

# C4SE Meeting 2-10-2026

---

## 1. Meeting Information

- **Topic:** Planning, drafting, and strategy for new student safety and discipline legislation, tentatively named “Andrew’s Law.”
- **Date & Time:** 2026-02-10, starting at 18:03:56 and adjourning at 7:09 PM.
- **Participants:** Jesse (President), Mike Wilson (Assistant Treasurer), Dennis Paul (State Representative), Tom Butler (Candidate for State Rep), Jim Campisi, Cole Curley-Young (Campaign Staff), Linda Garcia (Judge, not in official capacity), Nick Rice, Brian Miller (Treasurer), Speaker 1, Speaker 2, Speaker 3, Speaker 4, Speaker 5, Speaker 6, Speaker 7, Speaker 8, Speaker 9, Speaker 10, Speaker 11, Speaker 12. (Key decision-makers appear to include legislative participants like Dennis Paul, Speaker 3, and Speaker 6).

## 2. Discussion Overview

- **Agenda Item 1:** Drafting and Strategy for “Andrew’s Law” and Related Legislation
  - **Key Points:**
    - **Jesse:** Stated the law’s goal: “We want it to say that any assault that causes physical injury, the DA has to accept and run it through the criminal justice system and take it off of the campus administration’s back...”. He specified the law should apply “regardless of any of classification” to avoid exceptions.
    - **Cole Curley-Young:** Confirmed he would assist the legislative research library in drafting the law.
    - **Dennis Paul:** Questioned the law’s intent and noted that while HB6 was passed to help remove problem students, the practice of disciplinary records starting from zero each year is “horrible”.
    - **Tom Butler:** Expressed a desire to understand how to amend existing laws like HB6.
    - **Speaker 1:** Argued for the law, stating that the DA accepts “less than [2%]” of cases from school districts. “I want the Goose Creek Police Department to have the same authority, at the school to arrest them and take them to Harris County or Baytown or whatever.”
    - **Speaker 3:** Clarified the proposal’s core is to move jurisdiction from the school system to the Harris County

criminal justice system. He identified three key legislative points: ensuring student criminal histories follow them, having local law enforcement know about violent students, and clarifying DA charging authority.

- **Speaker 4:** Argued for two changes: making student criminal histories follow them and reducing law enforcement discretion, stating, "we want law enforcement to look at physical injuries and make a determination, right? Take away some of that description that, in my opinion, is being abused, right?"
- **Speaker 6:** Suggested the need for two separate bills: one to hold DAs accountable and another to allow discipline records to be examined over time. He also noted the proposals could result in "four or five bills, because of just having to break that up into one subject."
- **Speaker 7:** Identified several areas for legislative change: "school district has the authority to remove", "no clean slate", "access to information", and "the intake process". He also suggested creating "a dedicated prosecutor to just hand like the in a specific school intake".
- **Speaker 8:** Argued that disciplinary records "should roll into next year" and that campus police are unaware of students with ankle monitors. From a parent's perspective, he noted court intervention could "change the trajectory of his life to a better path."
- **Speaker 9:** Emphasized the goal is to correct behavior early to prevent escalation, stating "This gives them now the history that they had no access to before."
- **Speaker 10:** Raised concerns about the law's scope, especially for younger children and mutual fights, and the potential for unintended consequences. "what stops a student from saying, hey, we're outside of school, meet me outside of school down the road."

○ **Points of Divergence:**

- A primary divergence was between enforcing strict, mandatory legal consequences for all ages versus concerns about applying such a law to younger students and the potential for unintended punitive outcomes instead of rehabilitation.
- There was a debate over whether the problem is a lack of law or the DA's discretion not to follow existing law.
- A key point of discussion was the balance between holding students accountable by making their disciplinary history visible and the risk of unfairly labeling them, which might cause teachers to "automatically... think he's a bad kid and just treat him as such."

