

No. 16-273

---

In the  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

GLOUCESTER COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

G.G., BY HIS NEXT FRIEND AND MOTHER,  
DEIRDRE GRIMM,  
*Respondent.*

---

**On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari  
to the United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fourth Circuit**

---

**BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE*  
PROFESSIONAL EDUCATORS FROM 46  
STATES IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

---

MICHAEL LEE FRANCISCO  
*Counsel of Record*  
MRDLAW  
3301 West Clyde Place  
Denver, CO 80211  
(303) 325-7843  
michael.francisco@mrd.law

*Counsel for Amici Curiae*

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
INTERESTS OF AMICI CURIAE.....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	2
ARGUMENT .....	4
I. The “Dear Colleague” letter announcing that Title IX extends to transgender students will stifle local educators’ ability to provide care for all students, including those struggling with gender identity.....	4
A. The “Dear Colleague” letter imposes far- reaching obligations on schools.....	6
B. State and local protections for gender identity are more flexible and provide educators with useful options. ....	12
II. Title IX does not dictate gender identity rules..	14
CONCLUSION.....	17
APPENDIX – LIST OF AMICI CURIAE.....	1a

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Alexander v. Sandoval</i> , 532 U.S. 275 (2001) .....	14
<i>Bethel Sch. Dist. No. 403 v. Fraser</i> , 478 U.S. 675 (1986) .....	5
<i>Cannon v. Univ. of Chicago</i> , 441 U.S. 677 (1979) .....	15
<i>Etsitty v. Utah Transit Auth.</i> , 502 F.3d 1215 (10th Cir. 2007) .....	15
<i>Fisher v. Univ. of Texas at Austin</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2198 (2016) .....	5
<i>Frontiero v. Richardson</i> , 411 U.S. 677 (1973). .....	15
<i>Johnston v. Univ. of Pittsburgh of Com. Sys. of Higher Educ.</i> , 97 F. Supp. 3d 657 (W.D. Pa. 2015) .....	16
<i>Knussman v. Maryland</i> , 272 F.3d 625 (4th Cir. 2001) .....	15
<i>Morse v. Frederick</i> , 551 U.S. 393 (2007) .....	5
<i>Nebraska v. United States</i> , No. 4:16-cv-03117 (D. Neb. July 8, 2016) .....	6
<i>New State Ice Co. v. Liebmann</i> , 285 U.S. 262 (1932) .....	5
<i>Sommers v. Budget Mktg., Inc.</i> , 667 F.2d 748 (8th Cir. 1982) .....	16

*Texas v. United States*,  
 No. 7:16-cv-00054 (N.D. Tex. May 25, 2016) ..... 6

*Ulane v. E. Airlines, Inc.*,  
 742 F.2d 1081 (7th Cir. 1984) ..... 15

*United States v. Lopez*,  
 514 U.S. 549 (1995) ..... 5

**Statutes**

11 R.I. Gen. Laws § 11-24-3.1 ..... 13

20 U.S.C. § 1681(a)..... 1, 14

20 U.S.C. § 1682 ..... 14

34 C.F.R. § 106.33 ..... 16

45 C.F.R. § 86.33 ..... 16

775 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 5/5-103 ..... 13

Conn. Gen. Stat. § 46a-64(b)(1)(B) ..... 12

Haw. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 489-4..... 13

Md. Code Ann., State Gov’t § 20-303(a)(2)..... 13

Wis. Stat. Ann. § 106.52 ..... 13

**Other Authorities**

“Dear Colleague” letter from Catherine E. Lhamon  
 and Vanita Gupta (May 13, 2016) ..... passim

Dep’t of Educ. Letter, “Examples of Policies and  
 Emerging Practices for Supporting Transgender  
 Students” (May 2016)..... 10

Nat’l Center for Educ. Statistics, “*Fast Facts*,” (2016)  
 ..... 6

U.S. Dep't of Educ., "10 Facts about K-12 Education  
Funding" ..... 15

## INTERESTS OF AMICI CURIAE<sup>1</sup>

The amici curiae are a diverse group of more than 300 educators from almost every state in the nation who are concerned with the federal government's rapid, inflexible transformation of how public schools relate to transgender students. School teachers, administrators, principals, superintendents, professors, and school board members—all represented as amici—are faced with implementing the federal government's announced obligations under Title IX. 20 U.S.C. § 1681(a). Amici include many educators from Virginia and other States in the Fourth Circuit, where the decision below has deprived schools of the ability to craft carefully tailored solutions to the needs of local students. The Appendix lists the individual amici curiae, their educational role, and state.

The educators share a unique perspective on how schools can, and have, worked to treat transgender students fairly by adopting solutions to best serve each particular school. The benefits and burdens of the novel Title IX guidance announced by the Department of Justice and Department of Education fall within the bailiwick of the amici who manage, run, and serve in schools receiving federal funds.

