



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
KA 'OIHANA HO'ONA'AUAO
P.O. BOX 2360
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96804

Date: 02/08/2024
Time: 02:00 PM
Location: 325 VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE
Committee: House Judiciary & Hawaiian
Affairs

Department: Education

Person Testifying: Keith T. Hayashi, Superintendent of Education

Title of Bill: HB 1651, HD1 RELATING TO THE SAFETY OF EDUCATIONAL WORKERS.

Purpose of Bill: Requires the Department of Education and public charter schools to take certain steps to report incidents of harassment and implement procedures for handling harassment of educational workers. Creates the offense of harassment of an educational worker. Effective 7/1/3000. (HD1)

Department's Position:

The Hawaii State Department of Education (Department) respectfully provides comments on HB1651 HD1.

The Department is fully supportive of protecting our school, district, and state office staff and administrators. Section 4 of this measure closely mirrors efforts the Department has made in the past to increase the protections for our administrators, teachers, counselors, and Department employees. By increasing these protections it has always been our hope that this would deter the type of aggressive behavior being leveled at our employees.

Regarding Section 2 of this measure, the Department is open to working with the legislature to create a process to provide additional protections for our employees. Our principals are provided training to deal with situations around threatening and intimidating behavior from non-Department employees but ultimately the safest course of action in these situations is to involve law enforcement. Currently, when our Department is alerted of aggressive or threatening behavior that results in the involvement of law enforcement, our Safety, Security, and Emergency Preparedness Branch works to assess the situation and provide an appropriate response. This could include developing a safety plan, providing additional campus security,

installation of video surveillance cameras, and have an additional threat assessment by Threat Team Hawaii, an organization of threat assessment experts from county, state and federal agencies.

However, the Department is not a law enforcement agency nor a legal authority. The Department is concerned that some of the processes identified in Section 2 of the bill fall outside the scope of the Department's expertise. For example, the Department is not familiar with the time required to pursue judicial protection and so determining a reasonable and sufficient time to allow for an absence of leave while pursuing judicial protection would be difficult. Instead, the Department would recommend alternative solutions such as having the Attorney General's Office pursue a temporary restraining order on behalf of the employee so that the employee would not have to take a leave of absence.

Should this bill continue to move forward, the Department is also requesting resources to carry out the mandates of this bill. While the measure requires the assignment of one full-time employee to carry out this work, the measure does not provide this position or funding.

To conclude, the Department is open to having a continued dialogue with the legislature as to how to best move forward with this measure. Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony on this measure.



Office of the Public Defender State of Hawaii



Testimony of the Office of the Public Defender, State of Hawaii to the House Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs

February 8, 2024

H.B. No. 1651, H.D. 1: RELATING TO THE SAFETY OF EDUCATIONAL WORKERS

Chair: David A. Tarnas, Vice Chair: Gregg Takayama and Members of the Committee:

The Office of the Public Defender opposes H.B. 1651, H.D. 1. only as to the creation of a special section in the HRS dealing with the crime of Harassment.

As referenced above, part of the bill hopes to create a section entitled Harassment of an Educational Worker, which would elevate the crime of harassment from a petty misdemeanor to a full misdemeanor if the complainant is an educational worker as defined within the proposed section. The OPD has uniformly opposed the creation of special classes of complainants within the criminal code, as it elevates one group above others, has no impact on public safety and has no measurable deterrent effect.

The language of the bill is vague and too general in its application. The language used in the bill which would grant jurisdiction is as follows: “because of the educational worker’s position as an educational worker”. Would merely the knowledge that a person is an educational worker suffice to satisfy this element of the offense, or is there a need for the purpose of the harassment to be linked to the person’s employment as an educational worker. Many times, issues within a work environment might spill over into the community in general, and thus would this new section apply to those matters? How tenuous of a link would be allowed between a dispute which may have started in an educational environment, but has now become personal. The OPD fears that this bill could in fact lead to a suppression of legitimate complaints or disputes, because aggrieved parties would be

concerned about committing “harassment”. What of issues involving two “educational workers” is it the intent of this bill to treat such a situation with elevated seriousness?

