such instruction. Under this law, health care providers must receive parental consent prior to providing minors with care. Florida also enacted HB 519, which requires K-12 health education to be age-appropriate, developmentally appropriate, and include instruction on the prevention of child sexual abuse. Further, the law requires curriculum to include an awareness of the benefits

of abstinence as the expected standard, along with the consequences of teenage pregnancy. In addition, Florida enacted <u>HB 545</u> on June 4, mandating each school district to notify parents of the right to remove their children from sex education and provide the opportunity to review the instructional materials. Further, the law mandates that all sex education instructional materials to be approved on an annual basis by the district school board in an open notice public meeting.

Illinois enacted <u>SB 818</u>, enrolled as Public Act 102-0522, on August 20th. Introduced by Senator Ram Villivalam (D-08), the law requires educators to teach comprehensive sex education. Such instruction is required to be age and developmentally appropriate, medically accurate, complete, culturally appropriate, inclusive, trauma informed, and replicate evidence-based or evidence-informed programs. This bill is an amended version of the model comprehensive sex education legislation entitled the Healthy Youth Act.

Montana enacted **SB 99**, enrolled as Ch. 316, on April 30. Introduced by Senator Cary Smith (R-27), the law requires schools to provide written notification to a parent or guardian prior to providing sex education and their right to remove their children from such instruction. Further, the law prohibits school districts from allowing any person or entity affiliated with providing abortion care from providing sex education instruction. **North Dakota** enacted <u>SB 2311</u> on April 27. Introduced by Senator Joan Heckaman (D-23), the bill mandates the provision of an evidence-based, online virtual mental health and suicide prevention stimulation training program for students.

Oklahoma enacted <u>SB 89</u>, enrolled on April 28. Introduced by Senator John Haste (R-26), the law requires health education to be taught in public schools and include, but is not limited to, instruction on physical health, mental health, social and emotional health, and intellectual health.

Ohio enacted <u>HB 110</u>, enrolled as the Ohio operating appropriations effective June 30. The budget allocates \$2 million towards abstinenceonly programming, obtain parental consent if additional sex education is provided beyond the mandated topics, and requires an annual audit of each localities sex education instruction. In addition, the budget includes additional mandates that threaten access to reproductive health care services.

Rhode Island enacted <u>HB 6469</u>, enrolled on July 9. Introduced by Representative Karen Alzate (D-60), the law amends the definition of dating violence within dating violence education to expand the scope of instruction. The law further requires each school to collect data regarding student misconduct that is considered dating violence. Tennessee enacted HB 529/SB 1229, enrolled as Ch. 281, on May 5. Introduced by Representative Debra Moody (R-81), the law requires schools to provide parental notification at least 30 days prior to commencing instruction on sexual orientation or gender identity in any subject, and permits parents to opt their children out of such instruction. Further, Tennessee enacted SB 1360, which requires each local education agency to provide family life education. Tennessee also enacted HB 577/SB 1392, which amended requirements regarding instruction on contraception to require the local board of education to review and approve instruction to ensure it is medically accurate, age appropriate, in compliance with state statute, aligned to state academic standards, and available for parental review.

Texas enacted <u>HB 1525</u> on June 16. Introduced by Representative Dan Huberty (R-127), the school funding bill includes a provision that requires schools to receive parental consent prior to their children receiving sex education.

B. Access to Reproductive Health Care for Young People

Arizona enacted **SB 1457** on April 27. Introduced by Senator Nancy Barto (R-15), the law prohibits abortion based upon the presence or presumed presence of a genetic abnormality in the fetus and further prohibits the delivery of medication abortion.

Arkansas enacted HB 1646, enrolled as Act 931, on April 26. Introduced by Representative Joe Cloud (R-71), the law establishes fetal personhood, thus prohibiting abortion. SB 6 was also enacted, prohibiting abortion unless in the case of a medical emergency. The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), the ACLU of Arkansas, and Planned Parenthood Federation were granted their Motion for Preliminary Injunction against the restrictive measure on May 26, temporarily blocking the ban from taking effect while the lawsuit continues. In addition, HB 1570 was enacted, which prohibits medical professionals from providing gender affirming care to minors. On July 31, a federal judge temporarily blocked the enforcement of this mandate, following the state legislature's overruling of Governor Hutchinson's veto of the bill. Arkansas also enacted HB 1592, which prohibits public schools or open-enrollment public charter schools from entering into any type of transaction with an individual or entity that provides abortion care.

Colorado enacted <u>SB-21-016</u> on July 6. Introduced by Senator Brittany Pettersen (D-22), the bill permits minors to consent to prescription of medication to treat a sexually transmitted infection (STI). **Idaho** enacted <u>H 366</u>, enrolled as Ch. 289, on April 29. The law prohibits abortion after a fetal heartbeat has been detected unless in the case of a medical emergency.

Indiana enacted **HB 1577**, enrolled as Public Law 218, on April 29, 2021. Introduced by Representative Peggy Mayfield (R-60), the law further limits the time in which medication abortion may be provided, requires the physician to provide false information about medication abortion, prohibits telemedicine to be used to provide medication abortion, and imposes further restrictions on abortion providers.

Kentucky enacted <u>HB 91</u>, enrolled as Ch. 174, on March 30. Introduced by Representative Joe Fischer (R-68), the law amends the Constitution of Kentucky to state that nothing in the Constitution secures or protects the right to abortion or requires the funding of abortion care.

Montana enacted <u>HB 136</u>, enrolled as Ch. 307, on April 28. Introduced by Representative Keith Regier (R-03), the law prohibits abortion if it has been determined that the fetus is capable of feeling pain unless in the case of a medical emergency. Montana also enacted <u>HB 171</u>, which prohibits the use of telehealth to provide medication abortion.