---

<sup>1</sup> In accordance with Rule 37.6, no counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part, nor did any person or entity, other than amici and their counsel, make a monetary contribution to the preparation or submission of this brief. The parties consented to this filing. Their letters of consent are on file with the Clerk as required by Rule 37.2(a). The Parties have been timely notified of the intent to file this amici curiae brief. *See* Rule 37.2.

The amici can speak to the consequences from allowing the result below to stand, which would afford the recent “Dear Colleague” letter the force of law. The Court should hear about the far-reaching rules that limit schools’ ability to work with and protect the interests of transgender students as well as all other students.

### SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The amici educators have experience with addressing the oftentimes contentious and competing claims of students to use facilities or participate in activities at school. While people of goodwill may disagree about many aspects of education policy for handling the needs of transgender students alongside the needs of all other students, that disagreement cannot distill into healthy policy solutions if administrative letters are afforded deferential, legal status as the only acceptable interpretation of Title IX.

The Petition involves, most directly, the application of the federal government’s interpretation of Title IX as requiring schools to allow students identifying as transgender to the use common bathrooms on the basis of gender identity, not biological sex. Just after the Fourth Circuit decision below was issued, a “Dear Colleague” letter has amplified the legal position in this case to reach far beyond common bathrooms. *See* “Dear Colleague” letter from Catherine E. Lhamon and Vanita Gupta (May 13, 2016), *available at* <https://www.justice.gov/opa/file/850986/download> (hereafter “Letter”). The new guidance spells out many rules and de facto regulations that displace

solutions developed by local schools and educators. The stifling effect of the “Dear Colleague” letter about “transgender” falling under the restrictions on “sex” discrimination should be taken into account when weighing the reasons favoring granting certiorari in this case.

The federal government’s position that Title IX’s protections against “sex” discrimination should extend not just to biological sex, but to gender identity lacks democratic legitimacy. The extensive policy obligations on schools have been adopted without any Congressional action. This displaces state and local governing authorities’ ability to address complicated issues surrounding transgender students in a way that best reflects the needs of all local students.

In addition to being an overbearing announcement of law outside the recognized process, the federal government’s unprecedented interpretation of Title IX violates the clear terms of the statute and its implementing regulations, as well as the overwhelming voice of precedent over the past three decades. The Petition should be granted so this Court can prevent the federal government from adopting a nationwide set of policy obligations for transgender students in the absence of the refining legislative process at the national, state, or local level.



## ARGUMENT

### **I. The “Dear Colleague” letter announcing that Title IX extends to transgender students will stifle local educators’ ability to provide care for all students, including those struggling with gender identity.**

The amici educators highlight the inflexible, far-reaching content of the “Dear Colleague” letter. The reasons for not deferring to the “Dear Colleague” letter as a matter of administrative law and statutory interpretation are well covered by the Petitioner and other amicus briefs. The amici educators will focus on the extreme form of micromanagement threatened by the “Dear Colleague” letter. This brief will highlight the harms of avoiding the administrative notice and comment process, or the legislative process, where important policy refinements should be addressed.

Even assuming nondiscrimination laws should extend to cover gender identity and gender expression, those protections should be adopted through the proper process in the legislature or, at minimum, through notice and comment rulemaking. Either way, difficult policy questions, including how to best balance the rights of students who struggle with gender dysphoria with the privacy interest of other students are best left to the deliberative legislative process, not a unilaterally-announced “Dear Colleague” letter.

Schools often face challenging situations where the rights of some students may compete with the rights of other students. And, primary and secondary

schools bear the responsibility of “acting *in loco parentis*” to protect children from harms to health and safety. See *Bethel Sch. Dist. No. 403 v. Fraser*, 478 U.S. 675, 684 (1986); see generally *Morse v. Frederick*, 551 U.S. 393, 413 (2007) (Thomas, J., concurring) (tracing history of *in loco parentis* as applied to schools and competing free speech rights of students).

With schools in particular, the question of how to optimally support a student with a gender identity that does not conform to biological sex, while maintaining respect for the privacy rights of other students, is best left to local educators who are closest to the situation. As this Court recognized last term in the context of a challenge to a school’s preferred policy on the use of race for student admissions, “[c]onsiderable deference is owed to a university in defining those intangible characteristics ... that are central to its identity and education missions” and when “striking this sensitive balance, public universities like the States themselves, can serve as ‘laboratories for experimentation.’” *Fisher v. Univ. of Texas at Austin*, 136 S. Ct. 2198, 2214–15 (2016) (quoting *United States v. Lopez*, 514 U.S. 549, 581 (1995) (Kennedy, J., concurring); see also *New State Ice Co. v. Liebmann*, 285 U.S. 262, 311 (1932) (Brandeis, J., dissenting) (“It is one of the happy incidents of the federal system that a single courageous state may, if its citizens choose, serve as a laboratory; and try novel social and economic experiments without risk to the rest of the country.”). Likewise, with the often contentious questions of how to best provide private facilities for all students, the local schools and the states are better equipped to strike the appropriate balance.

