U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

+ + + + +

BRIEFING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY, MAY 13, 2011

+ + + + +

The Commission convened in the Grand Ballroom of the Washington Marriott at Metro Center, $775\ 12^{\text{th}}$ Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C. at $9:00\ a.m.$, Martin R. Castro, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

MARTIN R. CASTRO, Chairman
ABIGAIL THERNSTROM, Vice Chair
ROBERTA ACHTENBERG, Commissioner
TODD F. GAZIANO, Commissioner
GAIL L. HERIOT, Commissioner
PETER N. KIRSANOW, Commissioner
DINA TITUS, Commissioner
MICHAEL YAKI, Commissioner

KIMBERLY TOLHURST, Delegated the Authority of the Staff Director

STAFF PRESENT:

TERESA BROOKS
MARGARET BUTLER
CHRISTOPHER BYRNES
LILLIAN DUNLAP
PAMELA DUNSTON, Chief, ASCD
LATRICE FOSHEE
ALFREDA GREENE
TINALOUISE MARTIN, Director, OM
LENORE OSTROWSKY, Acting Chief, PAU
JOHN RATCLIFFE, Chief, Budget and Finance
EILEEN RUDERT
DAVID SNYDER
AUDREY WRIGHT
MICHELE YORKMAN

NEAL R. GROSS

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

NICHOLAS COLTEN
ALEC DEULL
TIM FAY
DOMINIQUE LUDVIGSON
JOHN MARTIN
ALISON SOMIN

PRESENTERS:

RUSSLYNN ALI, Assistant Secretary For Civil Rights, Department of Education

JOCELYN SAMUELS, Senior Counselor to the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, Department of Justice

FATIMA GOSS GRAVES, National Women's Law Center

ROGER CLEGG, Center for Equal Opportunity GREGORY HEREK, University of California, Davis ILAN MEYER, Columbia University HIRAM SASSER, Liberty Institute

ELIZA BYARD, GLSEN

JOHN EASTMAN, Chapman University

PAULA GOLDBERG PACER Center

HELEN GYM, Asian Americans United

STUART BUCK, University of Arkansas

KENNETH MARCUS, Institute for Jewish & Community Research

HILARY SHELTON, NAACP

RAJDEEP SINGH, Sikh Coalition

TAMMY AABERG, Parent Advocate

FRANCISCO NEGRON, National School Boards Association

KEN TRUMP, National School Safety and Security Services

EUGENE VOLOKH, UCLA

DEBORAH LAUTER, ADLINOTE: FOR SPEAKER

NEAL R. GROSS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Panel 1: Federal Agency Efforts to Enforce Civil Rights Laws
Russlynn Ali, Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education Jocelyn Samuels, Senior Counselor to the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Justice
Panel 2: Gender & LGBT 54
Fatima Goss Graves, National Women's Law Center Roger Clegg, Center for Equal Opportunity Gregory Herek, University of California, Davis
Ilan Meyer, Columbia University Hiram Sasser, Liberty Institute Eliza Byard, GLSEN John Eastman, Chapman University
Panel 3: Race/National Origin, Religion and Disability
Paula Goldberg, PACER Center Helen Gym, Asian Americans United Stuart Buck, University of Arkansas Kenneth Marcus, Institute for Jewish & Community Research Hilary Shelton, NAACP Rajdeep Singh, Sikh Coalition
Panel 4: Federal/Local Role in Bullying
Tammy Aaberg, Parent Advocate Francisco Negron, National School Boards Association Ken Trump, National School Safety and Security Services Eugene Volokh, UCLA Deborah Lauter, ADL
Adiourn

NEAL R. GROSS

PROCEEDINGS

9:01 A.M.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The meeting will come to order. My name is Marty Castro. I'm Chairman of the United States Commission on Civil Rights. I want to welcome you all to this business meeting of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. I also want to take this opportunity to welcome back Michael Yaki, our Commissioner who was recently reappointed.

Welcome back, Michael.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you.

9:01 on May 13, 2011. The purpose of this meeting is to conduct a briefing on the federal response to peer-to-peer violence and bullying as well as harassment, as information today will be gathered for the purposes of our 2011 Statutory Enforcement Report that will be presented in September of this year to the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States.

This is an extremely important issue for us all. Every one of us in this room and on this Panel and listening to this has children in our lives that we love and care for, whether they are our own children, grandchildren, nieces, nephews, students,

godchildren, neighbors and we all want them to have safe, happy, and long lives where they can reach their full potential.

I know that I can say that each one of us, regardless of our party affiliation or our political ideology, wants to have communities and schools that are safe for our children regardless of their race, their national origin, sex, religion, disability status, or sexual orientation. Where we may differ is how we want to accomplish that goal. To that point today, we're going to hear from various individuals who are going to present to us different points of view and different perspectives on the legal responsibilities and the constitutional and civil rights implications of those different methods to protect our children.

I think that as we have this discussion,

I know that each one of my Commissioners and I will

lead by example so that today we have a very

thoughtful discussion about these issues with our

fellow Commissioners and the witnesses so that we

prepare for Congress and the President a thoughtful

and bipartisan report.

I want to thank each of you for being here today. I want to give you a little bit of the

ground rules on how we're going to manage the panels for today. We're very fortunate, we've invited 20 highly-distinguished speakers to provide us with a array of expertise and Unfortunately, with so many wonderful panelists, time is going to be at an extraordinary premium. In order to maximize the amount of time and opportunity for discussion between Commissioners and the witnesses, and to ensure that those people that are participating on panels later in the day have opportunity for their fair share of time, I'm going to strictly enforce time allotments for each panelist to present his or her statement.

Panelists are going to notice that there's a system of warning lights set up here like traffic lights. The lights are red, green and yellow, as we do when we're driving, we know it's time to show caution and wrap up. You'll have two minutes remaining when you see that yellow light. When the light turns red, I'm going to ask all panelists to please cease your presentation. We have your written statements. We've reviewed They're part of the record, so we ask you to strictly adhere to that time limit. I don't want to have to cut anybody off, which I know my General Counsel here

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

will require that I do, so please keep to that.

The first panel will have a ten-minute time frame for their statements and the other succeeding panels throughout the day will have seven minutes.

Also due to the time constraints, I'm only going to be giving a cursory overview of the individual panelist's background. All their full bios and some of their presentations are out in the lobby at the table. So if you'd like to see the full bio, please make sure you receive a handout if you already have not.

Lastly, I'm going to ask my fellow Commissioners to be considerate to the panelists and to one another by keeping their questions and comments concise. I will be calling on Commissioners as they raise their hands and I will fairly allocate the time for them to ask questions. So when you do ask a question, please make it one question, although I know that at times there will be multiple parts to that question. We just ask you to keep that to a minimum. If we all abide by that time arrangement, we're going to have multiple opportunities to ask questions of all the panelists.

So we'll now begin with Panel 1, which

1	is the Federal Agency Efforts to Enforce the Civil
2	Rights Laws. We have as our speakers Russlynn Ali,
3	Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, U.S. Department
4	of Education, and Jocelyn Samuels, Senior Counselor
5	to the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights at
6	the U.S. Department of Justice. Assistant Secretary
7	Ali unfortunately has a very tight schedule and has
8	to leave early this morning, so in order to
9	accommodate her schedule, I'm going to bifurcate this
10	panel, so she will have ten minutes to make her
11	presentation. We'll follow that with questions that
12	will occur until 9:40. At that time we'll go to Ms.
13	Samuels who will have ten minutes to present her
14	presentation and then we will question her until
15	10:10.
16	So I would ask each panelist to please
17	raise your right hand and swear or affirm that the
18	information you are about to provide to us is true
19	and accurate to the best of your knowledge and
20	belief.
21	(The panelists were sworn.)
22	Assistant Secretary Ali, we will begin
23	with you.
24	PANEL 1: FEDERAL AGENCY EFFORTS TO ENFORCE

CIVIL RIGHTS LAWS

RUSSLYNN ALI, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS,
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

ASSISTANT SECRETARY ALI: Thank you, Chairman Castro. Thank you all for the opportunity to be here with you today. This is a hugely important issue and the Secretary of Education Arne Duncan has made clear it can't come from Washington only. The solutions can't come from Washington alone and certainly not from the Department, so that you are taking the time to think so deeply about this issue, we very much appreciate and will be hugely important moving forward.

I don't have to tell anyone in this room and certainly none of you how important the crisis of bullying has become. You would have heard the President talk about it that we need to shift the paradigm in our nation's schools, the cultures that give rise to bullying that make it seem as though bullying or harassment are somehow a right of passage. We are working with local educators and officials across the country to help change those patterns.

As the Secretary has also often said, students can't learn if they don't feel safe. So our work in the Office for Civil Rights on this issue has

been geared towards that, ensuring that students feel safe in our nation's schools, colleges, and universities and that those responsible for teaching them understand their roles and responsibilities when it comes to complying and helping to adhere to the nation's civil rights laws.

We are working with educators, parents, community members, advocates, and concerned citizens everywhere help students, to help students to understand both what their rights are and to help teachers and their community members and parents understand what they can do in the event that their child is a victim of bullying and what to do in the event that they see bullies or teach bullies in their We are very proud of the effects our recent work have demonstrated already. example, and I'll talk about it a little bit more momentarilyrecent guidance that we issued on sexual violence under Title IX making it clear that sexual violence can constitute a violation of Title IX, that there are real responsibilities for college campuses and school districts to ensure that victims feel safe, that they address cultures that give rise to sexual harassment and sexual violence and they help prevent it from moving forward. In very short order,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

several universities began taking action. We have heard that Stanford University, that Yale University, that University of Virginia, have all announced that they are proactively changing their standards of proof in Title IX investigations to better comply with the Office for Civil Rights standards and our quidance.

have also recently resolved complaints on the issues of harassment and bullying, working with our colleagues at the Department of Justice. We are helping school districts that are confronting this issue today. Recently in Owatonna School District in Minnesota, а involving case harassment of Somalian-American students, we worked with local officials there to ensure that those students would feel safe and we would address the very serious acts of harassment that those students suffered. Owatonna's superintendent, I'm pleased to say, said in the press when asked about this that the Office for Civil Rights, and we together with the Department of Justice, have made her school district better.

The guidance that we've issued has been designed to help school districts and universities, recipients of federal funds, just as I mentioned,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

understand what their responsibilities are. We have issued two recently. One on sexual violence where we made it clear, as I mentioned, what the requirements were when sexual violence occurred, what the requirements were when adjudication of Title IX complaints happens on school campuses, the kinds of interim supports that might be required if a victim needs them.

We've also issued this past October guidance on bullying and harassment under all of the statutes in our jurisdiction, Title VI, Section 504, and Title IX, there too with the intent of making it clear what responsibilities were and providing as assistance proactively that we could to institutions. We are also embarking technical assistance, coordinating our work with amazing relationships with the Department of Justice so that we can ensure that we bring all of our resources to bear to help solve this problem.

Now the role of the policy guidance, while intended to make clear what the standards are, are also a little more detailed than you might have seen in the past. That is because we are trying to apply the guidance and legal standards for school districts in circumstances that they deal with in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

real time.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We understand some of the concerns about the guidance so that we proactively address some of what we've heard. We've heard that we are changing the standards of proof. We've heard that Davis vs. Monroe requires actual notice, not institutions to know or should have known the acts of harassment or violence occurred on their campuses. There though we are talking in Monroe about very different We're talking about monetary damages circumstances. the private litigation sense. Courts recognized that we set different standards, Monroe itself did. And since 1994 and 2001 and beyond, the Office for Civil Rights has made it clear that the standards for harassment are whether institutions knew or should have known that harassment occurred.

We are also very mindful of the concerns around the interplay of our guidance with First Amendment and, as our guidance in October made it clear, our work in no way attempts to trump the First Amendment. Those values and core constitutional principles are complementary, not contradictory to enforcing the nation's civil rights laws.

But even so, very little of the harassment that we see involves protected speech.

Physical harassment, violence, and threats are not constitutionally protected, as I know you know. is harassment the same thing as unpopular offensive speech. As our Dear Colleague Letters make clear, student-on-student harassment violates federal civil rights laws only if it is sufficiently serious to create a hostile environment that interferes with or limits students' ability to participate in or enjoy the benefits or services offered by the The First Amendment's institution. free speech clause does not give students license to say what they want whenever they want without regard to the effect that their speech has on other students. Schools cannot tolerate discriminatory harassment that interferes with providing a safe, nurturing learning environment for all of their students.

Of course, no universal one-size-fitsall approach will be right for every school or every student struggling with issues of bullying harassment. And our policy guidances have not in any way attempted to mandate one, but keeping the school free from harassment is primarily local responsibility and one that want to help we institutions maintain.

The other aspect of our work -- as I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

mentioned, some of the very positive feedback we've received has been around our complaint resolution. Last year, we received a little over a thousand complaints alleging harassment on the basis of race, national origin, sex, or disability, which was about 14 percent of the total number of complaints we've received on all issues. And a 31 percent increase from 2009. That's almost twice as many as we saw in 2005.

We carefully review all complaints. We determine whether, after our evaluation, there's sufficient jurisdiction, et cetera, to launch an investigation, and we thoroughly and diligently investigate.

We are also pleased to see an increase in voluntary resolution around this issue in particular. Thirteen percent of our cases were resolved either through early complaint resolution, which is a kind of mediation, or through a voluntary resolution and negotiations. We are collecting data on these issues in ways that we haven't in the past, disaggregated data on instances of bullying under all of the harassment statutes in our jurisdiction. We are launching compliance reviews on this issue. Over the past five years OCR

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

initiated a dozen sexual harassment compliance reviews, one racial harassment, and one disability. Five of those were -- began in 2009, and in 2010 we initiated two sexual violence reviews. This year we have initiated two more, one under Title VI and Section 504; the other on sexual violence under Title IX.

Lastly, the kind of coordination that you will hear from Jocelyn and myself certainly during the question and answer period has been hugely important to ensure that we provide the kind of assistance that we know is necessary. We are also working with several other agencies. You would have seen -- the Department convened alongside other agencies, Bullying Summit in August; the President and other agencies at the White House in March to bring further attention to this issue, to understand what the kinds of best practices are so that we can help replicate them, model them, and show what's working for the nation.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you, Assistant Secretary. I'll now open it to questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Heriot.

NEAL R. GROSS

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Thank you very much.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY ALI: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I want to talk about the 800-pound gorilla issue here. And that is, the Department has had a sexual harassment policy for some years and in some ways it's very similar to what And it hasn't always we're talking about today. worked out that well. For one thing, school districts have often responded by adopting tolerance rules and some of those zero tolerance rules have turned out rather silly. For example, in a four-year-old kindergarten student punished after a teacher's aide accused her of pressing his face to her breasts during a hug. Αt the Potomac View Elementary School, just up the road here in Maryland, we had a six-year-old who accused of sexual harassment and written up and they called the police on him. In fact, I'm told that in Maryland, and of course that's just one state, in the year 2007, 166 elementary students were suspended for sexual harassment and that included 3 pre-schoolers, 16 kindergartners, and 22 first graders.

Now I know the Department of Education is not looking to punish pre-schoolers, but the fact

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

is whenever the federal government gets involved in an issue, it is so very local in character and I believe so much better dealt with at the local level. There's going to be over-reaction at the local level. How is this policy going to be different? How can you prevent that kind of response?

ASSISTANT SECRETARY ALI: Well, I certainly can't say whether that kind of response is due to the work of the federal government in the past. What I can say is we are providing the kind of technical assistance to assure that institutions understand what rises to the level of a civil rights violation, what clearly our enforcement standards are and what doesn't rise to the level of civil rights violation.

We are also collecting data on things like zero tolerance policies so that we can better understand how they are being implemented.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: You've got to remember that, at a school district, the worst thing in the world that can happen to them is to have a giant investigation, which is often what happens. I was a little troubled by your quoting the school district, school board member praising the Department. Remember, they're under your authority.

You're supposed to know that when somebody is under your authority and they praise you, you're not supposed to take it seriously. You're supposed to realize that that may not be really what they're thinking.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY ALI: I can only take people for what they say and what that superintendent said was clearly that she believed that we helped make her institution better.

We have also heard just recently from General Counsel in a compliance review that the General Counsel had resolved. There, threatened with obstruction of justice when tried to do their Title IX work, when they were confronting issues of sexual violence. And our work helped them facilitate an agreement with local law enforcement to resolve some of those issues and some of those long-standing tensions. There too, the General Counsel said that we helped break down silos institutions in their and helped make their institutions safer and better.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Again, I worry about the 800-pound gorilla problem.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Commissioner Heriot, we do have to limit the follow ups. We do want to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

have the opportunity to have all the Commissioners 1 ask questions. 2 3 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Sure. 4 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: We appreciate that. 5 I'm sorry to interrupt you. Commissioner Yaki, you're recognized by 6 7 the chair. COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you very much, 8 9 Mr. Chair. And I just want to say it's great to be back after my four-month furlough. 10 11 Just a quick response and then question. I always get a little nervous when people 12 start talking about issues being solely of a local 13 character and therefore should be of local reaction 14 15 because certainly we heard that refrain during the '30s, '40s, and '50s when it came to certain items of 16 17 discrimination that happened in this country back 18 then. 19 But we're not talking about that. We're talking about an issue that has transcended local 20 21 areas. It is a national issue and that is why we are 22 having this hearing here today. What happens at the 23 enforcement level, the local level, it's something that we can discuss and monitor, but it doesn't 24

diminish the importance of what we are talking about

today.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now there was one aspect of your testimony and I think it's probably going to be for both of you in the next round, but for you, Assistant Secretary, and that is one of the things that has come about in the news has been the issue of cyber bullying and the fact that basically any person, young person with ill will, or lots of people with ill will, can sort of gang up on someone in cyberspace and create the kind of emotional trauma, emotional damage that we're concerned about.

Could you talk a little bit about cyber bullying and sort of the potential limits, if there are, of the authority of ED, as well as responsibility of the schools of what really could be described as off-campus, but as we all know probably emanates from within a particular school, circle of people.

assistant secretary all: Thank you. It is certainly an issue that in this world of social media, so many superintendents and school folk and university folk are wrestling with. We are working in real time with our colleagues in the Department of Justice and in other agencies to produce some guidance on this issue that addresses the emerging

technology and addresses some of the novel issues including that of jurisdiction.

That said, we have seen cases where bullying on things like Facebook have been done in school and clearly rose to the level of adults in school knowing about it. And in fact, we resolved a case just recently where bullying and harassment that occurred off campus that was promoted and talked about through the social media rose to the level of school district officials and school officials knowing about it and therein we worked with them to resolve those issues.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Basically, anyone with a smart phone inside a classroom can engage in that kind of conduct.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY ALI: Again, the standard, though, is whether adults knew or should have known about it.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY ALI: So that is really going to be a case-by-case determination. We do believe that there are some principles that we can help institutions understand. At this point, I think it's premature for us to articulate what they are. We are working with our colleagues to sort through

some of the complications and I would be happy to come back when we are ready to articulate them.

In the meantime, we are focusing on again what happens in school, where information occurs out of school, but impacts school, making it clear what those responsibilities are.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The chair recognizes

Commissioner Gaziano.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Thank you, and I'll ask the chair for a little indulgence. I'll forego questioning of the other witness, but this -- my lead-in may take a little while.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Try to keep it brief.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I will try, but I want the witness to understand the premise. It's sort of related to Commissioner Heriot's question. It's clear to me that if the Department of Education wants to become the 800-pound gorilla in all matters, student teasing, sexual harassment, state-level petty crimes, it can. And I have some concerns I'm going to raise with other panelists on whether you've done so, the way you've done it is authorized by your statutes and whether the way you have done so will lead to increase in violations of students' First Amendment rights who politely disagree with school

administration views.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But my question for you at this time is really a much more pragmatic one and that's whether coming in as the 800-pound gorilla necessarily make matters better at the local level for students, rather than worse. I can forgive interest groups into thinking that the more levels of government that are involved, and the harder it comes down on local officials, the better. But the problem I have with that is that it allows the local school board to deflect the accountability they have to parents and to those same interest groups that would normally go to the school districts. And it's quite understandable that federal bureaucrats who want to help will also tend to believe that they can make things better, but when the -- there are thousands of school districts. There are tens of thousands of schools.

When parents and the interest groups are led to believe that the federal government is the guarantor of preventing teasing of little Johnny or little Betty, I have a serious concern that that will allow the school district to deflect the accountability they have to those groups by saying well, we're following federal guidelines. We're

doing everything according -- our hands are tied. DOE is telling us what to do.

To what extent did you study that issue and how did you study that issue, the sort of unintended effect of undermining the accountability before you issued your Dear Colleague Letter?

ASSISTANT SECRETARY ALI: Thank you for your question. Certainly we want to help, but let me be clear. We also want to do our jobs. We're enforcing laws that for decades have been in effect. We are neither expanding our jurisdiction, nor the scope of those laws, nor creating new standards.

Our work is not designed in this context to imply that common teasing, that perhaps shouldn't be common at all, rises to the level of a civil rights violation. We are talking about a hostile environment that is so sufficiently severe, based on a student's race, skin color, sex, national origin, or disability status, and that harassment is so severe that it interferes with their ability to learn and to enjoy the benefits that every student in our nation's schools, colleges, and universities should enjoy.

I will stand with my colleagues as we work to enforce the laws that Congress has given us

job to enforce. We will provide technical 1 assistance wherever possible so that institutions 2 3 understand clearly what their lines are. I have not 4 met a college president or a superintendent or a anywhere that 5 teacher says that they an environment where any student feels unsafe, no less. 6 7 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Commissioner Gaziano, got follow-up. 8 I've limit the I've 9 Commissioners over here who have not had an opportunity to ask questions. Thank you. 10 11 The chair recognizes Commissioner Achtenberg, am I right? 12 Commissioner Titus. 13 Thank 14 COMMISSIONER TITUS: you, Mr. 15 Chairman and thank you, Madam Under Secretary for 16 being here. You don't look like an 800-pound gorilla 17 to me, but we welcome you this morning. 18 You know, the administration is not the 19 only branch that's working on this problem 20 recognizing that it's an escalating issue that we 21 need to address. In Congress, there are a couple of 22 bills pending. I know you're familiar with them: 23 The Safe Schools Improvement Act and Student Nondiscrimination Act. Both of these have bipartisan 24

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

sponsorship and they're in both houses.

1	T just wondered if were would somewhat
1	I just wondered if you would comment on
2	those, if you're supporting those, if there are
3	elements in there that help you do your job, that
4	hinder you, or just in general how they affect how
5	you'll move forward on this issue.
6	ASSISTANT SECRETARY ALI: We are
7	reviewing the laws to better understand them, the
8	proposed legislation. We've not taken a position on
9	them as an administration. Those certainly any
10	work done with the bipartisan Congress that seeks to
11	protect students is work that we will pay close
12	attention to and, if charged with authority to ensure
13	that those laws are effectuated and enforced, we will
14	diligently do that.
15	COMMISSIONER TITUS: Thank you.
16	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: We're going to go to
17	Mr. Kirsanow and then come back to Commissioner
18	Achtenberg.
19	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you, Mr.
20	Chair, and thank you for coming this morning, Ms.
21	Ali.
22	You stated that the issue of harassment
23	is primarily a local matter. And I'd like to follow
24	up on that a little bit. My understanding is that
l	

there are at least 44 anti-bullying, harassment laws

at the state level. There are scores of ordinances to the same effect. There are hundreds of statutes that deal with the underlying acts that might otherwise qualify as harassment or bullying such as laws against battery, assaults, stalking, what have you.

What evidence is there that state and local authorities are either incompetent, incapable, unwilling, or don't have the resources to handle this matter? And could you give us an example of how the Office for Civil Rights adds value or can do something better than can be done at the state and local level to address the issue?

ASSISTANT SECRETARY ALI: So education at large is primarily a local issue. As I mentioned, and as the Secretary often says, we can't make the kind of transformational change that our schools need to undergo from Washington alone.

Our guidance was not intended, nor is any of our work, to suggest that local officials are incompetent. But as we see the complaints, the allegations of the complaints, what we're learning in our compliance reviews, places where gang rape has become all too common, where young girls feel like if they report being raped to school officials, even if

1	they're raped on school grounds, that they will be
2	subject to a kind of public humiliation and
3	victimization all over again.
4	From General Counsels, as I mentioned,
5	that need help as they're working to assure that
6	justice is done through local law enforcement, but
7	that they also comply with their civil rights
8	responsibilities, standards, and laws that have been
9	in place since the '70s and beyond.
10	So our role, while clear and defined, is
11	but one role in the system designed to ensure that
12	all children feel safe. We are making clear I'm
13	sorry. Thank you, Commissioner.
14	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The chair recognizes
15	Commissioner Achtenberg.
16	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Secretary,
17	please state for the Commission the distinction
18	between the context in which private parties seek
19	monetary damages as compared to the context in which
20	the Department, through its various vehicles
21	including compliance reviews, exercises its
22	prerogative to set administrative procedures within
23	the parameters of the civil rights laws?
24	ASSISTANT SECRETARY ALI: The
25	distinction between private, the standards in private

litigation and the enforcement of Title IX has been 1 clear for a very long time, since 1979 when the regs 2 were first done, 1994 certainly, and 2001. 3 4 Our -- we did not change those standards 5 in any way. For example, preponderance of evidence as the standard for Title IX investigations 6 7 when it comes to sexual violence— that standard has always been our enforcement standard. We made it 8 clear in the guidance that it was. 9 10 The many institutions, as we saw from 11 Yale and Stanford and others, have somewhat of a higher standard more towards clear and convincing, 12 13 not because they were attempting to thwart their 14 Title IX responsibilities, but many because they were dealing with Title IX sexual violence and harassment 15 16 issues in the disciplinary context of which there was a higher standard. 17 So we were helping to articulate the 18 difference. 19 20 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The chair recognizes Vice Chair Thernstrom. 21 22 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Thank you. couple of very fast questions. You talked about 23 hostile environments so severe as to interfere with 24 25 the ability of students to learn.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Is it crystal clear in your view when actions amount to, add up to, creating a hostile environment? Those are nice words, but it seems to me they're very vague and to put some specificity -- to talk about specific instances just underscores the problem of the vagueness.

then let me just add question here so you can answer both at the same time. Commissioner Kirsanow talked about state and authorities and their ability and all regulations that are already in place. Well, I spent Massachusetts 11 years on the State Board Education. And we were not impressed with ability at the state level to in any way regulate bullying, nor were we particularly impressed with the ability of local school authorities, that is school What we were impressed with was the ability of principals and teachers in a school to establish a culture in which such bullying was not acceptable, and the ability of those same local authorities to reach out to parents and say this responsibility, too.

And I just wondered what your reaction would be to those two points.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY ALI: To the latter,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

there is certainly as we talked about morning the local responsibility, the principals are in the best position to be able to spot it, as are teachers, when it's happening in real time. and community have this hugely important role to assure that what happens out of school also is safe for all students. We at the federal government and Department of Education also have important role, one that is designed to provide real assistance. For example, Commissioner Kirsanow, December, you referenced the 44 states increasing number that are just developing state-wide policies on this issue. In December, the Secretary issued a memo to state officials pointing to what those policies were, helping to identify some model practices and some things that we know are working from the state level.

While all of those stakeholders, local enforcement, local officials, parents and communities, have responsibilities, schools have a responsibility, too. And adults in the schools have a responsibility under the civil rights laws the students free from а hostile ensure are environment based on protected characteristics.

Our work is designed to help them where

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	they need it, remind them where they have fallen
2	short. Well, let's also be clear. If the Office for
3	Civil Rights gets involved in an enforcement way, not
4	in a technical assistance way, it's probably too
5	late. Some tragedies and unfortunate things have
6	already occurred. So we are trying to help prevent
7	them on the front end as much as possible.
8	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you, Assistant
9	Secretary. We appreciate the time you spent in your
10	testimony today and I know you have to leave soon.
11	Thank you for being here.
12	ASSISTANT SECRETARY ALI: Thank you for
13	your time.
14	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: We'll now move on to
15	the Justice Department, Jocelyn Samuels, you'll have
16	ten minutes to make your presentation. And then
17	we'll do questions and answers.
18	JOCELYN SAMUELS, SENIOR COUNSELOR TO THE ASSISTANT
19	ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR CIVIL RIGHTS, U.S. DEPARTMENT
20	OF JUSTICE
21	MS. SAMUELS: Thank you very much for
22	inviting me here today. I'm delighted to be here and
23	appreciate the Commission's focus on this extremely
24	important issue.
25	Before I get started, I'd like to

introduce Anurima Bhargava, my colleague who is the chief of our Educational Opportunities Section in the Civil Rights Division. I'd also like to thank my colleagues in the Educational Opportunities Section for all of the work that they do in this and other areas to ensure that students can go to school free of harassment and discrimination on prohibited bases.

I don't have to tell any of you how important education is as a key to a child's success in our country and how important it is for a child to feel safe in order to be able to benefit from the education that our schools provide.

Harassment can have a profound and long-lasting effect on students who are subjected to it, as well as on students who observe it and those who become attuned to it in a school environment. We've seen truly dire consequences when students who are harassed feel like they have nowhere to turn. We've seen harassment based on sex, on disability, on religious beliefs, on national origin, and on race. And when that harassment occurs and is not remedied by a school district, we take action under the laws that have been in effect for decades. We have been involved in this area for a very long period of time. For example, in the seminal Supreme Court decisions

in the *Gebser* and *Davis* cases, we have brought harassment cases or worked with school districts throughout administrations. The laws that we enforce, as I said, have been on the books for decades.

Among those laws are Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which bars discrimination including harassment on the basis of race, national origin, sex, and religion in public schools and in public universities.

We enforce Title II and III t.he With Disabilities Americans Act, which bar discrimination and harassment based on disability. We enforce the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974 which, among other things, requires states and school districts to provide services to English language learner students and, on referral from the Department of Education or other federal agencies, we enforce Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972, and Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which discrimination and harassment when educational institutions that received federal funds violate the laws.

Now under Title IX, both Courts and the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Department of Education have recognized for a long time that sex discrimination includes discrimination based on gender stereotyping. In 2001, the Office for Civil Rights issued guidance stating that gender-based harassment, including that predicated on sex stereotyping, violates the law, and we apply that U.S. Court interpretation of the legal standards.

Now before I continue, I just want to provide a little bit of background information to put in context the information that we provided in response to your interrogatories and document requests.

The Educational Opportunities Section is comprised of 20 lawyers. It's a very small group and we do the very best we can with the limited resources that we have to enforce the laws mandating equal educational opportunity in the host of contexts in which they arise.

We get complaints about harassment and other forms of discrimination in numerous ways, from phone calls, from letters, from congressional inquiries. We look into those and marshal our resources to get involved in the cases in which we think we can have the greatest impact, those in which we can promote systemic reforms that can serve as

models for school districts around the country, those where there are questions of law that will result in interpretations that will be applied across the board or in various areas of the country.

do not have the resources or, frankly, the jurisdiction to proceed with every complaint that we get. And the number of complaints that we have reported to you, we think, represent only a small component of the amount of bullying and harassment that occurs out there. So for example, while bullying and harassment based on weight or on income or on appearance are all unfair and something that school districts should address, federal simply does not give us the authority to look at or to take action in those kinds of cases.

As a result, the numbers that we have reported represent those cases in which we believe, with our resources, we are able to make a significant difference, not a representation of the universe of the problems out there.

Let me talk a little bit about some of the cases in which we've been involved. As I mentioned, we look for opportunities to help school districts with systemic reforms and often, I should say, our cases are resolved by agreements with the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

school districts, who are anxious to ensure that they are providing their students a safe environment in which to go to school.

School districts are conscious of their responsibilities here and, along with our colleagues at the Department of Education, we believe that voluntary compliance and technical assistance to enable them to recognize their legal responsibilities and implement effective practices is the preferred way to promote school safety and anti-harassment policies.

So, as a result in our cases, we have often looked for systemic reforms that we think will help a school district down the road to address the kinds of conduct that I know we all deplore. In Owatonna, as Assistant Secretary Ali mentioned, along with the Office for Civil Rights, we entered into an agreement with the school district to address severe and pervasive harassment of Somali-American students. Our agreement there provided for a review of the school district's policies, training for teachers and staff about both the standards of the law and effective practices to prevent harassment, evaluation of the effectiveness of policies, engagement of an expert to assess whether the school district is, in

fact, providing the kinds of supports and oversight that it needs to in order to truly address this problem.

Similarly, in South Philadelphia, we entered into an agreement with the Philadelphia School Board in a case of truly horrific harassment by African-American students of Asian-American students that resulted at its climax in having numbers of children sent to the hospital because of the physical violence that had occurred on the premises of the school.

In that case, as well, we agreed with the school district that they would retain an expert to evaluate their policies and to provide advice on how to address bullying and harassment going forward. We asked them to ensure that their complaint procedures were effective. We provided for training and notice to parents and students of the resources available to them if they were subject to harassment, and agreed to work with the school district as they report to us on their success in implementing the provisions of this agreement.

In both of these cases, these were district-wide relief that I think will make the school environment for all students in the district a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

better one.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

also introduced We've а settlement agreement in cases in which there are cases pending in court. So, for example, last year we entered into a settlement agreement in Mohawk, New York on behalf of a student who had been severely harassed on the basis of sex stereotyping. This was a student who engaged in effeminate behavior, who was as a result of both the verbal and ultimately physical assaults to which he was subjected, forced to stay home and miss classes and, again, the agreement that case provided for the reached in this kind of systemic institutional relief that ultimately beneficial to ensure that students are protected going forward.

Similarly, in the Lopez case against the National School Board, we were involved on behalf of a nine-year-old autistic student who was raped by a teenager on a special education bus. And the school had knowledge that the perpetrator of this assault had engaged in similar conduct in the past and had not taken effective action to address it.