North Dakota enacted <u>SB 2265</u>, enacted on April 6. Introduced by Senators Kyle Davison (R-41) and Kathy Hogan (D-21), the law permits minors experiencing homelessness to consent to medical, dental, or behavioral health services, except for abortion care.

Oklahoma enacted <u>HB 1102</u> on April 26. Introduced by Representative Jim Olsen (R-02), the law prohibits abortion unless in the case of a medical emergency. Further, <u>HB 2441</u> was enacted, prohibiting abortion after a fetal heartbeat has been detected. Oklahoma also enacted <u>SB 918</u>, which prohibits abortion in Oklahoma if Roe v. Wade is overturned by the United States Supreme Court or if an amendment to the United States Constitution is adopted that permits states to prohibit abortion.

Rhode Island enacted <u>HB 5083</u> on July 2. Introduced by Representative Carol McEntee (D-33), the law requires all public schools to make menstrual products available to students at no cost. **South Carolina** enacted <u>S 1</u>, enrolled as Act. 1, on February 18, 2021. Introduced by Senator Larry Grooms (R-37), the law prohibits abortion after a fetal heartbeat has been detected.

South Dakota enacted <u>HB 1110</u> on March 29. The law prohibits abortion based upon the fetal diagnosis or probable diagnosis of Down Syndrome.

Tennessee enacted <u>HB 1027</u> on May 21. Introduced by Representative Sabi Kumar (R-66), the bill prohibits medical professionals from providing gender affirming care to minors prior to puberty.

Texas enacted <u>HB 1280</u> on June 16. Introduced by Representatives Giovanni Capriglione (R-98), the law prohibits abortion unless in the case of a medical emergency. Texas also enacted <u>SB 8</u>, which prohibits abortion after a fetal heartbeat has been detected. ■



N. Implications for the Future of Sex Ed

PHOTO BY SHARON MCCUTCHEON



The Coronavirus Pandemic

While the impact of the unprecedented coronavirus pandemic took a demonstrated toll on states' legislative sessions in 2020, the impact of the pandemic has been heavily felt by educators, parents, and students who navigated remote learning. In July, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) released updated standards regarding in-person learning. The new standards emphasize in-person learning as a priority, while also highlighting the need for increased vaccination rates and emphasizing the use of masks indoors for those who remain unvaccinated. While these new standards are significant, safety guidelines are continuing to evolve as the Delta variant continues to infect thousands of individuals on a daily basis. While nearly 100% of students in grades K-8 have been reported to be enrolled in either a hybrid or full-time in person model since April, the numbers vary when it comes to high school instruction. School officials have begun conducting community outreach efforts across the country in the hopes of increasing in-person summer and fall enrollment. Leading education experts have begun conducting data regarding rates of in-person learning among high school students, but at this point remain uncertain about exact figures.

Additional disparities regarding a return to in-person instruction come to light when considering the racial diversity of students. <u>One report</u> conducted in February found that white students in California are more than **three times** more likely than their Black peers, more than **twice as likely** as their Latinx peers, and nearly **twice as likely** as their Asian peers to have the opportunity to return to in-person instruction.⁵ Further, a survey conducted by the CDC in December found that Black and Latinx parents were less likely than white parents to feel confident in sending their children back to school.⁶ This discrepancy may reflect the way in which Black and Latinx communities have experienced disproportionate rates of COVID-19 infection, hospitalization, and mortality rates as a result of systemic, structural racism that influences contributing factors such as income, access to health care, education, and occupation. Marginalized communities, including Black and Latinx communities and low-income communities, are over-represented in essential work settings, and are more likely to be exposed to COVID-19.7 These factors are only compounded by the lack of trust many parents feel that their local school district has taken appropriate measures to protect their children, given the persistent, racist history of abuse committed against students of color nationwide.

"

White students in California are more than **three times** more likely than their Black peers, more than **twice as likely** as their Latinx peers, and nearly **twice as likely** as their Asian peers to have the opportunity to return to in-person instruction.

A Sophisticated Attack on Inclusive Education

Sex education legislation is no stranger to controversy. Long challenged by movements based in fear and moral ideology, the opposition to comprehensive sex education has been evolving and has debuted in the US as a more organized, localized, and better funded movement during the 2021 legislative session.

State-based advocacy groups have joined together under the guise of "parental rights." These groups falsely demonize free thinking and public education as a "government indoctrination" under which any kind of tolerance education is misconstrued and lumped together. These organizations falsely claim Critical Race Theory (a college-level theoretical study on the impacts of racism in the creation of systems) is being taught in preK-12 public schools, that comprehensive sex education inappropriately teaches young people information about sex and sexuality and "sexualizes" youth, and, in COVID, claims mask wearing and vaccinations, according to CDC guidance, as an infringement on their "freedom." The major linking tenet behind the "parental rights" groups is an assertion that the public education system does not have the best interests of young people in mind and doesn't engage parents in the education process. In reality, all public education systems must, by existing law, engage parents and the community in developing educational standards which dictate what is taught in schools. Parents play an essential part in guiding their children's education, and should be their children's first and primary source of quality sex education. However, these organizations disregard the important role of public education to ensure young people receive sex education that is free from religious ideology, shame based or stigmatizing messaging, based in science, and culturally responsive.