**A. The “Dear Colleague” letter imposes far-reaching obligations on schools.**

The Department of Justice and the Office of Civil Rights issued a joint “Dear Colleague Letter on Transgender Students” on May 13, 2016, shortly after the Fourth Circuit’s decision in this case. (A predecessor letter which interpreted “sex” in Title IX as including gender identity served as the primary basis for the Fourth Circuit’s decision below to defer to the agency on the legal question at issue.) The recently issued “Dear Colleague” letter represents the federal government’s expansive position that all schools receiving federal funds must follow a detailed set of rules and procedures governing the often tense relationship between students of both biological sexes and students with a gender identity diverging from biological sex.

The provenance of the “Dear Colleague” letter has recently been called into question as it has been challenged by almost half the States in a pair of federal lawsuits, *Texas v. United States*, No. 7:16-cv-00054 (N.D. Tex. May 25, 2016); *Nebraska v. United States*, No. 4:16-cv-03117 (D. Neb. July 8, 2016), resulting in a nationwide injunction issued against the “Dear Colleague letter from the *Texas* litigation on August 21. See Preliminary Injunction Order, *Texas v. United States*, No. 7:16-cv-00054, (Aug. 21, 2016) (No. 58), available at <http://bit.ly/2c29yub>.

A careful reading of the “Dear Colleague” letter shows how many important policy issues it purports to answer for virtually every school in the nation, with not so much as a period for comment or input from

any elected representatives for the roughly 100,000 public schools in the United States. See Nat'l Center for Educ. Statistics, "*Fast Facts*," (2016) <http://bit.ly/1idSSu8>. As an initial matter, the letter announces "title IX obligations regarding transgender students" and provides "*significant guidance*." Letter, p.1 (emphasis original). This is not a mere policy preference or suggestion for the schools where the amici educators are involved. The substantial legal issues dictated by the letter include:

- Definition of gender identity. *Id.*, p.2.
- "Sex" includes "gender identity" for Title IX and implementing regulations. *Id.*
- Schools must immediately accept a student's self-declaration of gender identity. *Id.*
- Schools cannot involve medical professionals before changing how a transgender student is treated. *Id.*
- Schools cannot fully consider objections or concerns of third parties. *Id.*, p.2 ("a desire to accommodate others' discomfort cannot justify a policy that singles out and disadvantages a particular class of students.").
- Schools cannot require documentation for claims of transgender status. *Id.*, p.3 ("Under Title IX, a school must treat students consistent with their gender identity even if their education records or identification documents indicate a different sex.").

- School staff and contractors must use pronouns and names consistent with a transgender student's desires. *Id.*
- Restrooms segregated by biological sex must be opened up to transgender students of the opposite biological sex. *Id.* (schools "must allow transgender students access to such [sex segregated] facilities consistent with their gender identity.")
- Locker rooms segregated by biological sex must be opened up to transgender students of the opposite biological sex. *Id.* ("transgender students must be allowed to participate in such activities and access such facilities consistent with their gender identity.")
- Shower facilities segregated by biological sex must be opened up to transgender students of the opposite biological sex. *Id.*
- Housing segregated by biological sex must be opened up to transgender students of the opposite biological sex. *Id.*
- Athletic teams appear to be required to allow transgender students to "participate in such activities .... [c]onsistent with their gender identity." *Id.*<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> *But see id.* ("Title IX does not prohibit age-appropriate, tailored requirements based on sound, current, and research-based medical knowledge about the impact of the students'

- Single-sex classes segregated by biological sex must be opened up to transgender students of the opposite biological sex. *Id.*, p.3 (“a school must allow transgender students to participate consistent with their gender identity.”)
- Housing and overnight accommodations separated on the basis of sex must allow transgender students with opposite biological sex to have access. *Id.*, p.4 (“[A] school must allow transgender students to access housing consistent with their gender identity and may not require transgender students to stay in single-occupancy accommodations or to disclose personal information when not required of other students.”).
- General school activities such as yearbook photos or school dances cannot exclude students “for appearing or behaving in a manner that is consistent with their gender identity”. *Id.*
- Schools are prohibited from listing a student’s “sex, including transgender status” as directory information that would otherwise be subject to disclosure under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). *Id.*

---

participation on the competitive fairness or physical safety of the sport.”) (citing *On the Team: Equal Opportunity for Transgender Student Athletes* (2010) by Dr. Pat Griffin & Helen J. Carroll, which contemplates exclusion of some transgender students from some high school sports activities based on biological sex).