In this case, our settlement agreement, in fact, will enable them to do so and we look forward to working with them in the future.

I'm happy to take your questions.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you, Ms. Samuels. Recently, the National Council of La Raza issued a report on discrimination faced and felt by Latino youth. At around the same time the National Crime Victimization Survey indicates that about one of four Latino students believe that they've been bullied.

In the work that you're doing, have you seen anything to substantiate those statistics?

MS. SAMUELS: Yes, I am sorry to say that harassment and bullying seems to be on the increase across the country and on the basis of national origin is no exception, particularly following 9/11. I think we have seen an uptick in the amounts of harassment focused on national origin groups and we do everything that our legal tools provide us to be able to address those situations.

One thing I should note and make clear is that there is no federal law that prohibits bullying. Our authority goes to harassment which is physical or verbal or other conduct that is sufficiently severe or pervasive to create a hostile environment that interferes with a student's ability to learn.

1	So there is, unfortunately, a level of
2	school-yard taunting that we do not have the
3	jurisdiction to reach. And that, of course, is in
4	part a recognition of the First Amendment concerns
5	about overly restricting student speech. But, to the
6	extent that there is a hostile environment that is
7	created by the harassment, that is something that we
8	absolutely would take steps to address.
9	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: I'll remind my fellow
10	Commissioners that we will not be doing compound
11	questions or multiple questions. So please ask a
12	question.
13	Commissioner Yaki has indicated that he
14	wanted to ask a question.
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes, although I
16	always wonder how you define compound.
17	Quick question for you, Ms. Samuels.
18	First of all, thank you for the hard work that you've
19	been doing on this.
20	I understand that one of the I'm
21	going to stop referring to primates and go to
22	pachyderms. I'm going to talk about the elephant in
23	the room here, and that is the fact that we're
24	talking a lot about, and I talked about this last
25	year and the year before about where the Commission

should be going.

And it addressed the issue of bullying of LGBT kids in this country and the rise and the terrible toll it's taken on families and on young people in this country. To me, the elephant in the room is to the extent to which you have the authority to proceed based upon the orientation of that particular individual, the ability to protect their civil rights.

I believe that the state has -- the federal government and the state has that ability, especially when it comes to young people, based on case law going back over 100 years about the state's ability to override certain protections, not even override, but simply to act on behalf of protecting a young person from harm, in this case, serious psychological harm that can result in suicide, self-inflicted harm, and other sorts of things.

That is part of why we are having this hearing today is to discuss whether or not, and how we go about making it clearer, that a child is not bullied based on these types of factors. But that being said, this is where I'm trying not to make it a compound question.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Ask your question now,

Mike.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: The case law that you were using, I mean is there case law that exists out there that allows you to proceed based on sex stereotyping because -- I ask that because the -- not really compound, but a follow up you might want to put in your comments, and I'm not going to ask directly, has to do with whether or not it would be easier if there were more implementing language like a Title VII, like Title VI or Title IV that made it more specific on behalf of certain individuals in this country.

Thank you.

MS. SAMUELS: Thank you for your question, compound or not. Let me say the premise that sex stereotyping has long been recognized both under Title VII which bars sex discrimination in employment and under Title --

(New microphone given to Ms. Samuels.)

-- Price Waterhouse decision in the 1980s, the Supreme Court said --

(Staff gives another microphone to Ms. Samuels.)

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Just in the interest of time we would want you to continue.

NEAL R. GROSS

MS. SAMUELS: Okay. In the Price Waterhouse decision in the late 1980s -- I think this is working now -- the Supreme Court said that people who are penalized for acting contrary to stereotypes about the way members of their gender should act are protected by the prohibitions on sex discrimination.

Now courts have simultaneously said that the federal laws do not bar discrimination based on sexual orientation, which fundamentally is a different category than gender stereotyping which goes to behaviors, mannerisms, the way in which an individual presents him or herself.

That said, we know and there are studies that demonstrate that school policies that ban harassment or bullying based on sexual orientation have a significant impact. So for example, a recent study that was done showed that there was a 20 percent reduction in the teen suicide rate in schools that have LGBT-supportive environments, where they have Gay Straight Alliances, where they have explicit policies that ban sexual orientation discrimination, where students feel that they have a place to turn. And this is one of those areas, as across the board, where schools have a responsibility as a matter of fair treatment of their students to step up and make

sure that all of their students can go to school in a 1 safe environment. 2 3 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: I will now recognize 4 Commissioner Kirsanow, followed by Commissioner 5 Achtenberg, followed by Commissioner Heriot. 6 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you. And 7 thank you for appearing, Ms. Samuels. You were talking about the increase in 8 bullying 9 protected class and harassment. Ι jurisdiction 10 understand you've got only 11 harassment and not bullying. For example, bullying that 12 based on matters are not protected class 13 bullying, but harassment of protected classes. 14 When did the Department of Justice begin 15 tracking data related to instances of protected class 16 harassment and what has been the trajectory in terms 17 of the number of such instances, if you've collected such data? 18 19 MS. SAMUELS: Thank you for your question, Commissioner. 20 Let me make two things First, we do not have jurisdiction over 21 22 bullying on any basis, even if it is on the basis of 23 sex, race, national origin, religion, or disability. We only have jurisdiction over conduct 24 25 that amounts to unlawful harassment. In addition, we

1	don't have jurisdiction over harassment that is not
2	on a prohibited basis. So if it is because of
3	someone's weight or someone's appearance, that's
4	absent a sex stereotyping approach; we don't have
5	jurisdiction over that.
6	With regard to our tracking, as you will
7	see from our responses to interrogatories, we have
8	only tracked those matters that we, in fact, open for
9	investigation. We get many more complaints every
10	year than we open and I don't believe that at this
11	point in time we have any means to evaluate or assess
12	the nature of the complaints that have come in that
13	have not resulted in Department action of some sort.
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: How many
15	complaints did you
16	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: I'm sorry,
17	Commissioner Kirsanow
18	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I'm sorry
19	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Commissioner
20	Achtenberg?
21	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Madam Attorney
22	General, thank you very much for your participation
23	in this hearing. I am assuming that the Department
24	of Justice does not assert jurisdiction when there
25	comes forward a single incident of playground

taunting as some have accused the Department of doing.

But when activity rises to the level of creating a hostile environment as you have stated, could you clarify the distinction, sort of consistent with Commissioner Thernstrom's question to Jocelyn Ali, and could you respond as well to the notion that most of these issues are better dealt with at the state and local levels and by professionals such as principals and teachers?

MS. SAMUELS: Absolutely. In response to the first question, we do not have jurisdiction and would not take action against single incidents of playground taunting absent something like physical conduct that made a single incident sufficiently severe or pervasive to create a hostile environment.

I think one of the things to recognize about harassment is that it is necessarily a very fact-based inquiry and we are, both because of resource constraints and because we recognize that school districts need to be able to address situations in ways that they see fit, not -- we don't find the standards vague, but we will address and intervene in cases only where we find that the conduct or the speech is so severe or pervasive that

it has limited a student's ability to take advantage of the educational offerings.

Most of our cases are not even close. In South Philadelphia, we had students being sent to the hospital. In *Lopez*, we had a student being raped on a special education bus. These are serious cases where it is not at all a question about whether a hostile environment has been created.

With regard local issues, to we think that absolutely schools are in the best position to address harassment and ensure the safety of their school environments and that's why, first of all, we only get involved when there has been a failure of the school district to take the necessary steps, and why our resolution agreements uniformly contain provisions for training of staff, evaluation of procedures, and engagement of experts, so that we can get the schools the help they need in order to be able to take the best steps possible to protect their children.

COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The chair recognizes Commissioner Heriot.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Thank you. I just want to make sure I understand, and I'm tracking the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	Department's interpretation of Title IX here. Back
2	when I was in school, back in the pre-historic days,
3	we had separate personal grooming and dress codes for
4	boys and girls, like in elementary school or junior
5	high or high school.
6	What is the Department's position on
7	such codes?
8	MS. SAMUELS: I'm not aware that there
9	has been case law about dress codes. Well, actually,
10	no, in the old days there were cases that did talk
11	about reasonable dress codes and certainly employer's
12	ability to create reasonable dress codes has been
13	recognized in the case law.
14	If we got an allegation that a dress
15	code violated Title IX, it's something that we
16	obviously would take a look at and make a
17	determination about how to proceed on.
18	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The chair recognizes -
19	-
20	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: You don't have
21	cases of that sort now?
22	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: No follow-up
23	questions. I'm sorry, Commissioner Heriot. We've
24	really got to get through the balance of the
25	questions.

Commissioner Titus?

COMMISSIONER TITUS: Thank you. It sounds like your Educational Opportunities Section is overworked and I appreciate the good work that they are doing. But you mentioned that you would perhaps look at other cases if you had the jurisdiction and I understand that issue, but also the resources. And several times that's come up, that you don't have the resources.

I wonder if there are not meritorious cases that are falling to the side because of those resources. Is there something that we can do or recommend to help you enhance those resources so you can do -- maybe not a better job, but a broader job?

MS. SAMUELS: Well, thank you for asking

MS. SAMUELS: Well, thank you for asking that question, Commissioner.

I think we do do excellent work, but we are truly limited by the resource constraints that we face, and I think with additional funding and additional staff we would be able to, as you say, do a broader job and address more of the complaints that we get that we find to be meritorious, but that, for example, won't necessarily result in the kinds of systemic relief that we think are the best use of the resources that we have.

So we would very much like to proceed in cases which often present egregious facts, but which we simply do not have the bandwidth to be able to take on.

COMMISSIONER TITUS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Vice Chair Thernstrom is recognized by the chair.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: You know, you've talked about the Philadelphia case, but that is really an extreme case and, as you've recognized, it involved physical violence. So, I mean, it seems to me there's a bright and clear line between physical violence and verbal harassment that I think everybody here would agree on.

I'm still having a problem defining when verbal harassment amounts to something that the Department needs to get concerned about. I mean, kids are monsters and I mean they are, at a certain age, and you're talking about playground stuff. You're talking about, as you said, kids say you're fat. That can be very wounding at a certain age. I mean there is a lot of wounding stuff that goes on in schools.

And I'm back to my point that the solution to that -- you're talking about the culture

of a school. I'm not sure that the federal government can effect the culture of local schools. I'm not even sure states can; to some extent, local districts can. But it really depends upon the authorities in the schools, and there are frankly too few school authorities that really are committed to creating a culture in which kids are safe.

MS. SAMUELS: Thank you for the question, Commissioner. And I think we all agree that abuse by children, whether it is illegal or not, can have damaging consequences that schools ought to attend to. And, as I mentioned in citing the study before, school actions on this basis can really make a difference.

I can assure you that there are legal standards in place to ensure that we will act to hold schools accountable only when the environment that is created involves harassment, whether verbal or physical, although verbal is often a precursor to physical harassment, and we have found that in many of our cases what starts as verbal harassment escalates into physical violence.

We urge school districts to take action to nip these kinds of things in the bud, both because it will prevent legal problems down the road and also

because they owe it to their students to provide them a safe environment to go to school. But as a federal government, there are legal standards that govern when we get involved, and we make that assessment in every case to ensure that we are using our resources to address and bring legal action against school districts where the harassment has, in fact, resulted in a hostile environment that limits a student's educational opportunities.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you, Ms. Samuels. We want to thank you and the Department of Justice for being here today and for the work that you are doing. We appreciate it very much.

As Panel 1 leaves, we are going to ask folks who are on Panel 2 to begin to come to the podium here.

Panel 2 will focus on issues of gender and LGBT status. Those individuals who will be on Panel 2 will be Fatima Goss Graves, of the National Women's Law Center; Roger Clegg of the Center for Equal Opportunity; Gregory Herek of the University of California, Davis; Ilan Meyer of Columbia University; Hiram Sasser of the Liberty Institute; Eliza Byard of GLSEN; and John Eastman of Chapman University.

We ask the panelists to please take your

seats.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Pause.)

Given the time frame we're in, we're going to ask each panelist to limit their comments to seven minutes. We have your written statements. We reviewed them. They are part of the record.

We will thereafter have a 70-minute discussion that will take place among the panelists and the Commissioners, and I remind our Commissioners again to please keep your questions brief and simple and non-multiple.

Please panelists, take your seats.

(Pause.)

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: And while we wait for will panelists to sit down, Ι remind Commissioners if we're precise in asking questions, then we'll have time at the end hopefully for brief follow-up questions. So we will endeavor to make sure we cover as much ground as fairly as Unfortunately, with the size of possible. panels, we are, as I said, challenged in terms of time today.

I'll ask all panelists to please raise your right hand and swear or affirm that the information you are about to provide is true and

1	accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief.
2	(The panelists were sworn.)
3	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: We will begin with Ms.
4	Goss Graves.
5	PANEL 2: GENDER & LGBT
6	FATIMA GOSS GRAVES, NATIONAL WOMEN'S LAW
7	CENTER
8	MS. GRAVES: Good morning. My name is
9	Fatima Goss Graves and I am the Vice President for
10	Education and Employment with the National Women's
11	Law Center. And I so appreciate the invitation to
12	testify today and really applaud the Commission on
13	taking up this important issue.
14	Gender-based harassment including
15	bullying and violence manifests itself in many ways.
16	It includes sexual harassment, and sexual violence
17	and assault. It includes harassment that is not
18	sexual in nature and instead is based on sex
19	stereotypes. So for example, the conduct of a group
20	of students who have harassed and intimidated a
21	female student to discourage her participation in
22	wrestling because they consider her athletic activity
23	to be not feminine would constitute gender-based
24	harassment.

Or a girl who targets a female classmate

for repeated humiliation and name calling through electronic means at school, names like slut and whore and things like that because her classmate is pregnant, is engaged in gender-based harassment, and these are the sort of intakes that we get frequently at the National Women's Law Center from parents who are concerned about their children.

Gender-based harassment need not be perpetrated by boys or targeted at girls. Students can be harassed by other students, by teachers, by coaches, school employees, third parties. It can involve images that are posted on blogs or through electronic means. And a sense of comments that are heard by a group can create a hostile environment.

These are all core principles that have been developed by courts over the time as they have grappled with these issues and that the Office for Civil Rights has helpfully spelled out in guidance to educational institutions.

As you've heard earlier today, Title IX plays an important role in addressing harassment, and we really view bullying as a form of harassment when it rises to a certain level. The Supreme Court has recognized that Title IX provides for a private right of action under which students may pursue claims for

for injunctive relief to address and harassment and, you know, I raise this because I know that there has been some confusion over the standard for damages versus the standard for administrative enforcement or for injunctive relief that Assistant Secretary Ali spoke about today. Now she explained the distinction has been a long one, but the good news for students is that, even though some courts around the country have interpreted the Title standards for damages in ways that have really raised the bar for being able to bring these cases, the standard for administrative enforcement and for injunctive relief is whether school officials knew or should have known about the harassment. And this known standard applies when should have also individuals file a lawsuit seeking injunctive relief only, and likewise, for enforcement actions that have been brought by the administration and these are standards that are closer to the legal protections for employees in the work place.

Moreover, even if there is a suit for damages, the *Gebser* and *Davis* cases that have been talked about today only apply when the harassment does not involve an official school policy, as the purpose of the standard is to really ensure that the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

school is held liable for damages for its own acts and not responding to harassment not for a third party's act. So for example, in the Simpson vs. University of Colorado case, the 10th Circuit held that the University had an official policy of deliberate indifference to sexual harassment in its footballrecruiting program. So the plaintiffs did not actually have to show that actual notice of particular incidents of harassment.

Speaking at least in part to clarify what constitutes unlawful gender-based harassment in the wake of *Gebser* and *Davis*, around ten years ago the Office for Civil Rights issued its 2001 guidance that's been discussed today. And in that guidance it recognized that conduct that is sufficiently severe, persistent, or pervasive remains actionable under Title IX.

The Office for Civil Rights also emphasized that a school must respond to harassment it rises to a level that denies or limits a student's ability to participate or benefit from an educational program. And it clarified that schools run afoul of Title IX by failing to respond to harassment of a student on the basis of a victim's failure to conform to stereotype notions

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

masculinity or femininity.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Despite the 2001 sexual harassment harassment gender-based continued quidance, pervade our schools and in some cases such conduct may have led to particularly tragic consequences. is unclear as to whether educational institutions understood that the conduct that was referred to commonly in the media as bullying and by schools as bullying included, in some cases, gender-based bullying that could have implicated Title IX.

So, drawing from this revised guidance, we were very pleased to see that in 2010, just this past fall, the Department issued its new guidance which reiterated the core principles from 2001, but also provided hypotheticals that allowed for schools to really be able to see what these standards mean in practice.

The letter was not, as some critics may imply, a break with or an expansion of the Office for Civil Rights' previous interpretation of Title IX, and it was consistent with the cases that had come out between the 2001 guidance and what happened in 2010.

Importantly, in 2011, the Office for Civil Rights also released additional guidance on

peer-to-peer sexual violence. Among other things, that guidance supplemented the 2001 guidance and expanded upon the standards that apply for sexual in schools, and we have really gratified to see some institutions change standards even in the past month, that some have announced that they would be implementing, example, a preponderance of evidence standard, rather than the higher threshold that they had before. we saw that the University of Virginia, for example, made that their standard.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you, Ms. Goss Graves.

Mr. Clegg.

MR. CLEGG: Thank you very much for inviting me to testify today. My name is Roger Clegg, and I am the President and General Counsel of the Center for Equal Opportunity, which is a conservative civil rights organization. I should also say, that for four years in the Reagan and Bush administrations, I was in the Civil Rights Division at Justice Department and my duties there included supervising the Educational Opportunities Section.

In my written statement I focus on the issue of bullying and harassment on the basis of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

sexual orientation. And I make two basic points. One is that Title IX does not cover that kind of bullying and harassment. And the second point I make is that this is not an area where federal government involvement is likely to help, and therefore additional statutes that would focus on sexual orientation to give the federal government authority to investigate and prosecute bullying and harassment in this area would be a bad idea.

We're going to hear a lot today about how damaging bullying and harassment can be to individual students. And it certainly can be a heartbreaking situation. We're also going to hear about how widespread it is.

The first point is not really disputed. Nobody disputes that bullying and harassment can be a terrible thing.

On the second point, how widespread it is, I would just say that I think the Commission needs to take with a grain of salt the numbers that you're given by interest groups and by federal bureaucracies who want to expand their jurisdiction, especially when the two of them are working together. I also think that we have to bear in mind when we're looking at trends the changes in technology, like the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Internet, have made it much easier to file complaints, and may also have made the kinds of harassment we're talking about here more widespread. So I think that's all something to bear in mind when people are trying to lay the groundwork to say well, the federal government has to get in here: This is a problem that's not being addressed.

As I say in my statement, I really think that this is a very difficult area with a lot of difficult line-drawing that has to be done. When does protected speech become unprotected speech, and that become harassment? When does harassment become a threat? When does a threat become an actual physical assault? And so forth.

These are difficult line-drawing questions and I've heard nothing today from the administration representatives to suggest why the federal government is going to improve the way that this line-drawing is done. I'm not going to repeat what I say in my written statement on that point.

What I'd like to focus on a little bit in my oral remarks here is why I actually think that the federal government involvement would make things worse. I think the burden is on the federal government to show — or those who want the federal

government to get involved to show — why the federal government is going to make it better. I don't think they carry that burden.

In addition, I think that there are a lot of reasons — and I think some of the Commissioners have alluded to this — why the federal government is actually going to make things worse.

It is going to be the 800-pound gorilla when the federal government gets involved. And going to be pressure for it guidelines, and these guidelines are going to end up creating not only a floor, but also a ceiling. going to encourage local schools not to be proactive in this area as they should be. The guidelines will inevitably lead to speech codes and sensitivity training. It will coerce schools into zero tolerance policies.

The involvement of the federal government makes it much easier for interest groups to get involved — on both sides of the aisle — to get involved and to use that as a means for effecting policy in this area. I think you can see that by the interest that these hearings today have attracted. This is going to create a whipsaw effect. As administrations change, there's going to be pressure

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

brought by interest groups to change the guidelines that have been put out, to pass new or different laws, to amend regulations.

And local schools are going to be caught in this bind where they're afraid of being sued if they do, they're afraid of being sued if they don't. It's going to chill the kind of local involvement and local attention to these issues which I think everybody agrees needs to happen, since this is really the sine qua non of good policy in this area.

Let me just say that it's very odd that the gay rights groups should need to be reminded that government legislating morality, particularly the federal government legislating morality, is something that we ought to be very wary about. It wasn't very long ago where the morality that was being legislated was aimed at gays. Now we're being asked to pass laws that are going to get the federal government involved in saying whether what a fifth-grade student says is or is not something that ought to attract the attention of the Federal Government.

Finally, I also think that we ought to agree — both sides ought to agree — that it's very scary in this area to have the federal government just making up laws so that it can go after behavior

1	that it views as being immoral. I think that Title
2	IX, I think everybody agrees that Title IX is about
3	sex discrimination. It is not about discrimination
4	on the basis of sexual orientation. Yet, the federal
5	government is being very aggressive in concocting the
6	issues to prosecute civil rights issues, to
7	accomplish something that's not there in the
8	statutes.
9	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you very much.
10	Professor Herek.
11	MR. HEREK: Mr. Chairman and members of
12	the Commission, I'm pleased to have the opportunity
13	to appear before you today to discuss social
14	scientific knowledge on peer-to-peer violence and
15	school bullying based on sexual orientation.
16	Thank you for addressing this important
17	matter. My name is Gregory Herek. I am a professor of
18	psychology at the University of California at Davis.
19	As a social psychologist, I have been
20	conducting empirical research related to sexual
21	orientation, stigma, and prejudice for more than 30
22	years. The details are in my curriculum vitae, which
23	I submitted to the Commission earlier.
24	I have published more than 100 scholarly

papers and chapters on these and related topics. I

have received numerous federal, state, and foundation 1 grants for my research. 2 3 Ι Fellow of American am а the 4 Psychological Association and the Association for 5 Psychological Science. I have testified on behalf of the American Psychological Association for 6 7 Congressional hearings on anti-gay violence. I was an invited participant at President Clinton's 1997 White 8 9 House Conference on Hate Crimes, and recently I was a member of an expert panel convened by the National 10 11 Academy of Sciences to prepare a comprehensive report health of lesbian, gay, bisexual, 12 on the and 13 transgender people, which was just released in March. 14 These and my other professional 15 activities are detailed in my vita. 16 Му written statement details the 17 findings of social science research related to school violence and other forms of victimization based on 18 sexual orientation. 19 20 And to put that research in context, it knowledge 21 also discusses current about 22 orientation and stigma. In my oral statement I will 23 briefly summarize that material. Sexual orientation is commonly used to 24 25 refer to an enduring pattern of sexual or romantic

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

attractions to males, to females or to both sexes. 1 It's also used to refer 2 to an 3 individual's sense of identity based on those desires 4 and attractions, his or her pattern of behaviors 5 expressing them, and his or her membership in a 6 community of others who share them. 7 Although sexual orientation ranges along a continuum, it is usually discussed in terms of 8 9 categories: heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual. 10 11 The terms lesbian and gay are commonly used to refer to people whose social identity is 12 based on their homosexual orientation. 13 The mental health profession has long 14 15 recognized that homosexuality is a normal expression of human sexuality, and there is no inherent linkage 16 17 between sexual orientation and a person's mental 18 health, or ability to contribute to society and to 19 lead a happy, healthy, and productive life. Like most heterosexuals, 20 most sexual minority individuals function well in their daily 21 22 lives. 23 There is currently no consensus about the specific factors that cause an individual

become heterosexual or homosexual or bisexual but,

24

irrespective of origins, most gay men and lesbians 1 report experiencing little or no choice concerning 2 their sexual orientation. 3 4 Sexual orientation is highly resistant 5 to change through psychotherapy or other interventions. Because homosexuality is a 6 7 variant of human sexuality, the major mental health professional organizations don't endorse efforts to 8 9 change sexual orientation. Virtually all of them have adopted policy statements challenging the safety, 10 11 efficacy, or ethics of treatments purporting to change sexual orientation. 12 13 Homosexuality remains stigmatized in the 14 United States, and such stigma can be observed both 15 in the institutions of society and the attitudes of individuals. 16 17 Large numbers of lesbian, qay, bisexual people experience harassment, discrimination 18 and violence based on their sexual orientation. 19 sexual 20 And because person's а orientation is not readily apparent in most social 21 22 interactions, virtually anyone can be a target of anti-gay violence or harassment regardless 23 of their actual sexual orientation. 24 25 Children, adolescents, and adults whose

1	behavior or appearance is perceived as atypical for
2	their gender are frequently victimized, often because
3	the perpetrators assume that gender nonconformity is
4	a marker for homosexuality or bisexuality.
5	In addition, gender nonconformity is
6	itself stigmatized and some people are targeted
7	entirely because of their gender atypicality.
8	Although there is no inherent linkage
9	between sexual orientation and mental health,
10	research indicates that experiencing stigma-related
11	victimization is stressful and can lead to
12	psychological and physical problems.
13	Thus, to the extent that non-
14	heterosexuals are subjected to additional stress
15	beyond what the heterosexual population normally
16	experiences, including stress resulting from stigma,
17	they may as a group manifest poorer overall physical
18	and psychological health.
19	
20	With this general discussion as
21	background, I turn to the main focus of today's
22	briefing.
23	Peer violence and victimization based on
24	sexual orientation are widespread in school settings.
25	The problem may be more extensive today

than in the past because contemporary sexual minority youth appear to be recognizing their sexual orientation and coming out at earlier ages than was the case for previous generations.

Being identified as gay, lesbian, or

Being identified as gay, lesbian, or bisexual poses risks to students in middle and high school, where negative attitudes toward homosexuality and sexual minorities are common.

Experiencing bullying and peer victimization based on sexual orientation is often associated with mental health problems, including depression, anxiety, and suicidal thoughts and behavior.

It also is often associated with truancy and poor school performance, substance use and other risk behaviors.

Although bullying and victimization are likely to have negative consequences for all students who experience them, being targeted because of one's sexual orientation is associated with more problems and greater distress than is experiencing bullying or harassment that is unrelated to one's identity.

The negative psychological effects of anti-gay bullying and peer victimization can last long after students leave high school.

1	Institutional practices and policies may
2	help to reduce peer victimization based on sexual
3	orientation and to mitigate its negative impact when
4	it occurs.
5	Research currently points to at least
6	three promising strategies. First, having anti-
7	bullying and non-discrimination policies that
8	explicitly include sexual and gender minority youth
9	appears to reduce anti-gay behaviors among students,
10	increase feelings of safety among sexual minority
11	youth, and create safer schools.
12	Second, schools in which teachers and
13	staff are trained to stop and prevent harassment and
14	victimization of sexual minority youth are likely to
15	provide a safer environment for those youth.
16	
17	A positive school climate also helps to
18	buffer the negative impact of experiences with anti-
19	gay harassment and violence.
20	And third, having resources and
21	supportive groups and programs for sexual and gender
22	minority students increases school safety.
23	Now, I have been focusing on peer
24	violence based on sexual orientation, but some of the
25	research cited in my written statement also examined

1	the experiences of gender minorities, that is,
2	transgender people and other individuals whose gender
3	expression does not conform to cultural norms.
4	Gender minority youth, some of whom are
5	also lesbian, gay, or bisexual, routinely experience
6	harassment and violence and they are likely to
7	benefit from policies and interventions designed to
8	protect sexual minority youth.
9	But a comprehensive approach to the
10	problem of peer victimization in schools will
11	necessarily include attention to their specific needs
12	as well. Thank you.
13	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you. Professor
14	Meyer?
15	
16	MR. MEYER: Good morning Mr. Chairman
17	and members of the Commission. My name is Ilan Meyer
18	and I am a Professor of Clinical Sociomedical
19	Sciences at Columbia University's Mailman School of
20	Public Health.
21	My background is in psychiatric
22	epidemiology and social psychology; that is, I study
23	patterns and causes of mental disorders and mental
24	health problems, particularly as they relate to
25	social factors.

I submitted a written report for the record that is more comprehensive than my oral testimony and that includes references to cited research as well as my curriculum vitae.

In my testimony today, I will discuss three issues: the nature of anti-gay stigma and prejudice and how it forms stress for sexual minorities; the exposure of sexual minority youth to stress related to peer-to-peer violence and bullying; and the effect of such stress on mental health and well-being.

Stigma is a function of having an attribute that conveys a devalued social identity in a particular social context. A related concept, prejudice, refers to negative attitudes and actions that society as a whole or individuals take against a stigmatized group member.

For example, discriminatory acts and anti-gay violence are expressions of stigma and prejudice. I have developed a theory of minority stress that states that, when compared with heterosexuals, stigma, prejudice can predispose gay people to excess stress and as a result to increasing prevalence of mental disorders and other adverse health outcomes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Stress can be defined as any condition that requires adaptation. Researchers have shown that stress negatively impacts a multitude of health outcomes, both mental and physical, and well-being.

In addition to stressors that all people experience, gay people are exposed to unique, added stressors. I have referred to these as minority stress.

Minority stressors strain sexual minorities because they require adaptation to an inhospitable social environment. Exposure to minority stress is chronic in that it is attached to enduring, persistent social structures.

Exposure to these minority stressors is a risk for mental disorders and other adverse outcomes. Although generally, causal relationships are difficult to prove in public health research, results from studies of sexual minority youth provide solid and irrefutable support for the minority stress hypothesis, showing that social stressors resulting from stigma and prejudice against gay populations expose them to the unique stressors that in turn cause health problems.

It has been shown in numerous studies that sexual minority individuals, especially youth,

stressful experiences than their 1 have more 2 heterosexual peers. Results concerning sexual minority youth 3 4 are abundant and overwhelming in their evidence. 5 Indeed, of the numerous scientific studies conducted on gay youth, many with large probability samples, 6 7 conducted in the United States, Canada, and other know of study that 8 nations, Ι not one shows 9 significant contradictory evidence. Gay youth at home, at school, and at the 10 11 community at large significantly more frequently than their heterosexual peers experience adverse events. 12 13 Αt school, sexual minority youth experience more bullying, including physical assault, 14 15 being injured, threatened, and harassed, having their 16 property stolen or damaged. school, sexual minorities 17 Out of often victims of violence, homelessness, 18 19 physical and sexual abuse, verbal and physical sexual harassment, and forced sex and dating violence. 20 Studies have also shown that, unlike 21 22 other minority groups, rejection can occur at home 23 and anti-gay events can be perpetrated by family members of sexual minority children and youth. 24 25 important to note that stress

related to stigma has a symbolic meaning. Even a seemingly minor event or incident, such as being called derogatory names, can be damaging because of its deep, cultural meaning, and does create pain and indignity beyond its seemingly low magnitude.

In the context of school climate, seemingly minor experiences, especially when chronic, can color the entire social environment for the sexual minority youth, sending a message of rejection and disdain.

This message is exacerbated when, as has been found to be the case, teachers and school personnel ignore instances of such harassment, such as name calling, implicitly joining the perpetrator in rejecting the sexual minority youth, and indeed sending a message that gay youth are to be scorned.

Studies that assess mental health outcomes also provide conclusive evidence that gay populations, including youth, have higher prevalence of disorders and adverse health outcomes compared with heterosexuals.

Several meta-analyses found that gay populations have about one-and-a-half to three times as many disorders as heterosexuals, including mood, anxiety, and substance abuse disorders, and they are

more than twice as likely to have suicide ideation.

Against minority stress, gay people individually, as well as the ay community as a group, mount coping efforts that build resources that may buffer the toll of stress.

Research has shown that coping and social support can reduce the adverse effect of stress health outcomes.

In the context of minority stress, coping and social support must have an affirmative function supporting the person as a gay person.

For these reasons, and because families and other community institutions such as the church, are not always supportive, and are sometimes rejecting and even harmful, it is important for schools and community organizations to provide sexual minority youth with resources to counter minority stress.

Many studies in various settings and using a variety of methods have shown that when families, friends, and school environments are supportive of sexual minorities, the otherwise observes adverse effects of minority stress on health and school performance drop significantly.

Overwhelming observations of the

NEAL R. GROSS

1	relationship of stress exposure and health and
2	academic performance outcomes, and the ameliorating
3	effect of coping and social support, had led many
4	schools and government and non-governmental
5	organizations to create supporting services to sexual
6	minority students.
7	Studies on the effectiveness of such
8	programs span over a decade now. They have been
9	conducted in different states and locales and using a
10	variety of methods.
11	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you, professor.
12	MR. MEYER: These studies show that such
13	programs have been effective in improving crime
14	rates, including dating violence and improving the
15	health and educational outcomes of sexual minority
16	youth.
17	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you Professor
18	Meyer. Mr. Sasser?
19	MR. SASSER: My name is Hiram Sasser. I
20	am the director of litigation for Liberty Institute
21	and I have spent the better part of a decade both
22	suing and defending governmental entities in the area
23	of the First Amendment, including free speech and
24	discrimination issues.

The Liberty Institute, like federal

organizations such as the ACLU, seeks to protect the rights of students who express what are sometimes unpopular views at school, even views that reflect particular religious sentiments.

Decades ago the student speech fights were much different. They had students who wanted to protest the Vietnam War in very military-friendly towns, wearing black armbands to school and had to take their case to the Supreme Court in order to ensure their right to free speech.

Next three paragraphs were inaudible.]

You had students in the south, who were wearing freedom buttons to protest desegregation, not a very popular stand to take at the time. They had to take their case to the courthouse too in order to prevail and ensure that they had the right to wear the freedom buttons.

And in the middle of World War Two, there were two elementary school children who did not want to say the pledge of allegiance. They wanted to express their patriotism in other ways. They too won the right.

These early victories had led to a body of clearly-established law that protects students'

NEAL R. GROSS

free speech rights while they are at school, specifically as relevant to this particular issue, the religious viewpoints or the viewpoints that students may express.

