

THE ASSEMBLY STATE OF NEW YORK ALBANY

COMMITTEES
Alcoholism & Drug Abuse
Codes
Consumer Affairs & Protection
Corporations, Authorities & Commissions
Insurance
Science & Technology

Statement on Community Education Council District 2 Resolutions #247 and #248

I am a proud graduate of District 2 public schools and Public School Athletic League (PSAL) programming, and am grateful to have been a part of a diverse community that embraced individuals from various backgrounds, including members of the LGBTQ+ community.

Last night, the District 2 Community Education Council passed two resolutions, one in support of the LGBTQ+ community at large (#247) and the other adversely targeting transgender student athletes (#248).

I commend the District 2 Community Education Council for passing resolution #247, which seeks to proactively establish District 2 schools as an inclusive environment, supportive of transgender students. As highlighted in the resolution, transgender students are at a higher risk of suicidal ideation, a concerning trend that has grown in recent years. The resolution also notes that schools with LGBTQ+-affirming policies end up with less bullying and less suicidal ideation among their students. It is crucial that every leader takes it upon themselves to protect, uplift, and support the transgender community.

It is for this very reason, expressed so eloquently in resolution #247, that I am extremely disappointed regarding the passage of resolution #248. The latter resolution asks for the review and redrafting of the New York City Public School's Guidelines, which currently support transgender and gender expansive students. While supporters of resolution #248 have claimed that they are "simply asking for a review," the "whereas" clauses include multiple inaccuracies, and imply that embracing the humanity of transgender students somehow diminishes others. Resolution #248 calls for evidence-based policy, but resolution #247 already cites scholarship on mental health that supports creating an LGBTQ+-affirming environment.

To the five CEC members who voted for both resolutions, I hope you can see that the message you send with resolution #248 (intentional or not) is exactly what you were trying to combat with resolution #247.

To the two CEC members that voted no or abstained on resolution #247, you are internally consistent but dangerously wrong.

Sincerely,

Alex Bores

Assemblymember, 73rd District

hard