- Schools must change school records to “reflect the student’s gender identity and new name”. *Id.*, p.5.

These detailed requirements covering everything from procedures for recognizing a student’s claim to be transgender, to facilities and activities traditionally separated by the two sexes, to recordkeeping, did not end the matter. The “Dear Colleague” letter attached and incorporated a 25 page document entitled, “Examples of Policies and Emerging Practices for Supporting Transgender Students,” which include 19 points, or types of policy, which the Departments “encourage[]” schools to “consult” for “ways to meet Title IX’s requirements.” Letter, p.1; “Examples” Letter (May 2016), *available at* [www.ed.gov/oese/oshs/emergingpractices.pdf](http://www.ed.gov/oese/oshs/emergingpractices.pdf). This additional level of education policy minutia further diminishes the ability of local educators, local school boards, or even states to adopt policy details better suited to the needs of local students.

The “Dear Colleague” letter’s accompanying document is also the source confusion on some details of Title IX compliance, given the firm positions taken in the “Dear Colleague” letter itself. For example, the “Dear Colleague” letter is quite clear that schools are required to accept a student’s self-identification of gender identity. Letter, p.2 (“schools sometimes request some form of confirmation, they generally accept the student’s asserted gender identity”). But the accompanying document hedges on the question, by providing an example policy that states “being transgender ‘involves more than a casual declaration

of gender identity or expression....” Accompanying Letter, p.2.

The amici educators do not necessarily oppose each and every policy prescription of the “Dear Colleague” letter and its accompanying example policies. Rather, the amici recognize that many details of school policy for protecting student privacy and protecting transgender students from discrimination are better handled by the levels of government closer to the needs of the students. For some schools or some individual situations, it may be appropriate to accept a student’s self-declaration of having a transgender gender identity, as required by the “Dear Colleague” letter. But in other circumstances, schools may be better served by involving parents or even medical professionals in the determination of what school actions would be most appropriate for the student’s individualized situation.

Consider, under the “Dear Colleague” letter, schools must accept a student’s self-assertion of being transgender, regardless of the student’s age. (The letter often presumes or asserts that parents will likely advocate for younger age transgender students.) However, the letter calls into question a schools’ ability to communicate with parents without the student’s written consent, and the letter announces that “[u]nder Title IX, there is no medical diagnosis or treatment requirement that students must meet as a prerequisite to being treated consistent with their gender identity.” Letter, p.2. Thus, educators who have legitimate concerns about an individual student’s claims to identify as transgender are prohibited from involving medical



professionals outright, and in some cases, precluded from involving parents.

As another example, the “Dear Colleague” letter imposes absolute requirements that schools grant transgender students access to facilities that would otherwise be treated as highly private, such as shower facilities and overnight accommodations, regardless of the level of privacy provided to individual students by the facility. While not all shower facilities or locker rooms include non-private, communal space, many do, and the “Dear Colleague” letter mandates that transgender students of the opposite biological sex of the rest of the students using the facility be given access in all cases. Again, the “Dear Colleague” letter goes far beyond merely requiring schools to give access to common bathrooms on the basis of gender identity.

**B. State and local protections for gender identity are more flexible and provide educators with useful options.**

In contrast to the “Dear Colleague” interpretation of Title IX as applying to gender identity, a number of states have adopted nondiscrimination protections for gender identity, both in public accommodations laws and general nondiscrimination laws. Those laws, serving laudable goals, commonly recognize the privacy interests that counsel towards sex-segregated bathrooms and similar facilities. For example, Connecticut’s public accommodations law provides that “the prohibition of sex discrimination shall not apply to ... separate bathrooms or locker rooms based on sex”. Conn. Gen. Stat. § 46a-64(b)(1)(B).

Similar exceptions in other state laws affirm the need for certain private areas to be maintained even while generally affirming broad nondiscrimination rights for people based on a wide variety of protected classes (increasingly including gender identity). *See* Md. Code Ann., State Gov't § 20-303(a)(2) (exempting from discrimination based on sex those facilities that are "(i) uniquely private and personal in nature; and (ii) designed to accommodate only a particular sex"); 11 R.I. Gen. Laws § 11-24-3.1 ("Nothing contained in this chapter that refers to 'sex' shall be construed to mandate joint use of restrooms, bath houses, and dressing rooms by males and females."); 775 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 5/5-103 (exempting "restrooms, shower rooms, bath houses, health clubs and other similar facilities" for discrimination based on sex).

Some state laws provide a more general recognition that the common practice of having separate bathrooms for the two sexes does not constitute discrimination:

The provision of separate facilities or schedules for female and for male patrons, does not constitute a discriminatory practice when such separate facilities or schedules for female and for male patrons are bona fide requirements to protect personal rights of privacy.