The case law is very clearly established

-- there has been no wavering for more than half a

century -- that students must be free from viewpoint

discrimination perpetrated by the schools.

Unfortunately the schools have not always responded to the case law positively and that has led to continuing conflict with schools engaging in sort of rolling censorship of religious speech.

Some examples that I would like to share, and these are not limited to any particular faith, it seems that students of all faiths have had their troubles recently, being -- invoking the laws that have been hard fought and won by our group and ACLU and others.

For example, there was a student in Muskogee, Oklahama. She wanted to wear her hijab, her head covering that is consistent with her Muslim faith, and it took litigation to enforce a clearly established law to make sure that she could continue to wear her hijab at school.

You have little kids who wanted to hand

out candy cane pins to their classmates, not causing a major problem, but those candy cane pins had to be confiscated by the school because they were too dangerous for all those other kids to see because they had attached to them a religious message about the candy cane, Jesus pencils being ripped out of kids' hands while they are standing in line, after school, outside the school building, to get on the school bus, because you know, this type of message was not going to be tolerated.

There's a lot of intimidation and harassment that goes on at schools and unfortunately a lot of it seems to be directed at religious students, students expressing a religious faith, and attempts by government-roving censors to ban that speech.

It's quite unfortunate that this sort of up-tick is going on, and if you'll read the paper you will notice that many of the cases that we are citing are -- the current examples are within the past few years, and it seems to be a growing trend, sort of this roving censorship of religious sentiment at school.

Another example that I might give is that, you know, again it's not a matter of one

particular faith. There was a school district in Texas recently that the ACLU had a case on that the kid wanted to wear his hear length longer than the dress code allowed because of his native American faith.

Well that law has been clearly established for many years in the Fifth Circuit, yet the school district continued to try to ban him from wearing his hair.

So this is a very sensitive issue and a very litigious issue that is going on, which is totally unnecessary, because the law has been, like I said, clearly established since World War Two.

One of the outgrowths of -- so there's a call, there's been a call for training students in trying to persuade them to hold particular views as that directly in conflict with clearly runs established law from the 1943 West Virginia University Barnette case that I alluded to before, dealing with the pledge of allegiance.

Justice Jackson in that marvelous opinion really expressed, I think, the sentiments that most Americans agree with, which is that our school districts are not there to teach and ingrain into our students a particular orthodoxy.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

They are not to decide what is right and what is wrong on questions of social importance.

Those should be left to parents and other institutions.

And that has been our law since 1943. As a matter of fact, I think the Supreme Court said it best in *Tinker v. Des Moines*, and I would just like to read the quote because it is really a magnificent quote.

Ιt warns against this type indoctrination, to try to teach students particular -- whatever it is, whatever view it is, this happens to be the homosexual rights issue, but it could be on any issue, that any departure from regimentation may cause trouble, absolute variation from the majority's opinion may inspire fear.

spoken word in class, the Any lunchroom, on the campus, that deviates from the views of another person, may start an argument or cause a disturbance, that our Constitution says we must take this risk, and our history says that it is this sort of hazardous freedom, this kind that is the basis for national openness, our strength, and of the independence and vigor

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Americans who grow up and live in this relatively 1 permissive, often disputatious society. 2 3 Freedom to speak amongst our students 4 has been a clearly established right for many, many, 5 many decades. It affects a broad range of issues, from students fighting against racial desegregation 6 7 segregation rather -- students protesting the 8 Vietnam War, or even today, students protesting 9 military actions in other parts of the globe. These rights are very precious because, 10 11 as the Supreme Court has said, we have to be careful lest we strangle the free mind at its source amongst 12 13 our students, who obviously are the most 14 impressionable, and that impressionability is greatly 15 impacted by the power imbalance that school officials 16 exert over them. 17 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you Mr. Sasser. Ms. Byard? 18 19 BYARD: Thank you, and thank you very much for the opportunity to testify today. My 20 name is Eliza Byard and I am the Executive Director 21 22 of GLSEN, the Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education 23 Network. Founded in 1990 by a group of educators, 24

and students, GLSEN is now the leading

parents,

national education organization focused on 1 LGBT issues in K-12 schools and committed to partnering 2 3 with school districts across the nation, to promote 4 school cultures of respect and safe schools for all 5 students. I want to begin by introducing you to 6 7 Joey, a fairly typical high school junior, except in one respect: Joey is gay. Until he revealed this 8 9 fact, Joey was a popular kid and never thought twice about his safety at school. 10 11 After he came out, Joey's school 12 experience changed dramatically. He was harassed 13 daily, a problem that escalated to the moment when 14 another student threatened Joey with a knife. 15 Rather than intervene, а school 16 administrator's response was to encourage Joey to act 17 "less gay" and to suggest that the bullying he experienced was something that he deserved. 18 19 On Joey's behalf, I thank you 20 shedding light on this important issue, but I must also urge you to act. 21 22 Visible or invisible, LGBT youth are in every district in this country, and are drawn from 23 every constituency that you are empowered to protect. 24

They need your help to cut through the

noise that too often surrounds this issue. LGBT students face bullying, harassment, and violence that can deprive them of equal educational opportunity, undermine their individual well-being, and keep them from achieving their full potential.

In GLSEN's 2009 National School Climate Survey, nearly nine out of 10 LGBT students reported that they had been verbally, physically, or sexually harassed in the past year at school, because of their sexual orientation or gender identity.

One in three had skipped school because they were simply too afraid to go, and one in five had been physically assaulted.

Youth who face this violence do less well academically and are less likely to plan to graduate from high school. LGBT youth are more likely to engage in behaviors that put them at risk, because of the discrimination and violence they suffer.

These statistics are grim. Equally disheartening is the fact that this situation has not yet sparked the response it requires. Only 18 percent of LGBT students report that their school explicitly protects them on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity, and the vast majority of LGBT students report that when a member of the school

staff witnesses anti-LGBT behavior, they do little or nothing about it.

A core challenge we face is the fact that bias-based bullying complicates adult response. Whether out of fear of controversy, failure to recognize the seriousness of the behavior, or active indifference to the fate of the students involved, adults charged with the education and care of our children are not consistently living up to their responsibilities.

Federal leadership is necessary to make the basic level of the extent of their responsibilities crystal clear, and to assure those who fear controversy or backlash that they are doing the right thing.

We are grateful to the Office of Civil Rights at the Department of Education and to the Department of Justice for their commitment to exercising what authority they have under Title IX to protect LGBT students.

But this statute only covers some of the serious challenges LGBT students face. Research consistently shows that the policies that most effectively address anti-LGBT behavior in our schools, actually name the problem by specifically

enumerating sexual orientation and gender identity as categories included within the commitment to protect all students.

LGBT youth whose schools have such policies are less likely to be victimized and more likely to say that school staff intervene when they witness anti-LGBT behavior.

In recent months, school districts in Oklahoma City, Jackson, Mississippi, Dallas, and Park City, Utah have adopted enumerated policies that include sexual orientation and gender identity among their protections. And just last month the state of Arkansas passed an enumerated anti-bullying law, the 11th state to do so.

But state laws and district policies create only a patchwork quilt of protection for LGBT students. As a baseline matter of safety, we need to establish a national floor of protection upon which states and districts may build.

As a national issue of equity, we also need non-discrimination protections for some of our nation's most vulnerable students.

I encourage the Commission to support the Safe Schools Improvement Act, a measure introduced in Congress with bipartisan support in

1	both chambers and broad-based support among
2	education, youth development, health, religious, and
3	civil rights organizations, and the Student
4	Non-Discrimination Act, which would extend
5	non-discrimination protections to students on the
6	basis of their sexual orientation.
7	You have heard testimony that to extend
8	these protections would somehow compromise the First
9	Amendment rights of other students' strongly-held
10	personal beliefs regarding homosexuality.
11	As an educator and as a parent myself, I
12	am firmly committed to the principle of respectful
13	debate and dialogue as part of a good education.
14	But let me be very clear: the words
15	faggot and dyke are not part of any religious creed.
16	And harassment and assault are crimes.
17	To those who deny the need for action
18	and attack the principle of enumeration, I challenge
19	them to provide data to support their arguments.
20	For every Jackson, Mississippi, and Park
21	City, Utah, there are places where
22	bullying-prevention efforts do not explicitly protect
23	all students and where the consequences are real.
24	Joey knows this all too well. His family

had to move across state lines to find a school where

he would be treated with the same respect as every 1 other student. 2 3 Fortunately his family had the means to 4 find that safe school. Many parents don't, nor should 5 any parent have to make this choice. Every child in this nation deserves a 6 school environment where they are safe and respected. 7 8 Each deserves the same chance to excel, and they need 9 your help to have that equal opportunity. Thank you. CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Professor Eastman? 10 11 MR. EASTMAN: Good afternoon Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, thanks for 12 13 having me here, back at the Civil Rights Commission. 14 I was a number of years ago the director of the Congressional public affairs office here, so it's 15 16 nice to be back, although different digs than we had 17 back then up on Vermont. I am not going to address the particular 18 19 topic in front of the panel, but the broader question about federal authority generally in peer-on-peer 20 21 harassment that is the broader purpose 22 hearing, because Ι think we have greatly misunderstood the role of the federal government 23 here. 24

In fact, the misunderstanding of federal

authority, I think, is evident from the very opening sentence of your own briefing concept summary, which states that acts of bullying, violence and harassment are reportedly pervasive in K-12 schools.

Even if true, and with all due respect, that statement does not begin to establish the necessary premise for federal intervention.

Rather, federal intervention is warranted under the Fourteenth Amendment only to remedy violations of that amendment, which speaks to state action, not private conduct.

Congress's lawmaking power under Section 5 of that amendment extends only to enforcing the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment, and when Congress seeks to act proactively to prevent potential harms, there must be both a congruence and proportionality between the injury to prevent it and the means adopted to that end.

And remember, under the Fourteenth Amendment we are talking about state action, not the conduct of private actors.

So federal intervention might be warranted if the assertedly pervasive acts of bullying, violence and harassment were being perpetrated or facilitated by the school district

itself, and the intervention was designed to remedy that unconstitutional state action.

Yet, even if that was the case, and neither the Commission's briefing summary, nor the recent efforts by the Department of Education that led to it, appears to be aimed at that concern, the description of prior federal interventions that have been deemed appropriate by the Supreme Court, indicates a much higher threshold before Congress itself, much less unelected administrative agencies, can intrude on core state powers, such as how we manage the local school districts.

The Voting Rights Act of '65, for example, spoke of the flagrant violations that had been existing for decades. It sought to banish the blight of those discriminations that had been in place for nearly a century.

The Court also approved using strong and remedial preventative measures when necessary to respond to the widespread deprivation of constitutional rights that was going on by government officials themselves.

None of those preconditions are evident here. There's no indication that school districts have engaged in widespread and persistent deprivation

of constitutional rights, either through their own harassment, or in the manner in which they have responded to student-on-student harassment.

There's no hint that any such failure on the part of schools, even if it exists, has been flagrant or long-standing. Indeed, the Dear Colleague Letter sent last October from the Department of Education to school districts across the nation, demonstrates just the opposite.

In that letter, Assistant Secretary Ali praises state departments of education and local school districts for the steps they have taken to reduce bullying in schools, describing the efforts as a movement that reflects schools' appreciation of their important responsibility to maintain a safe learning environment for all students.

It is impossible to tease out of that complimentary picture the kind of flagrant disregard of constitutional rights by the officials themselves that is a necessary precondition for federal intervention under the Fourteenth Amendment. We are hardly witnessing a return of Bull Connor here.

But the Department of Education further claims that a number of federal statutes enacted pursuant to the spending clause fully authorize

other

federal intervention here. Now, although Congress's power under the spending clause is not limited by its enumerated powers, it may not use its spending power

do directly. 6

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The limits on Congressional regulatory authority under the Fourteenth Amendment therefore quite germane to the issues before us today.

as a pretext to accomplish indirectly what it cannot

And if Congress cannot accomplish indirectly through federal funding, then it is even more clearly the case that an administrative agency cannot impose new conditions on the receipt of federal funding that are not authorized by law.

The Department seems to claim authority when it cites the Gebser case from 1998, but I think it's misreading that case.

the Department's claim that liability standards in the Davis case do not limit the terms of its funding contracts is misleading at best.

The latitude given to the agencies is narrow. The deviations between the Department's Dear Colleague Letter last October and the reasonable

interpretation of the relevant civil rights statutes 1 2 are large. The Department may not think the Supreme 3 4 Court interpretation of those statutes is protective 5 enough for the rights at issue here, but it has no conceivable basis to fundamentally alter the meaning 6 7 of those statutes in the name of enforcing them. I should be clear, none of the statutes 8 9 cited in that letter were passed with the child-onchild playground bullying even in mind, much less out 10 11 of concern about flagrant violations of constitutional rights by the school officials 12 in 13 dealing with the bullying. 14 That alone makes it extremely 15 problematic to extend those statutes to cover the child-on-child conduct here. 16 17 I see my time is running out so let me skip towards the end. You know, the Department's 18 19 discussion about the specific kinds of conduct that would trigger remedial action is somewhat erroneous. 20 21 Harassing conduct may take many forms, 22 it says, including verbal names, acts and name 23 calling, graphic statements, et cetera. Supreme 24 But the Court has expressly

disclaimed such conduct as a trigger for school

district liability. Courts must bear in mind that schools are unlike the adult workplace and that children may regularly interact in a manner that would be unacceptable among adults, it noted in the Davis case.

It is thus understandable that you are going to have those kinds of insults and banter and teasing, et cetera. Damages are not available for those acts, even if the comments target differences in gender under Title VI, or race, or color or national origin, et cetera.

Rather, in the context of school on school - student-on-student harassment, damages are available only when the behavior is so severe, pervasive and objectively offensive, that it denies the victims equal access to the education.

And the deliberate indifference response by the school district must be systemic, not just with respect to individual instances of harassment.

In the end, I think it's important for us to recognize that, in our federal system, there are some things that are left not just primarily, but exclusively, to state and local control, and this is one of those things.

It's time to let the school districts,

their principals and their teachers do their jobs 1 without being second-guessed by folks in Washington, 2 3 D.C., often a thousand miles away. 4 Only then can we take advantage of the 5 laboratory of experiment that our federal system provides, and maybe they can come up with solutions 6 7 yet envisioned here in Washington, D.C. Thank you. CHAIRMAN CASTRO: 8 Thank you, Professor 9 Eastman. We are now going to open it to questions from the Commissioners. I remind the Commissioners, 10 11 keep your questions concise. If possible, indicate what panelist you are asking the question to, and 12 13 then we will have enough time for follow-ups, 14 hopefully. 15 Commissioner Yaki, Commissioner Kirsanow, and Commissioner Achtenberg and Gaziano. 16 17 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. So many interesting comments to be made 18 19 from what we just heard but I want to go back to something that I think was best addressed to Mr. 20 21 Herek and Mr. Meyer. 22 I think one of the most, to me one of 23 the most important factors in determining why we are having this hearing and why I believe we 24

specific federal legislation protecting LGBT youth,

has to do with the harm associated with this kind of bullying behavior to individuals in that grouping.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

Could you elaborate a little bit more about the susceptibility and the vulnerability of especially young people, in the LGBT category, who in terms of bullying, in terms of this kind of conduct, that I think it's important to draw out why it is that protection is necessary in these instances.

MR. Ι HEREK: think Ι can Certainly one thing we see, that many survey studies looking at especially middle and high school age boys and girls have found, is that those who are lesbian, gay or bisexual, or those who have a history of samesex attraction or behavior, often appear to be not functioning as well, at least on average. Many are functioning well, but on average they look like they are doing worse than many of the other kids and they often manifest higher levels of depressive symptoms and anxiety. They miss class more often. They skip school. They often engage in risk behaviors.

And that is one pattern that was observed in research, but then when researchers started asking about the kids' experiences with victimization and harassment in the school setting,

it turned out that that helped to explain quite a lot of the disparities there.

And so it seems that the experience of being targeted for harassment and violence in the school setting leads kids to have more psychological problems, leads them to be afraid of school, to perceive it as being an unsafe place, and this often leads them to both not be as healthy and to engage in more behaviors that are going to be detrimental to their own well-being.

It also appears to be the case that when that -- when questions have been asked about whether that teasing, harassment, and violence were specifically targeted at them because they were perceived by someone else to be lesbian or gay or bisexual, that is associated with a greater negative impact than other, what might be called routine teasing and harassment and violence that isn't based on a particular aspect of the child's identity.

MR. MEYER: I think it is important to add to that that we are not talking about a vulnerability that a child has coming in. We are talking about a reaction that a child has to the environment that is, not as some of the panelists characterized it, as something like teasing and

saying things.

This is a severe -- and I am not saying this is for every single child who is gay. Many of them are not out and nobody knows about it -- but when a child or youth is out or when people identify him or her as being LGBT, they suffer from persistent, chronic, day-in and day-out harassment, intimidation, things that, from a stress perspective, require immense adaptation if they are to sustain themselves in that environment.

We have had adults tell us in research about experiences that happened to them 20 years prior to that that they still remember freshly about not being able to walk to school, having to change their route, having to walk in different times from other children, missing classes and missing school.

So this is not minor events, not minor teasing and it is not about freedom of speech. This is about making the environment completely intolerable for these kids and that is why they suffer from these types of outcomes that I described before.

I just want to add one thing that two of the panelists said that there was not sufficient evidence, and I think that is something that I

strongly disagree with.

There are many, now, studies, there are meta-analysis studies that have looked at the accumulation of studies, that is they looked at -- over the accumulation of studies, what are the trends that children that overcome any kind of problems within a study, those permutations.

Those are studies with probability samples that they represent the population of students, and these studies showed, as I said before, incredibly strong evidence for, number one, the experience of stressors that I described, number two, the evidence of the outcomes that come out of this as well as the evidence for the mediating, as we call it, role of those experiences, that is that those experiences are responsible for those outcomes.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The Chairman recognizes Commissioner Kirsanow.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you all the panelists. This has been really informative. And I also thank the previous panel although they did not answer two questions I posed to them.

And pursuant to the testimony of Professor Eastman, I am curious as to the extent of

1	the deprivations of civil rights based on protected
2	class, perpetrated by school districts, that would
3	necessarily engender federal involvement or federal
4	jurisdiction.
5	And to that extent I would repeat my
6	question, of whether any of you have the answer to
7	when there's been reliable data collated and prepped
8	either by the Department of Education, Justice, or
9	any other entity, as to the number of complaints of
10	protected class harassment, when that tracking began,
11	what the number was when that tracking began, and
12	what the number is now, in terms of, again,
13	deprivations of civil rights based on protected class
14	status, related to harassment. Does anyone have any
15	such data or know where we can find such data,
16	because we have gotten copious amounts of information
17	in advance of this hearing from a number of people
18	and we appreciate that, but in going through the
19	data, I have not been able to assess it.
20	
21	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Can we get an answer,
22	if not any panelist?
23	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you, I

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: We will move on to

appreciate it.

24

Commissioner Achtenberg.

COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Dr. Meyer, I have next to me approximately 3,000 pages of recent reports, peer-reviewed journal articles and book chapters which are already in the record of this proceeding and to which you have referred indirectly.

These documents examine a range of issues related to the overall mental health of the LGBT population, the pervasiveness and nuanced problems associated with peer-to-peer student violence directed at sexual minority youth, and many short- and long-term negative outcomes suffered by targeted youth to which you have testified.

The authors come from institutions including Harvard Medical School, Columbia University, UCLA, UC Davis, and many other most reputable institutions.

Do you have an overall comment that you can make to this Commission about this body of scholarship and the weight we should give this scholarship in our deliberations?

MR. MEYER: Yes. Of course I haven't reviewed each of those 3,000 pages, but the references that I provided, as well as the articles

that I could identify from your cues there, are published in peer-reviewed, top scientific journals.

It is not very easy to put an article out there after it has been reviewed by an editor and at least three other reviewers who are not necessarily friendly to the author.

Those articles went through very, very severe critical review. In my mind, having reviewed many of those articles, in particular in the area of youth, the evidence is overwhelming on each of those three elements that are required to show causal relationships between the environment and some kind of health outcomes.

And the three are: number one, that you have to show that the group, in this case sexual minority youth, experienced more stressors; number two, that they experience more of the disorders that are purported to be caused by the stressors; and number three, that these are -- that the reason for the increase in rates of disorders are those stressors.

This is called mediation analysis. In this particular evidence, we have very, very strong evidence for each of those three elements, as I said before, using a variety of methods, a variety of

samples, a variety of sampling methodologies, 1 variety of analytical approaches, and for many, many 2 institutions and investigators in many different 3 4 places, and across two decades now. 5 COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Thank you. CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The chair recognizes 6 7 Commissioner Gaziano. COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I want to thank 8 9 all of you but, because our time is limited, I think I will direct my question to former Dean Eastman, 10 11 because I wanted you to elaborate using an example from an OCR's recent Dear Colleague, to illuminate 12 13 this point you made, that the use of federal funding 14 cannot be used as a pretext to invent new legal 15 standards. 16 We heard from Assistant Secretary Ali 17 that they only use funding or their power for sort of procedural issues, and I would certainly concede, I 18 19 think all would concede, that the federal we 20 government could potentially require data to submitted to show that they are actually living up to 21 22 the standards of the civil rights law. 23 But the example that I would like you to apply is, on April 4th, the Office for Civil Rights 24

sent a letter to colleges and universities seeming to

insist that they have a preponderance of the record - preponderance of the evidence standard in student
sexual harassment disciplinary proceedings.

The only argument I could see in the OCR's letter is this was the standard in Title VII. To me it's profoundly troubling that they would borrow that standard where discovery is available, where an employer has control over its supervisors, to the university context where students don't even have a right to know who accused them, don't have a right to see the statements, don't have a right of discovery.

But my question to you is, does OCR, regardless of who's right, whether that's good or bad, does OCR have the authority to read Title IX as requiring colleges and universities, or is there any authority that OCR has, to require colleges and universities to apply a preponderance of the evidence standard in student sexual harassment or rape allegations?

MR. EASTMAN: I don't believe so and I should clarify as well that I am here in my own capacity, not as the former Dean of Chapman University. We don't always speak with the same voice in a university, as I am sure many involved with

universities acknowledge.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

No, they don't. The federal government generally is not supposed to be intruding on local decisions unless they rise to a certain level. That's the congruence and proportionality test that comes under the Fourteenth Amendment.

And the Court has also been very clear that we can't use the spending power to accomplish things that we don't have other authority to accomplish.

What OCR seems to be doing here is using its conditions on spending in an effort to obtain a regulatory regime that they could not do directly, that Congress itself could not do directly, much less OCR.

And I'll give you another example, from the Dear Colleague Letter from last October. standard that the Supreme Court sets out in the Davis Monroe County case in 1999 is deliberate VS. indifference, intentional conduct by the officials themselves to a hostile environment. That's the only time when it rises to the level of federal actionable conduct.

The Department of Education's letter says instead a school is responsible for addressing

1	harassing incidents about which it knows, all right,
2	and knowledge is even lower than deliberate
3	indifference, or reasonably should have known. That
4	is a standard that the Supreme Court expressly
5	rejected in the <i>Davis</i> case, that that would adopt a
6	somewhat negligent standard for school officials.
7	And in rejecting that, it said there
8	should be a strong presumption in favor of deference
9	to the school districts on how they respond to any of
10	these kind of harassing conducts.
11	And remember, most of this conduct, when
12	it crosses from mere speech over to physical
13	violence, is already actionable under state tort law
14	and what have you.
15	The notion that that is sufficient to
16	rise to the level of federal intervention was
17	rejected by the Supreme Court in another significant
18	case, United States vs. Morrison.
19	So I think what the Department here is
20	doing, is expanding through a spending hook, a
0.1	
21	regulatory regime that Congress would not have
22	regulatory regime that Congress would not have authority to pass on its own.

Commissioner Yaki, and Commissioner Titus. Before I

ask my question, I just want to ask members of the staff and Commissioners who are on stage as much as possible try to limit your movement; it's a little distracting and it is important for us to stay up here and not direct questions to the panel unless it's in this open forum, although I know folks will have to get up at some point and understand that. If with amount you could do that the least of disruption, that would be appreciated.

Professor Clegg, you had mentioned in your comments, I'm sorry, Mr. Clegg, that you did not want to see an expansion of coverage for protections for LGBT, if I understand correctly, because you didn't want to see a whipsaw effect occurring.

But isn't it true that you could make that whipsaw argument for any effort to expand the protected classes in the past, whether it was race, national origin, disability status, and should that be the standard by which we decide whether or not we are going to protect our citizens and residents?

MR. CLEGG: I think that it is going to depend on the specific situation. Let me take the most dramatic example, and that would be racial discrimination.

There you had - 50 years ago - a

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

situation where school systems and state governments were themselves deliberately discriminating on the basis of race. They were not going to change that policy, absent the intervention of the federal government, and in light of Supreme Court case law, as it was developing, it was also very unlikely that there was going to be very much back and forth once the federal government intervened and said you cannot engage in racial discrimination.

That's very different than the situation now. You don't have the situation now where school districts are deliberately harassing or bullying students on the basis of sexual orientation. The problem is one of student on student bullying and harassment, and there has been no showing here today that the school districts are systematically uninterested or unsupportive of stopping that kind of bullying and harassment.

The problem now instead is one of line-drawing, as I discuss in my statement and has been discussed by this panel. That kind of nuanced line-drawing is something where reasonable people can differ, and where people are going to draw the lines differently, depending on local circumstances. And where getting the federal government involved — and

1	saying that no, this is where, here in our
2	guidelines, here is where you should draw the line in
3	our administration — will predictably be a source of
4	controversy and will likely be changed when a, say,
5	liberal Democratic administration is replaced by a
6	conservative republican one.
7	So I think that the whipsaw danger —
8	which is only one of the problems that I have
9	identified in this area, for why the federal
10	government shouldn't get involved and will actually
11	be unhelpful if it gets involved — is a much more
12	significant problem in this area than in the school
13	desegregation context.
14	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: And I will reserve my
15	follow-up question if we have time at the end. I will
16	ask Commissioner Heriot to please ask her question.
17	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I am not sure
18	anybody is going to be able to answer my question,
19	but Ms. Byard, you are probably my best shot on this
20	one.
21	The emphasis of the Department's policy
22	is on training and not so much on punishment, which
23	kind of surprised me when I looked at the letter.
24	The Dear Colleague Letter repeatedly

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

says that punishing bullies is not enough, that there

is some need to train. 1 I understand that GLSEN provides some of 2 that training, is that right? 3 4 MS. BYARD: They work in different parts 5 of the country, primarily professional development work with school staff, so we do. We have done that 6 7 for the entire district, the City of Rochester and in 8 other places. COMMISSIONER HERIOT: It's the resource 9 issue that interests me, 10 allocation the kind of 11 training and such that you provide. Is this like a day-long program, are you talking to teachers, are 12 you talking to students, are you talking 13 14 administrators? 15 MS. BYARD: Well, I am happy to talk 16 with you about our training work, but on the other 17 hand, that's actually not the request we have of you for action. 18 19

We do not seek that level of -- what we ask for in terms of the Safe Schools Improvement Act and non-discrimination protection, is regarding taking a standard that has been developed in the laboratory of the states to which my colleague Mr. Eastman referred, and which is having a salutory effect on the health and well-being of young people

20

21

22

23

24

1	who are experiencing harm, by promoting effective
2	action
3	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: But it's not a
4	question of what you are asking for I am asking
5	you whether you provide that training and what kind
6	of training it is that you provide.
7	MS. BYARD: Yes, we actually provide
8	professional development training to districts across
9	the country, and they have resulted in fact in higher
LO	rates of intervention in the kinds of behavior that
L1	currently harm young people, and we are very proud of
L2	the
L3	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Do you charge for
L4	that training?
L5	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Commissioner Heriot
L6	MS. BYARD: In general, actually we
L7	leverage private resources to make things available.
L8	We recognize that districts
L9	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: You said in
20	general. Does that mean that you sometimes charge for
21	those?
22	MS. BYARD: I really feel like you are
23	saying schools pay for resources that help them do
24	a better job.
25	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Do you charge for

1	your services?
2	MS. BYARD: And at times we do.
3	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Commissioner Heriot,
4	we are going to move on to another Commissioner's
5	questions.
6	MS. BYARD: But I would appreciate just
7	the point to say
8	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Do you charge?
9	MS. BYARD: I have said yes
10	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Commissioner.
11	MS. BYARD: we do on occasion charge,
12	but on the other hand, I would also point out that
13	the thing that federal action would do is set a floor
14	of protections through policy language that has been
15	developed in the states, and is having a beneficial
16	effect.
17	The way that districts then move on to
18	those next levels of implementation appropriate to
19	their local area is their own decision. They would
20	then be responsible for reporting on the impact of
21	their policy, and that is the action where federal
22	leadership could have a beneficial effect for young
23	people who are suffering today. Thank you.
24	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: We will ask members of

the audience to please turn off your cell phones.

1	They have gone off several times and please do that
2	if you haven't already done so.
3	
4	The Chair recognizes Commissioner Yaki.
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well actually,
6	Commissioner Titus hasn't gone yet.
7	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay. Commissioner
8	Titus.
9	COMMISSIONER TITUS: Okay. Thank you. We
10	have heard evidence from difference ones of you and
11	then the previous panel that technical assistance,
12	teacher training, developing anti-bullying policies
13	in school have all helped to lower the rate of
14	bullying in those particular situations.
15	Most of the testimony, though, has
16	focused on what we do after the fact, after bullying
17	or harassment occurs, how do we deal with the
18	situation.
19	I'd like to take a step back, if you
20	would help me. Mr. Clegg kind of scoffs at the notion
21	that statistical evidence compiled and presented by
22	top-notch social scientists suggests that this is
23	getting to be a more serious problem by saying well,
24	maybe just technological developments allow more

people to report it.

1	I don't really think that's the case. I
2	think it is an increasing problem, so I'd like to
3	talk about some of the societal conditions that have
4	led to this increase, because I believe they are out
5	there.
6	Maybe Ms. Byard, or maybe Professor
7	Herek could address that?
8	MS. BYARD: Sure. I think that what is
9	clear is that in recent years, as LGBT life in this
10	country has become more visible, we have seen it
11	become an increasing subject of debate.
12	Many of GLSEN's members are teachers and
13	school principals, and the fact is that what you see
14	in the headlines shows up in the hallways.
15	Now the problem is not the debate
16	itself, it is the environment of hostility, the fact
17	that there are legislative efforts to clamp down on
18	speech related to LGBT people in our schools, there
19	are eight states in this country where there is
20	legislative language that prohibits the positive
21	discussion of homosexuality in a public school, and
22	there is an effort today to pass such a statute in
23	the state of Tennessee.
24	In that environment, it is very
25	difficult to make it clear to teachers that they

1	should intervene. We have seen specific concerns in
2	the Anoka-Hennepin district of Minnesota, that the
3	prohibitive statutory language about any discussion
4	by school faculty of homosexuality stands in the way
5	of effective response by adults, to behavior that
6	clearly crosses the line into harmful behavior
7	directed at young people.
8	We want to be very clear about what we
9	are here to discuss. It is the appropriate role of
10	the government to set the floor, the minimum standard
11	to which districts must adhere.
12	They must make it clear that the adults
13	who run our schools have to protect all children,
14	including those who have been singled out on the
15	basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.
16	COMMISSIONER TITUS: Thank you, just
17	real quick oh excuse me.
18	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: We will come back.
19	COMMISSIONER TITUS: Okay.
20	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The next I'm sorry.
21	Okay. Sure, go ahead.
22	MR. CLEGG: The point is, you know,
23	what's really relevant here is not just whether there
24	has been an increase in the reported instances of
25	harassment on the basis of sexual orientation, but

1 whether there has been an increase in unresponsiveness among local school districts. 2 3 don't think that And Ι any of the 4 statistics or the thousands of pages that have been 5 submitted into the record here address that question. CHAIRMAN We will 6 CASTRO: to go 7 Commissioner Yaki, then to Vice Chair Thernstrom, then to the individual delegated the authority of 8 staff director. 9 10 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you very much, 11 Mr. Chair. This is directed at Ms. Graves. We have heard a lot about -- and one quick comment, we have 12 13 heard a lot about the inability to have the right 14 data, and I would just submit that part of our 15 problem and part of why we are here today, is to try 16 and gather that data. 17 Part of the challenge, of course, is that, as an unprotected class, agencies are 18 19 required to gather that kind of data for us 20 analyze. 21 Ms. Graves, I wanted you to sort 22 answer some of the questions posed by Mr. Eastman and 23 some of my colleagues over on the other -- down the dais from me, having to do with the reach of the 24

federal government, the ability of the Fourteenth

Amendment and the power of Congress to enact laws to 1 create a protected class, to do the sorts of things 2 that would allow us not to have to tap dance on the 3 4 head of an opinion here or there in order to grab 5 jurisdiction on this. But what is your view of the Fourteenth 6 7 Amendment, and Congress's enabling power under that to reach a protected class? 8 9 MS. GRAVES: Thank you. And I agree that there is a need for additional data as well, and one 10 11 of our recommendations is that there be additional data in the civil rights data collection that takes 12 into account bullying and harassment based on sexual 13 14 orientation, which it currently does not. 15 But in response to some of the points 16 made by Mr. Eastman, I mean I think that some of the 17 questions that he raised have really already been answered by the Supreme Court's jurisprudence. 18 19 You know, there's no question that there's heightened protection under the Fourteenth 20 Amendment for sex discrimination. There's no question 21 22 that there's protection for sexual orientation. And you know, many times Congress has 23 Title IX, through Congress's spending 24 that

clause authority, is -- it's valid to say that you

misuse federal dollars to engage 1 discrimination. 2 So to the extent that, for example, the 3 4 Student Non-Discrimination Act would make explicit, 5 similar to the way that Title IX and Title VI in the rehab act do, that you cannot misuse federal dollars 6 7 to discriminate based on sexual orientation or gender identity, and that's another valid exercise 8 9 Congress's powers, both under section five and the spending clause. 10 11 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The Chair recognizes Vice Chair Thernstrom. 12 13 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Let me address 14 this question to Professor Eastman, and to Mr. Clegg 15 if he wants to comment as well. I am - and, by the way, I second all the 16 17 questions about the data. But I am concerned about free speech issues. And of course what we want to 18 19 tolerate depends on specifically what is being said and the age of the students who are involved. 20 I mean, it's different to be a second 21 22 grader than it is to be somebody in their junior year 23 in high school in terms of what you want, it would seem to me, in allowable speech. 24 25 But one of my concerns is that it seems

to me possible, in an effort to get rid of ugly speech, of which there is a lot between students, that that effort can have a ripple effect in the schools such that students become nervous saying controversial things on political matters, let's they maybe disagree, say, where where sensibilities may be ruffled, where you are talking about basic values taught in the home, and a student may be nervous about bringing those values to the classroom, or to discussions with other children.