We also fear that this proposed statute could be used to elevate the seriousness of situations involving minors and educational workers, and result in said minors being adjudicated as law violators as opposed to being treated with alternative resolutions.

Lastly, allowing a prosecution for a full misdemeanor for such minor acts as insults, taunts or an offensive touch will allow a defendant to seek a jury trial for any such prosecution. Cases that could be tried within a district court session would then take one or two days to be resolved. It should also be noted that a conviction of a misdemeanor offense can lead to difficulties in seeking employment, and other issues unrelated to the crime itself.

For these reasons, we respectfully oppose the above referenced part of H.B. 1651, H.D. 1

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this bill.



HAWAII GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION
AFSCME Local 152, AFL-CIO

RANDY PERREIRA, Executive Director • Tel: 808.543.0011 • Fax: 808.528.0922

The Thirty-Second Legislature, State of Hawaii
House of Representatives
Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs

Testimony by
Hawaii Government Employees Association

February 8, 2024

H.B. 1651, H.D. 1 — RELATING TO THE SAFETY
OF EDUCATIONAL WORKERS

The Hawaii Government Employees Association, AFSCME Local 152, AFL-CIO fully supports H.B. 1651, H.D. 1, which seeks to require the Department of Education to take certain steps to report incidents of harassment and implement procedures for handling harassment of educational workers and creates the offense of harassment of an educational worker.

Each school year, we are contacted by multiple members who work at public schools and who have experienced threats made directly at them or witnessed by them in the course of their employment and within the scope of their duties and responsibilities. These threats occur in school offices, at meetings, over the phone, via email, and more recently, through social media.

We strongly support any efforts to increase protection for our educational workers. They should feel assured that the Department is committed to taking prompt and effective action against harassing conduct and those who engage in harassing behavior should be held accountable.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony in support of H.B. 1651, H.D. 1.

Respectfully submitted,

Randy Perreira
Executive Director



Randy Perreira
President

HAWAII STATE AFL-CIO

888 Mililani Street, Suite 501 • Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Telephone: (808) 597-1441
Fax: (808) 593-2149

The Thirty-Second Legislature
House of Representatives
Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs

Testimony by
Hawaii State AFL-CIO

February 8, 2024

TESTIMONY ON HB1651 - RELATING TO THE SAFETY OF EDUCATION WORKERS

Chair Tarnas, Vice Chair Takayama, and members of the committee:

The Hawaii State AFL-CIO is a federation of 74 affiliate labor organizations who represent over 68,000 union members within the State of Hawaii. The Hawaii State AFL-CIO serves its affiliates by advocating for workers and their families before the state legislature and other branches of state and county government.

The Hawaii State AFL-CIO **supports** HB1651 to require the Department of Education and public charter schools to take certain steps to report incidents of harassment and implement procedures for handling harassment of educational workers, while also establishing the criminal offense of harassing an educational worker.

Ensuring the safety and well-being of educational workers is paramount to maintaining a positive and effective learning environment for our students. Passing this bill would also demonstrate a commitment to protecting the rights and dignity of those who dedicate themselves to our keiki. Furthermore, it is imperative that we provide the necessary tools and support systems to address harassment in educational settings and uphold the fundamental values of respect and professionalism within our schools.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Randy Perreira".

Randy Perreira
President

My name is Lindsay Chambers and I'm submitting testimony **in support of HB1651**, and providing comments regarding the changes recommended by the Attorney General's (AG) office during the EDN committee hearing. In particular, "Deleting the requirement that the Department of Education assist an educational worker in obtaining representation from the Department of the Attorney General."

Should an educational worker face severe harassment through the course of their employment necessitating a Temporary Restraining Order (TRO), AG support becomes essential for navigating the legal intricacies. Handling the legal steps for obtaining a TRO alone is unfair to harassed employees. The process itself can be traumatic, as it forces direct confrontation with their harassers. Furthermore, in my experience, the Hawaii Department of Education (DOE) and AG's presence at hearings was solely to protect DOE leadership from having to directly address the harassment, not to advocate and protect its employees. For background on my specific situation, please see Attachment A.