Haw. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 489-4; *see also* Wis. Stat. Ann. § 106.52(b), (c) ("Nothing in this subsection prohibits separate dormitories at higher educational institutions or separate public toilets, showers,

saunas and dressing rooms for persons of different sexes”), (“Nothing in this subsection prohibits separate treatment of persons based on sex with regard to public toilets, showers, saunas and dressing rooms for persons of different sexes.”).

When subject to the legislative process, however, with input from the educators and others interested in the impact of such laws, the state laws often include an express provision exempting restrooms or other areas with patent privacy concerns.

## **II. Title IX does not dictate gender identity rules.**

The avant-garde application of Title IX by the Departments “Dear Colleague” letter requires an anachronistic definition of “sex.” Congress passed Title IX in 1972 to prohibit discrimination and certain unequal treatment “on the basis of sex.” 20 U.S.C. § 1681. There is little doubt that the word “sex” was understood at the time, and for decades following, as referring to biological sex only, not physiological identification as male or female (i.e., gender).

Title IX places restrictions on recipients of federal education funds, effectively governing schools from elementary to post-doctorate. Title IX was modeled on Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1965 and, like that act, prohibits only intentional discrimination. *See Alexander v. Sandoval*, 532 U.S. 275, 282–83 n.2 (2001) (discussing Title VI and Title IX similarities). The consequences for violating Title IX are drastic, as the federal government can terminate a recipient’s federal funding. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1682. Educators are keenly aware of the need to faithfully comply with

Title IX as federal funding represents an increasingly important share of education funding. Total federal spending on education in 2016 is expected to top 126 billion dollars (\$126,000,000,000), with the federal share of total spending on education increasingly rapidly since 1990 from approximately 5 percent of total education spending to almost 9 percent of total education spending today. *See* U.S. Dep’t of Educ., “10 Facts about K-12 Education Funding,” <http://bit.ly/2ctGZjD>.

The amici educators come from a wide array of states and levels of schooling, but all share in common an increased reliance on federal funding and, thus, concern with how the federal government interprets and applies the funding conditions of Title IX. Without dispute, “Title IX embodies a national commitment to the elimination of discrimination based on sex.” *Cannon v. Univ. of Chicago*, 441 U.S. 677, 747 (1979). Likewise, the application of Title IX to govern how schools treat students based on sex as biological sex has long been settled. This Court has recognized that “sex” in Title IX refers to “an immutable characteristic determined solely by the accident of birth.” *Frontiero v. Richardson*, 411 U.S. 677, 686 (1973).

That understanding of “sex” has been widely recognized by lower courts, before the novel holding in this case. *See Etsitty v. Utah Transit Auth.*, 502 F.3d 1215, 1222 (10th Cir. 2007) (“[T]here is nothing in the record to support the conclusion that the plain meaning of ‘sex’ encompasses anything more than male and female.”); *Knussman v. Maryland*, 272 F.3d 625, 635 (4th Cir. 2001) (quoting *Frontiero*); *Ulane v. E. Airlines, Inc.*, 742 F.2d 1081, 1087 (7th Cir. 1984)

("[I]f the term 'sex' as it is used in Title VII is to mean more than biological male or biological female, the new definition must come from Congress."); *Sommers v. Budget Mktg., Inc.*, 667 F.2d 748, 750 (8th Cir. 1982) ("[T]he plain meaning must be ascribed to the term 'sex' in absence of clear congressional intent to do otherwise."); *Johnston v. Univ. of Pittsburgh of Com. Sys. of Higher Educ.*, 97 F. Supp. 3d 657, 676 (W.D. Pa. 2015) (sex "means nothing more than male and female, under the traditional binary conception of sex consistent with one's birth or biological sex."). The courts, before this case, speak with a unified voice that affirms the common sense conclusion that "sex" in Title IX refers to biological sex.

Bolstering this conclusion, the regulations implementing Title IX expressly allow for sex-segregated restrooms and similar facilities: "A recipient may provide separate toilet, locker room, and shower facilities on the basis of sex, but such facilities provided for students of one sex shall be comparable to such facilities provided for students of the other sex." See 45 C.F.R. § 86.33 (HHS); 34 C.F.R. § 106.33 (DOE). It is difficult to understand how Title IX could be interpreted as applying to gender identity when it permits separation of facilities on the basis of sex.

In contrast to the overwhelming consensus on the meaning of "sex" in Title IX, the recently issued letters from various federal government officials, including the "Dear Colleague" letter, assert that "sex" in Title IX must include the concept of gender identity, not just biological sex. This novel claim that "sex" includes gender identity conflicts with the

longstanding interpretation of Title IX, as well as the text of Title IX and its implementing regulations.