The movement against tolerance education represents a small minority of individuals who have amplified their voice using fear tactics and messaging supplied to them by The Heritage Foundation, The Family Policy Alliance, and the Alliance Defending Freedom. This well-funded movement is largely driven in local and state organizations by one or two individuals with links to anti-reproductive freedom organizations, while the <u>majority of parents</u> support sex education. While small, this movement cannot be ignored. The funding behind them and their ability to message and gain political prominence gives the impression that anti-tolerance education is larger than it really is. It will be imperative moving forward that these organizations and elected officials are exposed for who they really are: extremists who do not represent the majority of Americans.



Sex Education and Racial Justice

The 2021 legislative session saw both progressive and regressive efforts to systemic racism and other forms of discrimination within both sex education courses and other core subjects. **Massachusetts** and **Delaware** introduced legislation that sought to advance anti-racist instruction. Massachusetts' <u>HB 3718</u> sought to incorporate anti-racist curriculum in elementary and secondary public schools, including the impact of racism on health in health courses. Delaware's <u>HB 198</u>, which was successfully enacted on June 17, now requires schools to develop and provide a curriculum on Black history.

State legislatures must act now to ensure that sex education be culturally responsive, explicitly acknowledging a history of racism within the sexual and reproductive health field.¹⁷ When drafting legislation related to teacher training and sex education, states can align requirements to both the <u>Professional Learning Standards</u> for Sex Education and the <u>National Sex Education</u> <u>Standards</u>, which include considerations for the impact of racism on sexual and health. States can also ensure that leading racial and reproductive justice state organizations are involved in sex education policy decisions. Advocates for comprehensive sex ed must continue to ask themselves how the policies they promote acknowledge and incorporate race, and understand racial and reproductive justice as a key component of sex education advocacy.

The newly enacted provisions represent a positive step forward in ensuring young people receive instruction across a variety of subjects, including sex education, that encompasses an anti-racist lens and intentionally addresses the devastating abuse Black Americans and other communities of color have endured throughout America's history. Despite this, an unprecedented number of bills that sought to ban this essential instruction were also introduced this year. Referred to as both equitable education bans or anti-critical race theory legislation, at least 23 bills were introduced across 17 states (Arizona, Idaho, Iowa, Massachusetts, Missouri, Michigan, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin) that prohibit critical race theory or any instruction that includes race or gender stereotyping. Seven of these bills were enacted across six states (Iowa HF 802, Idaho HB 377, Oklahoma HB 1775, New Hampshire HB 2, Tennessee HB 580/SB 623, and Texas H 3979).

While many of these deceptive bills may appear to be positive provisions that prohibit discrimination, their intention is to prohibit instruction on systemic racism and racial or gender-based privilege. They aim to emphasize individual action, rather than acknowledge the way in which systemic racism is present throughout American history and continues to impact nearly every aspect of modern life through access to education, health care services, employment, and housing. Further, it fails to acknowledge the way in which conscious and unconscious bias, internalized racism, and racial and gender-based privilege are omnipresent factors that must be continuously addressed and scrutinized beginning at a young age. It is essential that sex educators are able to incorporate these critical lessons regarding racism, discrimination, intersectionality, and conscious and unconscious bias within sex education instruction. If and when these equitable education bans are written into law, educators could be penalized or even fired for providing instruction on these vital topics.

Beyond the school setting, several states sought to address racial disparities that have resulted in significant health disparities among communities of color. **Eight** bills were introduced across **six** states that sought to declare racism as a public health crisis and develop commissions to reduce health inequities among marginalized communities. Some bills, such as Ohio SB 125 and North Carolina SB 577 sought to address racial disparities in maternal morbidity, access to reproductive health care services, and infant mortality. These disparities are most prominent among Black women and girls, as Black women are **three times more likely** to die from a pregnancy related cause when compared to white women. It is essential that sex education curriculum incorporates instruction on the way in which systemic racism influences the way in which these disparate health outcomes occur. This may include, but is not limited to, structural barriers to health care, the denial of concerns of Black patients by health care professionals, and the multitude of societal factors that adversely influence the social determinants of health for Black and Latinx communities.



v. State Bill Table

The highlights above provide a topline glance at the common types of sex education and reproductive health bills and their provisions introduced across the country in 2020. A comprehensive list of state sex education bills, the topics they cover, and available links are below. In a similar manner to how sex education legislation is classified, the below table includes classification as to whether the introduced reproductive health legislation advances or restricts minors' access to reproductive health care.

> PHOTO BY JESWIN THOMAS

Key

Bold intent = Sex education legislation

A = Abortion
AP = Abuse/violence/assault prevention
Ab = Abstinence
CSE = Comprehensive sex education
Comm = Communication (parents, partners, digital)
CR = Consent requirements
FC = Foster care
STI/HIV = Sexually transmitted infections, including HIV
LGBT = LGBT

MEAC = Medically accurate, evidence-based, age-/ developmentally-/culturally-appropriate
RHC = Reproductive health care
TX = Title X
N = Notification
TT = Teacher/training
OI = Other implementation
OC = Other content
Opt = Opt-in and opt-out requirements

State	Bill Number	Intent	Bill Status	Topic Areas	Legislative Session Status
	<u>HB 1</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>HB 377</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
AL	<u>HB 385</u>	Advance	Enacted	LGBT, MEAC, CR, Ab	Adjourned
AL	<u>HB 620</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	May 17
	<u>SB 10</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 196</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT, MEAC, CR, Ab	
AK	<u>H 8</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	Adjourned
An	<u>H 206</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	May 19
	<u>HB 2035</u>	Restrict	Enacted	Opt, N	
	<u>HB 2184</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	Opt, N	
	<u>HB 2251</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	CSE, MEAC, Opt	
	<u>HB 2487</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>HB 2647</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	MEAC, CT, Opt	
	<u>HB 2650</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>HB 2656</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	CR, OC	
AZ	<u>HB 2710</u>	Mixed	Died in Committee	MEAC, CR, TT, AP, Opt	Adjourned
AZ	<u>HB 2878</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	June 30
	<u>SB 1317</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT, OC	
	<u>SB 1381</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>SB 1340</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	MEAC, TT, Opt, CR, AP, C	-
	<u>SB 1383</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>SB 1423</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT, OC	
	<u>SB 1426</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 1456</u>	Restrict	Vetoed	LGBT, CR, Opt	