The DOE has long neglected its responsibility to safeguard its employees from public threats. During the recent EDN committee hearing, the DOE leadership's alarming indifference was exposed, as they claimed to have no knowledge of harassment that had been brought to their attention many times and claimed to have no authority to address instances of public harassment targeting their staff. That was despite the clear between the harassment and the employees' position within the Department.

By way of example, this neglect is evident in a distressing decade-long pattern where court records reveal numerous TROs filed by DOE employees against a single individual. This failure to ensure workplace safety is systemic. Unfortunately, the true extent of the problem remains unknown, as the DOE neither supports nor tracks employees facing such situations.

It's frustrating to see the AG's office avoid accountability, especially when it comes to prioritizing employee safety. In my experience, I filed a formal complaint through my union and rather than investigating the situation or otherwise performing any due diligence, the AG's office dismissed my claims because:

"The HIDOE cannot control [redacted] verbal conduct. His nasty and vulgar attacks to you and other employees who deal with him regarding the education of his children, unfortunately, are part of the duties of HIDOE employee's involved with his children's education."

The letter was disappointingly dismissive, especially since the AG who drafted the letter did not interview the numerous other DOE employees who had been threatened and harassed by this individual. They also did not interview me to obtain the facts and recordings of threats I had available, or otherwise seek to understand the situation.

The AG's remarks suggest a troubling philosophy that accepting of verbal abuse, harassment, and threats are unavoidable parts of a DOE employee's job duties and that employees are on their own when those things occur.

My efforts to obtain a TRO ended with a successful injunction against harassment. The court's recognition of the severity of the situation sharply contradicted the previous guidance provided by the AG's office. This disparity between the AG's counsel and the court's decisions is troubling. During my hearing Judge Richard J. Diehl stated:

"So what constitutes harassment? Well, obviously if there has been physical violence or a threat of imminent physical violence or there has been a pattern of harassment where there is no reason for it, including the -- what might be considered by a reasonable person to be the infliction of mental distress, emotional distress by constantly harassing or bothering somebody.

Typically for -- to prove that, there needs to be established a pattern of it with no justification for it. That can be, in other words, if I have a business relationship with let's say my employer and I call them up and I want to talk to them and they don't call me back and I call back and I insist that they call me back and they don't call me back and then I call eight more times. Is that harassment? Probably is. Probably is.

And of course the defense to that could be, well, yeah, but I had something to talk to him about. But you don't get to do that in a civilized society. You don't get to do that."

In another hearing where I was forced to proceed on my own to seek a TRO to protect members of my team who were being threatened, Judge Hilary B. Gangnes and the defendant had the following exchange:

"The Court: Um, you know, Mr. -- let me just say that if what they say is true, [redacted], then there -- the concern is your -- I mean they're saying that there's 15 temporary restraining orders against you. Is that true?"

[Redacted]: Uh, no. I believe that she's trying to say is that I have a history of restraining orders.

The Court: Right.

[Redacted]: And they're -- right now --

The Court: Do you?

[Redacted]: -- I have people that are sensitive to me calling their supervisors, filing complaints, or me actually objecting to what people says. And then when I do so, they result in trying to use the courts as a sword against me.

The Court: Okay. Well, let me just give you the bottom line. Most people have no TROs against them ever in their entire lives.”

This admission by the defendant highlights the pervasiveness of his behavior, with the court recognizing the excessive number of TROs against him. However, both the AG and DOE fail to recognize the severity of this issue.

The incongruity between legal interpretation and practical application, and the subsequent rulings and statements from the court, underscores the urgent need for legislative intervention to rectify systemic flaws. This institutional betrayal cannot be tolerated, and intervention from the legislature is needed to mitigate any risk of further harm or potential tragedy.

I respectfully request the reinstatement of the following specific language in the bill:

“Assist educational workers with any legal actions that may arise from harassment, including obtaining representation from the department of the attorney general and covering the costs incurred from serving temporary restraining orders related to substantial or repeated incidents of harassment.”

However, I understand the need for strategic compromises to advance HB1651 through the legislative process and appreciate your consideration of my comments. Ultimately, we must enact measures to compel the DOE to fulfill its duty to safeguard its employees.