The attempt to legislate through letter should be corrected by this Court. If left to stand as authoritative, these letters will operate as functional law for the amici educators, the schools they serve, and all other public schools and education institutions. The important legal and policy questions about how to best serve the needs of all public school students, including transgender students, are best served by allowing the democratic process to work at the state and local level.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, this Court should grant the Petition for Writ of Certiorari.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL LEE FRANCISCO  
*Counsel of Record*  
MRDLAW  
3301 West Clyde Place  
Denver, CO 80211  
(303) 335-7843  
michael.francisco@mrd.law

September 27, 2016

## **APPENDIX**

**Appendix**  
List of Amici Curiae

Adams, Lori	Teacher	IA
Adamus, Rachel	Former Teacher	NJ
Addie, Mary	Teacher	CA
Adkins, Mary	School Librarian	MO
Alexander, Jo Ellen	Teacher	CA
Alter, Virginia	Teacher	TN
Arts, Thomas	Administrator	AK
Ascione, Angelo	Teacher	NJ
Avery, Catherine	Teacher	ID
Baade, Steven	Administrator	TN
Bacon, Joel	Teacher	PA
Bailey, Barbara	Teacher	NJ
Barger, Cathy	Teacher	CO
Barner, Jordan	Teacher	GA
Barras, Ode	Administrator	AK
Barry, Justin	Teacher	PA
Barton, Judy	Teacher	AL
Bassett, Dianne	Teacher	CA
Bauer, Debbie	Teacher	VA
Baugh, Grace	Teacher	NC
Benedict, Jodi	Teacher	VA
Bentley, Adrienne	Teacher	VT
Berry, Rhonda	Teacher	IA
Bickelhaupt, Jeremy	Administrator	OH
Bielby, Earl	Retired Principal	NC
Birdsall, Mary	Administrator	CA
Blaauboer, Mary	School Board Member	NY
Blankinchip, Kimberly	Teacher	MS
Boes, Christine	Teacher	VA



## 2a

Borland, Lawrence	School Board Member	PA
Boyd, Ali	Teacher	NE
Bracy, Donald	Teacher	MI
Brainard, Tod	Superintendent	FL
Brooks, Marilyn	Preschool Director	MI
Brown, Geoffrey	Superintendent	AZ
Brown, Philip	Teacher Candidate	AK
Brown, Sherri	Teacher	HI
Brunner, Lawrence	Professor	MI
Brusati, Steve	Teacher	VA
Bublitz, Sherri	Teacher	NM
Bulthuis, Barbara	Executive Director	CO
Bunger, Kent	University CEO	AZ
Burns, Courtney	Administrator	NV
Butkus, Jill	Teacher	NJ
Button, Jeff	Principal	MN
Buuck, Julie	Administrator	NV
Buuck, Steve	Superintendent	NV
Callaway, Grace	Teacher	CA
Carradice, Carlotta	Teacher	PA
Carrier, Andrea	Teacher	TX
Chalfant, Tina	Administrator	NV
Chambers, David	Teacher	TN
Chapman, Thomas	School Board Member	GA
Cheney, Mark	Teacher	NV
Chilman, John	Counselor	NV
Christman, Ronald	Professor	PA
Chucci, Anthony	Teacher	NC
Cirucci, Mary	School Board Member	PA
Claar, Megan	Teacher	PA
Clark, Matthew	Teacher	CA

Cochran, G. Randy	Teacher	GA
Collette, Amanda	Teacher	VA
Collier, Monica	Administrator	TX
Cooney, Huntley	Teacher	AZ
Coumou, Susan	Teacher	NV
Craig, Lisa	Teacher	TN
Crouch, Christine	Teacher	AR
Cunningham, Carol	Teacher	TX
Cutbirth, Stacey	Teacher	TX
Damon, Sherri	Teacher	MS
Davis, John	President	WI
Deering, Michele	Teacher	AK
Desmarchais, Jim	Superintendent	AZ
Dillinger, Terry	Teacher	SC
Donnelly, Anne	Retired Teacher	NJ
Dougherty, Annie	Administrator	AK
Dunseath, Beverly	Administrator	NV
Edmiston, Bryan	Teacher	TN
Edmonston, Kathy	State Board of Education Member	LA
Ehlers, David	Teacher	OH
Eidsmoe, John	Professor	CA
Elder, Vicci	Teacher	OH
Eledge, Judy	Retired Principal	AK
Elliott, Kristin	Teacher	NV
Enders, Michael	Teacher	OH
Erb, Phylis	Administrator	MS
Eutsler, Cherise	Teacher	KS
Evoniuk, Mark	Teacher	OR
Figuroa, Jelena	Teacher	CA
Fink, Patricia	Retired Teacher	AK
Fitterer, Thomas	Retired Teacher	AK
Flowers, Karen	Teacher	TN