State	Bill Number	Intent	Bill Status	Topic Areas	Legislative Session Status
	<u>SB 1457</u>	Restrict	Enacted	А	Adjourned
	<u>SB 1482</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 1511</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT	
AZ	<u>SB 1532</u>	Restrict	Passed Senate; Passed House; Failed Senate Final Reading	OC	June 30
	<u>SB 1641</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>SB 1706</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT, OC	
	<u>HB 1570</u>	Restrict	Passed Assembly; Awaiting Second Senate Reading	LGBT	
	<u>HB 1592</u>	Restrict	Enacted	A, CR	
	<u>HB 1646</u>	Restrict	Enacted	А	
	<u>HB 1749</u>	Restrict	Passed House; Referred to Senate Committee	LGBT, OC	
	<u>SB 6</u>	Restrict	Enacted	А	Adjourns
AR	<u>SB 347</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	А	November 30
	<u>SB 389</u>	Neutral	Delivered to Governor	Opt, N	
	<u>SB 463</u>	Restrict	Enacted	А	
	<u>SB 468</u>	Restrict	Recommended for Study	А	
	<u>SB 510</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 519</u>	Restrict	Withdrawn by Author	А	
	<u>SB 655</u>	Advance	Recommended for Study	CSE, TT	
	<u>AB 367</u>	Advance	Passed Assembly; Referred to Senate Committee	RHC	Adjourns September 10
CA	<u>SB 65</u>	Advance	Passed Senate; Referred to Assembly Committee	RHC, OC	
	<u>SB 217</u>	Neutral	Referred to Committee	Ν	
со	<u>HB 21-1017</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	Adjourned
	<u>SB 21-016</u>	Advance	Enacted	RHC, STI/HIV	June 8
	<u>HB 5510</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
ст	<u>HB 6293</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	Adjourned
	<u>HB 6662</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	RHC, RE	June 9
	<u>S 332</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
DE	<u>HB 198</u>	Advance	Enacted	RE	Adjourned
	<u>HB 199</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	June 30
DC	<u>B 24-0029</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	RHC, STI/HIV	Adjourns
	<u>B 24-0158</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	RHC	December 31
	<u>HB 241</u>	Restrict	Enacted	N, Opt	
	<u>HB 301</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
FL	<u>HB 351</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	Adjourned
FL	<u>HB 519</u>	Mixed	Enacted	MEAC, Ab, AP	April 30
	<u>HB 545</u>	Mixed	Enacted	Ν	
	<u>HB 935</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT	

State	Bill Number	Intent	Bill Status	Topic Areas	Legislative Session Status
	<u>HB 1221</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>HB 1303</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	AP	
	<u>SB 410</u>	Mixed	Died in Committee	Ν	
	<u>SB 554</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	AP	
FL	<u>SB 582</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	N, Opt	Adjourned April 30
	<u>SB 690</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	/pm30
	<u>SB 744</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>SB 1094</u>	Mixed	Died in Committee	MEAC, Ab, AP	
	<u>SB 1664</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>HB 54</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	CR	
GA	<u>HB 195</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	MEAC	Adjourned
GA	<u>HB 401</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT	March 31
	<u>HB 569</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>HB 11</u>	Advance	Passed House, Died in Senate Committee	LGBT, RE	
	<u>HB 225</u>	Advance	Passed House, Died in Senate Committee	OC	
ні	<u>HB 478</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	STI/HIV	Adjourned
	<u>HB 1306</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	AP, TT	April 29
	<u>SB 25</u>	Advance	Passed Senate, Died in House Committee	STI/HIV	
	<u>SB 841</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>H 52</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
	<u>H 56</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	А	
	<u>H 249</u>	Restrict	Passed House, Died in Senate Committee	Opt	Senate Adjourned
ID	<u>H 302</u>	Restrict	Enacted	А	Sine Die;
	<u>H 366</u>	Restrict	Enacted	А	House
	<u>H 377</u>	Restrict	Enacted	RE	Recessed May 12
	<u>S 1085</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>S 1183</u>	Restrict	Passed Senate, Referred to House Committee	А	
	<u>HB 24</u>	Advance	Sent to the Governor	Comm	
	<u>HB 319</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	F	
	<u>HB 827</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>HB 1736</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	CSE, TT, N, AP	
	<u>HB 1797</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	A, N	Adjourned
IL	<u>HB 1893</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	May 31
	<u>HB 3043</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>HB 3046</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>HB 3047</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>HB 3053</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	