- **Interim Conclusion:**
  - The group reached a consensus on several legislative goals: 1) Mandate that District Attorneys accept charges for any student assault causing physical injury, without exception for student classification. 2) Ensure student criminal/disciplinary records follow them between schools to provide a behavioral history. 3) Improve information sharing between law enforcement and schools regarding students with violent histories. The legislation will need to clearly define “physical injury” and will likely be broken into multiple bills.
- **Agenda Item 2: Sustaining Student Advocacy and Information Gathering**
  - **Supporting Data:**
    - Speaker 9 mentioned that [780] laws were changed in the recent legislative session.
    - A Facebook snippet of a disciplinary “rap sheet” and a list of all violent offenses by the perpetrator were requested.
  - **Recommended Actions:**
    - Jesse will meet privately with the family to discuss the use of personal information.
    - The student coalition should actively recruit younger students to ensure the group’s longevity. Speaker 8 recommended, “Find the ones that have little sisters and invite those kids to y'all's meeting.”
    - Taking younger students on trips to the state capitol was proposed to get them involved in advocacy.

### 3. Decisions Made

- **Confirmed Items:**
  - ★ The central goal of “Andrew’s Law” is to legally require the DA to prosecute all student assaults that result in physical injury.
  - ★ The legislative effort will be a two-pronged approach, likely requiring two separate bills.
  - ★ An education plan will be needed to inform students and the community about any new laws.
  - ★ Plans will be made to take younger students to the state capitol.
- **Items Pending Verification:**
  - ◆ The exact wording of the proposed law(s) and how it will interact with or amend existing laws like HB6.
  - ◆ The specific legal mechanism and procedural language defining “visible physical injury.”

- ◆ The specific legal barriers preventing law enforcement and schools from sharing juvenile records.
- ◆ Receiving the Ledge request back to proceed with drafting legislation.

#### 4. Actions

- **Task:** Obtain a copy of the disciplinary “rap sheet” and a list of the perpetrator’s other offenses.
- **Responsible Person:** @Speaker 8 and other family members to provide to @Jesse.
- **Deadline:** Not specified.
- **Task:** Relay discussion points and collected information to Justin (Chief of Staff) for the legislative drafting process.
- **Responsible Person:** @Cole Curley-Young.
- **Deadline:** Not specified.
- **Task:** Draft legislative language based on the identified focus areas (student record portability, law enforcement-school communication, and DA discretion).
- **Responsible Person:** @Speaker 3, @Speaker 6 (and their legislative contacts).
- **Deadline:** Not specified.
- **Task:** Raise the proposed legislative changes at the upcoming discipline review committee meeting.
- **Responsible Person:** @Speaker 11, @Jesse.
- **Deadline:** During the meeting on 2026-02-24.
- **Task:** Develop a plan to recruit younger students into the student safety coalition.
- **Responsible Person:** @Speaker 10 (and other student members).
- **Deadline:** Not specified.

#### 5. Risk Alerts

- **Potential Issues:**
  - Existing laws (e.g., related to SPED, homeless students, juvenile record privacy) create exceptions that might weaken the legislation. As Jesse noted, "that's what got us to this point. There's exceptions."
  - An offender turning [18] can have their juvenile record sealed. As Speaker 4 mentioned, "juvenile history is sealed."
  - The law could lead to unintended consequences, such as the criminalization of young children or punishment of bullied students who retaliate. Speaker 10 asked, "why is this kid that's getting picked on being the one being punished."
  - There is a risk of creating a permanent negative “label” on students that could hinder their future progress.

- Legislative opposition is anticipated, with arguments that the new rules could be "hurting these kids' future".
- Administrative burden may lead school staff to bypass new procedures to avoid paperwork.
- **Contingency Plans:**
  - The proposed law is being drafted to eliminate exceptions, requiring the DA to accept charges "regardless of any of classification."
  - The judicial system's discretion will serve as a check, allowing judges to assign rehabilitative measures. Juvenile records being sealed at age [18] also mitigates long-term impacts.
  - Propose creating a dedicated prosecutor or division within large county DA offices to handle school-related crimes to ensure they are not deprioritized.
  - Promote existing anti-bullying resources, such as anonymous reporting, to address conflicts before they escalate.
  - A formal succession plan for the student coalition should be implemented to ensure its longevity.