## 4a

Flowers, Sue-Elise	Teacher	KY
Fogo, Robert	Principal	NV
Ford, Paula	Teacher	TX
Foreman, John	Superintendent	NM
Freeman, Leona	Teacher	DE
Friedrichs, Raymond	Teacher	CA
Friedt, Florian	School Board Member	ND
Garlock, Tammy	Teacher	GA
Garrett, Jeremy	Principal	IL
George, Janel	Teacher	AL
Gillentine, Joe	Professor	CA
Godfrey, Lori	Teacher	GA
Gonske, Teresa	Professor	MN
Goodwin, Celia	Teacher	KS
Gottschall, Brian	Administrator	NM
Grasty, Kara	Teacher	OH
Gray, Anita	Retired Principal	PA
Greenly, Norma	Retired Teacher	CA
Greer, Tiffany	Administrator	IL
Gutierrez, Lydia	Teacher	CA
Hall, Shawn	Teacher	CA
Hall, Thomas	Teacher	NC
Halle, William	School Board Member	PA
Hamilton, Eddie	Retired Education Volunteer	WA
Harding, George	School Board Member	PA
Harrelson, Linda	Superintendent	MO
Hayre, Micah	Teacherjess	VT
Head, Kathleen	Retired Teacher	MN
Hernandez, Shari	Teacher	IA
Heupel II, Timothy	Teacher	NV

## 5a

Hill, Mark	Teacher	AK
House, Collette	Superintendent	IL
Howard, Diane	Teacher	AR
Jacobs, Jacqueline	Teacher	GA
James, Jonathan	Teacher	KS
Jeffery, Michael	Teacher	KS
Jones, Douglas	Teacher	IN
Joyce, Robin	Administrator	NV
Karner, Jennifer	Teacher	NV
Kelsey, Judith	Teacher	IN
Kessinger, Mary Amy	Vice Principal	WV
King, Janice	Retired Teacher	IN
King, Rollin	Professor	MN
Klaassen, JoAnn	Professor	KS
Kliver, Barbara	Teacher	NE
Knight, Nate	Teacher	NV
Knob, Ann	Retired Teacher	NJ
Knorr, Karl	Counselor	NV
Kober, Daniel	Teacher	NV
Kopecky, Michael	Teacher	CA
Kothe, Jacob	Vice Principal	NV
Kraehmer, Jurgen	Teacher	NV
Kraft, MaryJo	Counselor	MD
Kropp, Kris	Teacher	KY
Kubena, Emily	Teacher	CT
Kuebler, John	Principal	NJ
Kurka, Diana	Retired Administrator	AK
Kurtz, Joy	Teacher	NC
Lagos, Julia	Teacher	CA

## 6a

Laursen, Finn	Executive Director of Christian Educators Association International Administrator	OH      NJ
Lawrence, Gail	Teacher	NC
Lawrence, Kurt	Teacher	MN
Leonhart, Amanda	Administrator	TX
Lewis, Patty	Former School Board Member	AZ
Lile, William	Teacher	OR
Little, Anastasia	Teacher	NJ
LiVecchi, Sarah	Teacher	SD
Lockner, Jeff	Teacher	IN
Lorigan, Emy	Administrator	MI
Losen, Cherie	School Board Member	MI
Losen, Vesta	Teacher	KY
Lundy, Stephen	Teacher	ME
Lunn, Anne	Teacher	MD
Maguire, John	School Board Member	MI
Manley, Carol	Teacher	HI
Manzon, Norman	Teacher	HI
Manzon, Suzanne	Retired Teacher	CA
Matsuda, Janet	Principal	AZ
MCafee, Mark	Teacher	CA
McCarty, Sheryl	Teacher	NV
McDaniel, Anna	Teacher	NV
McDaniel, Jennifer	Teacher	AZ
McGrath, Sean	Teacher	AK
McMahan, Sandra	Retired Teacher	TX
McNeely, Bart	Teacher	NC
McWhorter, Susan		

## 7a

Mebane, Elizabeth	Teacher	NC
Meng, Jennifer	Teacher	OH
Merwin, Robert	Administrator	AZ
Miladinovich, Jill	Teacher's Aide	NJ
Miller, Jennifer	Administrator	TX
Moore, Gary	Teacher	AK
Morelli, Farrah	School Board Member	DE
Morrill, Stephen	Teacher	NV
Murray, Raileen	Teacher	KY
Murray, Terri	Teacher	CA
Neal, Carol	Administrator	NV
Negron, Rebecca	School Board Member	FL
Nichols, Stephanie	Administrator	AR
Nieveen, Teri	Teacher	NE
Nixon-Williams, Kim	Teacher	NY
Okamoto, Joan	Principal	IL
Oppedisano, Sharon	Retired Teacher	NY
Oppenheimer, Carolyn	School Board Member	PA
Ownby, Dayla	Teacher	TN
Paczkowski, Craig	Administrator	MA
Paddock, Randall	Administrator	VA
Papanek, Angelina	Teacher	NV
Patrick, Kodia	Teacher	GA
Patterson, Anne	Teacher	TX
Pauly, Jeffrey	Teacher	NV
Pellegrino, Louis S.	Teacher	NY
Pender, Karen	Superintendent	IL
Phillips, Robert	Professor	CT
Ploshay, Martha	Retired Coach	NJ
Powell, Gini	Administrator	TN
Pratt, David	Teacher	NV