State	Bill Number	Intent	Bill Status	Topic Areas	Legislative Session Status
	<u>HB 3071</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	CSE	_
	<u>HB 3224</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	MEAC, Comm, C, AP	
	<u>HB 3274</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	AP	
IL	<u>HB 3535</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	Adjourned
IL	<u>SB 266</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	CSE	May 31
	<u>SB 647</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	CSE	
	<u>SB 818</u>	Advance	Enacted	CSE, Comm, C, Opt, AP	
	<u>SB 2190</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	A, N	
	<u>HJR 4</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	A	
	<u>HB 1213</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
	<u>HB 1310</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	A	
	<u>HB 1366</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	CSE	
	<u>HB 1505</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	LGBT	_
IN	<u>HB 1539</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	A	Adjourns November 15
	HB 1557	Restrict	Referred to Committee	Α	
	<u>HB 1577</u>	Restrict	Enacted	A	
	<u>SB 224</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 32</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 399</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	A	
	<u>HF 192</u>	Advance	Died in Chamber	AP, TT	
	<u>HF 193</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT, N	
	<u>HF 267</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
	<u>HF 272</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>HF 331</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
	<u>HF 376</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	CR, LGBT	_
	<u>HF 403</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	_
IA	<u>HF 414</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	AP, TT	Adjourned
	<u>HF 662</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	OC	May 19
	<u>HF 802</u>	Restrict	Enacted	RE	_
	SF 58	Advance	Died in Committee	AP, C	_
	SF 167	Restrict	Died in Committee	Opt	_
	<u>SF 270</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	AP	_
	SF 377	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	_
	<u>SF 381</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	CSE	_
	<u>HB 2207</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	HB 2210	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT	-
KS	<u>SB 208</u>	Restrict	Passed Senate, Died in House Committee	LGBT	Adjourned May 26
	<u>SB 214</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT	1
	<u>HB 2</u>	Restrict	Enacted	A	Adjourned
KY	<u>HB 19</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	March 30

State	Bill Number	Intent	Bill Status	Topic Areas	Legislative Session Status
	<u>HB 91</u>	Restrict	Enacted	A	
	<u>HB 96</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A, N	
	<u>HB 103</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
КҮ	<u>HB 460</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A, N	Adjourned
N I	<u>HB 462</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	MEAC, TT, Comm, CR	March 30
	<u>HB 477</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 30</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 83</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	OC	
LA	<u>SB 104</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT	Adjourned June 10
	<u>LD 550</u>	Restrict	Failed	RE	
ME	<u>LD 748</u>	Restrict	Failed	A	Adjourned
IVIE	<u>LD 825</u>	Restrict	Failed	A	March 30
	<u>LD 851</u>	Restrict	Failed	A	
	<u>HB 78</u>	Advance	Enacted	RE	
	<u>HB 846</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
	<u>HB 997</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
MD	<u>HB 1088</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	Adjourned April 12
	<u>SB 52</u>	Advance	Enacted	RE	
	<u>SB 768</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SJ 5</u>	Advance	Withdrawn by Sponsor	CR	
	<u>H 241</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	AP	_
	<u>H 251</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
	<u>H 567</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	MEAC, N, Opt, CR	
	<u>H 615</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	AP, C	
	<u>H 633</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	N, Opt	
	<u>H 688</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	Comm	
	<u>H 717</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	RHC, N	
	<u>H 2084</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	OC	
	<u>H 2089</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
MA	<u>H 2409</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	A	Adjourns January 4,
IIIA	<u>H 3718</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	RE	2022
	<u>S 284</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	MEAC, N, Opt, CR	
	<u>S 286</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	AP, OC	
	<u>S 292</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	ОС	
	<u>S 313</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	ОС	
	<u>S 318</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	CSE, TT, Opt	
	<u>S 391</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	AP, TT	
	<u>S 1303</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	OC, TT	
	<u>S 2282</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SD 1783</u>	Advance	Filed	AP, OC	

State	Bill Number	Intent	Bill Status	Topic Areas	Legislative Session Status
	<u>HB 4297</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
	<u>HB 4651</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
	<u>HB 4737</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	Α	
	<u>HB 4738</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	Α	
	<u>HB 4938</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	MEAC	
	<u>HB 5097</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	RE	Adjourns
MI	<u>SB 192</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	OC,TT	December 31
	<u>SB 208</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 223</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	AP, TT	
	<u>SB 367</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 460</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	RE	
	<u>SB 496</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	MEAC	
	<u>HF 259</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	Α	
	<u>HF 262</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	Α	
	<u>HF 345</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	Opt	
	<u>HF 358</u>	Advance	Died in Chamber	CSE	Adjourned May 17
	<u>HF 643</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	Α	
	<u>HF 1924</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>HF 1934</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	Α	
	<u>HF 2134</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	STI/HIV	
	<u>HF 2156</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
MN	<u>SF 223</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	Α	
	<u>SF 340</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	STI/HIV	
	<u>SF 356</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	Α	
	<u>SF 360</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	_
	<u>SF 632</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	CSE, TT, N	
	<u>SF 731</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	Α	
	<u>SF 1374</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SF 1636</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	Α	
	<u>SF 1871</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>HB 143</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	Ab	
	<u>HB 338</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	Α	
	<u>HB 554</u>	Neutral	Died in Committee	OC	
	<u>HB 736</u>	Mixed	Died in Committee	CR, Ab	
	<u>HB 790</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	Α	Adjourned
MS	<u>HB 805</u>	Mixed	Died in Committee	MEAC, C, Opt, Ab	April 1
	<u>HB 890</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	Ab	
	<u>HB 891</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	Ab, A	
	<u>HB 893</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	CR	
	<u>HB 1089</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	N	