HB-1651

Submitted on: 1/28/2024 5:21:37 PM

Testimony for EDN on 1/30/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Lindsay Chambers	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

In addressing the pressing issue of harassment against educational workers, we must confront the questions: How many warning signs and red flags must we overlook before enacting decisive change? Are we resigned to waiting until someone is gravely injured or worse, killed, before acknowledging the urgent need for action?

During my tenure at the Department of Education (DOE), I encountered an individual who had persistently harassed educational workers for more than a decade. This person had amassed numerous Temporary Restraining Orders (TROs) from DOE employees, leading to directives from the Board of Education and Superintendent offices to avoid transferring his calls to their phone lines due to safety concerns.

When this individual made threats of physical violence against someone on my team, the DOE instructed me to obtain a TRO to shield him and those under my supervision. However, this directive put a target on my back, with insufficient support leaving me exposed and vulnerable. I faced relentless harassment, incessant calls and voicemails filled with intimidation and racial slurs, leaving me deeply worried about my safety.

I was forced to personally obtain legal counsel to help me secure the TRO directed by the DOE. Throughout that entire time, I was told that the DOE and AG will not provide any support because they considered TROs to be “personal matters.” Despite obtaining an injunction against harassment, I found myself navigating this nightmare alone, as the system failed to provide the protection and assistance I needed.

My experience is not unique, mirroring the struggles of countless educators who face threats, abuse, and harassment simply for doing their jobs. This not only takes an emotional toll but also poses a profound threat to our well-being and community safety.

HB1651 isn't just legislation, it is a crucial lifeline for educational workers. Through its establishment of clear protections and support mechanisms, it delivers a resounding message: harassment will not be tolerated, and those molding the future of our children deserve to do so free from fear.

Authored by both current and former educational workers who themselves endured harassment through the course of their employment, this bill confronts the consequences of the DOE's inaction, allowing one individual's destructive behavior to persist unchecked for over a decade.

The state-level leadership of the DOE, spanning several administrations, has consistently demonstrated a reluctance or incapacity to actively institute measures to safeguard the well-being of its employees.

This legislation not only heightens the gravity of such negligence but also compels the DOE to systematically monitor instances of harassment and establish protocols to safeguard harassed individuals. HB1651 represents a significant leap forward by mandating the DOE to document these occurrences and assume responsibility for the treatment of its workforce.

Let's proactively act rather than waiting for tragedy to spur our actions. We can shift the narrative from regretful hindsight to proactive prevention, saving someone's loved one—a parent, spouse, friend or cherished educator.

I extend my sincere gratitude to Chairman Justin Woodson, his team, and the 27 House members who backed the introduction of HB1651. Your willingness to help amplify the voices of educational workers and provide them a platform to propose meaningful solutions is deeply appreciated.

HB-1651-HD-1

Submitted on: 2/7/2024 12:28:14 PM

Testimony for JHA on 2/8/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Inger Stonehill	Individual	Support	Remotely Via Zoom

Comments:

Honorable Members of the Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs Committee,

I am Inger Stonehill, and I am submitting this testimony in wholehearted support of HB1651, along with some comments on the recommended changes from the Attorney General’s (AG) office.

One significant recommendation suggests removing the requirement for the Department of Education (DOE) to assist educational workers in obtaining representation from the Department of the Attorney General. The term 'representation' may benefit from further clarification within the context of this bill.

Drawing from my own distressing experience, I didn't require an attorney to represent me; rather, I needed assistance from someone well-versed in legal matters to navigate the complexities of obtaining a Temporary Restraining Order (TRO). The process was daunting and traumatic, and I lacked guidance. Despite some considering it a personal matter, I believe involving the DOE and the Attorney General, who represents the DOE, would have provided the necessary support, addressing my concerns and ensuring my safety.

In a previous hearing, both the DOE, specifically the Office of Talent Management (OTM), and Investigative Services seemed unaware of my situation. This lack of awareness further emphasizes the need for improved communication and support mechanisms within the DOE. I had to seek a hardship transfer through OTM and my Complex Area Superintendent, and had I been able to contact someone in the AG's office, my case might have been stronger, and I could have continued working at my original school feeling safe.