And I wondered if you wanted, and perhaps Roger Clegg as well, to respond to that concern on my part.

MR. EASTMAN: Ι think it is a serious concern, and something that Professor Meyer said earlier, only highlights it, in his discussion of how gays and lesbians are more susceptible to the stressor of harassment in speech, he said one of the school districts' responses must be to affirmatively support homosexuality if people are making statements on the campus that disagrees with that proposition, that all of a sudden is going to be taken as conduct that leads to harassment that invokes federal intervention and training programs and what have you.

It is a very dangerous slope to head

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

down, on such a contested issue as this, to basically tell people that, if you engage in such speech, that some people might interpret as harassment because you don't like the lifestyle or the conduct or what have you, that will then lead to federal intervention that will lead to training programs that will lead to affirmative responses by school districts supporting this conduct rather than opposing it or saying what have you.

That's where the dangerous slippery slope is, and we see it happening in a number of the cases that have already hit the trial court levels, and I think it's a real serious concern.

As I understand it, there's going to be even more discussion about that at the next panel, but I think it's a very serious concern and it's one that we ought to be very cautious about allowing an overreach by the federal government on this issue, as we try and grapple with how to get that balance right. It's not something that is going to come out of Washington, D.C.

MR. CLEGG: May I answer that? [portion inaudible]

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Sure. But I

NEAL R. GROSS

would love for Mr. Sasser to answer it.

MR. CLEGG: Just to say that I agree with your concern, I agree with what Mr. Eastman said, and you know we have had discussion this morning of different, large animals in the room.—And so, let's be honest, I think that part of what's going on here, part of what's being pushed, is an agenda that seeks to use the power of the federal government to vilify and marginalize people who believe that gay sex is a sin. And it doesn't want that kind of thought to go unpunished.

MR. SASSER: What I'll say is that this is really -- it should be treated no differently than Mary Beth Tinker when she wore her black armband in Des Moines. There were lots of veterans in that community, lots of children of soldiers who died in Vietnam and who were serving in Vietnam. They were extremely upset. They were incredibly impacted emotionally by seeing those black armbands. But we can't take away Mary Beth Tinker's right to wear the armband, in the same way with the students in the Burnside case in 1966, when they were wearing their freedom buttons demanding equality.

That upset some people. It was something that the government maybe didn't agree with, with

their freedom button message, but we can't stamp out 1 2 those messages as well. 3 And I think that's what is really at issue 4 here, is are we going to use the government to stamp 5 out thoughts and beliefs and speech with which the government disagrees. That's a very dangerous game, 6 7 because it's easy to do that when it's the speech that you favor, but it opens the door when it comes 8 9 time when it's your speech that's targeted, and we have to stand up for everybody, because if we don't, 10 11 then your speech is next. 12 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you Mr. Sasser. 13 MR. MEYER: Mr. Chairman. 14 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: We are going to -- we 15 are going to --16 MR. MEYER: May I just correct the 17 quote? 18 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay, one -- go ahead 19 Professor Meyer. I think Professor Eastman 20 MR. MEYER: quoted my testimony which is he misunderstood it. 21 22 what I was talking about is not about the school 23 district saying that it is okay or not okay to be gay, and in fact nothing in my testimony, and I think 24 25 in the other people here, is about speech at all.

What I was talking about is about schools supporting affirmatively a gay student, not by taking sides about if it's okay or not, but against the types of evidence that I have quoted about being injured, about physical assault, about rape, about being threatened, about having their property stolen, about being threatened with a knife or a weapon.

So these are not issues about whether somebody, as Mr. Clegg referred to before, one student thinking it's a sin and another student thinking that it's not a sin.

I have -- I'm totally in agreement with them about the speech part of it. But we are talking about very severe harm that is conducted and that is where I think -- and I agree with Ms. Byard -- the school has to have a role in ensuring that the students have an opportunity to learn.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you, Professor Meyer. We are going to have a question from Ms. Tolhurst, the individual delegated the authority of staff director, followed by Commissioner Heriot, Commissioner Achtenberg, and Commissioner Titus for her follow-up question, and then I will indicate who else will come after that. Ms. Tolhurst?

TOLHURST: Thank you. This is for 1 MS. Professors Herek and Meyer. And I have read both of 2 3 your written statements and I should thank all the 4 panelists for providing us a great deal of reading 5 material. 6 In both of your statements, you 7 addressed the idea that identity-based bullying, and 8 the social stigma attached to it, has a greater 9 impact on teens than more general forms of bullying. You were both addressing LGBT students. 10 11 Would you say the same holds true for students bullied based on their race, religion, disability or 12 13 qender? 14 MR. HEREK: Well, at least one of the 15 studies that I cited, which was from the California Healthy Kids Study, did look at those other factors, 16 17 and yes, the comparison was between kids who had been 18 bullied based on their sexual orientation, perceived 19 or actual, versus kids who were bullied for reasons 20 that weren't related to identity. And there we saw the difference. 21 22 recollection of that study is that they did find 23 other -- that being targeted as a member of a particular group, a racial group for example, is more 24

associated with greater harm than being

is

of violence. 2 3 I would say there's a parallel there in 4 what we have seen in research with adults, which is 5 that we see, for example, that adult lesbians and gay men who have experienced a hate crime in recent years 6 because of their sexual orientation show greater 7 8 psychological distress and more problems than other 9 comparable lesbians and gay men who have experienced comparable crimes of violence but not based on their 10 11 sexual orientation. So there does seem to be an added harm 12 associated with victimization 13 that 14 associated with one's sexual orientation 15 believe some other data would say with other sorts of identities as well. 16 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Commissioner Heriot. 17 MR. MEYER: I just wanted to --18 19 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: I'm sorry. I just wanted to answer. I 20 MR. MEYER: 21 think that this has been shown with regard to other 22 types of groups, and the reason behind it, as I said, is because of the symbolic value that is involved in 23 something that is such a hate crime. 24

targeted for, again, what we might call routine sort

25

And by the way, this was addressed by the Supreme Court in discussing the issue of hate crime and whether there can be added punishment for a hate crime.

An opinion written by Chief Justice Rehnquist actually acknowledged that social science finding about the added harm to the individual in society that comes from hate crimes because of the added hate aspect.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you.

Commissioner Heriot?

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Thank you, my question is also for Drs. Herek and Meyer. I have the barely started to look at empirical literature, but so far I am thinking there might be a tension here. On the one hand, there's the I'm okay, you're okay, everybody's okay, or almost everybody's okay line in the literature, and I'm thinking of the work of Dr. Rich Savin-Williams, and if I understand him, he is looking at the data, I assume very similar data to what you are looking at, and his point is that if you take the bisexual community out of the equation, you really don't run across higher mental health issues or higher suicide rates either, rates are about the same as the heterosexual

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

community.

And from that he concludes that this is just a normal sexual variant and it's all very normal, and everything's fine. On the other hand, there is the literature that I believe you have contributed to that concludes that the lesbian and gay communities do have higher rates of suicide and mental health issues. Can you reconcile that for me, is there something that you can point me to that would help me sort that out?

MR. HEREK: Yes. I think, actually I think Professor Meyer's work speaks more directly to that point.

MR. MEYER: Yes, as I said, there are different studies and you are doing different things when you are looking at different problems.

What Professor Savin-Williams was talking about is the fact that there are in fact areas in the country where gay youth are more accepted, they have less of those stressors that I was describing. He works particularly around Cornell University area, with gay youth there.

And he has shown that they are doing fine, which is consistent with what I have said and what Professor Herek said, that when the environment

is supportive, when the parents, when the schools are supportive, these kids do very well.

In terms of the finding about suicide in particular that you quoted, it is true that bisexual youth have more problems than gay-identified youth, but both bisexual and gay youth have much more experiences of suicide ideation as well as serious suicide attempts, than heterosexual youth.

And this has been shown in many, many studies. There is actually a meta-analysis which, as I said, this is the kind of evidence that we like to see, where a researcher takes an accumulation of studies and looks at what the total shows, and this is going to be published soon by Marshall and shows over those many sets of studies.

commissioner Heriot: My understanding is he found the suicide rates were actually the same. This does suggest that the bisexual community is different than the gay and lesbian community in this so we are dealing with a very complex problem here, probably more complex than the notion of bullying leads to suicide.

MR. MEYER: No, that is wrong. That was not the finding. The finding is that both gay and lesbian and bisexuals have more than heterosexual

peers. But you are right that the bisexuals have more 1 than the others, but they both have more 2 heterosexual peers. 3 4 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Then we are going 5 back to the --6 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: No, Commissioner 7 Heriot, I'm sorry I am going to once again have to interrupt you. We will try to come back to you at the 8 9 end. Commissioner Achtenberg will be followed 10 11 by Commissioner Titus and Commissioner Gaziano, by Commissioner Yaki and Commissioner Kirsanow. 12 13 COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Thank you, Mr. 14 Chairman. This is going to be a question to Ms. 15 Byard. I want to agree with Mr. Sasser that, if this were a case of training students to hold particular 16 views, I would be vehemently against that for the 17 18 particular reasons that you outlined in 19 testimony: forced professions are to be resisted at every turn; they shouldn't be the manifestation of 20 the government, or private parties for that matter. 21 22 So I couldn't agree with you more. Nor would I disagree with the notion that, if this were 23 an effort to get rid of ugly speech, we should turn 24

away and run away as far and as fast as we could,

1	because the government has no business in trying to
2	outlaw ugly speech, no matter how offensive, provided
3	it's not a precursor to ugly, damaging action.
4	Ms. Byard, could you talk a little bit
5	about the training that we have heard so much about,
6	and discuss the extent to which it forces students to
7	hold or to manifest particular views or it is an
8	effort to rid the public sphere of ugly speech?
9	MS. BYARD: I just want to say one thing
10	first. It's hard to know what training people are
11	referring to, in part because districts that have
12	effective anti-bullying and anti-harassment policy
13	that specifically address sexual orientation and
14	gender identity, seek professional opportunities from
15	a wide range of places such as
16	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: But just
17	comment on whatever training you offer in this regard
18	please.
19	MS. BYARD: Sure. The purpose of
20	training for example, work that we did actually in
21	partnership with the ADL in the City of New York, the
22	respect for all
23	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: I'm sorry,
24	with whom?
25	MS. BYARD: Sorry, the Anti-Defamation

League.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Anti-

Defamation League, thank you.

MS. BYARD: GLSEN and the Anti-Defamation League were among the partners that provided district trainings in the City of New York, trainings that were designed to prepare school staff to respond effectively to the kinds of behaviors that could have a detrimental effect on student life.

And I think the follow-up issue here, and as I alluded to before, what we found was that these trainings over time, tracking the participants, actually had a good effect in terms of the ways in which those school staff responded to things happening in their schools.

But I would note very, very clearly and firmly, that all of this is about an issue of behavior, not belief. We are talking about efforts to ensure that schools as entities effectively act to deal with the hostile school environment the LGBT students currently face, and I would submit that we do not need to think that the student is in imminent danger of taking their own life to agree that that student is worthy of equal protection. I would say that the most important thing here is that there is

significant common ground on the need to address the violence and harassment that young people face.

I was proud to be on panels with the head of the Christian Educators Association on this topic. I would also submit that ugly speech, including the words faggot and dyke, do not unto themselves constitute bullying or harassment. I want to be very clear about this. There is a context.

And the definition that has emerged at the state level that is showing a good effect in schools, for bullying and harassment, it's separate questions, includes the concept that the student has a reasonable fear of physical harm, as a result of what they are facing, and even a word as ugly as faggot or dyke, because I do not want us to lose sight about what we are actually talking about, has to be used in a context where it produces that expectation in a student in order to constitute bullying, or to constitute harassment.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The Chair recognizes Commissioner Titus.

COMMISSIONER TITUS: Thank you. I was talking earlier about what are the conditions that have led to the increase in bullying, but some other things have been said so I will just leave that.

I am getting the impression that some of the members of the panel think that establishing a federal policy against harassment or bullying of LGBT students will somehow have a chilling effect on what students can say when they go to school about politics or about religion, and it will have a negative impact on local school policy. But, and yet, allowing the states to do it, which seems to be the argument, the federal government doesn't do it, the states will, passing those laws doesn't seem to have that kind of negative effect on children or school districts, and I just don't quite get that, why it would make a difference. Furthermore, I would like to ask Mr. Sasser, you keep citing the Tinker case but Tinker case is a situation where the system worked. The First Amendment was protected. It was popular, but the individual was protected. What makes you think the system would work then, and it wouldn't work now? Well, actually, the problem MR. SASSER:

MR. SASSER: Well, actually, the problem with the system now is that the school officials are actually not following the clearly-established law.

If you look in my paper, you will see cases from just in recent years where you have a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

student in California, a person who had a Bible verse that referenced homosexuality in probably not a way that some people would appreciate, printed on a t-shirt and he was banned and he was discriminated against, not just by his peers, but by the actual government apparatus, the government officials themselves, inflicting that type of harassment and intimidation on him.

You have students who want --

COMMISSIONER TITUS: That was a local school board that did that, right, that wasn't a national intervention?

MR. SASSER: Well, that's exactly right. What I am saying is, though, that this problem is pervasive and ongoing, that there's a constant problem of harassment and intimidation on students of faith when they express sentiments that may disagree with official school orthodoxy that's in favor of, for example, homosexuality.

So that when this training happens and the teachers are there or the students receive various instruction and training, they are being taught that their beliefs, what they believe, is wrong, and they are intimidated and harassed into not

NEAL R. GROSS

wanting to express their beliefs, and this is not based upon conjecture. These are cases that we deal with on a daily basis.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The Chair recognizes Commissioner Gaziano.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Hopefully my question follows nicely from Commissioner Titus's, because I am going to use one of the examples in your testimony. And I wonder whether it was -- I think you had two examples where a student wanted to wear a t-shirt that was deemed offensive to the message that the school was trying to convey, and the day of silence message that the school was trying to convey.

And I might disagree with some people who have argued that the schools ought not to teach morality or values. I actually think it's quite important for the schools to teach morality and values, including the western value of tolerance.

But what seemed problematic about the school district that -- the school that prohibited the student from wearing that t-shirt, is that, one, it violated the First Amendment, so that's an important value too; and number two, that doesn't teach the student real tolerance. Real tolerance that I want to be taught is the kind of tolerance that

allows dissent, and if that is a real-world problem, that the school districts don't understand how to teach tolerance, I think it's much more likely, and I would like Mr. Clegg to answer this as well as you, Mr. Sasser, much more likely that we can straighten them out at the local level and explain to them what the First Amendment requires and what true tolerance is about, that I want taught.

But that if the federal government is involved, they resort to zero tolerance policies, and they hide behind -- they are either more resistant to teaching proper tolerance. Is that consistent with your all explanation?

MR. SASSER: Well, what I have seen in my practice is day after day, you have school districts who, out of fear for a loss of funding or whatever it may be, that they have to go around and stamp out any particular dissenting speech lest it lead to, nip it in the bud, lest it lead to some sort of feelings, unwanted feelings towards a particular student.

So, the problem that we have is one of lack of tolerance. The tolerance that we need, the value that we need is that the Constitution and the First Amendment protect all people, allow free and

open debate on controversial topics, and the government's not going to put its thumb on the scale of one side or the other.

It's perfectly okay, as the en decision said, and the Supreme Court said, perfectly okay to teach uncontroversial values like kind to your neighbor, and the Constitution is a good thing, we love America and American exceptionalism and things of that nature, but what is not okay is to try to intimidate students into not expressing their beliefs even when the government doesn't agree with those messages.

And in this case it's about intimidating and harassing students who express religious sentiments. That's an ongoing sport that happens in school districts today. They intimidate today students who are engaging in religious speech, and we need more tolerance of that, not more clamping down.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Mr. Clegg.

MR. CLEGG: I agree, Commissioner Gaziano, with what you said and with what my copanelist just said now. Again, this is an area — as we are learning more and more this morning — that has a lot of difficult line-drawing issues in it.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Everybody seems to agree that those lines are best drawn by local governments, and I continue to hear nothing to suggest that local school boards are indifferent to drawing those lines in the right place.

I hear nothing that suggests that the federal government is going to play a helpful role in getting those lines drawn in the right place, and I continue to think that the federal government's involvement will actually make matters worse, because it's much more difficult for the federal government to draw these nuanced lines on the basis of local conditions, what was actually happening in the school, what the student actually said, all of that — much more difficult for the federal government to design a policy that is going to be sensitive to all of that — than leaving it to the local schools.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The Chair recognizes Commissioner Yaki.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you very much. I am somewhat confused by the discussion we have had over the last 15 minutes because, based on what I have heard, if we had this debate in 1963, we would still be talking about whether or not we should give equal rights to African Americans in this country.

I mean, the idea that speech and conduct 1 are not separate is well settled in constitutional 2 3 law. They are completely separate. 4 The idea that a group of guys can sit 5 around in white robes and burn a cross and say bad things to each other in a private thing, okay, they 6 can do that. They can't go and do it outside a black 7 8 church. They can't go and do it inside a black 9 storeowner's location. This is -- we are not talking 10 about the same thing. 11 This First Amendment discussion in some ways is really a red herring in terms of the speech/ 12 conduct separation that is well settled doctrine in 13 14 American constitutional law. 15 I understand what you are saying. I am 16 someone who is pretty much, Mr. Sasser, a First 17 Amendment close to absolutist, Cohen vs. California, all those -- Tinker -- all those cases. 18 19 But the difference is, the difference is 20 the distinction between someone talking -- going back 21 to 1918, the difference between someone whispering to 22 themselves in а theater, "fire," and screaming "fire" at the top of their lungs and 23 causing a stampede and a panic. 24

There are consequences to speech that is

aimed at conduct. And I think the -- what I want to hear, we have been talking about this a lot and I think that the testimony from Mr. Herek and Mr. Meyer has been illuminating, but I would like them to explain, again, because I don't think it -- it somehow hasn't resonated, I don't know why it hasn't.

But the fact is that we are not talking about someone who just casually says, well you know, I just hate blankety blanks, or I hate blankety blanks. That is not what we are talking about.

That's not what causes these debilitating problems for young people. Could you elaborate a little bit about it's not sort of the isolated person who kind of walks down the street and someone says I hate blankety blank. Ms. Byard, I can't even say those words. It's one of those things where I can't even say them.

But Mr. Herek and Mr. Meyer, could you talk about what is, I guess, what is bullying? What is the impact of bullying, on the psyche, on the emotional defenses of a young person that is so different, that is why we are talking about it here today, because I think somehow, people are missing this. We are wrapping this up around the American

the American flag is the 1 but Amendment as well --2 3 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Please, go ahead and 4 answer. 5 MR. HEREK: Well yes, what we are talking about is children and youth who aren't simply 6 7 having a reasoned discussion or disagreeing about a philosophical or religious point. What we are talking 8 9 about is kids who are feeling that their safety -that they are not safe. They are feeling that they 10 11 are going to be subjected to physical violence and in sometimes have been subjected to physical 12 fact violence, and that this is something that pervades 13 14 life, often something that isn't 15 associated with single perpetrator, а 16 associated with multiple members of their peer group 17 are harassing them and teasing them who in 18 merciless way on an ongoing basis. 19 And, as Professor Meyer has said, these sorts of things are called stressors, and in the 20 social scientific sense what we mean is that they do 21 22 require the individual to respond. 23 And we know that people do what we call

-- the term we use is coping, when someone feels that

resources needed

to

they

have

the

24

25

respond

stressors. We all face stressors all the time.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The problem occurs when people don't feel that they have the necessary resources to deal with the stressor, and that's where we end up having this experience where people actually have very negative consequences.

And so what we see in the school situation is that you have kids who probably could deal with occasional teasing or even namecalling or something like that, but this is something that often ends up being very pervasive and it's something that confronts them on a frequent basis, sometimes on a daily basis, and so that just requires huge amounts of psychological resources to respond to. It requires social support. It requires assistance from others and often what we see in the research is that the kids are saying that they don't have that. They don't -- not only are they experiencing this widespread harassment and teasing and brutality, but they are also not getting support, teachers are not stopping it from happening, other authority figures are not stopping it, there doesn't seem to be anything happening.

They end up feeling very much like they are isolated, they are on the outside, the world is

against them and in fact they are right in a sense, in their subjective world it is largely against them, and that's what we see when we are talking about these very negative outcomes.

MR. MEYER: One point to add to that, that the importance of understanding these issues as I said before when I talked about stigma, is the social context for this.

So for a Christian kid to display -- to show attitudes that are supported by his community around him or her, is not the same as for a gay kid who is not supported within this community and who feels that they are subject to disrespect and disdain and hatred.

It is not the same. The context matters here a lot and the context is the stigma that surrounds this person, and in the United States, being Christian is not a devalued social identity.

So the other panelist talked about evidence. As an epidemiologist I look for evidence. I don't see evidence that Christian kids are harassed, that they attempt suicide, that they are thrown out of their homes for their Christianity, that they are bullied by their peers because they are Christian. I don't see that.

1	And I totally share your frustration
2	because I keep hearing from the other side about
3	speech, which we all are in agreement about. This is
4	not about speech. I think we have said it many, many
5	times and I don't know how else to say it. This is
6	really about serious infringement on these people's
7	lives.
8	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The Chair recognizes
9	Commissioner Kirsanow.
10	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I think this
11	question is probably best directed toward either Mr.
12	Sasser or if Professor Eastman wants to jump in.
13	This is an issue that I think all
14	panelists have resolved and agree want to be
15	addressed. Everybody wants to address the issue. But
16	I think there's at least a tertiary inquiry.
17	First is the jurisdictional standards,
18	then whether or not in terms of remedial efficacy,
19	such standards should emanate from the federal or
20	state or local school district, and then third,
21	presumably you get from the first two what is the
22	standard that should be applied.
23	And when we talk about harassment, what
24	I see in the jurisprudence, it seems as if the
25	harassment standards have evolved or emanated from

the Title VII sexual harassment standards that originally began in the private sector. Now they are also applicable to public sector employment, but again it's employment.

Is that in fact the right standard, even in public employment, to be had, when we have in terms of schools a certain pedagogical imperative. If you look at New Hampshire v. Sweezey, the Supreme Court has recognized that we hold institutions of higher learning, for example, to a different First Amendment standard.

We want to encourage the free flow of ideas. If certain types of speech, even within a certain penumbra, and I very seldom use that term, are prohibited or circumscribed, as much as we want to do so, does that then impede the free flow of ideas?

And Mr. Sasser, do you find in your litigation a different, not necessarily a heightened standard, but a different standard that is applied both prudentially and jurisprudentially in the educational environments?

MR. SASSER: Well, what I would say is that the educational environment is the key place for the marketplace of ideas and the exchange of various

viewpoints on a wide range of topics.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What I will say is that one of the things that really disturbs me about Professor Meyer and Professor Herek's testimony is that they seem to base everything upon the feeling of the hearer.

Well the feeling of the hearer can't be an appropriate standard because that's tantamount to a heckler's veto, which is that someone in the crowd is so upset and incensed about what is said, they have such an emotional response internally, that we have to shut down the speaker. We don't shut down speakers because there happens to be a visceral reaction negative, even deep negative or а а reaction, in the hearer.

And what I will finally say, and then I'll turn it over to Professor Eastman, is this, that the Supreme Court was very clear that we have to be careful not to strangle the free mind at its source, and that's in our educational system, that freedom of speech is something that is so important that we are going to tolerate things that we wouldn't want to tolerate necessarily in our own living room, but we are going to have to in the schools, because that's where the speech rights are beginning, as our students are learning.

there obviously are going to 1 things that are age-inappropriate that's for students 2 3 not to be discussing, certain sexual topics, students 4 obviously shouldn't be exposed to or talking about at 5 very young ages in elementary school kindergarten, shouldn't be sex education or sexual 6 discussions there, obviously. 7 8 But for the most part students need to 9 be free to disagree amongst themselves in respectful ways, in ways during non-instructional time that do 10 11 not disrupt the educational environment. That's what the law is. It's very clear. 12 13 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Professor Eastman to 14 be brief and then Commissioner Titus will have the 15 last question. 16 EASTMAN: Sure, and I think it's 17 important to see how the speech and the concept things overlap, so let me address when students come 18 19 school wearing t-shirts that say homosexual 20 conduct is a sin, or take the religious connotation out, homosexual conduct is immoral, or homosexual 21 22 conduct is against nature. 23 And a number of students wear that, and

then somebody pushes one of the students who has self-identified as gay and lesbian, that conduct then

24

results in the normal sanction by the school officials, to the bully who did the pushing who crossed over the line into violence.

But the message is then taken as part of the hostile environment, that ups the ante on what the school district's response has to be, and that's where the danger starts that Vice Chairman Thernstrom talked about, the danger into speech sanction or speech censorship because that becomes part of the backdrop that creates hostile environment. That's not just the discrimination by school districts that we are treating the conduct differently. That's covered by the civil rights statutes, but the consequences of that broader message that might be there, leading to the hostile environment claim, provides the direct connection with speech and that's where the danger is.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you Professor Eastman. Commissioner Titus, you have the last question.

COMMISSIONER TITUS: Thank you. Mr. Clegg, I just seem to keep going back to you but I can't help it. You argue that one of the reasons we don't need a federal policy is that our schools don't have entrenched policies against sexual minority

students. Well, I would like to ask Ms. Byard, what about the benign neglect or turning a blind eye or neutrality policies, those aren't specifically antiminority, sexual minority students, but aren't they part of the problem?

MS. BYARD: If that scenario were true, and schools responded when conduct crossed the line into bullying and physical violence, we would not be here today. That is not what is happening.

Schools are not responding in a way sufficient to protect the educational access, physical well-being and emotional well-being of young people who are facing violence and harassment every day.

The conduct we are talking about as bullying involves the definition, involves fear of physical harm and harassment that we talk about is severe, pervasive and objectively offensive in ways that keep you from enjoying the benefits of going to school.

I would also like to note, for the amount of time that we have spent talking about religious issues here, that the definition for which GLSEN advocates includes religion among its protected categories. We have no interest in chilling speech.

We want good schools where our children learn in a 1 way where they can participate and compete in a 2 diverse society and where everyone's child 3 is 4 afforded the same respect and opportunity. 5 But what we are here to discuss is the necessary federal response that would set a bottom 6 7 line standard for safety, for anti-harassment policies that protect young people on the basis of 8 9 race, religion, national origin, disability, sexual orientation, gender, and gender identity, and I would 10 11 not wish to withhold that equal protection from any child, because I want it for my own. 12 13 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you. Thank you 14 all. It is now 12:11. This panel is concluded. We appreciate the time and effort and the information 15 16 you have shared with us. Thank you. 17 We will be back and starting at o'clock sharp, so I ask all panelists for the next 18 19 panel, all Commissioners, and all audience members to be back in this room at 12:55 because we will start 20 promptly at 1:00 o'clock. Thank you. 21 22 (Whereupon, the above-entitled meeting went off the record at 12:12 p.m., 23 resumed at 1:02 p.m.) 24

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: We are back after our

lunch break. It is now 1:02 p.m. I want to welcome everyone to our Race and National Origin, Religion and Disability Panel.

PANEL 3: RACE/NATIONAL ORIGIN, RELIGION, AND DISABILITY

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: This afternoon's panelists are Paula Goldberg, Executive Director of the PACER Center, Helen Gym, Vice President of the Asian Americans United, Stuart Buck, Doctoral Fellow at the University of Arkansas, Kenneth Marcus, Executive Vice President of the Institute for Jewish and Community Research, Hilary Shelton, Senior Vice President of Advocacy for the NAACP, and Rajdeep Singh, Director of Law and Policy for the Sikh Coalition.

You'll each have seven minutes to make your statements. As I said earlier, if you weren't here, there's a series of traffic lights here that have red, yellow, green, so we all know what that means.

When yellow comes on, you've got two minutes left, and we ask you to wrap up with red. Yes, I'm going to be rude and interrupt folks in the middle of their statements, but I hope that won't happen.

1	Thereafter, we'll have 60 minutes of
2	discussion.
3	I now ask all the panelists to please
4	raise your right hand and swear or affirm that the
5	information you're about to provide is true and
6	accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief.
7	Is that so?
8	(CHORUS OF YESES.)
9	Let the record reflect they've all said
10	yes.
11	So, we will begin our questioning our
12	statements this morning with Ms. Goldberg. Please
13	begin.
14	MS. GOLDBERG: My name is Paula
15	Goldberg, and I am the Executive Director and Founder
16	of PACER Center, a national parent center in
17	Minnesota that provides information and resources to
18	parents of children with all disabilities.
19	PACER began its national bullying
20	prevention center six years ago, after receiving
21	numerous calls from parents about their children with
22	disabilities being bullied.
23	PACER's National Bullying Prevention
24	Center has since expanded to serve all children, and
25	PACER is also the founder of National Bullying

Prevention Month, which is in October.

I would like to thank members of this Commission for inviting me today, and I would also like to recognize Commissioner Dina Titus for her being an advocate for her entire career in Nevada for people with disabilities. And the Nevada Parent Information Center has also partnered with PACER on bullying issues.

I want to begin by sharing just several stories about children with disabilities. A month ago, I personally received a call from a mother who has two sons with Asperger's Syndrome. She shared a horrific story of three years of bullying and harassment against her sons and their family by 15 to 20 teenagers.

The teenagers damaged the family home on many occasions, including one incident where five dozen eggs were thrown against the house the night before the funeral of the grandsons' -- their grandmother.

The teens also left feces on the steps of the house with a threatening note. When one of the sons went on his first date, the teens hung bloody tampons all over the car. The son has not dated since.

1	The bullying also occurred at school,
2	where one son was urinated on in the locker room, and
3	the teenagers also cyberbullied the sons. The
4	bullying was so pervasive that the son went into a
5	long-term depression.
6	The parent said that her family's life
7	has been changed forever because of the teenagers who
8	made a project to terrorize her two sons. She said,
9	"they took something from our family that we can
10	never get back."
11	The parent talked to a school
12	administrator who said that, if the family didn't
13	like the bullying that was occurring, the son should
14	leave the school, which they did.
15	The second story involves a 12-year-old
16	girl with epilepsy who attended a small rural school
17	where everyone had grown up together.
18	She had a seizure at school. The girl
19	was ostracized then by the entire school, including
20	the school staff. She was ordered to sit alone
21	during class and lunch.
22	When she would walk into the bathroom,
23	the girls would all fall down and imitate her
24	seizures. The girl's classmates would steal her

books and homework, lock her in closets, and draw

pictures of her having a seizure and then post them throughout the school.

After months and months of begging, her

grandma finally agreed to homeschool her. Since this incident, the girl has had no friends and is ashamed of her disability.

A third very short story involves a 15-year-old boy with learning disabilities. He was bullied every Friday. Why? Because a group of students called Friday "beat up the retard day."

These are just several examples of the hundreds of stories PACER has heard from all over the country regarding bullying of children on the basis of disability.

Research demonstrates that children with disabilities are bullied more frequently than their peers without disabilities. In one study, 60 percent of students with disabilities reported being bullied, compared to only 25 percent of typical students.