State	Bill Number	Intent	Bill Status	Topic Areas	Legislative Session Status
MS	<u>HB 1275</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	OC	
	<u>SB 2171</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT, N	Adjourned
MS	<u>SB 2226</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	OC	Ápril 1
	<u>SB 2791</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	Ab	
	<u>HB 1</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
	<u>HB 4</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
	<u>HB 33</u>	Restrict	Died in Chamber	LGBT	
	<u>HB 225</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	A, OC	
	<u>HB 468</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
	<u>HB 786</u>	Neutral	Died in Committee	N, Opt	
	<u>HB 831</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	A	
MO	<u>HB 952</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	RE	Adjourned
МО	<u>HB 1077</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT	May 30
	<u>HB 1269</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 207</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 391</u>	Restrict	Died in Chamber	A	
	<u>SB 442</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 443</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
	<u>SB 450</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
	<u>SB 458</u>	Restrict	Died in Chamber	A	
	<u>HB 113</u>	Restrict	Died in Process	LGBT	
	<u>HB 136</u>	Restrict	Enacted	A	
	<u>HB 171</u>	Restrict	Enacted	A	
	<u>HB 337</u>	Restrict	Died in Process	А	
MT	<u>HB 427</u>	Restrict	Died in Process	LGBT	Adjourned April 29
	<u>LC 2865</u>	Restrict	Draft Died in Process	A	7,011,23
	<u>LC 3124</u>	Restrict	Draft Died in Process	A	
	<u>SB 99</u>	Restrict	Enacted	N, Opt, A	
	<u>SB 282</u>	Restrict	Died in Process	RHC, N	
	<u>LB 67</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
NE	<u>LB 231</u>	Advance	Died in Chamber	LGBT	Adjourned
INE	<u>LB 281</u>	Advance	Died in Chamber	AP, TT	May 27
	<u>LB 282</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	CR	
NV	<u>AB 176</u>	Restrict	Failed	N, A	
IN V	<u>AB 261</u>	Advance	Enacted	LGBT	
	<u>HB 2</u>	Restrict	Enacted	RE	
NH	<u>HB 68</u>	Restrict	Died in Chamber	LGBT	Adjourned
	<u>HB 622</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	July 1
	<u>HB 625</u>	Restrict	Died in Chamber	A	

State	Bill Number	Intent	Bill Status	Topic Areas	Legislative Session Status
	<u>A 1488</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
	<u>A 3232</u>	Restrict	Withdrawn from Consideration	А	
	<u>A 3725</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	А	
	<u>A 5124</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	AP	
	<u>A 5144</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	STI/HIV	
	<u>A 5560</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	Adjourns
NJ	<u>ACR 123</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	A, N	January 11,
	<u>S 113</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	2022
	<u>S 398</u>	Advance	Withdrawn from Consideration	STI/HIV	
	<u>S 429</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	А	
	<u>S 3030</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	А	
	<u>S 3206</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SCR 20</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	A, N	
NM	<u>HB 142</u>	Advance	Passed House, Died in Senate Committee	AP, C, TT	Adjourned March 20
	<u>A 817</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>A 822</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	STI/HIV	
	<u>A 840</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>A 1209</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	AP	
	<u>A 2511</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	OC	
	<u>A 3715</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	MEAC, CR	
	<u>A 3780</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A, N	
	<u>A 4763</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	OC	
	<u>A 5679</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	RE	
	<u>A 6298</u>	Advance	Enacting Clause Stricken	LGBT	
	<u>A 6412</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	С	
	<u>A 6616</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	CSE	Adjourned
NY	<u>A 7161</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	CSE	June 10
	<u>A 7437</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>S 82</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	OC	
	<u>S 369</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>S 757</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	AP	
	<u>S 937</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	STI/HIV	
	<u>S 1294</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	MEAC, CR	
	<u>S 1929</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>S 2584</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	CSE	
	<u>S 2987</u>	Advance	Passed Senate, Passed Assembly	RE	
	<u>S 4909</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	AP	
	<u>S 6241</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	OC	

State	Bill Number	Intent	Bill Status	Topic Areas	Legislative Session Status
	<u>HB 31</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	А	
	<u>HB 149</u>	Restrict	Passed House, Referred to Senate Committee	А	
	<u>HB 324</u>	Restrict	Passed House, Withdrawn from Senate Committee and Re-Referred	RE	
	<u>HB 450</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
NC	<u>HB 452</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	Adjourns
NC	<u>HB 453</u>	Restrict	Vetoed	А	July 30
	<u>SB 392</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 396</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 514</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 577</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee, Withdrawn from Senate Committee and Re-Referred	RE	
	<u>HB 1313</u>	Restrict	Died in Chamber	Α	
	<u>HB 1476</u>	Restrict	Died in Chamber	LGBT, Opt	Adjourned
ND	<u>SB 2265</u>	Mixed	Enacted	N, A	April 30
	<u>SB 2311</u>	Advance	Enacted	OC, TT	
	<u>HB 105</u>	Advance	Passed House, Referred to Senate Committee	AP, TT	Adjourns December 31
	<u>HB 110</u>	Restrict	Enacted	Opt	
	<u>HB 208</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
	<u>HB 240</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	N, Opt, CR	
он	<u>HB 322</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	RE	
	<u>HB 327</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	RE	
	<u>SB 50</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 119</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 123</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	А	
	<u>SB 125</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	RE	
	<u>HB 1004</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>HB 1102</u>	Restrict	Enacted	А	
	<u>HB 1641</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	RE	
	<u>HB 1775</u>	Restrict	Enacted	RE	
	<u>HB 2011</u>	Advance	Passed House, Died in Senate Committee	OC	
ОК	<u>HB 2441</u>	Restrict	Enacted	А	Adjourned May 27
	<u>HJR 1027</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	iviay ∠7
	<u>SB 89</u>	Advance	Enacted	CR	
	<u>SB 495</u>	Restrict	Failed in Committee	А	
	<u>SB 583</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 612</u>	Restrict	Passed Senate, Died in House Chamber	А	