As a special education teacher, I have attended conferences where the Attorney General was present due to concerns about possible due process invocation by parents. It strikes me that the AG could similarly be involved when an educational worker faces severe harassment, potentially reaching the point of physical threats. The importance of our safety should not be overshadowed by legal nuances, and I urge you to consider the significance of legislative intervention.

The inconsistency between legal explanations and practical representation underscores the need for legislative action to rectify these flaws jeopardizing the well-being of state

employees. Such incongruences are unacceptable and demand intervention from the legislature to mitigate the risk of mental or physical harm, preventing larger tragedies.

I respectfully request the support of the Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs Committee for HB1651. Furthermore, I humbly request the reinstatement of the language in the bill that addresses the assistance of educational workers with legal actions arising from harassment, including obtaining support from the Department of the Attorney General and covering costs incurred from serving temporary restraining orders related to substantial or repeated incidents of harassment.

While the term 'representation' may be reconsidered for a more supportive connotation, it is crucial for everyone to acknowledge the necessity for educational workers not to feel isolated in their pursuit of safety. As indicated in other testimonies, enduring harassment from one individual for over a decade is unacceptable, and urgent action is warranted.

I hope that my testimony serves as a means to provide explicit guidelines for accountability, change, and, most importantly, the safety of all DOE employees.

Sincerely,

Inger Stonehill

HB-1651-HD-1

Submitted on: 2/7/2024 1:56:47 PM

Testimony for JHA on 2/8/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Christian Chambers	Individual	Support	Remotely Via Zoom

Comments:

This bill is an important step forward for the many DOE employees who are helping to shape the future of our State. There is no question that DOE employees are entitled to work in a safe environment, which includes being protected against actions that meet the legal definition of harassment. The testimony of several DOE employees - along with records from countless TRO cases before the Judiciary - show the Department has not taken action to protect its employees. This bill will require action that could save lives.

In response to testimony from the Attorney General's office ("AG"), the House Committee on Education removed an important part of this bill. I urge this committee to consider reinstating the requirement for the Department to provide affirmative assistance to an employee who is required to take legal action (including petitioning for a restraining order) as a result of harassment suffered because of their employment by the Department.

The AG's written testimony to the Education Committee included the statement that their "Department is not authorized ... to file affirmative claims on behalf of a State employee." That statement is probably correct, but misses the point that the Legislature could authorize the Attorney General to make affirmative claims on behalf of State employees in limited circumstances like those considered by this bill.

Further, the Legislature has already found circumstances that are so important to the well-being of the community that the AG's office has been authorized to bring affirmative claims. For example, pursuant to HRS 334-60.3, the Legislature provided that "the attorney general, the attorney general's deputy, special deputy, or appointee designated to present the case *shall assist the petitioner* to state the substance of the petition [for involuntary hospitalization] in plain and simple language."(emphasis added). Since the statute allows any person to file such a petition, the Legislature has authorized the AG to bring an affirmative claim on behalf of anyone who reasonably believes a person located in the State is in need of involuntary hospitalization for treatment of mental illness.

Likewise, the legislature should ensure that any DOE employee who faces harassment as a result of their employment will have the support necessary to obtain the protections afforded under the law. Without that support, employees will be left to fend for themselves as they attempt to figure out the legal process, serve their harasser, and argue for themselves in court. That is an untenable situation, especially when the employee is dealing with a habitual harasser who has been through the process himself more than a dozen times.

To provide actual protection to DOE employees, the bill should be amended to reinstate the requirement that the Department assist educational workers in obtaining representation to assist with any legal proceedings to obtain protection from harassment arising from the victim's position as an educational worker. That can be accomplished by including language modeled upon HRS 334-60.3, that provides "the attorney general, the attorney general's deputy, special deputy, or appointee designated to present the case shall assist an educational worker who is the subject of harassment with the preparation and filing of an application for an order of protection from the harassment, and shall represent the educational worker in any legal proceedings required to obtain an order of protection."