Another report found that children with disabilities were 10 times more likely to be bullied than a typical student. In response to these alarming statistics and stories, PACER has developed innovative resources to educate all students with information on how to effectively respond to

bullying. 1 PACER's elementary website, 2 kidsagainstbullying.org, was designed first, and was 3 4 so successful that, in 2009, PACER created a second 5 website for teenagers called 6 teensagainstbullying.org. 7 The websites focus on engaging bystanders to make a difference and have evolved to 8 include classroom toolkits which educators and other 9 professionals can download for free to use 10 in 11 educating students. 12 PACER's national bullying prevention website, pacer.org/bullying, includes links to all 13 these resources for parents, students, teachers, and 14 15 the community. PACER views bullying of children with 16 disability and all bullying as a civil rights issue. 17 18 PACER recommends the following: enact a 19 federal bullying law that enumerates the protected 20 classes of disability, race, ethnicity, national and sexual orientation and gender 21 origin, sex, 22 expression. 23 PACER recognizes that bullying knows no

boundaries, but that specific groups of students, especially students with disabilities, are more often

24

1	targeted than their peers, and there needs to be
2	prevention strategies to address their protected
3	civil rights.
4	This law should be incorporated into the
5	reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act,
6	and should include the following provisions:
7	
8	A) require training on bullying
9	prevention for school administrators, educators,
10	parents, and students. The stories that I share
11	clearly demonstrate the need for increased training
12	for professionals, so they are able to respond
13	appropriately when bullying incidents occur.
14	B) Establish a nonprofit center in every
15	state that can provide technical assistance and
16	resources to parents, professionals, and students to
17	prevent and respond to bullying. Two and also,
18	I'm sorry, and collect data on bullying incidents.
19	Two, incorporate bullying prevention
20	language into the Individuals With Disability
21	Education Act and state special education laws also
22	that bullying must be addressed in a student's
23	individual education program, or IEP.
24	Three, urge states to require bullying
25	prevention training to be included in teacher

1	preparation courses, especially for elementary and
2	secondary teachers and coaches.
3	Four, teach peer advocacy and support
4	skills to students in all schools.
5	Five, implement initiatives that are
6	school-wide, such as PBIS, which stands for Positive
7	Behavior Intervention Support, to prevent bullying
8	and creating a school culture and climate that is
9	safe and respectful and encourages positive
LO	behaviors.
L1	We recognize that bullying is a complex
L2	societal problem, and that there are no simple
L3	solutions. However, we believe we can prevent
L4	bullying by systematically engaging and educating
L5	students, parents, school professionals, and the
L6	community.
L7	We believe that we can and must prevent
L8	bullying. The end of bullying begins with everyone
L9	in this room.
20	Thank you.
21	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you, Ms.
22	Goldberg.
23	Ms. Gym?
24	MS. GYM: Good afternoon. On December
25	3rd, 2009, more than two dozen Asian immigrant

students were beaten in a series of assaults at South 1 Philadelphia High School. 2 3 The assaults began before 9:00 a.m., 4 when teachers reported groups of students roaming the hallways looking for Asian students. 5 one dozen students rushed inside 6 classroom, а and 7 assaulted an Asian student, reportedly beating him and throwing a desk on top of him. 8 9 Before 11:00 a.m., there was a rush of 20 to 40 students onto a hallway where immigrant 10 11 students took classes. While school police held the crowd back, teachers hurried students into classrooms 12 and locked their doors. 13 14 At lunchtime, Asian immigrant students 15 expressed fear of going to the cafeteria, but their 16 request to remain in their classroom was denied by 17 the school principal, who ordered them downstairs where they were subsequently attacked by more than 60 18 19 to 70 students, and security cameras showed other 20 students egging them on. Around 1:00 p.m., a group of three to 21 22 students dragged an Asian girl down 23 stairwell by her hair. After school, 10 Asian students 24

requested to remain in the building, expressing fear

larger-than-usual crowds that had amassed 1 2 street corners. 3 They were ordered outside and, although 4 the school principal offered to walk them home, she 5 quickly dropped from sight. 6 A crowd of more than 100 chased them, 7 cornered, and surrounded the students, most of them young girls, as 20 to 40 of their peers beat them. 8 9 At the end of the day, more than two dozen Asian immigrant students had been assaulted, 10 11 many more were terrorized, and 13 went to emergency room for treatment. 12 13 Afterwards, a regional superintendent 14 told the media that -- shrugged the day off as a 15 blip, and the District Safety Chief and school 16 principal reported that a minor incident had happened 17 off school grounds and no students were injured. As shocking as the events of this day 18 19 were, they were far from isolated. For more than a year, Asian Americans United, along with the Asian 20 American Legal Defense and Education Fund and a 21 22 number of community advocates, have been raising alarm bells increasing anti-Asian, 23 about antiimmigrant violence at South Philadelphia High School. 24

My own involvement began in October 2008

after five immigrant students were severely beaten in the subway by dozens of their classmates. Twenty Chinese youth met with community leaders and requested their involvement.

Over the ensuing months, we documented dozens of incidents from multi-student assaults to random beatings, threats, and intimidation, racial slurs, and near-constant harassment and ridicule for students who are Asian and recent immigrants.

The harassment did not just come from students. Yo, Dragon ball. Hey, Chinese. Speak English. Those were some of the comments students reported that staff members said to them.

Staff members who also turned their faces away when classmates threw food at them in the cafeteria or shoved them out of line, a staff member who mimicked Asian students' accents in front of others, security personnel who failed to investigate reported complaints, or worse, refused to file incident reports unless students spoke English to them, and who failed to call for translation assistance for concerned parents and families.

As one student said, "as soon as we opened our mouths, we were treated like animals."

In response to the October 2008

immigrant students began organizing 1 beatings, raise their concerns. They formed a Chinese Student 2 Association. One immigrant student leader volunteered 3 4 on the school's Safety Task Force. 5 Community advocates and students met on multiple occasions with administrators and school and 6 7 district leaders about addressing the anti-Asian, climate, 8 anti-immigrant but the reaction we 9 experienced was stubborn resistance, denial, and delay. 10 11 When the December 2009 violence students did 12 happened, these the unexpected, They boycotted their school. 13 therefore. 14 For eight days, more than 50 and upwards 15 of up to 70 to 80 students met every single day for 16 eight hours a day to analyze the situation at their 17 school, document the violence, and work on solutions. They called for recognition about racial 18 19 and anti-immigrant bias against them, a responsible and responsive safety plan, dialogue among staff and 20 students, curriculum and, above all, moral leadership 21 22 from the adults who are charged to serve them. 23 In our 25 years in working with Asian youth in our public schools, many of whom are recent 24

immigrants, we have been repeatedly struck by the

failure of schools to recognize and address violence in general and anti-Asian, anti-immigrant violence in particular.

In the 1980s, Southeast Asian students were targeted in rampant violence at another Philadelphia public school. Even when one Vietnamese student had his neck broken in an attack, the school remained unresponsive to addressing anti-Asian bias.

Years of advocacy eventually resulted in the creation of office of multi-Cultural an Curriculum and the hiring of Latino and Asian-American curriculum specialists who provided curricular and academic resources, well as training for staff and schools.

Today, over the past decade, we now see that the district has disbanded its Asian and Latino studies curriculum offices, and its current antiharassment policy does little more than reiterate that students and individuals are prohibited from harassing others, rather than creating a fuller context for helping schools understand that.

One would have hoped that the attacks on December 2009 would have served as a wake-up call to address serious anti-immigrant, anti-Asian violence within the institution at the school.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Instead, school and district officials denied that the attacks against Asian immigrant youth had anything to do with race, failed to communicate with student victims and families, refused to hold adults in the school accountable, and even retaliated against Asian immigrant victims.

Through the rest of the year we

Through the rest of the year, we documented more than half a dozen continued violent incidents against Asian students, physical assaults that is, and more than a dozen harassment incidents.

As appalling as the December 2009 attacks were, it was the egregious conduct of school officials in the months leading up to that day and in the months following that warranted federal intervention.

It is this experience which has shaped our firm belief in the necessity of federal intervention in bias-based harassment at schools, and the valuable role that the US Department of Justice this collaboration with has in communities implement at South Philadelphia High School what we hope is a groundbreaking settlement agreement address bias in schools across the country.

But I would like to address the Commission around two central points. First, schools

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

and district officials bear responsibility for not 1 climate of 2 addressing a pervasive bias and This is not solely or even primarily a 3 harassment. 4 student-to-student problem. 5 Second, there is a difference between bias-based harassment and generalized violence and 6 7 bullying in schools, and each requires a different approach towards remediation. 8 9 The US Department of Justice settlement charged the school district of Philadelphia with 10 11 deliberate indifference, and here's how it played out: denial of anti-Asian, anti-immigrant bias. 12 13 repeated occasions, district On 14 officials denied that the targeted violence was 15 racial. They blamed a few bad apples, violent homes and communities, gangs, and a general pandemic of 16 17 violence in society. When community members raised concerns 18 19 about racial bias and slurs, their concerns were characterized as emotions and sensitivities unrelated 20 21 to physical attacks, or worse, as part of quote "an 22 Asian agenda," according to the school principal at 23 the time. There was a failure to investigate and 24

document incidences; district officials repeatedly

1	failed to investigate incidences of violence
2	documented against them.
3	Students who reported complaints often
4	found that those reports were dismissed, therefore,
5	as accidents, mutual fighting, or misunderstanding.
6	The district failed to translate
7	documents or provide students and families with
8	interpretation. Students reported that school
9	security did not offer translation assistance to
10	students who made complaints, and therefore, did not
11	investigate them, or only heard the perspective of
12	the English-speaking students.
13	School and district officials also
14	spread misunderstandings about English language
15	classes offered to students, referring to such
16	programs as a dynasty that "needed to be broken up,"
17	or implied that language services were special
18	privileges or desire for segregation.
19	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you, Ms. Gym.
20	Mr. Buck?
21	MS. GYM: Oh, I'm sorry.
22	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: It's okay. Well,
23	we'll come back and ask you some questions, so.
24	Thank you.
25	MR. BUCK: Thank you. I'm Stuart Buck,

a doctoral fellow at the University of Arkansas, and I wrote the book, <u>Acting White</u>. It was published by Yale University Press last year. So I was asked to talk about the "acting white" criticism as a possible form of intra-racial bullying.

First of all, what is acting white?

"Acting white" is when a black student accuses a

fellow classmate of "acting white" or trying to be
white because of that classmate's behavior.

And that behavior could include schoolwork, showing too much excitement about schoolwork or studying too hard, but it can also include cultural patterns of behavior such as how someone dresses, how they talk, what sort of music they listen to, and the like.

There is a recent example that made the newspaper in Norfolk, Virginia. Ixavion Wright graduated first in his class at Lake Taylor High School there. He told the local newspaper that he thinks "the `acting white' pressure influenced other students. They feel they're supposed to be cool, and cool is not supposed to be making good grades in school. As I've gone through my whole school career, people have called me white because I've made good grades and didn't conform to the stereotype."

Another example from Mesa, Arizona that also made the local newspaper, a girl named Alexandra Gray said, "All my life, I've been accused of `acting white.' Just because you are articulate or take AP classes, kids want to say that, but I'm only being me. I'm only being myself."

And another incident from Florida, Clarence Stephen, the 2004 valedictorian at Seminole High School in Orlando, heard his black classmates say that he was "a white boy in a black man's body."

Now, these are just anecdotes, of course. So what about more systematic evidence?

I've found more than a dozen scholarly studies from 1970 to the present day demonstrating that the "acting white" criticism does affect some black schoolchildren, not all. To be sure, I admit it's impossible to find the exact rate at which "acting white" occurs. The rate surely differs widely, depending on the time and place, and many such incidents might never be reported in the first place.

But a few of the studies, one recent study surveyed 166 gifted black students in Ohio and found that two-thirds of them reported that they knew someone who was ridiculed for doing well in school,

that most students thought of "acting white" as being smart, and that most students defined "acting black" as being dumb and pretending not to care about school.

Ronald Ferguson of Harvard did a survey of 20 high schools in eight states. He found that, in integrated schools, almost half of the A students reported that they were sometimes or always accused of "acting white".

In a 1996 book, psychology professor Laurence Steinberg reported on the results of a multi-year study that surveyed some 20,000 high school students.

In his words, "we heard variations on the `acting white' theme many, many times over the course of our interviews with high school students.

As a result, many black students are forced to choose between doing well in school and having friends."

The most recent and systematic evidence from Roland Fryer, African-American comes an economist at Harvard. He found in a large and nationally representative survey that, while white students' popularity grew along with their GPA, kind of a steady curve upwards, black students with a 3.5 GPA or higher suffered a huge hit to their

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

popularity.

In his words, "A black student with a 4.0 has an average one-and-a-half fewer friends of the same ethnicity than a white student with the same GPA."

Now, to be sure, this study is about popularity in general, not about specific bullying incidents, but it does shed light on the unfortunate fact that academic success sometimes can be penalized by one's peers.

Now, interestingly, he found that the "acting white" criticism seems to have a stronger effect on boys, which possibly could help explain why black boys graduate from high school at a lower rate than black girls.

In his words, "Popularity begins to decrease at lower GPAs for young black men than young black women, at 3.25 GPA compared to a 3.5, and the rate at which males lose friends after this point is far greater.

"As a result, black male high achievers have notably fewer friends than do female ones."

Now, I want to emphasize and clarify that there are many students from all races who criticize nerds or geeks or who act in some way

antagonistic towards the world of school, and this has been an unfortunate kind of anti-intellectual bent to American life for many decades.

Fifty years ago, the sociologist James Coleman found in his book, <u>The Adolescent Society</u>, that in white high schools in Illinois, boys were prized for their cars or athletic ability and girls were valued mainly for their physical beauty, nice clothes, and an enticing manner, in his words.

So he found that "The adolescent subcultures in these schools exerts a rather strong deterrent to academic achievement."

And more recently, Laurence Steinberg, who I've already cited, found in his study of some 20,000 students that adolescent peer culture in contemporary America demeans academic success and scorns students who try to do well in school.

Still, the "acting white" accusation could be more devastating than the "nerd" or "geek" labels. One black scholar recently pointed out that a student who's accused of "acting white" is essentially being told they do not belong in the black race, and she even said, her emphasis, "`Acting white' is the most negative accusation that can be hurled at black adolescents."

So, as far as I know, there's been only one federal lawsuit alleging that the "acting white" criticism was so pervasive that it created a hostile racial environment in violation of federal law, and that lawsuit was settled out of court for \$150,000 as reported, and the citation's in my written statement.

As reported in South Carolina Lawyers Weekly, the plaintiff's lawyer said, you have a culture where to act like you want to do well in school is considered "acting white," and that's part of why we're saying that it was racial, even though the students were all the same race, because they weren't acting how the others thought they should be acting as members of that race.

So I guess the further question is, should the law be involved here? However you answer that question, I think the answer ought to be the same as your answer to the question of sexual orientation discrimination that was discussed this morning.

And I say this because, as I read the statutes, the statutory prohibitions on sex discrimination and race discrimination are exactly parallel to each other. They're practically verbatim, except that one says race and the other

says sex.

So if you think that sex discrimination should include discrimination against someone not merely for their sex in and of itself, but for displaying a particular pattern of behavior and preferences along with -- that's deemed inappropriate for that sex, then, likewise, it seems you ought to interpret the ban on race discrimination as including acts of discrimination, and it could be white or black or any other race, that are aimed at a particular student, not for the race in and of itself, but for acting in a way that is deemed inappropriate for that particular race.

So I think the answers to those two questions ought to be kind of parallel, just like the statutes are.

So that's all I have, and I thank you for inviting me.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you, Mr. Buck.

Mr. Marcus?

MR. MARCUS: Thank you. Chairman Castro, Vice Chair Thernstrom, and members of the Commission, it's a pleasure to appear before you today on an occasion where I cannot be blamed for anything that goes wrong here at the Commission for

once.

(Laughter.)

I have been asked to address harassment and bullying of religious minorities today, and I appreciate your including within this briefing the topic of religious harassment, an understudied topic, because I believe that any comprehensive approach to the problem of bullying and harassment needs to include a discussion of religious minorities.

Today I will urge the Commission to recommend that Congress introduce legislation that would prohibit harassment of religious minorities, which surprisingly still is not barred by federal civil rights law.

In my experience, the best way of understanding the problem of religious harassment is by way of examples, so I will give you just a few.

The first one that came to my attention when I was Acting Head of the Office for Civil Rights a few years ago involved a Sikh seventh-grade student in New Jersey who faced serious and repeated harassment at his school.

This included taunts of Osama, and a physical assault on the school grounds that resulted in head injuries.

1	In Pennsylvania, a Sikh eighth-grader
2	was called Bin Laden, told to go back to turban land,
3	and had his religious head covering yanked, again,
4	because students conflated his religious identity
5	with those responsible for the 9/11 attacks.
6	According to a 2007 report, nearly one
7	in five New York City Sikh students were harassed
8	because they were misidentified as terrorists.
9	Mr. Chairman, I hope I'm not swimming
10	too much in Mr. Singh's lane. There are many other
11	examples that could be raised.
12	In a different incident, a Muslim junior
13	high school student reported being beaten until he
14	bled at a Staten Island middle school.
15	"They punched me," he reported. "They spit in
16	my face. They tripped me on the floor, they kicked
17	me with their feet, and they punched me. And as they
18	were kicking and laughing," he said, "they kept
19	saying, `You F-ing terrorist, F-ing Muslim, you F-ing
20	terrorist.'"
21	This young man reported being kicked so
22	hard in the groin that he bled in his urine.
23	In another incident, students at a
24	different school allegedly yanked a 13-year-old
25	Muslim girl's head scarf and beat her. "They just

attacked me," she said. "They called me terrorist.

They called me Muslim. I am afraid that they will come back and beat me again."

Over the last few years, we've seen some schools that have had "Kick a Jew Day" on school grounds during school hours. Some of these events may have been inspired by a 2005 television episode called "Kick a Ginger Day" on the South Park television program, which has mutated into scores, if not hundreds, of facebook "Kick a Jew" pages, which have been enacted by dozens of students on some school grounds.

These incidents are sadly representative of a host of problems that were faced -- that we're facing around the country. In some cases, school administrators or law enforcement officials take prompt and effective action. In other cases, they do not.

What I would argue is that whatever apparatus that we have to deal with harassment of other minority groups, we should have the same degree of protection for religious minority students, and yet we don't.

There is a gap in federal civil rights law which has allowed these incidents to occur, and

this Commission can play an important role in fixing it.

To this day, Congress has never acted to prohibit religious discrimination in federally-assisted programs and activities such as elementary and secondary schools.

Title 6 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in federally-assisted programs or activities. This list of classifications has been expanded by legislation over the years to include discrimination on the basis of sex, disability, age, and even membership in certain patriotic youth organizations like the Boy Scouts of America, but has not been included -- has not been expanded to include religion.

Now, there is an exception. There is a difficult problem that arises with respect to what one might call ethno-religious groups, that is to say, groups that have both religious and ethnic attributes.

The Office for Civil Rights at the Department of Education has gone back and forth over this issue during the years. For most of the Office for Civil Rights' history, when it got complaints

from groups like Jews, it would say, I'm sorry, Jews are members of a religious group, we do not have jurisdiction.

In 2004, when I headed the Office for Civil Rights, I issued guidance which said that, if a group like Jews or Sikhs that have both ethnic and also religious characteristics faced discrimination based on ethnic or ancestral attributes, OCR needs to move forward. That policy was essentially disregarded for several years after my departure.

I'm pleased to say that in October of this year, Assistant Secretary Russlynn Ali included a very important provision in her Dear Colleague Letter which established once again that OCR will address ethnic or ancestral discrimination against groups like Jews or Sikhs. I think that was a very important development for which Assistant Secretary Ali should be commended.

However, that policy remains an informal guidance. It is not permanent in the way -- or durable in the way that legislation is. It could be disregarded by future administrations in the same way that the 2004 policy was disregarded between 2004 and 2010. Moreover, it has an enormous loophole for students who face discrimination on purely religious

grounds.

There is, I would argue, no reason why a school should escape any sort of overview or oversight on the grounds that the hostile environment that it permits is merely religious and not racial or ethnic. There are many other reasons why I think legislation would be appropriate here, and I would suggest that the written submission describes those reasons in greater length.

I would suggest that, while administrative action like Assistant Secretary Ali's is helpful, it is really only Congress that can provide the fix that's required here, and that this Commission can play a very important role by recommending that legislation.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you, Mr. Marcus.

MR. MARCUS: My pleasure.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: We'll come back and ask you some questions.

Mr. Shelton?

MR. SHELTON: Thank you, Chairman Castro, and members of the US Commission on Civil Rights for holding this important briefing and for inviting me to participate. The NAACP greatly appreciates the opportunity to voice our thoughts and

concerns on this crucial issue.

Founded more than 102 years ago in 1909, the NAACP is our nation's oldest and largest grassroots-based civil rights organization. We currently have more than 2200 membership units across the nation, with members in each and every of the 50 states throughout our country.

For over 15 years now, I have served as the Director of the NAACP's Washington Bureau, the federal, legislative, and national public policy arm of this organization.

For nearly 46 years after the enactment of the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964, and despite a number of groundbreaking laws since then, including the Voting Rights Act of `65 and the Fair Housing Act of `68, harassment and bullying on the basis of race is still prevalent in our nation today.

Members and friends of the NAACP know all too well the insidious taunts and harassing comments and bullies based solely on our race or ethnic background. Bullying and racial harassment ruins individuals' lives, decimates families, and can break apart whole communities.

Is it because of these ongoing problems associated with bullying that the NAACP is so

appreciative to this Commission looking at all the approaches being employed by the federal government, including the US Department of Education, the US Department of Justice. Bullying and harassment based on race, ethnicity, national origin, sex, disability, or sexual orientation is so damaging that we need an aggressive, coordinated response.

Furthermore, with the advent of new technologies, including cellphones, texting, emails, and social media tools such as Facebook and Twitter, to name a few, there seem to be new avenues for bullies to take in their quest to make the lives of others absolutely miserable.

As such, the NAACP commends and appreciates the US Department of Education, Department of Justice, and of course, Commission, as well as various other government and non-government organizations for aggressively pursuing the laws in an attempt to protect our children.

Yet, sadly, there always seems to be a case in which their efforts fall short. Take for example the case of Derrion Albert. Derrion was a 16-year-old junior and high school student at Christian Fenger Academy High School on Chicago's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

South Side when he was beaten to death.

Although the location of this beating was outside the school grounds, it has been reported that he had been bullied and harassed by the two opposing gangs on school property during school hours for some time.

Derrion's death serves as a tragic reminder of the dangerous and sometimes lethal repercussions of bullying and harassment.

I've been asked to give my opinion and that of the NAACP on the extent of the problem. Because many victims of bullying and harassment are oftentimes too frightened to come forward, suffice it to say that cases such as Derrion's offer proof that bullying is alive and prevalent in our nation's schools.

On October 26, 2010, Russlynn Ali, the Assistant Secretary of Civil Rights at the US Department of Education, issued a Dear Colleague Letter to schools outlining which actions would instigate actions by the US Department of Education or the US Department of Justice.

In her letter, Assistant Secretary Ali was careful to point out how -- and I quote, "that even when bullying or harassment is not a civil

rights violation, schools should still seek to prevent it in order to protect students from the physical and emotional harm that it may cause."

She went on in her letter to state to school boards, and I again quote, "that if an investigation reveals that discriminatory harassment has occurred, a school must make prompt and effective steps reasonably calculated to end the harassment, eliminate any hostile environment and its effects, and prevent the harassment from reoccurring."

Yet a careful review of Assistant Secretary Ali's letter demonstrates, and what the NAACP believes to be true, that punishment is not always the answer.

In fact, the NAACP firmly advocates a comprehensive or holistic approach to eliminate and discourage bullying, which not only educates the victims of his or her rights and helps him or her to heal, but investigates, determines, and eliminates the roots behind the actions of the bully.

Mr. Chairman, bullying and harassment is a real problem in our schools, and one that needs to be dealt with effectively. We need a response to this at the root of the problem if we are to completely eliminate it once and for all.

1	And because bullying affects individuals
2	as well as families and whole communities, we need a
3	response that allows input from all who have been and
4	might be affected.
5	Thus, the NAACP supports the
6	establishment of anti-bullying programs to put a
7	structure in place. That structure would, number
8	one, determine the extent of the problem, the damage
9	done to the victim or victims, and determine an
10	appropriate recourse.
11	Number two, offer support for victims
12	or victim or victims so that he or she or they may be
13	able to fully heal and move beyond the incident.
14	And three, provide the services to the
15	perpetrators and ensure that they stop their abusive
16	behavior while being mindful of their age and stage
17	of their development.
18	If the war on drugs has taught us
19	anything, it's that blanket incarceration and zero
20	tolerance can easily result in a racially disparate
21	implementation of the law, which only further
22	decimates our people and our neighborhoods.
23	Rather, the NAACP would like to see
24	school districts establish groups and committees made

up of teachers, counselors, administrators, as well

1	as community representatives and people from local
2	advocacy organizations who are familiar with
3	resources, whether they are educational, health-
4	based, or others, to help the bully realize the
5	hurtfulness of his or her actions and eliminate the
6	root causes.
7	I suspect the Department of Justice and
8	the Department of Education already have resources to
9	assist in the establishment of such groups, but if
10	not, we would certainly support legislation to assist
11	in the creation of such interventions.
12	Chairman Castro, members of the
13	Commission, I again that you for your attention to
14	this very important issue. School-based bullying,
15	whether it is due to an individual's race, ethnicity,
16	national origin, sex, disability, or sexual
17	orientation, is not only hurtful but dangerous.
18	As well, it should be eliminated if we
19	are as a society to reach our full potential.
20	Again, I thank you very much and look
21	forward to your questions.
22	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Mr. Singh?
23	MR. SINGH: Thanks very much for
24	convening this hearing. It's a privilege and a
25	pleasure to be here.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

By way of background, the Sikh Coalition is the Sikh-American civil largest rights United organization in the States. We were constituted on the night of September 11th, 2001, in response to a torrent of hate crimes against Sikh Americans throughout the United States.

The Sikh religion was founded over five centuries ago in South Asia, and it's presently the fifth largest world religion with more than 25 million adherents throughout the world.

Sikhs are distinguished by visible religious articles, including uncut hair, which Sikh males are required to keep covered with a turban.

Although the Sikh turban is a symbol of nobility and signifies a commitment to upholding freedom, justice, and dignity for all people, the physical appearance of a Sikh is often ignorantly conflated with images of foreign terrorists, some of whom also wear turbans and many of whom have received copious publicity in the mainstream media in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks.

As a consequence, Sikhs in the United States are ridiculed and stereotyped because of their appearance and subjected to bias crimes, racial profiling, employment discrimination, and school

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

bullying.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of offering In the course this testimony, are guided by a belief that we all children, regardless of religion, race, sex, disability, national origin, and sexual orientation have the right to enjoy a safe and healthy learning environment at school.

Our focus on the experiences of Sikh children is designed to highlight challenges and opportunities that implicate the fundamental rights of all our nation's children.

Now, in the course of the day, I'm sure you've heard of statistics which reinforce the fact that bullying is a severe and pervasive problem for many communities in this country. Our own studies, our own reports, are consistent with these findings.

A Sikh Coalition community survey published in 2007 revealed that 62 percent of turban-wearing Sikh students in the Queens borough, the very multi-cultural diverse Queens borough of New York City, experienced bias-based bullying, and that 42 percent of them had been hit or involuntarily touched because of their turbans.

A similar survey published last year found that 74 percent of turbaned Sikh boys in the

San Francisco Bay area suffered bias-based bullying 1 and harassment. 2 Now, what does this mean in human terms? 3 4 I offer to you the personal testimony, in their own 5 words, of two individuals who we have worked with in the last several years. One is Mr. Gurwinder Singh, 6 7 a young man from New York City. Again, speaking in his own words, 8 9 grew up in Richmond Hill, in Queens, and ever since I can remember, I've been treated differently. 10 11 "It wasn't exactly bullying that started in elementary school, but the other kids didn't look 12 at me very much. I stood out from the rest of them 13 14 because my uncut hair, tied in a topknot, made me 15 look different. "When I got to elementary school, they 16 17 used to call me an egghead. Loneliness just became a part of my life. After 9/11, things became much 18 19 worse. Kids called me names and would ask me things They 20 like, are you related to Osama Bin Laden? called me a terrorist. 21 22 "Once on the bus ride home, pulled my turban off my hair. I had to walk home 23 without my turban, and my hair was open, which was 24

very embarrassing. I was crying and wondering what I

could do."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

if that wasn't bad enough Now, for Gurwinder, subsequent to those experiences, one of his best friends turned on him, initially ignoring him, and then denying their friendship, but then ultimately leading a group of bullies one day as they chased Gurwinder through the city, eventually catching hold of Gurwinder and slamming his head against a metal pole.

None of the bystanders helped him. They just watched as Gurwinder began bleeding profusely and nearly passed out.

Now, in the interest of the time, as detailed more fully in our written testimony, our written statement, we have a statement from a mother, a Sikh mother in San Francisco named Upinder Kaur, who documents some of the experiences that her own son faced while going to school.

Among other things, he had his turban ripped off, and she said, in one of our surveys, that, "As a mother, I will repent for the rest of my life that I cannot bring back my son's childhood. I think every child, every child has the right to grow up in a much healthier environment and achieve their full potential."

Now, this is sort of a foundation for a discussion that we very much look forward to having about the need for federal intervention. The Sikh Coalition regards a safe and healthy learning environment as a fundamental human right for every child who attends school in the United States.

In light of our own experiences, in particular, in recent years with school officials in New York City, we believe that vigorous federal intervention is needed to hold schools and school districts accountable for their inactions and perhaps more importantly, their inaction.

Consider some of our experiences in New York City of late. Between 2007 and 2008, the Sikh community in New York City experienced a spate of brutal bias attacks against its children.

One student had his orbital bone broken at school. Another one had his turban set on fire by a bully. Two had their hair, which we're required to maintain uncut, forcibly cut by bullies.

Now, in response to this, our organization and a number of others undertook an effort to pass a Chancellor's Regulation, an administrative regulation in New York City that on paper is very strong and affords relief and redress

mechanisms to students who have been bullied, for whatever reason.

However, the implementation has been quite poor. We conducted a survey over the last couple of years of teachers and, according to our survey results, only 14 percent, 14 percent of teachers and staff surveyed said that the regulation and some of the training diversity programs that are called for under the auspices of that regulation are effective or very effective.

Only 31 percent of the respondents said that students in their schools received diversity training, as mandated by the regulation. And perhaps worst of all, according to Pat Compton, a former high school in New York City teacher at a Brooklyn, "Any staff training on harassment that my school did last conducted year was in lackadaisical, perfunctory manner." Okay, this is a former teacher speaking about the non-implementation of the Chancellor's Regulation that we had hoped would afford redress to students in New York City.

In the interest of time, we will defer our discussion of recommendations, but we look forward to having that discussion.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you, Mr. Singh.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

At this point, we're going to open it up 1 to the Commissioners for questions, concise questions 2 directed to a panelist. 3 4 The Chair recognizes Vice Chair 5 Thernstrom, thereafter Commissioner Yaki and Commissioner Achtenberg. 6 7 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, I have a 8 lot of questions, and I hope we'll be able to go 9 around several times, because I know I only have -- I should get closer to mine. 10 11 But I should start out directing questions to only one of the panelists, and it will 12 be to Stuart Buck. 13 14 This comes with a question and then a 15 thought after that question on my part. The question is whether there's any difference in terms of the 16 17 bullying you were talking about between integrated schools, you made your study, was it Roland Fryer's, 18 19 he looked at only integrated schools, and whether 20 there's any evidence that the same bullying doesn't go on in all-black schools. 21 22 But that leads me to a larger question It seems to me that a lot of what we've heard 23 here. that more school choice, 24 suggests

parents can send their children to schools where they

think the children will be safer. And where -- and 1 schools of choice are schools in which bullying can 2 thrown out and sent wherever, you can have 3 4 different state and local arrangements 5 bullies are sent and as to what kind of programs they're sent. 6 7 But so much of the testimony today seems 8 to me indirectly an argument for vouchers. So, I get 9 from my question -- what about all-black schools, which voucher schools, of course, could be, and is 10 11 there the same kind of bullying, to a larger point about, a lot of the testimony doesn't end up as 12 13 amounting to advocacy for much greater school choice. 14 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Is that for Mr. Buck? 15 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: yes. 16 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay. 17 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, anybody else can weigh in. 18 19 MR. BUCK: Yes, actually, Roland Fryer 20 in his work, and again, that doesn't deal specifically with bullying, it deals with the drop in 21 22 popularity among high-achieving black students, but 23 he found the effect was, I think, seven times greater in well-integrated schools, as opposed to largely 24

black or largely white schools.

And there are several other studies that have found kind of similar findings. In fact, the first study that even noticed the "acting white" kind of attitude was a 1970 book about a desegregated school. It was by four Arizona sociologists, and one student, for example, was asked, what pressures do you feel from the fact that you attended a desegregated school?

And he said, well, I participate in speech, and using the language of the time, he says, I'm the only Negro in the whole group. The Negroes accuse me of thinking I'm white.