_

State	Bill Number	Intent	Bill Status	Topic Areas	Legislative Session Status
	<u>SB 676</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 723</u>	Restrict	Passed Senate, Died in House Committee	А	Adjourned
ОК	<u>SB 918</u>	Restrict	Enacted	А	May 27
	<u>SB 923</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
	<u>SJR 17</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>HB 2117</u>	Advance	Enacted	LGBT	
	<u>HB 2540</u>	Restrict	Failed in Committee	А	
	<u>HB 3414</u>	Advance	Failed in Committee	RE	
OR	<u>SB 358</u>	Advance	Speaker Signed	LGBT	Adjourned June 26
	<u>SB 507</u>	Restrict	Failed in Committee	А	June 20
	<u>SB 654</u>	Restrict	Failed in Committee	А	
	<u>SB 671</u>	Restrict	Failed in Committee	А	
	<u>HB 729</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
	<u>HB 784</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	OC	
	<u>HB 904</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee, Reported as Committed	А	Adjourns December 15
	<u>HB 1335</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	CSE, TT, Opt, AP	
PA	<u>HB 1532</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	RE	
	<u>SB 21</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	А	
	<u>SB 26</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 354</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	AP, TT	
	<u>SB 378</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	А	
	<u>HB 5083</u>	Advance	Enacted	OC	
	<u>HB 5354</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	OC	
	<u>HB 5604</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	MEAC, CR	
	<u>HB 5865</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
RI	<u>HB 6070</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	RE	Adjourned
	<u>HB 6469</u>	Advance	Enacted	AP	July 1
	<u>SB 282</u>	Advance	Passed Senate, Died in House Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 463</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	CR	
	<u>SB 669</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>H 3163</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>H 3330</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	OC	
	<u>H 3424</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	AP	
	<u>H 3467</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	OC	
sc	<u>H 3512</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	Adjourned June 29
	<u>H 3872</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	Juile 29
	<u>H 3890</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	CR, C, AP	
	<u>H 4046</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>H 4088</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	

State	Bill Number	Intent	Bill Status	Topic Areas	Legislative Session Status
sc	<u>H 4325</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	RE	
	<u>H 4343</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	RE	
	<u>H 3568</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	Adjourned
30	<u>S 1</u>	Restrict	Enacted	A	June 29
	<u>S 381</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>S 399</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
SD	<u>HB 1110</u>	Restrict	Enacted	А	Adjourned
30	<u>HB 1220</u>	Advance	Died in Chamber	RHC	March 29
	<u>HB 3</u>	Restrict	Enacted	LGBT	
	<u>HB 529</u>	Restrict	Enacted	LGBT, N, Opt	
	<u>HB 577</u>	Neutral	Enacted	MEAC, Opt	
	<u>HB 578</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>HB 580</u>	Restrict	Enacted	RE	
	<u>HB 800</u>	Restrict	Died in Chamber	LGBT	
	<u>HB 1027</u>	Restrict	Enacted	LGBT	
	<u>HB 1079</u>	Restrict	Died in Chamber	A	
	<u>HB 1233</u>	Restrict	Substituted for SB 1367	LGBT	Adjourned May 5
	<u>HB 1307</u>	Advance	Died in Chamber	CR	
	<u>HB 1506</u>	Advance	Died in Chamber	MEAC, CR, Comm, C, Opt	
	<u>HB 1539</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
TN	<u>SB 125</u>	Mixed	Died in Chamber	A, CR	
	<u>SB 126</u>	Restrict	Substituted for HB 1027	LGBT	
	<u>SB 204</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>SB 494</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>SB 640</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	CR	
	<u>SB 646</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	MEAC, Comm, C, Opt	
	<u>SB 654</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>SB 657</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT	_
	<u>SB 1216</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 1229</u>	Restrict	Substituted for HB 529	LGBT, N, Opt	
	<u>SB 1360</u>	Advance	Enacted	CR	
	<u>SB 1367</u>	Restrict	Enacted	LGBT	
	<u>SB 1392</u>	Neutral	Substituted for HB 577	MEAC, Opt	
	<u>HB 68</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT	Adjourned
	<u>HB 69</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	May 31.
	<u>HB 296</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	RHC	Special Session convened
тх	<u>HB 407</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	July 8.
	<u>HB 560</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	Special Session
	<u>HB 726</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	OC	legislation is not reflected
	<u>HB 835</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	RHC	in this report
	<u>HB 1037</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	or chart.

State	Bill Number	Intent	Bill Status	Topic Areas	Legislative Session Status
	<u>HB 1038</u>	Advance	Considered in Public Hearing, Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>HB 1165</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
	<u>HB 1171</u>	Restrict	Died in Chamber	A	
	<u>HB 1280</u>	Restrict	Enacted	A	
	<u>HB 1399</u>	Restrict	Died in Chamber	LGBT	
	<u>HB 1424</u>	Restrict	Died in Chamber	OC	
	<u>HB 1426</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	AP	
	<u>HB 1432</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
	<u>HB 1515</u>	Restrict	Died in Chamber	A	
	<u>HB 1525</u>	Restrict	Enacted	Opt	
	<u>HB 1623</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
	<u>HB 2516</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>HB 2679</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	MEAC, CR, Comm, C, N, Opt, Ab, AP	
	<u>HB 2753</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>HB 3058</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	CR	
	<u>HB 3196</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	Adjourned
	<u>HB 3218</u>	Restrict	Died in Chamber	A	Adjourned May 31. Special Session convened July 8. Special Session legislation is not reflected in this report or chart.
тх	<u>HB 3326</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
	<u>HB 3369</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	RHC	
	<u>HB 3641</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
	<u>HB 3760</u>	Restrict	Died in Chamber	A	
	<u>HB 3872</u>	Mixed	Died in Committee	N	
	<u>HB 3979</u>	Restrict	Enacted	RE	
	<u>HB 4014</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>HB 4034</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
	<u>HB 4088</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	MEAC, CR, Comm, N, Opt	
	<u>HB 4200</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
	<u>HB 4339</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
	<u>HB 4389</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	A	
	<u>HB 4425</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>HJR 33</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 8</u>	Restrict	Enacted	A	
	<u>SB 9</u>	Restrict	Passed Senate, Died in House Committee	A	
	<u>SB 53</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	RHC	
	<u>SB 72</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	AP	
	<u>SB 97</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 129</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 137</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	RHC	
	<u>SB 261</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	