Precourt, Cheryl	School Board Member	DE
Prevosto, Paul	Teacher	NJ
Prewett, Bonnie	Teacher	GA
Price, Jeffrey	Teacher	CA
Price, Jesse	Teacher	NV
Price, Kathleen	Teacher	AK
Price, Rose	Teacher	TN
Raczynski, Mark	Teacher	OH
Ramler, Kent	Superintendent	MD
Rasmussen, Bryn	Teacher	CA
Ratliff, Ashley	Teacher	KY
Ream, David	Teacher	KY
Renfro, Erin	School Board Member	AK
Reutter, April	Teacher	CA
Richter, Paul	Administrator	MT
Rider, Maurice	Teacher	AR
Riedweg, Deborah	Coach	IN
Rivera, Ellen	Administrator	NV
Rodgers, Paul	Administrator	AK
Roell, Karsten	Teacher	CO
Rowles, Mary	Administrator	CA
Ruggles, Amarilis	Teacher	NV
Russell, Gloria	Retired Teacher	CA
Salibi, Charles	Teacher	WI
Samek, Jeremy	School Board Member	PA
Santini, Cecilia	Administrator	TX
Saunders, Cyndi	Coach	AK
Saunders, Renee	Former Teacher's Aide	AK
Scherb, Zachary	Teacher	IA

## 9a

Schmig, Tim	Executive Director	MI
Schurman, Kurt	Teacher	TX
Schwartz, Lisa	Teacher	NV
Seidman, David	Principal	NJ
Sheehan Boljen, Marie	Retired Administrator	CA
Shelton, Lisa	Teacher	TN
Shope, Debra	Teacher	PA
Short, Gene	Principal	KS
Shults, Robert	Assistant Principal	TN
Sierer, Timothy	Superintendent	PA
Simons, Tina	Teacher	VA
Sizemore, Linda	Teacher	NJ
Smith, Elisabeth	Teacher	AL
Smith, Kevin	Teacher	DE
Snow, Rebecca	Principal	TX
Stelzer, Wilbert	Teacher	NV
Stevens, Barb	Teacher	TX
Stouffer, Dr. Bob	Principal	SC
Stramilov, Ali Ann	Teacher	AK
Stroshine, Jonathan	Teacher	TN
Stryker, Pam	Teacher	AZ
Stryker, Timothy	Retired Teacher	AZ
Sullivan, Ann	Teacher	KY
Sullivan, Julia	Teacher	TN
Sundby, Lee	Teacher	AK
Taylor, Barbara	Teacher	TX
Taylor, Jessica	Teacher	TN
Tayrien, Linda	School CFO	NV
Tennant, Donna	Teacher	FL
Terry, Angela	Teacher	GA
Thomas, Diana	Administrator	KY



Thorne, Barton	Vice Principal	TN
Tobin, Lisa	Teacher	DE
Tokkesdal, Sherry	Retired Teacher	MN
Torrado, Carlos	Professor	FL
Tripp, Anne	Former Teacher	NJ
Troxell, Frederick	School Board Member	AZ
Turner, Dustin	Teacher	WV
Tyminski, Cindy	Teacher	TX
Villalobos, Chris	Speech and Language Pathologist	CA
Vincent, Melinda	Administrator	NV
Wagoner, Matthew	Teacher	NC
Walls, James	Teacher	AL
Walo, Karen	Teacher	NV
Walter, Bret	Administrator	NV
Walter, John	Teacher	VA
Wehrman, Shelby	Teacher	KS
Wendover, Wendy	Administrator	CO
West, Cassandra	Teacher	NC
White, Joe	Administrator	GA
Wild, Jeff	Teacher	IN
Williams, David	Teacher	TX
Williams, Marvella	Early Education Provider	AK
Willis, Richard	Principal	OH
Willweber, Marie	Administrator	HI
Winters, Brandon	Professor	MN
Wisehart, Ashley	Teacher	GA
Yegenian, Vicken	Teacher	CA
York, Sandy	Teacher	AK
Young, Kenneth	Teacher	OK
Young, Mason	Principal	CO

11a

Youngblood, Daniel	Vice Principal	GA
Yousling, Enoch	Teacher	CA
Zellhart, Kim	Teacher	DE
Ziesmer, Mark	Teacher	CA
Zimmerman, Daniel	School Board Member	WI
Zugmier, George	Retired Teacher	AZ