And so the idea that some scholars have forth is that, well, to quote a couple of Michigan, is that high achieving scholars from students of color in racially balanced schools appear most likely to be accused of "acting white" because their enrollment in advanced classes puts them in constant contact with white students, and at the same time, there's a large number of students of color who are in a position to notice and comment on the supposed defection. So it can sometimes ironically set up a sort of clash where students might be forced to kind of pick sides, at least, so they feel. That's not to say that integration is a bad idea at all.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

It's just to say that this might be one aspect of 1 attitudes that might be 2 students' important to address and to figure out how to handle and to 3 4 combat. And as to your further point, I guess I 5 suppose I agree. I mean, it seems a lot of the disputes and clashes that go on in schools, from 6 bullying incidents to curriculum disputes and 7 forth, possibly occur because 90 percent of everyone 8 9 is forced into the same school, and with different clashes of values, people want to see their own side 10 11 prevail. And so if you had more of a freer system 12 for people to choose their own school, as is the case 13 14 in Belgium, for example, over there, it's been seen 15 as a way to allow people to sort themselves out and to find an environment that's more comfortable. 16 17 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, as opposed to choose the students, and that's not something 18 19 they're able to do, expel. CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Commissioner Yaki? 20 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. This is for 21 22 I know that you didn't quite finish your Ms. Gym. 23 statement. I think I know where you were headed, so let me see if I can help you get there. 24

What -- I'm curious as to what was the

nature of the federal intervention, and how 1 has its effect been on the Asian-American student 2 3 population at South Philadelphia? 4 MS. GYM: The US Department of Justice 5 on December 15th filed a suit, and then a settlement agreement, with the School District of Philadelphia 6 7 and the School Reform Commission. Among the things that we felt that were 8 9 covered in an important way was the establishment of an effective anti-harassment policy and procedures, 10 11 including timely investigations as well as it also required anti-harassment and anti-bias training for 12 staff and students. 13 14 It clarified issues of language access, 15 so, for example, like at the school, there's a huge 16 number of Nepali-Burmese students. The school 17 district has one Nepali interpreter in the entire 18 school district. 19 It clarified that language access required at the school, so they can use an online 20 telephone service, they can find other ways, they can 21 22 train other people. 23 Victim services counseling and were things that were recommended, 24 the that process

for perpetrators,

kicks

in

25

there's

but

nothing left for victims, and the appointment of an 1 independent consultant and compliance monitor. 2 3 In terms of what the impact has been, I 4 mean, the thing that I thought was most helpful is 5 that, at the school that we experienced, there was such a lack of clarity about what was -- when did 6 7 something rise to the point of being a problem? And even today, people still think that 8 9 it was not really an issue, this was a student-onstudent problem, you know, it was isolated, I didn't 10 11 hear about it. So, you know, to some extent, like what 12 we wanted to talk a little bit about and why we felt 13 14 that the Justice Department settlement was really 15 important was that there's a difference in some ways 16 between bullying among students and harassment and 17 how you handle bias-based harassment within a school. So, for example, harassment at 18 19 Philadelphia High School caused students to drop out, to walk in groups for their safety. Even though one 20 victimized, the 21 student was whole group felt 22 threatened by it. 23 Sources of bias go well beyond what bullying is, so it's not a personality conflict with 24 25 that child and another child, so, for -- you know,

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

peer mediation is a popular resource for conflict, 1 but wholly inappropriate for bias, physical violence. 2 3 punitive approach also fails 4 substantially address problems, because, you know, 5 things like racial verbal attacks did not rise to that level. 6 7 There wasn't an understanding that you can punish one individual student, but if whole 8 9 groups of students carry biased feelings towards 10 whole other groups that cause them to act in a 11 certain manner, then punishing one individual student on a case-by-case basis simply wasn't helping people 12 identify patterns of bias. 13 14 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you. 15 Commissioner Achtenberg, and after that, Commissioner Gaziano. 16 17 COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Mr. Chairman, thank you. 18 19 Earlier this morning, we heard a number of 20 witnesses express about federal concern intervention per se, and some speculated that the 21 22 laws that seem to authorize federal intervention, whether it comes in the form of Title 6 or the ADA or 23 Title 9 perhaps were, if not wrongly adopted, then to 24

the extent that they have been validated by the

courts as not being ultra vires, those decisions may 1 have been false. 2 3 I'd like to ask Mr. Marcus, Mr. Shelton, 4 and Singh, why your plea for federal 5 intervention, in your case, Mr. Marcus, when it comes to religious-based discrimination, Mr. Shelton, 6 7 your plea for protection of all groups, and your similar plea, Mr. Singh, about protections for all 8 9 groups and federal intervention, if that's what's required. 10 11 MR. MARCUS: Thank you, Commissioner I would like to stress at the outset 12 Achtenberg. that I am not recommending any federal intervention 13 14 on behalf of religious minorities beyond what 15 already provided for other groups. What I'm urging is 16 only equal protection for religious minorities. 17 would not require any degree of expansion of existing law, only the extension of 18 19 existing law to cover groups that are protected under many other civil rights laws but not under Title 6. 20 So then the question becomes, I think, 21 22 why is it important for religious minority groups to 23 have that same protection which other groups have? And what I would say is this. There are 24 25 many, many schools that have existing policies that

prohibit religious discrimination. That's widespread in the policies of school boards, of state education agencies, so on and so forth. It's also true with respect to accreditation agencies in the higher ed field.

The problem is that it is one thing to require teachers and administrators to refrain from

require teachers and administrators to refrain from discrimination and another thing to actually create an enforcement apparatus that will make them accountable if they don't.

And what I'm saying is that when you create an administrative apparatus that's available for some groups but not others, the excluded groups are not able to hold educators accountable when they fail to comply with policies of their schools.

COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Thank you.

MR. SHELTON: Commissioner Achtenberg, first, I'd like to clarify that, as we're talking about federal intervention, that we would strongly oppose any use of school vouchers as a tool of achieving this goal. I know it's a little confusing earlier on how somehow that kind of went into consideration.

COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: I am very shocked to hear that.

NEAL R. GROSS

(Laughter.)

MR. SHELTON: It's so good to see you, yet again.

(Laughter.)

Well, let me say that, quite frankly, that as we talk about federal intervention, we're talking quite frankly about the creation of programs to help students understand what's going -- we're talking about a very young age, students that are in grade schools and in our high schools that for some reason take exception to those they perceive as being different.

One of the commonalities in all the descriptions that we've heard here is that, whether it's black students seeing other black students as somehow acting more white, which is not compliant with the type of behavior they're used to or they expect within their schools, or other behaviors, other differences in students, most of the bullying described here in this place is bullying against those who are perceived for one reason or another as being different.

Creating programs to help educate students and actually help prepare them for the differences not only in their schools but in the

world is what we're talking about for federal intervention, educational programs that, again, help us understand each other better, and why this kind of behavior is so damaging.

I'm very fortunate that I have children from 7 to 16 that attend schools that put a lot of emphasis on diversity. They talk about how important the differences are between us and how we should celebrate those differences and not somehow ostracize each other because of that.

It is that kind of prevention, we believe, both by the federal government as well as programs that can be sponsored by non-governmental organizations that we'd see as being most successful in preventing the kind of bullying we're discussing today from occurring.

MR. SINGH: I share the sentiments expressed by Mr. Marcus. You know, we're not really looking for or pursuing an expansion of civil rights law. We're looking for parity with respect to the categories that are protected under existing law.

So, for example, religion is recognized as a protected category in the context of employment and accommodations under the Civil Rights Act. Similarly, it's afforded protection under the Hate

Crimes Prevention Act.

But beyond sort of the legal argument, rather, we believe that federal intervention becomes a moral imperative when local, state, school officials, as similar to the ones that I described in my testimony in New York, you know, when they become sort of lackadaisical in their sort of obligations with respect to protecting children.

I would like to add, also, that many of the arguments that have been made about the appropriateness of affording federal protection to students in the bullying context were made during the civil rights movement, in opposition to efforts to afford minimal civil rights that we enjoy now under the Civil Rights Act. So, that is a point that we would like to underscore.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The Chair recognizes

Commissioner Gaziano, and thereafter Commission

Titus.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Thank you all, too. And like in just the last panel, I would like to ask several of you questions. Maybe I'll get a second chance, but I think I'm going to address my first question.

Is it Ms. Gym?

NEAL R. GROSS

MS. GYM: Gym.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Okay. I thought your testimony was very helpful, and you're a very effective advocate. It's very chilling to hear the incidents recounted, although most of us on the Commission have read and heard them before, and quite frankly, this is why it's so helpful to me, in contrast, in the situation you described in South Philadelphia, it was physical violence.

There was actual knowledge, there was no question, there was actual involvement by the school officials themselves in discriminating and denying rights. It was absolutely objectively unreasonable by anyone's standard. It was pervasive, by the number of students involved.

And yet we asked for months for information from the Justice Department on what they were going to do, and we got a big goose egg.

Now, maybe they were really acting fast, and I expect since you're pleased with the final resolution, you are going to be less likely to -- but I read some of the news reports, and it seemed like there was a lot of impatience in the community, and one of the -- it is undoubtedly the federal government's role to serve as a backstop to enforce

1	the non-discrimination where there really is
2	bullying, but here are my two concerns, and I wonder
3	if you could address them.
4	One is that, when you call everything
5	bullying, you kind of dumb down real bullying. And
6	secondly, whether it really will distract the federal
7	government from moving swiftly in incidents like
8	yours, or if there was a situation similar to what
9	PACER has described for disabled that are equally
10	chilling, if they are told that they really need to
11	police teasing that some people consider or
12	wearing t-shirts that someone doesn't like.
13	How long did the investigation run? How
14	many months was it before you got some sort of
15	response back from the Justice Department?
16	MS. GYM: We filed on January 19th, and
17	federal investigators were at the school beginning
18	their interviews by the end of February. So I'm not
19	really familiar at all with any federal processes of
20	any sort, so this was our first experience.
21	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: And when was the
22	final settlement?
23	MS. GYM: The final settlement was in
24	December of 2010. There was a letter of intent

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I'm sorry, I'm not sure what the exact title was,

that was delivered to the school district in the summer that indicated that they had found -- a finding of merit, that's right, a finding of merit toward the school district in the summer.

The school district began to move once the finding of merit was delivered to them, and then began to -- for example, they passed a brand-new harassment policy. They replaced the principal of the school. They hired a consultant to work with them. They presented different programs that they had done.

And I think that that might have -- I don't know -- what we were worried about is that we weren't sure how complicated that made it for the federal government.

And what we were trying to present to them was that the essential issue of harassment within the school, of training for students, I think that they did that for literally five minutes. They had a five-minute training for students on harassment, and then another one that followed up at ten minutes.

So that those were not valid, they weren't sincere efforts, that there was a real need to take a look at harassment and not to kind of gloss

over it, and that the school district's harassment policy itself was deeply flawed because it essentially reiterated the Fourteenth Amendment, which just said, please don't harass anybody based on their race.

So, you know, it was hard for us to understand what -- exactly what the process was happening, and what I'd like to commend the US Department of Justice for a bit is that they were in contact with us.

We were deeply afraid that once we filed with them in January that we would hear nothing back from them ever at any point in time, and you know, we would just write it off.

But they ended up collaborating with the state Human Relations Commission where we also filed another -- a separate complaint as well just in case things weren't -- you know, we weren't sure what was going to happen.

And they ended up collaborating and collapsing the settlements agreements together. They had a little -- a stronger statement actually from the State Department of Human Relations in terms of their findings. But, you know, the settlement agreement is the same.

1	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Thank you.
2	MS. GYM: Thank you very much.
3	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you. The Chair
4	recognizes Commission Titus, who will be followed by
5	Commissioner Heriot. Then I'll recognize myself and
6	then Commissioner Kirsanow, and then Commissioner
7	Yaki.
8	COMMISSIONER TITUS: Thank you, Mr.
9	Chairman.
10	I'd like to address my question to Ms.
11	Goldberg, and it's kind of a continuation of
12	Commissioner Achtenberg's question earlier.
13	As you mentioned, statistics show that
14	students with disabilities are more likely to be
15	harassed and bullied than students under any other
16	protected class, and yet we probably hear less about
17	that in the press and from policymakers.
18	You went on to say that, kind of because
19	of that, you support federal legislation to address a
20	problem with things like teacher training, data
21	collection, school sensitivity programs.
22	Now, I know from experience in Nevada
23	that you work with non-profits at a state level, and
24	also with state legislatures, and yet you see the
25	need for and value of federal legislation.

I wonder, do you agree with Mr. Singh that not only is it better policy to have a federal standard instead of a patchwork of different definitions and also results in better enforcement, but it is a moral imperative?

MS. GOLDBERG: I believe it's a moral imperative. I think it's so pervasive, we hear about disabilities, children with but we hear about children with any issue, we had 800,000 people, students, visit our website last year. young girl who said she was thinking of committing suicide. She went on our website for teenagers and changed her mind.

So it's kids with disabilities, it's all kids, it is so pervasive that indeed it is a moral imperative.

The harm that's happening to these kids, you talk about mental health issues, these kids end up with mental health issues, 160,000 kids drop out of school every day because they've been bullied. Children end up with so many issues their entire life. The story I told about the family, their life has been changed forever. So, yes, I agree that we need federal legislation, we need it across -- I think we have 45 states that have their own laws, but

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

it is not working.

We wouldn't be here today, you wouldn't have this hearing today, if it was working. It's not working. Therefore, we need something consistent.

With kids with disabilities, we passed the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act 30-some years ago. States had their own, but we needed a federal law to protect children, to educate children, to have positive outcomes. That's why we need a federal law across the country. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you. The Chair recognizes Commissioner Heriot.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Thank you. I would like to ask the rest of the panel to comment on something that Mr. Shelton mentioned. Some civil rights organizations, and I believe the NAACP is among them, have taken the position, not with regard to bullying generally, but rather that there's a problem with excessive school discipline across the board.

Too many expulsions, too many suspensions in schools. And I'd have to say I agree with Mr. Shelton when he sees concern about zero tolerance rules. I think they're a big problem and I believe very much that federal intervention here

creates an incentive to zero tolerance rules.

I guess I don't agree — if we're talking about outside the area of zero tolerance rules — that there's a problem with excessive school discipline. I guess my question here has to be, you know, it seems to me that part of the solution has to lie with more disciplining, yet what I'm hearing, from most of the witnesses, is not a call for more discipline but a call for more sensitivity training.

I think there was some mention of more multi-cultural curriculum decisions. Is it possible to control this problem without tougher discipline, and is it possible to use proper discipline under the jurisdiction of the federal government.

Doesn't the federal intervention make it more difficult for teachers and principals to use the kind of discretion that's necessary to control real bullying.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Whoever feels comfortable, I don't expect everyone to answer this.

MS. GYM: I can only speak to what happened in our case at South Philadelphia High School. So this school district in Philadelphia does have a zero tolerance policy.

It certainly has the highest number of

NEAL R. GROSS

1	persistently dangerous
2	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Zero tolerance of
3	what?
4	MS. GYM: Zero tolerance policy on
5	violence in schools.
6	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Violence is an
7	exception, yes. I'm against violence.
8	MS. GYM: That's exactly right. And,
9	you know, what we felt like with that, incidences of
LO	violence and harassment, that it was an easy crutch.
L1	We, after the South Philadelphia, after
L2	the December 3rd beatings they automatically
L3	suspended 10 students. We didn't actually know who
L4	they were, why they were.
L5	It ended up including two of the
L6	immigrant student victims who had actually been
L7	beaten in the melee. So it was a simple crutch for
L8	them, and then they wiped their hands and walked
L9	away.
20	So essentially they got, they changed
21	over the security staff, they put in \$700,000.00
22	security cameras and they suspended 10 students. And
23	that satisfied them.
24	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Should those
25	students have been expelled, in your opinion?

1	MS. GYM: The question was whether that
2	incident was investigated. I would not argue that
3	students should not be punished for, especially in
4	the situation that we were seeing at the school, that
5	it was the
6	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Would you argue
7	that they should have been expelled? There should
8	have been more punishment. CHAIRMAN CASTRO:
9	Commissioner, we're going to
10	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: There should have
11	been more punishment?
12	MS. GYM: I'm saying that there should,
13	it certainly exists, discipline and punishment for
14	students who are doing that. But, the larger issue
15	of tackling, really what we felt was rampant anti-
16	Asian, anti-immigrant bias at this school, was not
17	addressed and instead the simple crutch of relying
18	upon a handful of expulsions, give you a couple
19	thousand dollars in security cameras, and then we're
20	done, we can walk away.
21	That is not effective either. And it's
22	all too simple, I think, and something that people
23	
	lean on. So we got a lot of reactions from a lot of

whole school, find them out. But it's a lot more

complicated than that. 1 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I think a lot of 2 3 people are taking an opposite position. 4 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you, 5 Commissioner Heriot. I will take the mic at this point. Thank you for your question, we'll come back 6 7 at the end, again. 8 Mr. Singh had mentioned that the Chancellor's policy was great on paper, but 9 enforced or implemented properly. 10 You mentioned 11 that, Ms. Gym, that there were procedures training and policies that were put in place and then 12 13 there was also requirements for language access. 14 My question is, in terms of the language 15 access aspect of this, while there may be something 16 good on paper, what is the actual practical effect of 17 making these policies, procedures, and trainings accessible to individuals who are English proficient 18 limited? 19 20 And the flip side to that is to the extent any of your organizations have anti-bullying 21 22 materials web sites, to what extent do you make those 23 accessible for folks who limited English are proficient? 24

GYM:

25

Ultimately that change, the

changes that we've seen at the school, that story isn't going to ever be told through the courts or through settlements or policies or things like that.

The most dramatic change that we've seen is that there's been an incredible group of students who were once victims became very organized around these issues.

They now go out and work with other students at other schools and talk to them and have done workshops around the country. So, you know, for us, the language access, the thing that was very crystal and helpful was that the Department of Justice was crystal clear about what the District's and that school's obligations were for language.

So that they must use language line if an Interpreter is not available. The school district actually agreed to train half of its bi-lingual counseling force, which is not, it's a kind of a flexible position, shall we say.

But they agreed to train them into formal interpretation, how to become a formal interpreter. So that they, it wasn't just a matter of someone at the school who spoke the language, but someone who had been formally trained, who actually knew how to interpret, particularly in a disciplinary

situation or if there were consequences or 1 student is reporting violence against them. 2 3 The school, by having and working with a 4 consultant, actually not just leading up to this 5 school district, the Department of Justice allows some flexibility for the schools to determine how 6 7 best to share the information with a broader school. But the harassment training is for the 8 students and the staff. It feels like there's a lot 9 responsiveness and responsibility that 10 11 school is conscious of. 12 We also have a brand new Principal, which has made a big difference as a result of the 13 14 work. He's been much more conscientious about 15 language access and being concerned that translation 16 is done effectively. 17 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The Chair recognizes Commissioner Kirsanow, and thereafter, Commissioner 18 19 Yaki, Vice-Chair Thernstrom and Ms. Tolhurst. 20 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Commissioner Heriot actually asked most of 21 22 what I wanted to address. What strikes me is we have 23 the issue with respect to definition. I've heard a considerable 24 amount 25 testimony and there's been, no fault of your own, I

think this is a definitional issue that's pervaded 1 all panels on the entire issue. 2 3 We have a spectrum. We have bullying, 4 or maybe teasing, bullying, harassment, violence and 5 some of those things kind of overlap. Ms. Gym, your testimony especially struck me, insofar as there were 6 7 10 suspensions of students for actions that, based on what you describe, would normally land people in jail 8 9 for a considerable period of time. These were criminal acts. I'm struck by 10 11 the fact that the only punishments were suspensions. Did anyone actually end up serving jail time for 12 assaulting, battering, it seems to me almost, you 13 14 know, a battery with intent to commit grievous bodily 15 harm, if not death? Any jail time at all? 16 MS. GYM: It also strikes 17 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: me, that I didn't hear in your testimony, any kind of 18 19 repercussions, other than possibly the firing of a Principal — I'm not sure she was fired — toward 20 the staff that would normally happen in any kind of 21 22 functional environment. was clearly dysfunctional. 23 This Ιt seems to me some of these staff members should have 24

not just been fired, but should have private causes

of action against them in tort for permitting this negligent conduct. Was any of that, did any of that occur?

MS. GYM: No.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The Chair recognizes
Commissioner Yaki.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I have a question for Messrs. Marcus and Shelton and Singh. I think I know what the answer would be for Ms. Gym, from the testimony already and should just go over and testify as well, Mr. Buck, I don't think this is in your wheelhouse.

But, in testimony this morning, there was much ado by some who criticized the notion of expanding the protections of, against bullying to members of the LGBT community because, quote/unquote, it's really local discretion.

And it could be better handled at a local level, we don't need the federal government coming in to deal with this. I'd like your opinion, as people who've dealt with this issue for quite some time, about whether you believe that bullying is an issue that should just be handled locally with their own thing or why you believe, instead, in a federal policy that deals with the issue.

[Unofficial discussion re speaking into the microphone . . .]

MR. MARCUS: Commissioner Yaki, I would distinguish between those forms of bullying which also constitute harassment, and those that do not. To the extent that bullying constitutes harassment on a group characteristic, basis of collectively consider to be invidious, I would say that it is entirely appropriate for the federal government to continue to act as it has acted for several decades, and could step in, and to insist that if federal dollars are being used to fund an educational program, that those federal should not be used in ways that support activities that harass people based on minority status.

But, I would also say that the topic of bullying can be much broader and can include activity that does not address a minority, or which is not raised to the very high legal threshold for constituting harassment.

And in those cases I would say that I share a skepticism about federal displacement of the responsibility of local officials.

MS. SHELTON: I would just say that I think the federal government has a tremendous role

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

in helping to set standards and a clear understanding. I do agree with some of what Commissioner, I hope I'm saying your last name right, Kirsanow, said about --

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: It's a Klingon name.

(Laughter.)

MS. SHELTON: -- the differential in terms of definitions and interpretation. And I think there are many, many different definitions of interpretation. Whether it's just a childish behavior and when it's actually criminal behavior, in many of these cases.

We didn't make much of a distinction, quite frankly, in the conversation between forms of bullying that there are physical and violent, from the forms of bullying that are harassing and otherwise demeaning.

And I think we have to have those kind of national or federal standards to help understand at the local level. And I do, however, think that every community has its differences and that very well communities should be left to determine what is in the best interest, certainly, within the guise of those particular standards.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Mr. Singh.

MR. SINGH: I don't disagr

MR. SINGH: I don't disagree with much of what has been said, as a general matter, speaking in general terms, you know. To the extent that a student finds him or herself in an environment that might lead him or her to commit suicide, for example, on the basis of actual or perceived sexual orientation, your question had to do with, you know, extension of rights to people because of LGBT sort of characteristics.

That's unacceptable and that seems uncontroversial to us. And so as we vigorously pursue extension of protection to students in respect of religion, it would be sort of intellectually, morally inconsistent for us to withhold those sorts of protections to LGBT students, you know, subject to some of the issues that have been raised earlier about definitions and this sort of thing.

But, in general terms, that's where we stand on that particular issue.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The Chair recognizes Vice-Chair Thernstrom.

VICE-CHAIR THERNSTROM: I have a question for Goldberg and, but I do have a preliminary statement first. I have been, I've seen

a lot of schools. I've seen some great schools.

And they are orderly, there's no bullying, there's no running in the halls, there's no fighting. There's no fighting in the playgrounds, there's no ugly language to other kids.

There's no sassy language to teachers. There is a general culture of civility in the school. But it all starts at the top, with the Principal, and that Principal insists that every teacher in every classroom, all day long, reinforces that culture.

And it seems to me that the description, descriptions, I should say, Goldberg provided and the whole Philadelphia incident, which I've been very interested in, are, you're talking about stories of failures of school authorities.

Of principals, of teachers of, you know, in the case of Philadelphia it went beyond that one school. And there is no solution to that, except allowing [inaudible]. And schools have been totally delinquent in the way that they train teachers.

I mean there's very little emphasis on the importance of civility to learning and managing classrooms. But, we've got to have schools in which principals are, in which principals have the freedom to look at the kids in their particular school, and

those kids may be a different group than the, you 1 know, a school a mile away. 2 3 And say, in this school, these are the 4 messages we need to deliver. These are the kids that 5 we need to work with and we need to work closely with 6 them. 7 And, my preference is that the schools and most of the grade schools I've seen are Charter 8 9 schools — my preference is that these principals and these teachers be able to save your child. It's your 10 11 choice if they want to be in the school or not. You can't go along with this, you can't 12 13 go along with our culture of civility. But I know 14 this isn't a school you want to be at. So choose. 15 And in regular public schools, that is not possible. 16 And moreover, when Commissioner Kirsanow 17 said, well, was anybody let go in the Philadelphia schools, in that Philadelphia school, no. Letting go 18 19 of a teacher is, you know, the teacher has to engage, 20 they're not going to break the child or something. I mean it is really, if a teacher has 21 22 tenure, it's really difficult to get rid of them. it's my little speech in my, 23 Anyway, you disagree. 24

Ι

think

GOLDBERG:

MS.

25

every

that

student and every school has to be safe. You have to have a safe school in a climate that has respect for everyone. So I agree with you and I think leadership is important at the level of the Administrator.

And I think we have a way to go to

change that. So I do agree with you in many ways. I think there are excellent public schools out there.

And one of the things I recommended was positive behavior intervention supports.

There's a noted researcher, a professor,

George Sugai, and he has done amazing work in

building that respect. And he talks about a

triangle. And there are a few children at the top.

And you build that respect, and he doesn't say label bully, the kids who are bullied, because they also have issues. So you build that respect all the way through the school, and you provide some more intensive help for those kids who are having problems, who are the bullies, or who have been bullied.

So there are ways that have been noted by a number of years of research that we can do to improve our schools. So, thank you for bringing that up.

MS. GYM: I have two quick responses.

NEAL R. GROSS

The first thing is, is that when people talk about South Philadelphia High School, they talk about it as a failing public school.

in which case, the focus overwhelmingly is test scores, academic on excellence, become better at what you are. that context, issues like how are we getting along? is there cultural conflict? Do we have space to even dialogue about what the problems are in the school? are completely off the table. When we met with teachers in March about fostering this dialogue and how students were creating the dialogue, they said, we're in testing season, we don't have time, this is too much time for us. We're stressed out, we're trying to do too much, now you're asking us to do something else.

So in a situation where the school has become so overly focused, or has somehow separated the notion that test scores are separated from character or that academic excellence has nothing to do with your values or things like that, then I think it's gotten a little wrong.

The second thing I want to point out is that both nationally and specifically in Philadelphia, what we're seeing is an increasing

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

concentration of immigrant students 1 within neighborhood high schools. 2 You know, the Urban Institute in 2005, 3 4 showed that 70 percent of English language learners 5 are housed in just 10 percent of elementary schools. In Philadelphia itself, three-quarters of immigrant 6 7 students are housed in just nine high schools. 8 That's largely to do, you know, in some 9 ways, because Philadelphia is an extremely choice-10 oriented system. And in a choice-oriented system, 11 there are some who can choose and some who can't. 12 And the ones who can't are typically going to be, well among those who can't, are the 13 14 immigrant students. They aren't served by charter 15 high schools, there are only four out of 61 charter 16 high schools in a 2007 study, one of which was ours, 17 that served 10 percent or more immigrant students within them. There's no money that goes to Charters. 18 19 The Charter school that we built, which serves 20 immigrant students, we have a mission to do so. 21 We have five teachers, a home school 22 liaison, a handful or tutors. We get no more money

There's no possibility for these

than a Charter school, that serves zero immigrant

students.

23

24

So we're seeing them come back to our schools. So if we know that the immigrant students in fact, that the there and, numbers are increasing, so at a nearby school the numbers have tripled in percentage of Asian students, immigrant students have tripled in the last three years, then why would we not train, approach it like, shouldn't it be shocking or surprising disappointing or frightening that people have bias. think it's like, people carry bias. You know, I People have uncertain interpretations when they meet somebody different and new.

Conflict shouldn't be scary. But what's wrong is when people don't help children negotiate conflict, help them learn how to handle and identify what is harassment? when have you crossed the line? when is it okay to say, gee, I don't like you and then I will pick up a baseball bat and beat you with it. I mean like, you, where, at what point do we say you should just know better? And I don't think we've taught them that.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The Chair recognizes the Acting Staff Director, Ms. Tolhurst, followed by Commissioner Achtenberg.

MS. TOLHURST: Thank you. My question

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

is for Mr. Marcus. Regarding religion, what do you say to the suggestion that your 2004 guidance and the current Department of Education guidance on Title IX, simply bootstrap a currently unprotected group, into Title VI protection.

And to be clear in your answer, can you please give us some examples of types of religious-based harassment and bullying which, today, would not be covered under Title VI, unless and until it's explicitly expanded to include religion.

MR. MARCUS: Thank you, I will start with the second part of your question. And what I would say is that, under current law, I believe that discrimination against a religious group that lacks ethnic characteristics is not covered.

Now, I'm not sure that I would want to go through, on a case-by-case basis about all of the different religious groups, but there are some religions that do not claim any sort of ethnic or ancestral particularity, but rather more of a universal characteristic and I think that is a large percentage of the students in the United States, who do not belong to such.

So I would say that most forms of religious harassment would not be covered. In

addition, I would say that, to the extent that there's a loophole, where religious discrimination is not covered if it's just based on the tenets of religious belief.

And I would say even discrimination

against Jews or Sikhs or others are not covered, if it's just based on what they believe, right. So under OCR's guidance, even if it's a group that has ethnic characteristics, like Jews or Sikhs, if you can't prove that it's based on their ethnicity, then it's not covered.

So when you have this sort of loophole, it makes enforcement very difficult. It's very difficult, in many cases, to figure out, well, why exactly did this one child beat up or harass another child?

Was it religion? Was it ethnicity?

It's a group that had different sorts of characteristics. So, as a practical matter it's very important to eliminate that loophole.

Now, if I understood the first part of your question, I think you're asking me whether the 2004 and 2010 OCR policies create a right that doesn't exist under the statute.

In other words, whether the Civil Rights

NEAL R. GROSS

Act of 1964 does not cover groups like Jews 1 Sikhs, and whether my policy and Russlynn Ali's 2 3 policy inappropriately extends that. 4 Now I've written extensively on that. 5 I've got, I've written an entire book on that topic, called Jewish Identity and Civil Rights in America, 6 7 to address that. also published 8 And I've academic articles to address it. 9 Let me try very quickly. The U.S. Supreme Court in the case of Shaare Tefila 10 11 v. Cobb, asked the question whether Jews are covered as a member of a racial group, under the Civil Rights 12 Act of 1866. 13 14 I answered yes because Congress intended 15 to protect racial groups in a very broad sense, and 16 that in 1866, the term race was understood to include 17 Jews and Arabs and other groups. Now, one might say, well, that might 18 19 have been true in 1866, but not in 1964. In 1964, Jews were not considered to be members of a distinct 20 21 racial group. 22 My answer to that is that the Civil 23 Rights Act of 1964 was not intended to create new rights against racial discrimination, but rather was 24

intended to create an administrative enforcement

apparatus to protect the rights that were already established in the Equal Protection Clause and in other parts of the Constitution.

And that to that extent, the appropriate way of understanding the scope of anti-racism protection in Title VI is to look back to the Equal Protection Clause, the 1866 Act, so on and so forth, and the Supreme Court has already done that work in Shaare Tefila v. Cobb.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The Chair recognizes

Commissioner Achtenberg, thereafter Commissioner

Gaziano.

COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Mr. Marcus, if religion were a protected class, let's say the, some of the legislation that's currently in front of the Congress were to be, that would specifically include religion, were to be adopted, what would be your reaction to a student coming to school wearing a t-shirt that said, Jews killed Christ.

And the reason that I'm postulating this hypothetical is we heard this morning that the issue of student harassment and intra-student violence has to be bounded, to some significant extent, by respect for the First Amendment, and with which I completely concur.

And it was further postulated that we can't, we can't inhibit students from expressing unpopular beliefs, or beliefs that might be motivated by their own religious affiliation or what have you, and I concur with that, as well.

I'm wondering what significance, if any, you would ascribe to such t-shirt wearing and where you draw the line in terms of protection of First Amendment speech and where you, where things bleed over into activity, shall we say, that would be subject to civil rights law protection.

MR. MARCUS: That's certainly a very difficult and important question, Commissioner. Let me start with the beginning of your question that referred to legislation that is now pending before Congress.

And Ι would that there is say legislation pending before Congress that does the important work of including religion within provisions requiring school districts or universities to prohibit certain forms of bullying.

But none of those bills that I've seen are enough, because none of those bills would require the use of an enforcement system, like what's used for Title VI.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So I would say none of those forms of legislation, as written, would actually be terribly helpful. I think it's vitally important that, if the solution comes through one of the existing bills, that those bills be modified with language similar to what was in Title IX, that requires the Department of Education to create an enforcement system comparable to what's used in Title VI.

Having said that, in your example I would say that, in my view, the t-shirt that you described that says that Jews killed Christ is protected under the speech clause of the First Amendment.

However, it is my view that the correct response of educators to protected but offensive speech is never to do nothing, in that educators need to know that, even if they are legally prohibited from regulating speech or punishing it, that's not the end of the inquiry.

Educators need to know that there are lots of forms of hostile behavior that require response from the educators. Often it should be an opportunity to teach students about civility, tolerance, so on and so forth.

Where exactly one draws the line is very

difficult. I would say that I think that the standard established by the Supreme Court in Davis v.

Monroe County goes quite some distance, although perhaps not far enough, to prevent the enforcement of harassment law in ways that would chill protected speech, and that less stringent standards create a risk that protected speech would nevertheless be chilled. So I think that the first step is to make sure that the appropriate legal standard is being used.

And I also think that educators, before they regulate speech, should try any other less intrusive alternative way of ensuring that their goals are met. But I would also say that there are others with greater expertise than I, including, if I'm not mistaken, Professor Volokh is in the room and may be able to address the First Amendment questions in greater detail.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: We have four minutes left before this panel runs out, so I'm afraid all the Commissioners who had asked for questions of this panel aren't going to be able to. I'm giving the last question to Commissioner Gaziano.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to ask Mr. Buck a hypothetical

which I hope will help explain to others that my concern with OCR's new guidance is not so much the new classes, suspect classes, but the extent of the children's behavior that they seem to be reaching.

In the situation where we have real physical violence, actual knowledge, you know, I want the Justice Department to swoop in and have a zero tolerance policy on violence and do what it takes to stop it.

But in the situation where we've got the "acting white," and by the way I believe your analogy works mostly, but not completely. I think you have the stronger case for racial discrimination.

I think the kids, at least, are discriminating. But in the *Davis* standard, where it must be severe, pervasive and objectively offensive, that clearly met in the South Philly situation.

The OCR standard is severe, pervasive or persistent. So here's my hypothetical. Every week a particular child is called whitey, a black child is called whitey or "acting white" by some member or whatever.