_

State	Bill Number	Intent	Bill Status	Topic Areas	Legislative Session Status
тх	<u>SB 391</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>SB 394</u>	Restrict	Passed Senate, Died in House Chamber	A	
	<u>SB 442</u>	Mixed	Passed Senate, Died in House Chamber	Ν	Adjourned May 31.
	<u>SB 536</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	RHC	Special Session convened July 8. Special Session legislation is
	<u>SB 1109</u>	Advance	Vetoed	AP	
	<u>SB 1173</u>	Restrict	Passed Senate, Died in House Chamber	А	
	<u>SB 1311</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT	not reflected
	<u>SB 1646</u>	Restrict	Passed Senate, Died in House Committee	LGBT	in this report or chart.
	<u>SB 1647</u>	Restrict	Passed Senate, Died in House Chamber	A	
	<u>SB 1671</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>HB 92</u>	Restrict	House Strike Enacting Clause	LGBT	
	<u>HB 177</u>	Advance	House Strike Enacting Clause	C, Comm	Adjourned
UT	<u>HB 204</u>	Advance	House Strike Enacting Clause	OC	March 5
	<u>SB 229</u>	Advance	Senate Strike Enacting Clause	C, CR	
	<u>H 192</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	Adjourned May 21
VT	<u>H 248</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>S 32</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	CR, OC	
VA	<u>HB 2241</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	Adjourned February 8
	<u>HB 2244</u>	Restrict	Died in Chamber	CR	
	<u>SB 1235</u>	Restrict	Passed Senate, Died in House Chamber	RHC, N	
	<u>HB 1008</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	Adjourned April 25
	<u>HB 1149</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	OC	
WA	<u>HB 1422</u>	Neutral	Died in Committee	CR	
VVA	<u>SB 5044</u>	Advance	Enacted	RE	
	<u>SB 5053</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A, N	
	<u>SB 5416</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
wv	<u>HB 2114</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>HB 2169</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>HB 2239</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>HB 2538</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>HB 2595</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	RE	Adjourned April 10
	<u>HB 2697</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>HB 2917</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>HB 2954</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>HB 2982</u>	Restrict	Enacted	А	
	<u>HB 3024</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	
	<u>HB 3033</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	

State	Bill Number	Intent	Bill Status	Topic Areas	Legislative Session Status
	<u>SB 74</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	А	Adjourned April 10
	<u>SB 87</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
	<u>SB 109</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 118</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	N	
	<u>SB 237</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	OC, TT	
	<u>SB 251</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
wv	<u>SB 285</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	N	
	<u>SB 337</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
	<u>SB 416</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
	<u>SB 563</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
	<u>SB 595</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	A	
	<u>SB 598</u>	Advance	Died in Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 618</u>	Restrict	Died in Committee	RE	
	<u>AB 14</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	LGBT	Adjourns December 31
	<u>AB 312</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
14/1	<u>AB 411</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	RE	
WI	<u>SB 31</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 326</u>	Advance	Referred to Committee	LGBT	
	<u>SB 411</u>	Restrict	Referred to Committee	RE	
	<u>HB 134</u>	Restrict	Died in Chamber	A	Adjourned April 7
WY	<u>HB 161</u>	Restrict	Passed House, Died in Senate Chamber	A	
VVY	<u>HB 235</u>	Restrict	Did Not Consider for Introduction	A	
	<u>SF 133</u>	Restrict	Passed Senate, House Did Not Consider for Introduction	А	



vı. Endnotes

 \equiv

PHOTO BY KEIRA BURTON

- 1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2019). School Health Profiles 2018: Characteristics
- SIECUS: Sex Ed for Social Change. (2019). Federal Programs Funding Chart FY20. <u>https://siecus.org/wp-content/</u> <u>uploads/2019/03/Federal-Programs-Funding-Chart-FY19-</u> <u>Mar-2019.pdf</u>
- Sarah Smith Kuehnel, Abstinence-Only Education Fails African American Youth, 86 Wash. U. L. Rev. 1241 (2009). Available at: https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_lawreview/vol86/iss5/5
- 4. Future of Sex Education Initiative. (2020). <u>National Sex Education</u> Standards: Core Content and skills, K-12 Second Edition
- 5. Johnson, S., & Willis, D. J. (2021, February 12). White students in California more likely to be getting in-person instruction than Black, Latino and Asian students. EdSource: Highlight Strategies for Student Success. Retrieved from <u>https://edsource.org/2021/</u> more-white-students-learning-in-classrooms-while-more-blacklatino-asian-students-in-distance-learning/648862

- Gilbert LK, Strine TW, Szucs LE, et al. Racial and Ethnic Differences in Parental Attitudes and Concerns About School Reopening During the COVID-19 Pandemic — United States, July 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2020;69:1848–1852. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6949a2
- 7. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2021). Risk of Exposure to COVID-19: Racial and Ethnic Disparities. Retrieved from <u>https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/health-equity/racial-ethnic-disparities/increased-risk-exposure.html</u>







www.siecus.org