HB-1651-HD-1

Submitted on: 2/7/2024 8:20:01 AM

Testimony for JHA on 2/8/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Tara Taitano	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I, Tara Taitano, wholeheartedly endorse HB1651 as a vital step towards ensuring the safety and well-being of educational workers. The escalating instances of harassment targeting school officials highlight the pressing need for legislative action. Educational workers are integral to shaping the future of our children, and it is our collective responsibility to protect them from harm. This bill acknowledges the indispensable role of educational workers and seeks to enhance safeguards against harassment in educational settings.

By requiring the Department of Education to take proactive measures to address harassment and establishing the offense of harassment of an educational worker, HB1651 aims to create a safer and more conducive environment for educators and students alike. Additionally, providing educational workers with support, including legal assistance and paid leave for court proceedings related to harassment, is essential for empowering them to address such situations effectively.

I urge the legislature to prioritize the passage of HB1651 to ensure that educational workers can fulfill their duties without fear of harassment or intimidation. Let us stand together in support of our educators and the invaluable contributions they make to our communities and the future generations they serve.

Thank you for your consideration.

HB-1651-HD-1

Submitted on: 2/7/2024 8:56:08 AM

Testimony for JHA on 2/8/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Jaimie Song	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I, Jaimie Song, wholeheartedly endorse HB1651 as a vital step towards ensuring the safety and well-being of educational workers. The escalating instances of harassment targeting school officials highlight the pressing need for legislative action. Educational workers are integral to shaping the future of our children, and it is our collective responsibility to protect them from harm. This bill acknowledges the indispensable role of educational workers and seeks to enhance safeguards against harassment in educational settings.

By requiring the Department of Education to take proactive measures to address harassment and establishing the offense of harassment of an educational worker, HB1651 aims to create a safer and more conducive environment for educators and students alike. Additionally, providing educational workers with support, including legal assistance and paid leave for court proceedings related to harassment, is essential for empowering them to address such situations effectively.

I urge the legislature to prioritize the passage of HB1651 to ensure that educational workers can fulfill their duties without fear of harassment or intimidation. Let us stand together in support of our educators and the invaluable contributions they make to our communities and the future generations they serve.

HB-1651-HD-1

Submitted on: 2/7/2024 11:16:25 AM

Testimony for JHA on 2/8/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Shannon	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I, Shannon Goo, wholeheartedly endorse HB1651 as a vital step towards ensuring the safety and well-being of educational workers. The escalating instances of harassment targeting school officials highlight the pressing need for legislative action. Educational workers are integral to shaping the future of our children, and it is our collective responsibility to protect them from harm. This bill acknowledges the indispensable role of educational workers and seeks to enhance safeguards against harassment in educational settings.

By requiring the Department of Education to take proactive measures to address harassment and establishing the offense of harassment of an educational worker, HB1651 aims to create a safer and more conducive environment for educators and students alike. Additionally, providing educational workers with support, including legal assistance and paid leave for court proceedings related to harassment, is essential for empowering them to address such situations effectively.

I urge the legislature to prioritize the passage of HB1651 to ensure that educational workers can fulfill their duties without fear of harassment or intimidation. Let us stand together in support of our educators and the invaluable contributions they make to our communities and the future generations they serve.

HB-1651-HD-1

Submitted on: 2/7/2024 5:51:00 PM

Testimony for JHA on 2/8/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Brett Kulbis	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I OPPOSE HB-1651.

HB-1651 is not about safety, I wish it was. No, HB-1641 is about making education workers a protected class and criminalizing parental involvement in their keiki's education.

It is no different to HB-2125 (2022) and is a clear warning to parents, tutus, aunties, uncles, if you have an issue with what the State is teaching, introducing and exposing your keiki to, tough, keep it to yourself.

This is a law looking for a crime. In House Committee testimony of HB-2125 as in the testimony on this bill, none of the supporters have provided any evidence, crime stats, DOE reports, etc. that there is a problem.

Current law (§711-1106) already addresses the issue of harassment, but apparently that's not good enough.

It's obvious the Hawaii State Teachers Association union wants to make themselves a special class with special considerations and special laws.

I urge you to vote NO and kill this bill in committee.