And the school could be set to, it should have had knowledge because they observe or could observe that he's never allowed to play in any

of the reindeer games with any of the other kids in 1 his cohort. 2 Would it be, you think, effective, given 3 4 the cultural norms that you've been studying, for the 5 DOJ or OCR Swat Team to swoop in and declare zero tolerance for any more "acting white," that there 6 would be immediate suspensions and expulsions. 7 Is that likely to improve the situation 8 9 for the top high achieving black students, or is it likely to possibly cut the other way? 10 11 MR. BUCK: Well, it's hard to predict 12 what would happen in that situation. I mean, you could imagine that it might help stamp out 13 14 activity, or you could imagine that some people might 15 view it as calling in, you know, a largely white 16 authority group from outside to come in and enforce more, kind of white norms of behavior. 17 And so it might cut the other way, 18 19 you suggested. So, yeah, personally I guess I am rather skeptical of turning every incident of kids 20 being mean to each other into a federal crime. 21 22 And certainly there are many cases where it does rise to that level of abusiveness, but I'm 23 not sure that, you know, it's going to be productive 24

spend the resources and time of the federal

1	government in every situation you can imagine.
2	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you all, I
3	appreciate.
4	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: We have four
5	minutes left, right?
6	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: We have 2:42, is the
7	time we're stopping and that's what I have on my
8	watch here. But I will start with you at the next
9	panel.
10	So, thank you on behalf of the
11	Commission for being here and want to commend you on
12	all your work and look forward to continuing to see
13	your work.
14	We would ask the members of the next
15	panel to please begin to come to the front, while our
16	staff changes the nameplates. Thank you all.
17	IV. FEDERAL/LOCAL ROLE IN BULLYING
18	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: We are now turning to
19	our final panel of the day. This last panel shall
20	examine the issues of the role that the different
21	levels of government, both state and federal, should
22	have regarding the issue of bullying.
23	On this panel we have Tammy Aaberg, a
24	Parent Advocate; Francisco Negron, General Counsel
25	for the National School Boards Association; Ken

Trump, President of the National School Safety and 1 Security Services; Professor Eugene Volokh, of the 2 3 UCLA School of Law; and Deborah Lauter, Civil Rights 4 Director at the Anti-Defamation League. 5 As with the past panels, each panelist will have seven minutes to make your presentation. 6 7 We have received your written statements and we've reviewed them. They are part of the record, so don't 8 9 feel the need to finish through all your statements, 10 as you saw the prior panels. 11 There will be an opportunity interchange. We will have thereafter a discussion 12 13 period that will run until 4:25 p.m. We hope that 14 will be 55 minutes, but it may be a minute or so off, 15 depending on how long we can get through our 16 questions. 17 So, with that, I'd like to ask 18 Aaberg to please begin. 19 MS. AABERG: Good afternoon, My name is Tammy Aaberg, and my 20 Commissioners. story, my son, Justin, died by suicide. 21 22 Justin hanging from his futon frame in his bedroom. 23 This was the most tragic day of our lives and a traumatic vision that will never leave 24

our minds. Justin was 15 years old when he died and

also happened to be born gay.

Justin was a wonderful very smiley kid, who loved to play his cello and compose his own songs. He loved his pet chinchillas and loved making sand castles at the beach and laying out in the sun.

Soon after Justin took his life, his friends began to describe what life at school was like for Justin. One friend of his told me that in eighth grade she saw him crying down the hallway and the Counselor came out and they found out that, well, at the time Justin didn't say anything, but then the friend, he told a friend the next day what had happened.

And when the Counselor called the friend down, to ask what had happened to Justin, she said things like this happen to gay kids all the time. But this time it wasn't just mental, it was physical.

And the Counselor just said, you know, thank you for telling me what happened, as Justin is at the top of my worry list, and then just sent her back to class.

And I never received a call that he was upset the one day, and I never got a call to say something had physically happened to my son.

I was very angry with the Counselor when

I first found this out. But then students, staff members, and parents began to describe how bad the school climate was in the district for LGBT students, as there's a policy in place which people refer to as a neutrality policy, due to the neutral position staff need to take regarding sexual orientation in curriculum. Unfortunately this policy, which is call the Sexual Orientation Curriculum Policy, confuses teachers and staff and they feel like their hands are tied, as they don't know what should or shouldn't be considered neutral.

I believe this is what happened with the Counselor. Once she heard the word gay, she didn't ask Justin's friend any further questions and I never received a phone call.

Also, the incident that had happened in the hallway was actually also sexual harassment, so if she would have, if the Counselor would have asked the friend more details, she'd have found out that these two boys had grabbed him in his genitals and, actually the police, I believe, should have been called.

In the months after Justin's death, I learned more about the effects of the school district's Sexual Orientation Curriculum Policy from

many students, and also a few supportive staff who noticed and felt the harmful school climate against LGBT students.

found out that this so-called neutrality curriculum policy regarding sexual orientation affected a lot more than just curriculum and is anything but neutral. tragic story after story of things that happen to students that had nothing to do with curriculum.

Unfortunately, I found out too late that we lived in a very homophobic area throughout most of Justin's life. It's so sad that the misguided intentions of some in the community have led to policies that are harmful to the young people in the school district who happened to be lesbian, gay, bisexual or trans-gender.

Even now, eight months of me and others in the community pleading with the school board in the district Justin died in, to please get rid of the harmful neutrality policy and to please get proper training for teachers and staff regarding addressing LGBT bullying and harassment, they still keep saying that this is not a problem in their schools. Many kids and staff members in the district know that this is not true.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

245 made regarding Many reports were eighth-grade student who completed suicide by her friends and some of the staff members who did grief counseling for students after Justin died, know that they submitted reports. I'm here today not only to tell you of my son's story, but also to make a plea to the Commission to please consider helping to pass a federal law that includes bullying and harassment for all K-12 public schools across the entire country. The law would definitely need to be an include race, gender, enumerated law to sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, socioeconomic status, and disability. It is not right that kids in one part of

It is not right that kids in one part of the country have laws that protect them more than others. And some kids really have any protections at all.

And if they do have a policy in place, it is not enforced. I believe the federal government should enforce that each school turn in a yearly report of the incidences of bullying and harassment being reported, to make the schools accountable.

I met other mothers across the country that have lost children to suicide. In these cases

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

many attempts were made by the parents to have the schools do something about the harassment that their child was going through, to only fall on deaf ears.

A few of these children include Asher Brown, age 13 from Texas; Seth Walsh, age 13 from California; Carl Hoover-Walker, age 11 from Massachusetts. These children are dead, my son is Justin is gone from this earth and I will never be able to give him a hug, see his smile, hear his beautiful cello playing or tell him I love him, because some people believed he deserved fewer protections than others. All of these children and too many others across the country all died too young as a result of bullying and harassment.

They'll be forever missed by their friends and family. Life for us will never be the same again without them. The current level of federal involvement in our schools is not sufficient.

I also want to mention that last night, as I was getting ready for bed here in D.C., I got a call from a teacher in the district that we lost another student last night to suicide, an eighth grader. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you. We can't imagine what you're going through and we appreciate

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

your being here and sharing this with us. 1 2 Negron. 3 MR. NEGRON: Thank you, Chairman Castro, 4 Vice-Chairman Thernstrom and distinguished 5 Commissioners, good afternoon. 6 My name is Francisco Negron, I'm the 7 Counsel of the National School Association. The National School Boards Association 8 9 is the national organization of state associations of I'm representing more than 90,000 10 school boards. 11 local school board members throughout the United 12 States. 13 Collectively, we govern approximately 15,000 local school districts serving the nation's 14 15 46.5 million public school students. Thank you for the opportunity to be a 16 part of the conversation on inter-student violence, 17 18 to share with you a little bit about the 19 perspective of public school boards and school districts. 20 into 21 Summed up one sentence, 22 perspective is that federal mandates are not the 23 solution, local leadership is. Federalizing the response to bullying by 24 viewing it solely through the lens of federal civil 25

legislation is, in fact, not the approach. Forty-five states have already addressed bullying question, passing the state statutes, requiring school districts to enact policies, implement prevention measures and report incidents.

As a result, NSBA has expressed, as a part of our conversation, our concern that the Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights' approach in their Dear Colleague Letter of October, 2010, is too broad. It confuses the legal standard and may, in fact, invite litigation against school districts.

OCR's position confuses the standards between liability and enforcement, making it more difficult for school officials to understand the requirements of the law.

You know that, in 1999, the Supreme Court ruled in *Davis v. Monroe* that schools could be held liable, under Title IX, for student harassment when the school has actual knowledge, but is deliberately indifferent.

OCR now advises school officials could be responsible if they reasonably should have known about an incident of harassment. Additionally, OCR says harassment creates a hostile environment which

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

is a violation of the law, if it is severe, pervasive or persistent, rather than the *Davis* standard requiring that the harassment be severe, pervasive and objectively offensive.

Even though OCR says that this is an enforcement, an agency enforcement standard that's been in play for several years, the confusion around differing standards is spreading and it doesn't lie solely with non-lawyer school officials.

Courts are starting to use the OCR standard, granting the Department administrative deference for guidance that has not the same weight officially promulgated rules under the as Administrative Procedures Act.

Just last month, in T.K. v. New York City Department of Education, a federal district court in New York relied on OCR's Dear Colleague Letter, saying that the letter's illustrations, and this is a quote, "of when a school is required to act and what type of response is required," under the law is "useful in applying the appropriate legal standard."

The court then melds the *Davis* standard on peer harassment with the OCR's standard to find that the district was not entitled to summary

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

judgment, upon its failure to provide the free and appropriate public education.

Now this is not a money damages situation under Title IX, but it suggests that some courts are willing to apply the OCR standard more broadly. It's too early to tell if a trend is developing.

Our fear is that Plaintiffs' lawyers may be emboldened by such an approach to pursue litigation against schools. So let me be clear, it is indeed crucial that school officials respond to incidents of bullying and harassment swiftly and appropriately. But nuanced legal distinctions can create confusion that detracts from an understanding of the requirements of the law and could have the unwelcome effect of chilling educators' actions, for fear of their own personal legal liability.

From a practical perspective, it could mean that educators may be reluctant to resolve what may be a routine issue of student discipline with the least intensive, least intrusive, although perhaps more effective approach, rather than risk a federal lawsuit.

Lastly, one very real concern for schools is the tension, as has already been

identified, between student freedom of expression and 1 the regulation of a hostile environment. 2 Students 3 leave do not their 4 constitutional free speech rights at the school house 5 gates, simply because their views are unpopular and anti-majority. 6 7 In fact, even Justice Alito, when he was 8 on the Third Circuit, has said that harassing speech, 9 even in a school setting, is not categorically denied First Amendment protection. 10 11 The challenge for schools, which OCR does not address in its Dear Colleague Letter, is how 12 13 to regulate speech that may contribute to a hostile 14 environment without overstepping those constitutional 15 bounds. Forcing schools to pick their poison 16 17 between threats of litigation for competing federal rights is not the answer. At best, it's a quandary 18 19 for educators who are not jurists. 20 That bullying and harassment are unacceptable in schools is clear. What is less clear 21 22 that federal mandates are the solution. We continue to support the call for research and data to 23 eradicate bullying and nurture positive learning 24

Thank you.

environments.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you. Mr. Trump. 1 MR. TRUMP: Good afternoon. I bring to 2 3 you 25 years of experience in working with schools 4 and in schools on school safety issues. I also am a 5 father of two young children and member of a multicultural family and one who has had bullying hit 6 7 home. So I have personal experience as well as 8 9 front line experience. I'd like to touch on several items that have come up during the course of the day. 10 11 First, the issue of the data. There are serious gaps in federal data 12 on school violence, in general, and school bullying 13 14 specifically. The federal violence data relies on 15 half a dozen or so academic surveys that are very 16 limited in scope. Data on bullying is also relatively new 17 and limited to academic research, organizationally 18 19 commissioned surveys, and various other limited data 20 sources, as far as the extent of bullying. We have heard words such as bullying 21 22 epidemic, bullying crisis. When we see the headlines 23 in the media and cable and local news, the words crisis and epidemic arrive very quickly, and I had a 24

Principal who shared with me earlier this week the

concern that bullying has become such a broadly- used term and buzz word, that it's really diluting the real chronic bullying issues, to the point where he's had teachers come in and say, Principals are bullying.

Principals are saying teachers are bullying. Parents saying everybody is bullying their kid, and it's not perhaps, legitimate incidents are not perhaps receiving the attention that they deserve.

So we have to exercise caution while not devaluing anyone's individual experience, but not to also legislate by anecdote and have roller coaster public policy and awareness in a broader issue of school safety.

Related to that, bullying needs to be viewed on a continuum and we have violence, we have, a continuum that includes verbal disrespect, physical aggression, fighting.

We have potential for school shootings, preparedness for terrorist attacks on school, staff suicide, student suicides, weather and natural disasters, large-scale fights or riots, gang violence, accidental gun discharges, non-custodial parent issues, stranger danger in elementary schools,

and the issues we face go on and on and on in that continuum. So a bullying-alone approach or a gangs-alone or school policing approach alone is not the best. It requires a comprehensive and balanced federal policy and funding in a comprehensive approach at the school-based level.

Definitions of bullying in Most schools, the vast majority of schools, focus on those behaviors that would constitute bullying with threats, intimidation, assaults, extortion, disruption of the school environment in their school policies and the laws that have been proposed at the state and federal level largely are very vague and general and are very much open to frivolous lawsuits, increased confusion within the school community, and less focus on the behaviors of bullying and more on personal characteristics of the victims.

And we need to make sure that we're very clear, so that those cases do occur that we have language that is very specific focusing on bullying behaviors.

We also have concern about the skewed federal policy and funding, which has largely been shifted almost exclusively to bullying alone. The

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

school climate is important but we also have to have a secure environment.

The child who is on his way to the office to talk to the school psychologist is not going to benefit if they have an unsafe and insecure environment where he's beaten in the back hallway on the way to the office.

So you have to have a secure environment and a positive school climate. The two go hand in hand and they're not separate and distinct.

We have eliminated, the Congress and the Administration have eliminated, the federal Safe and Drug Free Schools grant that helped the schools deal with drug and violence prevention, security and other issues. We've just eliminated the emergency planning grant, the only K-12 school emergency planning grant.

We're focusing in a very skewed manner on bullying. We need to make sure that we have addressed bullying, but also as a part of a comprehensive and balanced federal policy, as well as local policies within the schools.

At the local level, an overemphasis on bullying and an overreach by the Department of Education is a concern of Administrators. I had a school, a 36-year old veteran school Principal said

earlier this week, quote, As an Administrator it makes you gun shy to actually deal with the problem, when you first have to think about whether your decision will put you on the front page of the paper or get you and your district in a law suit."

I also believe, as been said earlier, that when there is that emphasis and fear of the decision making local level at the with Principals, the Superintendents, when they become one more on a political issue and the fear of lawsuits, takes away from dealing with the actually hand, their ability to made incidents at decisions and it could increase the over-reaction that we've heard under so-called zero tolerance decisions that have been in the news where we all shake our heads. So I think that the caution needs to be viewed in terms of making sure that there's not an overreach.

And we also need to look at mental health issues. One of the things I was pleased to hear this afternoon was the issue of mental health. Dave Cullen and Dr. Peter Langman, in a 10-year post-Columbine study, found mental health issues, not bullying, were the primary actions behind many school shooters.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We also know that the American Foundation for Suicide Prevention cites that 90 percent of all people who died by suicide, had diagnosable psychiatric mental health issues, and that we have not fairly given the great deal of attention to the mental health needs of children.

One father of a student who committed suicide in our area in Ohio said the bullying actually pushed his child over the hill, but mental health and family stress issues pushed him up the hill.

So we need, when we look at this, we need to look at the suicides, the mental health needs of children, as well. But I believe that we can take a comprehensive approach at the local school level, by dealing with bullying in five areas, supervision and security, and hot spots where it occurs, effective firm, fair and consistent discipline in classroom management, use of the criminal law.

I was amazed that the Philadelphia case did not involve any type of law enforcement interaction for assault, as well as civil law, which I can assure you does occur.

I get calls from attorneys for expert witness work every week. School climate strategies,

communication plans. 2 3 I encourage the Commission to focus it's 4 recommendations on the tools available to 5 schools, supporting the roles of school administrators as the lead persons responsible for 6 local discipline and climate issues, and to make 7 recommendations, most of all, that are practical, 8 9 day-to-day implications for schools in consideration of the broader social, political and special interest 10 11 issues that we've heard about all day today. 12 you, Mr. Chairman. 13 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you. Mr. 14 Volokh. 15 MR. VOLOKH: Thank you, thank you very much for having me here. I specialize in First 16 17 Amendment law so that's what I'm going to talk about. There are lots of other important issues 18 19 here;, I just don't have much to say about them. 20 won't speak to the federalism questions, I won't speak to educational policy, nor will I speak to the 21 22 questions of the proper way of dealing with violence 23 threats violence, which and of are clearly unprotected by the First Amendment. 24

mental health support for students and effective

I've heard many people at both tables,

25

earlier today, say that really this is not a First

Amendment issue. Everybody agrees that the First

Amendment should be respected, but these proposals

don't really materially impact the First Amendment.

I wish that were true, but it seems to me that if you look at what the actual material — for example, the Dear Colleague Letter from the Department of Education — says, it really is in considerable measure about speech. That what is labeled bullying and harassment are capacious enough to include speech, including speech that is protected by the First Amendment, and my question is what to do about it.

For example, if you look at the Dear Colleague Letter, it specifically talks about how harassment was defined to include verbal acts.

That's lawyer speak for speech or statements.

In fact, it specifically says graphic and visual statements. It expressly says that harassment needn't, that speech in order to be harassment need not be limited to speech at a specific target.

So it's not limited to personal insults that go to a particular person. It could include general statements, such as condemnation of

homosexuality, of particular religions and the like. 1 The letter specifically 2 refers to 3 creating emails or web sites as a possible vehicle 4 for what would be actionable harassment. Posting to 5 social networking sites is another example. 6 We heard Assistant Ali Secretary 7 specifically echo that in an answer to a question 8 this morning. So what we're talking about is a broad 9 vision of what is punishable harassment and so-called bullying. 10 11 The definitions are broad enough, 12 capacious enough, not just to cover speech, but to 13 cover speech 24-7. We're not talking 14 restrictions that are premised on some notion — 15 which indeed the Court has rejected — that free 16 speech stops at the school house gate. 17 There is no more school house Perhaps in part because of technology, it's true that 18 19 speech that is created outside school can certainly affect the environment in school and can even be seen 20 in school on people's smart phones and computers in 21

But, despite that, the reality is that the vision expressed is — as the Dear Colleague Letter suggests — that the students should be

the lab and so on and so forth.

22

23

24

punishable for speech throughout the entirety of their school lives, including perhaps their early adulthood.

Many high school students are actually 18 by the time they graduate. Now, what kind of speech is punished. As I said, it's not just speech that sets a specific target.

Nor is it limited to personal insults more broadly. It covers for example, gossip. So, the letter talks about rumors about sexual behavior — that's often cruel and crude, that's gossip, that's the kind of behavior that most adults engage in, (though I hope at a less vulgar level than some teenagers do.) But according to the letter, say somebody spreads sexual rumors, which is to say, and says, oh, I heard so and so is in a relationship with this and such. Post it, save it to their Facebook page or send an email about it, that could be actionable harassment. Or at least could become part of that actual harassment if it is decided that it's severe, persistent or pervasive.

Another example from Ms. Graves' testimony from earlier, the written testimony from earlier today, had to do with Facebook insults of a pregnant student. Now, I'm certainly not in favor of

insulting mothers, pregnant or otherwise, but it is also the sort of thing that, if somebody decides that they want to express their views about a classmate — they think that the pregnancy is a sign of irresponsibility or sexual promiscuity or whatever else — I would think that that's constitutionally protected speech.

Now if this were just limited to inschool statements — you can't talk about it at school — I could understand that, although even that might be going too far. But we're talking here about, specifically, things that are posted online.

So, again, this is an attempt at 24-7 control of student speech. And it may cover criticism of religion, homosexuality and so on and so forth because of the theory that that creates a severe, pervasive or persistent enough to create an offensive environment or an abusive environment for the student — again, whether the speech is on campus or off campus.

The NEA — there's available outside the room a report of the NEA, a nationwide study of bullying. Their definition of bullying, which yields some of the high percentages they find for bullying, includes 'sexist remarks' and 'social/relational

bullying.'

Professor Meyer's presentation earlier today, I think, was very interesting. It was largely focused on violence, far outside my context, except that I think all of us condemn that kind of violence. But one of the things that he did note is that one of the dangers to the mental health of gay students is anti-gay stigma and prejudice. I think that's probably right, but the consequence of that is that if you take that logic seriously, then again speech, whether on campus or off campus, that expresses and contributes to the stigma of prejudice would be punishable.

The university cases — all of which have come out in favor of First Amendment protection, but after a lot of litigation — university cases likewise have made clear that harassment and hostile environment in the eyes of administrators is often defined broadly enough to cover this very kind of speech including political, religious and social commentary.

Now one thing that I think is quite correct from what the OCR said, is that the federal government only goes after the most egregious conduct and usually focused in violence.

But it does, this in part because there's such limited staff, that it only goes for the worst thing, correctly so.

But the OCR also seeks school policies that are much broader than the particular cases that are the most egregious cases that they did prosecute. And, in fact, we heard Ms. Samuels note that we urge schools to nip these problems in the bud, before they become so egregious. So you put all this together and it seems to me there's a hard to deny potential First Amendment problem.

Now, I think schools have some latitude, both to punish threats, and also to punish certain kind of vulgarities under the *Frasier* decision, As well as certain kind of speech that shows an imminent likelihood of substantial material disruption, from fights and the like.

So there is some flexibility, but that flexibility is not unlimited, especially once you get to what a lot of people are talking about — cyberbullying, for example, or control of off-campus speech, as well as on-campus speech controls. This goes far outside the schoolhouse gate and amounts to an attempt to control the expression, both the personal views and religious and political views of

children throughout the entirety of their school 1 lives, on campus and off. 2 3 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you, Professor 4 Volokh. 5 Ms. Lauter. MS. LAUTER: Thank you. Good afternoon. 6 7 I'm Deborah Lauter. I'm the Civil Rights Director of 8 the Anti-Defamation League. 9 Before giving my formal remarks, I just was so moved by Ms. Aaberg's presentation. 10 11 want to offer my condolences and commend you for what you're doing to raise your voice so that others won't 12 13 have to go through the same thing. 14 MS. AABERG: Thank you. 15 MS. LAUTER: The Commission needs to be commended as well for addressing this important 16 17 subject of bullying, violence and harassment, and I greatly appreciate the opportunity to testify here 18 19 today and with our written submission. It's been a very long day. 20 And for those of us on this last panel, 21 22 very much appreciate, Chairman Castro, your 23 attention to timing so that we can get out on time at the end of the day. And I harken back to when you 24

said you hope that this provides a model

civility, and I think that's been very successful.

At least we haven't gotten to the questions on our panel. But so far so good.

I hope that you're all familiar with the Anti-Defamation League. We're one of the oldest civil rights and human relations organizations in the country. We were founded in 1913. And our goal and our mission is to fight anti-Semitism and all forms of hatred, prejudice and bigotry. And we advance interfaith and intergroup relations.

Our strength is in our combination of talented education and legal professionals. We're headquartered in New York and we have 28 regional offices around the country. Over the past 30 years, we have emerged as one of the principal national resources addressing prejudice and violent bigotry.

I'm actually here with my colleague,
Michael Lieberman, who is considered one of the
foremost experts on hate violence in America today.

Through our award-winning anti-bias education programs known as a "A World of Difference," we estimate we've impacted close to 37 million students and educators. And over the past decade we have built upon our training initiatives to craft innovative programs to address bullying and the

pernicious new form of harassment affecting children and students known as cyberbullying.

create safe, inclusive Working to and communities is one of ADL's priorities. We take a very broad, holistic approach to addressing the problem. We track the nature and magnitude of the problem. We develop education and training programs for students, for parents, educators. And we advocate at the state and the federal level for policies and programs that we feel can make a difference.

We believe the federal government, in partnership with state and local public agencies, nonprofits, community organizations, colleges and universitie,s and media companies can all play a critical role in ensuring that our schools and our communities are safe places for all students. I know there's been a lot of discussion about what's the federal role. For us, the comprehensive approach is what's best. We all have a stake in addressing this problem.

Laws and appropriate inclusive school-based policies can be a focal point for addressing bullying. But education, training, and community involvement are necessary complements to any

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

effective response.

It's critical that government officials and civic leaders ensure that schools help foster a culture in which bias and bullying are not tolerated and are safe places for our students. We're very pleased that the Obama Administration has demonstrated extraordinary commitment to addressing bullying and cyberbullying in a comprehensive and inclusive manner.

We believe the OCR's October 26th Dear Colleague guidelines represent a significant step forward in protecting students from bigotry and from harassment. For us the guidance accomplished three major things.

First, it provides an unprecedented, inclusive description of the breadth of existing federal anti-discrimination laws and their application to both K-12 schools and to colleges and universities.

They explicitly set out a school's duty to address incidents of discriminatory harassment and stress that it's not enough for the institution to punish the student who is responsible. Instead the school administration must address the environment and the effect of the incident and take steps to

ensure the harassment does not recur.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the OCR guidance makes clear Second, that anti-Semitic harassment can be prohibited by Title 6, as Mr. Marcus testified. And in March I want you to know that the ADL, along with 12 other national Jewish organizations, wrote to Secretary of Education Duncan calling for this clarification and that the quidance states that Title 6 protects Jewish students from anti-Semitism "on the basis of actual or perceived shared ancestry or ethnic characteristics."

This clarification is particularly welcome in conjunction with ADL's continuing work to combat anti-Semitic bullying, harassment and bigotry in schools and college campuses, including in some instances anti-Semitic intimidation of pro-Israel activists.

Third. the quidance underscored harassment based on sexual orientation and gender identity in schools and on campus is prohibited by federal civil rights law. According to the OCR quidance, Title IXdoes protect all students including lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender students from sex discrimination. This is a very welcome development.

The ADL responds to bias, bullying and cyberbullying through a combination of education and legislative advocacy. As I said, on the federal level, on the state level and in schools, we do not support the criminalization of bullying. Instead we have promoted laws that require schools to adopt policies that are inclusive and comprehensive — balancing a school's duty to maintain a safe learning environment with students' constitutional rights.

Two years ago, we developed a model bullying prevention law for states. I have a pretty copy here. I think we have a copy in your packets. And we've been organizing and leading coalitions advocating for its passage, with recent successes in Florida, Massachusetts, and New Jersey.

The question was raised earlier, "Why are we seeing this explosion?" And I think we haven't really focused on this and I hope the Commission will. I think we see the explosion of what's happening in schools today for a combination of reasons. Some are because of the whole nature of social networking sites and the way kids are communicating.

I think we can't discount what's happening with cable, the change from TV stations and

in the good old days when we had three stations and they were pretty neutral. Today what kids are witnessing on cable stations, either through reality shows where civility is broken down, or shows like South Park -- that was mentioned earlier -- that has satirical humor that may not be appreciated by kids, and the ones who even do the "Kick a Jew Day" which is a problem and we have been dealing with it at ADL.

And also the news media. The news media yelling over each other. Kids learn what they live and I think these are areas.

For us, one of the key partnerships that we need to engage with are these media companies. We've been partnering with Cartoon Network, MTV, Nickelodeon, Microsoft and AT&T. And we salute these companies' dedication to this problem. They've acknowledged it and they're trying to work with groups such as ours to fix it.

We also led a recent effort to promote the adoption of a thoughtful and inclusive American Bar Association resolution and report on bullying. They approved it in February and it basically put the ABA on record for the first time in support of federal and state policies and laws designed to prevent bullying --

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you, Ms. Lauter. 1 As I promised, our first question will 2 3 go to Commissioner Heriot. I take it you have a 4 question. 5 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I do. Thank you. CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay. And will be 6 7 followed by Commissioner Yaki, Commissioner Kirsanow, and Commissioner Achtenberg. 8 9 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: First, I want to offer my condolences. 10 11 MS. AABERG: Thank you. COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I want to thank 12 13 all the panelists for their presentations. This is 14 very helpful. 15 My question, however, is specifically 16 for Mr. Negron. When the Department of Education 17 explains its bullying policies, and when 18 advocates explain those policies, I've heard two 19 different characterizations that I think are very much in contention. On the one hand, we've heard the 20 Department of Education's actions are historic and 21 22 important and they are addressing the crisis and one 23 that has been allowed to get out of hand. And on the other hand, at times we've been told the Department 24

really haven't

actions

Education's

of

25

changed

They are basically just reiterating what 1 they said in the past. And the law is just the same. 2 I understand why folks might be looking 3 4 at it both ways. And on the one hand, while the 5 Department has authority to issue regulations under Title IX and under Title VI when they do that they 6 7 have to get Presidential approval. And that's a real cumbersome procedure for them. So I can see why 8 9 they're not big on doing it. On the other hand, everybody likes 10 11 think that what they're doing is important. And 12 bullying certainly is an important issue. My 13 question for you, Mr. Negron, is to your members, 14 that is, school boards all over the country, 15 assume. Is that right? 16 MR. NEGRON: That is correct. 17 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Do they feel that they have a good handle on what the Department of 18 19 Education is asking them to do? MR. 20 NEGRON: First, let me tell that, in addition to the school board members, we 21 22 also represent 3,000 school lawyers across the 23 country through the Council of School Attorneys who joined in our response to the Dear Colleague Letter. 24 25 I think the concerns that the school lawyers have and

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

that the school board members have and that NSBA has really arise from the implementation side of what OCR's letter has done.

One of the things that I spoke about very briefly was the whole question of a chilling effect on educators to institute the least intrusive approach to solving a question. And one of the things that the OCR has done that is just slightly different is set out a variety of examples that are meant to be instructive to school districts about what they can and can't do.

Just to illustrate, one example is the whole approach they use around gender discrimination. And what the Department seems to be suggesting, even though they very clearly state that, for instance, sexual orientation discrimination is not covered under Title IX, we know that some courts have said that it is, depending on the circumstances. But their enforcement standard is very clear.

And what we think is a problem is that a school district may adopt, for instance, a more strict enforcement standard following the guidelines and then somehow adopt for itself some sort of legal liability. So, for instance, if a school district decides that it's going to use the enforcement

include sexual orientation standard and protected classification -- and by the way, most school districts already have that as a protected classification - but if they go that one step further and then equate that with gender discrimination, are they somehow now waiving a potential dispense under Title IX lawsuit, for instance? So these are the kinds of difficulties, from a legal perspective, that school districts have. COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Thank you. CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Commissioner Yaki. COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you very much, This question, first of all, I want to Mr. Chair. say, Ms. Aaberg, thank you very much for coming here. Thank you for your courage, for sharing the pictures of your son with us, which paints a face to what

we're talking about here today. My question is for Mr. Negron, but if you have anything you want to add I want you to feel free to join in.

Mr. Negron, I'm going to be as civil as But it just seemed to me very I possibly can. difficult for me to listen to your testimony talking about the fear of lawsuits and plaintiffs' lawyers, when you're talking about sitting next to someone who lost their son because of a loss of leadership at the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

local level. Here you have a situation where the local school board/school district failed. They failed in protecting. They failed in notifying. They utterly failed when it came to her.

And to talk about plaintiffs' lawyers and whatever is essentially saying, "Well, you know there's a price we have to pay and there's some cost benefit analysis that we have to do when it comes to how much a child's life is." At least that's the way it came to me. I know that's not what you meant, but certainly the way it came out.

So my question to you is, you talk about the fact that there should be no federal mandates because there should be local leadership. How do you explain to Ms. Aaberg? How do you explain to others? And how do you explain, five years from now when the school district has changed, when new leadership has come in and this just may be a memory to them? How do you explain to them what happened to Ms. Aaberg and why there shouldn't be any federal mandates?

MR. NEGRON: Sure. And thank you for the opportunity to clarify that. Certainly my remarks aren't meant in any fashion to disrespect the personal tragedy of Ms. Aaberg.

School districts are concerned about

They're concerned about the tragic loss of 1 students. And so my condolences to Ms. Aaberg. 2 3 would tell you that But Ι school 4 districts do have a responsibility to educate all 5 students. And I think it's important that this Commission understand that litigation defense dollars 6 7 are important. It may seem callous in the light of the realities and tragedies that happen. 8 9 But every dollar, by and large, that is spent on litigation generally comes from general 10 11 revenue dollars. And general revenue dollars are So, depending on the size of the 12 classroom dollars. district, we're talking about dollars that could be 13 14 spent in the classroom to educate all of 15 students. One of the missions of school boards and 16 17 school districts is to ensure that the environments in which students learn are safe. But those 18 environments could not exist without funds. 19 20 So it's disrespectfully, not meant Commissioner. It's meant as a very real recognition 21 of the realities that face our school. 22 23 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Answer my question about the loss of leadership in this instance. 24 25 NEGRON: I don't represent

1	school district individually and I can't respond to
2	the loss.
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: But you are
4	representing the school district. You're saying that
5	you want local leadership. But they failed here.
6	MR. NEGRON: Right.
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: So why do you want
8	local leadership?
9	MR. NEGRON: I think that, by and large,
10	I mean there's always an exception to every case.
11	And, by and large, school districts care about what
12	happens to their students. Just because there may
13	have been a particular lack of leadership in one
14	situation or a policy that didn't work, doesn't mean
15	that we should therefore assume from that that all
16	school boards are without leadership. That's the way
17	that democracy functions, sir.
18	MS. AABERG: I want to add that locally
19	speaking of which, I grew up in Minneapolis and there
20	wasn't a whole lot of problems with diversity — I
21	grew up, I was used to it and everything. And right
22	now Minneapolis has the best bullying policy that I
23	can even think of.
24	I also just moved over one school
25	district over. I have an eight-year-old. And this

school district, when I'm asking for -- I had been asking Anoka-Hennepin for eight months now to please offer training to their staff. And they said they did provide training to their staff.

I said, "Well, I would like to know what you did." And they mailed me a 12-page PowerPoint.

Whereas, just five miles away the school district I'm in now, so far this year they've already had, every other month they provide four hours of teacher training in different aspects of bullying. I went to one when they did the LGBT. And the lawyer even described to all the staff what the policy meant.

So for local involvement, a couple years ago Governor Pawlenty was going to sign a bill of Safe Schools for All. There were -- I guess there was a lot of suicides back then. Well, the suicides slowed down and even though other people that were trying to pass the bill changed so many things about it he ended up denying it or vetoing it. And now how many more kids have died. I wonder, if this Safe Schools for All in Minnesota bill would have passed for the whole state, would my son still be here today.

So in Minnesota, and I know down in

Texas and over in California, there are so many — I mean, with all the kids around the country coming to me and telling me what's going on in their district, obviously local involvement is not working.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The Chair recognizes

Commissioner Kirsanow.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you to all the panelists. It's been very educational. And my condolences to Ms. Aaberg. My question is for, I think, Mr. Negron. I was going to -- Mr. Trump can jump in if he wants to.

An earlier panel and I don't know if you were in the room, Ms. Gym testified about the South Philly school district. It was an extraordinary situation that the Commission has been interested in for a while. And many of the incidents there were incidents that I considered to be criminal conduct. Yet, at least according to Ms. Gym, there was no discipline of any staff members. Maybe she doesn't know all of the circumstances. But counselor, no principal, no vice principal, superintendent, no one was disciplined, not even a written warning maybe.

Then she testified also that a complaint was filed with OCR -- I'm sorry -- with the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Department of Justice on January 19th. And then at the end of February the Department of Justice showed up.

And they have rules. And there should be certain rules. But it strikes me that those rules would be ineffective in that interim six-week period where kids were getting beat up, heads beaten, hair pulled and people being dragged down stairs. Yet no one was disciplined.

You know, here we And I'm wondering. are in Washington, and a right to write rules and get the involved, lawyers and those things are appropriate. But in terms of the immediate prevention of this kind of conduct, it strikes me that that's something that a principal, a teacher, a counselor, a security guard should be involved in. What are the things that constrain schools from taking immediate action, exercising some form of accountability at those principal actors right there, on the ground as they say, who can prevent the conduct in the first instance?

MR. NEGRON: Thank you for the question.

I wasn't in the room when that conversation was had.

So I'm just going to speak from a theoretical approach. But my guess is that part of the reason

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that you don't know if any employees or any staffers were disciplined is because there might be a collective bargaining agreement in place. There might be some sort of public service laws that keep employee discipline matters private or confidential at least until there's the end of that proceeding. And that may be what the district is undergoing now.

So I would be speculating that those collective bargaining agreements or that those rules that might exist might have prevented some sort of employee action. I would hope that that is not the case.

Part of what we are concerned at the National School Boards Association is that educators be able to act when they need to act. If a policy is not a good policy -- and I'm not familiar with the neutrality policy that was discussed earlier — but that policy didn't seem to work, did it?

And so I think the first thing we need to do is make sure that our policies empower educators, that educators know that they have the ability to act, to correct whatever situation comes before them, whether it's bullying or harassment. But also we need to not chill their ability to do that. We need teachers not to believe that there

will be an impending federal lawsuit if they do not treat a specific set of circumstances as a federal 2 3 civil rights violation. 4 Courts have said -- a court out of the 5 6th Circuit, for instance, to use the scenario that has been discussed about sexual orientation, that 6 7 sometimes adolescents simply engage in harassing 8 behavior that doesn't necessarily equate, 9 instance, to a protected category under federal civil rights legislation. And so therefore teachers need 10 11 ability -- educators, principals, mentioned, need the ability to make those decisions 12 13 on the ground, resolve it as least intrusively as 14 possible if that's what's called for. 15 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The Chair recognizes 16 Commissioner Achtenberg. 17 VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I think Mr. Trump wants to respond. 18 19 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: I'm sorry. 20 MR. TRUMP: I'll keep it brief. 21 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: I'm sorry. 22 MR. TRUMP: Thank you. I did hear Ms. Gym's response and I heard that a lot of the things 23 that Justice ordered including training and various 24 25 mediation and components for students and staff.

1	would be curious, and I don't know the answer to this
2	in that case. Did they also address the issue of why
3	the school district or whoever did not make a
4	complaint for assault? We heard assault. And if
5	not, I'm just curious as to how a federal
6	intervention by the Justice Department could bypass
7	what you raised earlier about the lack of engagement
8	of law enforcement on the criminal end on the
9	assault.
10	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: All right. Now we'll
11	move on to Commissioner Achtenberg, who will be
12	followed by Commissioners Titus, Gaziano, Chair
13	Castro and Commissioner Heriot.
13 14	Castro and Commissioner Heriot. COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: [inaudible]
14	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: [inaudible
14 15	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: [inaudible portion] Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
14 15 16	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: [inaudible portion] Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. Aaberg, as a mother of a dearly
14 15 16 17	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: [inaudible portion] Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. Aaberg, as a mother of a dearly beloved son myself, I can only thank you for offering
14 15 16 17	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: [inaudible portion] Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. Aaberg, as a mother of a dearly beloved son myself, I can only thank you for offering your wisdom to this body as we discuss this very
14 15 16 17 18	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: [inaudible portion] Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. Aaberg, as a mother of a dearly beloved son myself, I can only thank you for offering your wisdom to this body as we discuss this very important national issue as it pertains to all
14 15 16 17 18 19	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: [inaudible portion] Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. Aaberg, as a mother of a dearly beloved son myself, I can only thank you for offering your wisdom to this body as we discuss this very important national issue as it pertains to all children.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: [inaudible portion] Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. Aaberg, as a mother of a dearly beloved son myself, I can only thank you for offering your wisdom to this body as we discuss this very important national issue as it pertains to all children. My question is directed at Ms. Lauter.

form. And I understand you have a great deal of

expertise in that regard, your organization, that you've been willing to share with many communities.

And I want to thank you for that.

I have in front of me more letters and declarations from parents and students about the misery that sometimes led to enormous physical violence, sometimes led to suicides in some cases, often led to deteriorating physical condition or mental health that emanated from pervasive harassment and bullying. In some cases as young people, people were spit on, taunted, punched, hair pulled, genitals grabbed. Vicious assaults and vicious taunting were leveled in many cases.

Does that description surprise you?

Does it comport with some of the things that you and your organization are seeing as you undertake this effort to combat bullying and discrimination in various forms? Or does it seem sort of out of whack with what you're seeing on the ground?

MS. LAUTER: Yes, sadly I have to say it comports with what we're seeing. And it affects -- It's not confined to any geographic region in the country. It's not confined to schools that are having diversity issues in itself. The bullying issue can happen almost in any school including

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

private schools that you would think are free of bigotry or whatnot.

We get reports from — I got an email from a friend in Atlanta whose daughter attends a private Christian school, one of the best in the Atlanta area, sharing the cyberbully messages she was getting because she was Jewish. So it's everywhere, unfortunately.

If you don't mind, I want to comment and follow up on Ms. Aaberg's comments about the standards in a state. In our testimony we present this, and I hope you do take a look at it, we charted all the state anti-bullying statutes. We've been referring all day to the 45 states that have it. And we think this is a good thing.

But what we did is we charted exactly what is in each of those states. So as she was commenting, I looked up what Minnesota's state law is and these are elements that we would look for and we put into our model statute, what we'd like to see in a comprehensive state.

In Minnesota they do have a district policy. They do not have a model policy. They do not have a -- Oh, I take that back. They do have cyberbullying mentioned in their policy. They don't

have enumerated categories. So there is no clear 1 signal of what is covered. 2 3 They do not have any procedures 4 reporting. They do not have any notification 5 processes for parents. So parents won't even know that there's a policy there. There is no requirement 6 7 for training. So administrators, educators, don't 8 have to do it. And there's no accountability or 9 reporting, which is a key component for us. How do we know that what's happening is being reported? 10 11 can this body do a better job? We need data collection. We need an analysis of how widespread. 12 13 And that's why for us SO 14 combination of having state laws as well as the 15 federal government doing the big picture would be 16 enormously helpful to advance this. Thank you. 17 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The Chair recognizes Commissioner Titus. 18 19 COMMISSIONER TITUS: Thank you, Mr. Since this is our last panel and our last 20 Chairman. chance to speak, I'm going to just sum up a couple of 21 22 things. I heard a lot of references to we don't 23 need the federal government. We need to leave it at 24 25 the local level. And yet that ignores the testimony we heard this morning from the Justice Department, where they said and showed evidence of how to solve this problem. They work with local school districts. It's not something imposed, but something that comes about collaboratively.

I've also heard we don't need the federal government. We should leave it to the local government to set their own policy. And yet there's been no mention of any mechanism of enforcement. You can set a policy. But then if you don't carry it out what good is it? If you don't have some hammer coming down, perhaps from the federal government, nobody said what else you're going to have as an alternative.

Third, I've heard a lot about the chilling effect of having a policy from the federal level. And I think you, Mr. Negron, said that school teachers or principals are reluctant to enforce it because I think your quote was "they don't want to see themselves on the front page of the paper." Well, better on the front page than on the obituary page.

Finally, a question I have for the professor. You talk a lot about the Dear Colleague Letter and how that's made this more of a First

Amendment issue, 24/7, all kinds of speech. But you don't mention the Morse v. Frederick case and how that might have some implications for this because it's more restrictive of speech school than the Tinker case. Would you elaborate on that for us?

MR. VOLOKH: Sure. So Morse v.

Frederick was a decision several years ago, five-four with a very important concurring opinion, that dealt with speech that the Court interpreted -- probably correctly -- as pro-drug speech at a school function.

And what the Court said is, in addition to the exceptions that are recognized for speech -- an exception for vulgarities in Frasier and an exception for speech where there was a substantial likelihood of material disruption in the Tinker case -- there's another exception for advocacy of drugs at school.

It's not clear whether that's the right answer, but that is the majority ruling that was substantially -- that two Justices, Justices Alito and Kennedy, made clear was narrow and limited to speech that did not have a political dimension. They interpreted that particular statement as being entirely apolitical.

So $\mathit{Morse}\ v.\ \mathit{Frederick}\ \mathsf{does}\ \mathsf{--}\ \mathsf{I}\ \mathsf{mean}$ what we do know is, when it comes to speech that

essentially advocates illegal conduct or is seen as advocating illegal conduct (which is to say drug use) at school, and that is not political, that forms another First Amendment exception.

I'm not sure that supports the Dear Colleague Letter Colleague Letter much. If the Dear Colleague Letter had been limited, for example, to speech that advocates violence at school in a nonpolitical context, then perhaps the analogy would be quite close.

But it is not limited to either of those respects. The Dear Colleague Letter sets up a standard that is by no means limited to advocacy of violence or drugs and the like. It includes just insulting speech and such. It is not limited to speech that is at school. Nor does it have any exception for speech that might have a political or religious dimension. Just doesn't mention that at all.

So I think Fraser and Tinker are potentially relevant more broadly. But Morse v. Frederick, I think, has very narrow relevance in the material.

COMMISSIONER TITUS: But harassment is illegal and it does also mention restricting off-

campus speech, I do recall. But that's all right. I would just conclude by saying I think you're very brave. And I think your son would be very proud of you.

MR. VOLOKH: Thank you. I'm sorry. Ιf I could just respond. Harassment, you say harassment is illegal. Justice Alito -- then Judge Alito -made clear there's no harassment exception of the First Amendment. Speech cannot be made illegal, and therefore stripped from constitutional protection, by simply having a statute or having interpretative regulations. What was going on in Morse v. Frederick awas dvocacy of conduct -- not of speech that is illegal, but of conduct that is illegal. Court said that that is actually -- I don't think that that helps much to support or challenge a restriction of harassment.

COMMISSIONER TITUS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The Chair recognizes Commissioner Gaziano.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Thank you and I thank all the panel again. But I have to choose and I choose Professor Volokh on this instance. And I wanted to -- Earlier my earlier questions were related to why I thought that federal government's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

expansion into the type of student teasing and harassment might not work well for the intended result. But I said I have legal concerns.

So now I'm going to raise the legal concern. And you mention one in your written testimony and that is the conversion of the standard. Let me tell you about -- you probably know. Morgan v. Swanson case pending in the 5th Circuit en banc right now involves a group of situations of the schools where one situation parents attending the winter party were not allowed to pass out their child's goody bag to the other parents because it contained religious material. Was instructed that religious materials were prohibited on the school. Their defense in the 5th Circuit en banc -- and they lost all the way up and down and it's now just on damages -- is that students have no First Amendment rights whatsoever. It's breathtaking to me.

Clearly these schools need to be educated on true tolerance and respecting First Amendment rights. I think there's a serious problem. So does the OCR help in this regard or hurt? The legal standard by the Supreme Court is severe, pervasive and objectively offensive. So it must be both severe and that's conjunctive.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The OCR in education of these schools miseducated is severe, pervasive or So if а child very politely persistent. persistently insists that "Jesus saves" once a week. In one such case the child was overheard praying over her lunch and was prohibited from doing that. are we to take of whether the OCR's quidance about what the First Amendment requires? Is that helpful or is that hurtful?

MR. VOLOKH: I think on the merits the OCR's guidance is mistaken in adopting severe, pervasive or persistent standard as opposed to the Supreme Court's standard in *Davis* severe, pervasive and objectively offensive. But I think there's a broader point that's maybe what you're trying to get at.

It's that the -- one thing that troubles me about a lot of this discussion including the Dear Colleague Letter is the sense that there's sort of denial going on. That there really isn't any speech Sometimes the claim is 'this is issue in play. conduct, not speech,' even though the consists of verbal acts which is another way of speech. Sometimes the claim is `it's harassment and not speech,' even though if you label

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

speech sedition or harassment or intentional infliction of emotional distress, that doesn't strip it of constitutional protection.

Now, to be sure, the Dear Colleague Letter has a footnote that says, "There's a First Amendment issue and we don't mean to trench on the First Amendment." But that's not terribly helpful to school districts, where they need to know what exactly it is that they should be protecting under the First Amendment. They're generally not lawyers. Here they have this long letter with all of these examples of mostly conduct, physical violence, that needs to be restricted but also with statements, yes, analogous kinds of speech should be restricted, too, and occasional general references to things posted on websites and so on and so forth. Really no meaningful examples of "Here are things that you shouldn't be restricting" or "Here are things that whether or not you should be restricting we don't mean to cover." "Here are the kinds of political or religious or social or commentary on campus or off campus that should be protected." It just is not offering any real quidance to the school districts.

I don't want to overstate the concern

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

about chilling effects. The fact is we have laws to deter people from doing bad things and sometimes we want people to be chilled from failing to properly protect those in their charge and so on and so forth.

But what you have to understand that when there's a very big hammer out there, the threat of federal investigation, then that disproportionate impact -- as opposed to perhaps a threat of a civil lawsuit for vindication of First So my worry is that with letters Amendment rights. like this, approaches like this, that do not really acknowledge the First Amendment issue and don't chart out examples and specific exclusions of what kind of speech should be protected, the inevitable effect is will be substantial deterrence that there constitutionally protected speech.

MS. AABERG: May I respond to that?

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Yes, go ahead.

MS. AABERG: There's been so much talk today about freedom of speech. And I honestly don't think -- Maybe I don't know. Maybe I should make -- about or ask for an amendment to the First Amendment saying that it can't apply so much to students. I mean their brains aren't even developed. I mean they shouldn't have free speech to be able to harm other

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

people. Yes, they should be able to pray at school or just things that aren't harmful or their beliefs.

My son told me two months before he died that a kid told him he was going to go hell because he was gay. So according to the First Amendment, that kid has the right to tell my kid that, when all these churches actually had the kids, the church kids, go to the school, wear shirts and tell, my son was like the only out kid in his grade. So I'm sure he got a lot of it that day.

Ι just don't see where the First Amendment -- I mean for students especially it should be if it's harmful I mean that should be it. it shouldn't be allowed. I mean your opinion whether I don't agree with your religion or I don't agree with -- You know, my religion doesn't accept gay people. Stuff like that, it's fine. That's your But to go up and tell someone they're going to go to hell or call them all kinds of names, I don't think that should be freedom of speech.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: I'm going to ask a question and then we'll go to Commissioner Heriot and Commissioner Yaki. We hear about the neutrality policy, and on its face the word neutrality seems so benign. Yet we've heard from you, Ms. Aaberg, how

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

malignant it has been. And you've mentioned that for the last eight months you've been interfacing with the school district trying to get them to undo that and they haven't. And as you indicated last night, although I don't know that we know all the circumstances, another child committed suicide.

What are the stated reasons that the school district is giving you for not addressing the neutrality issue? And conversely what do we see in the various states as it relates to the neutrality policy's impact, if Ms. Lauter could answer that part?

MS. AABERG: What we're finding out is that there is a group, a local group, called the Parent Action League. They're called PAL. And it seems like whatever they request they seem to get. We found out that the board seems -- they have a relation with the Minnesota Family Council as well and who knows if they're going as far as Focus on Family. I don't know.

So it seems so much more involved that outside groups on that aspect are coming in. They say they don't want their kid to be mentioned about gay people. But I don't understand why kids can't know that they exist anyway. And we're not even

asking right now for curriculum or anything. We're asking just that these kids have rights and that they should be protected.

So with this neutrality thing, that's what's mostly happening is they keep saying that these parents have rights to not have their child hear about gay people. But I don't -- I asked the board, "Well, what are my rights about my son being able to learn that gay people exist?" And they couldn't answer that question for me.

That's basically all the evidence that we've found and articles locally have a lot to do with the local Christian groups which -- I don't know. I'm a Christian. But they told my son when he told me is God loves everybody. So for them to even use it's like they're using hate in their religion to harm other people. That's kind of how it's winning out with the neutrality policy in Anoka-Hennepin.

MS. LAUTER: I mean, the neutrality policies unfortunately result in avoidance of an issue. I was very struck by Commissioner Thernstrom earlier talking about what makes a good school. You know, it takes leadership and it takes some top-down leadership from the principal and teachers who are the leaders in their classrooms to be able to address

issues in a way that doesn't promote, advance any kind of religious beliefs but at the same time is able to talk about respect for others.

The word tolerance was used earlier. ADL's curriculum, we talk about respect for differences. But you don't have to exactly address it and that's why it's so important to enact these laws. When we do training, we talk about all the different kind of classes. So it's not any kind of promulgation of one ideology over another. respect for human beings and for individual differences.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Commissioner Heriot.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Thank you. Mr. Negron, by my count at least, you've had somewhat more than -- a somewhat disproportionate share of the questions at least towards the beginning of the panel. But I want to throw one more your way. I want to ask you a question that is a follow-up to Commissioner Yaki's question a few minutes ago. I think it's a quick one and we can go on to other questions here.

I suspect, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, that one of the things that your members have to look out for is the possibility of the next

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

suicide case. The next case coming down the pike could be a suicide by a student who was wrongly or maybe even rightly accused of bullying and not the bullying victim. Am I right that your members have to balance a lot of considerations when they set discipline policy and it's not always easy to know what the right thing to do is and that sometimes tragic mistakes are made?

MR. NEGRON: I think you certainly are correct that educators sometimes make the wrong decisions for the best intentioned reasons. Most educators act in good faith. Most school boards act in good faith. And sometimes mistakes are made.

I think that what's important about your question is to understand that school boards need to have policies in place, but balance the interests of students. And I'm actually really gratified that the conversation has involved such а large Amendment component because, although we are talking almost exclusively about the tragedies that surround students in terms of violence and death, and that is very pointed, we also need to understand that school districts and educators have to make those balanced choices between First Amendment choices, the rights students and the rights to a safe learning

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	environment.
2	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: And I assume
3	suicide on both sides of the equation can occur.
4	MR. NEGRON: I imagine that that
5	happens. I think it's I don't know that that's
6	necessarily present in anybody's mind. But it does
7	bring to mind that these are very tough choices for
8	educators to make on the ground.
9	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Thank you.
10	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The Chair recognizes
11	Commissioner Yaki.
12	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you very much
13	Mr. Chair.
14	My mind is kind of boggled by some of
15	what was last said because I'm not too sure how you
16	balance rights when it comes to protected classes of
17	individuals who deserve and need treatment and
18	deserve protection under the Constitution.
19	But my question is for Mr. Volokh. And
20	I'm going to ask you to be helpful.
21	MR. VOLOKH: I try.
22	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And I think you can
23	do that. You and I think as I said to one of the
24	previous speakers, I'm very much a big First
25	Amendment close to absolutist in many ways, the way I

taught and brought up. But I also understand that there are limitations, that when you're in a crowded theater someone yelling "Fire" or falsely claiming fire in a crowded theater that can cause imminent chaos, death, is something that is not protected.

So I'm going to ask you this because, to me, certainly there are analogs in criminal law. There are certainly some analogs in other parts of First Amendment jurisprudence where the Supreme Court has held that, for example, the Free Exercise clause may not protect parents from certain acts involving their children, *Prince v. Massachusetts*, *Jacobsen v. Mass.* You're familiar with those.

the question is, having testimony earlier today from -- and believe me, Commissioner Achtenberg said, we have stacks testimony about how in the situation of, say, an LBGT child or unit, the kind of possibility, vulnerability, the disparity in terms of how they perceive themselves, how they believe others perceive them and how it leads to certain actions by them in terms of suicides, depression, those kinds of things, is there some line, is there some threshold, where someone essentially, I would say, lights the match but is engaged in kind of nonphysical but

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

psychological wordplay, verbal harassment ongoing
that to you for a child, for a young person, someone
whose brain is not as fully developed, doesn't have
the mental shields that all of us have so we can
engage in these kinds of colloquys without feeling
like we're being picked on or what have you. Maybe
we do. But for a young person for whom the Supreme
Court has said there are some different
constitutional observations in terms of their ability
to deal with certain things, help me. And if there's
a way that we can, that Department of Ed or Justice,
could come up with some kind of a standard that says
"You don't have to punch them in the face, but if you
deliver the equivalent of a punch in the face to
someone that verbally through other kinds of actions
that sends that person into a potentially dangerous
area where we have to worry about another situation
with another young person hanging themselves, doing
harm to themselves or what have you" help me. Where
can we draw that line if you can?

MR. VOLOKH: So it's a very interesting and difficult question. I should note the Free Exercise cases are quite different. The Supreme Court has seen the Free Exercise Clause as essentially being a nondiscrimination rule and not a

1	substantive right. Even during the 30 years when it
2	saw it as a substantive right, it was a right that
3	was much more weakly protected than free speech
4	rights.
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That's right.
6	You're a professor.
7	MR. VOLOKH: But the other thing I
8	should say is that it's not the equivalent of a
9	punch. Speech can be bad. It can be extremely
10	distressing, but it's not the equivalent of a punch.
11	And I think it's important to distinguish the two.
12	The other thing I should say
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Just let me Why
14	isn't it the equivalent of a punch? Let's take for
15	example. I saw in your bio that you also do
16	criminal.
17	MR. VOLOKH: Yes.
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I mean let's take
19	for example. So you would believe that, say for
20	example, in a defense in criminal case of battered
21	woman syndrome if the spouse was not physically
22	touched but was subjected to intense emotional
23	cruelty, those actions, that's a First Amendment
24	protected action.

MR. VOLOKH: It's not a criminal law to

1	the extent by battered woman syndrome, you mean a
2	woman claiming self defense.
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Exactly.
4	MR. VOLOKH: It's black letter criminal
5	law that you cannot claim self-defense rights because
6	you're defending against insult. A threat is a
7	different matter, when we're talking about threat of
8	violence. That is punishable and it's treated as not
9	quite the equivalence of violence but some would like
LO	that.
L1	But the example you gave, no. If
L2	somebody said "Well, he was very cruel to me, so
L3	that's why I shot him" you may not even get to
L4	voluntary manslaughter, much less a self-defense
L5	defense.
L6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay.
L7	MR. VOLOKH: So I think the law quite
L8	rightly does not treat insulting things as the
L9	equivalent of violence.
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: But for children?
21	MR. VOLOKH: Pardon?
22	COMMISSIONER YAKI: How about for
23	children?
24	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Commissioner, try to
25	keep that one question.

MR. VOLOKH: If you're asking for analogies to other laws, no. It doesn't, I think, treat them as equivalent. And I think it's important to keep them different.

Now you might say, despite the fact that they're different, nonetheless certain kinds of insulting things can be restricted. I should say also inside school a good deal could be restricted, partly under the *Frasier* Doctrine, if it's actually vulgarities. It could be restricted. And face-to-face insults might be in the fighting words category.

example But to take an that's on everybody's mind, cyberbullying, if somebody says mean things about somebody on their Facebook page, Student A doesn't like Student B for whatever reason and says, "I think Student B is bad for whatever His religion is idiotic. He is gay and that's bad. Or she's pregnant and that's bad" or whatever else, I don't think that the analogy would be sound even when we're talking about children. usually it will be teenagers or close to it. Suicide certainly is a tragedy. But fortunately a relatively small fraction of all insults lead to them. because of that we're going to be able to restrictions on insulting things that people say on

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

their web pages? I don't think I would say that.

I should also say suicide is immensely tragic. But there are many causes to suicide. Romantic problems occasionally cause suicide. We don't go out there and start pervasively regulating romance because of that danger including a danger to teenagers.

I think that we certainly want to try to stop the violence, needless to say. We may very well be able to do a lot of things within schools to help with suicide. But to start to come up with a pervasive kind of code of regulations of what can be said on Facebook pages because somebody who is insulted, even deliberately insulted, on Facebook might commit suicide, I think that would be unacceptable.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: The Chair recognizes

Commissioner Gaziano.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Thank you. Mr. Trump, since you've been here I think almost all day, you know that whenever Commissioner Kirsanow asked for data on bullying, when it started, whether the same questions were asked, the progression, there's been crickets. No one knows. You were the first person I think to admit that there are serious gaps

in the data.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So I'm going to ask you to elaborate in two respects. What data exists? Where does it exist that shows incidences of bullying that can be actually traced over time in some consistent manner?

And then more important to my interest, if you could also answer what data is there, if it exists anywhere, of school systems' indifference or animosity or encouragement of that kind of bullying because that seems to me, that second category of data, seems to be more relevant to when the federal government should get involved with this issue and swoop in in a real case of physical indifference or whether they should act in a much more systematic and universal way?

MR. TRUMP: To answer the first part of historical the question, there is no data bullying, to my knowledge, especially at the federal level for an extended period of time. In fact, the Department of Education Safe and Drug Free Schools office now is trying to start collecting that for one of the first times through what they refer to as School Climate Surveys. And there are a number of issues associated with that.

We do not even have accurate federal

data on a number of crimes and violence in school because there is no incident-based data on K-12 schools, such as what is required under the Clery Act in colleges and universities. There is no such law for K-12 schools. So we don't know how many crimes, assaults and other incidents that are criminal are in school, much less the other offenses and lower-level aggressions, bullying.

The second part of the question is I have found -- and we heard the phrase "zero tolerance" used a lot today. And in my 25+ years in schools, most school administrators strive for firm, fair and consistent discipline applied with good common sense. Sadly and unfortunately, we do have those anecdotal cases -- more than one is one too many -- where that latter part, common sense, is not there.

But I found that by and large school administrators err on the side of giving children a break in situations to give them the benefit of the doubt. I don't think that there's a mass conspiracy called Zero Tolerance.

And to go back to Commissioner Titus' comment and to I believe Mr. Negron, I think he took an unintentional hit of getting credit for my comment

1	about the principal who said being in the newspaper.
2	I will own up to that on the record. But what I also
3	said when I used that example, I followed at the end
4	of that by saying that the concern was, his concern
5	and mine, that fear of the newspaper would not be in
6	a lawsuit. It would be from overreacting because
7	they feel that there's a political pressure on them
8	and feel that the threat of a federal investigation
9	would actually force them to overreact, not to
10	underreact.
11	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: I've been informed by
12	my Acting Staff Director that we actually started ten
13	minutes early. So we can go to 4:15 p.m. without
14	being unfair to the other panels.
15	I've got Commissioner Achtenberg who has
16	asked for a question. Nobody else on this side?
17	(No verbal response.)
18	Okay. So Commissioner Achtenberg and
19	then I'll use Chair's discretion and ask the last
20	question before we end for the day.
21	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Well, first
22	with regard to the Dear Colleague Letter, let me say
23	that it is standard practice among federal agencies
24	to offer guidance within the realm of their
25	expertise. I did it when I was Fair Housing

Assistant Secretary without complaint. No one said that it was ultra vires for me do that. Far from it.

And the Courts do give great deference to the expressions of expertise of federal agencies.

Mr. Marcus did it when he was the Acting Assistant Secretary of OCR in the Department of Education. The same thing that Ms. Russlyn Ali did in her letter.

So the letter per se, I understand you have other quarrels with the breadth of the letter. But let me just say to Mr. Negron's assertion that somehow courts giving deference to guidance being offered by federal departments clearly within their mandate and their area of expertise is not only nothing unusual, it's an agreed-upon construction of federal law that is almost universally respected by federal courts.

But back to the seriousness and pervasiveness of the issue at hand. And let me also say I respect, Professor Volokh, your efforts to answer in good faith Commissioner Yaki's question. I think these are difficult questions to deal with. The line does have to be drawn somewhere when we're talking about federal rights. And it's not always easy to tell where the line should be drawn.

However, given the conclusions of the

National Crime Victim Survey that points out that one in four Latinos reports being severely harassed, given the fact that we are told that almost 100 percent of young people with disabilities report being harassed or severely harassed, given that 80 percent of students report that they experienced, have experienced, at least one of the many forms of sex discrimination in schools, given the fact that sexual minority youth, eight in ten say that at some point they have been harassed or severely harassed, I think this is an issue that is important, that we need to take cognisance of.

That doesn't mean necessarily that there has to be a federal remedy for this. But in this particular case there is well-recognized federal authority that is being invoked in this case, at least to my mind. And we heard a number of concurrences from those who work every day in the field.

I'd like to ask Ms. Lauter. The need for a federal response, would you articulate again why the grid of 45 state responses and the hundreds and hundreds of trainings that you yourself and your organization have done throughout the country isn't sufficient to address this pervasive issue?

MS. LAUTER: Right. Because there are so many elements that need to be addressed. To have federal response is important for a number of (1) that they can set out guidelines that would be what a district can have in order to be effective; but it also -- and since this is the windup of the session -- just critically important for the attention at the federal level for this subject. The very fact that this Commission is addressing this issue is fantastic because it's going to shine more light what the problems are what the on and challenges are.

This is an enormously difficult subject. And so you've all seen that in just this one day. And for those of us who struggle with it every day it needs from the highest level down. And again we commend the Obama Administration because they did the White House Summit. They've recognized the problem. They shine a light on it. And now it's up to the rest of us to work together to -- I don't think we'll ever fix it completely, but we can certainly make a difference.

CHAIRMAN CASTRO: I'll ask the last question. We've heard throughout the day today about how the system is so terribly broken. And part of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

what we want to do with this report is to put out 1 some best practices and show some success stories of 2 3 how this can be done right. 4 I know, Ms. Lauter, you've got 5 overview. I know, Mr. Negron, from the perch that Can you tell us some success stories of 6 you sit. 7 some districts that have done this right, so that we could propose and disseminate those best practices to 8 9 prevent more of our children from taking their lives or being forced to take their lives. 10 11 MS. LAUTER: Yes. We would be happy to Maybe in writing might be a better 12 give you some. Unfortunately sometimes the best 13 way to do it. 14 practices that I would be able to share with you are 15 ones that come out of something that started bad, woke up the community, then they addressed it and 16 17 went on, which we like to see. 18 But there are other systems that have 19 come up with good policies that do all those things we'd like to see in terms of reporting, training and 20 21 accountability. So I'd be happy to submit that 22 later. 23 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Please do. 24 Mr. Negron. 25 MR. NEGRON: Mr. Chair, I appreciate the

invitation because state associations of school boards across the country do have a variety of training, some more intensive than others for school boards. And we'd be happy to share that with the Commission.

I should point out, and I think school board members would probably not like the fact that I'm pointing out, a specific piece of legislation. But an example of one that the jury is still out on is we don't know its effects because it just went into effect in January, signed in New Jersey, is a very comprehensive model of what state laws can do. They require all kinds of training with definitions about bullying, what to look for. They encompass a plethora of scenarios for school districts and have in similar fashion to the IDEA, the Special Ed law, have timelines in which school officials have to report what they see to the next level of authority all the way to the school board and then requiring some sort of action. They also in New Jersey require training by school board members on the different kinds of harassment.

So there are states that are -- that's I think the most comprehensive statute in the country. It's certainly just one model. And there are others.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We'd be happy to share that with you. 1 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: We 2 Thank you. 3 appreciate it. 4 MS. AABERG: May I comment? 5 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Ms. Aaberg. MS. AABERG: I think what might be a 6 7 good compromise I guess is if the federal government be more inclusive on Title IX for sexual orientation, 8 9 gender identity and maybe even appearance, people being called fat and tall or whatever. 10 11 things in place. Like make each state accountable. Set more guidelines. Like have the states follow up 12 13 on it and have reports submitted to them. 14 And then let the states follow through 15 and maybe then submit based on the problems that they 16 get like reports to the DOE, DOJ if it's verv That would take a little off of the 17 worrisome. DOJ/DOE in a sense. And give them the best -- I 18 19 mean, the incidences that really require attention. 20 So that way the states kind of have control, but yet they do have guidelines. 21 22 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you. On behalf of the Commission, we want to 23 thank each and every one of you that are here with us 24

this afternoon and all the panelists that were with

us today.

I also want to make sure that I publicly thank the Commission staff for their Herculean efforts to prepare this hearing, this briefing, for today. Many of them were working day and night to do the work that is normally done in a year in half the time. So we very much appreciate that in working very hard to make sure we meet our statutory report deadline.

Particularly I would like to highlight
Commission staff members, Dave Snyder, Lenore
Ostrowsky. I know they're here in the room or around
here. So wave your hand. Pam Dunston, Lillian
Dunlap, Audrey Wright. And of course our Acting
Staff Director and Acting General Counsel Kimberly
Tolhurst.

Lastly, the record for this Enforcement Report is going to remain open for the next 15 days. If panelists or members of the public or anyone watching this on television would like to submit materials to us in writing they can mail them to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Office of the General Counsel, 624 9th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20425.

It is now 4:19. This meeting of the

1	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is hereby adjourned.
2	Thank you.
3	(Whereupon, at 4:19 p.m., the above-
4	referenced matter was concluded.)
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1

2

NEAL R. GROSS