

Risk Audit Plan

Introduction

Many Americans are aware of the growing visibility of homosexuality as an issue in our culture. Where it concerns our children, this visibility causes increased interest and possibly acceptance by them at a vulnerable age. Many people are frustrated, wondering: *What can I do?* How do parents get a firm fix on what their children are seeing and hearing?

What the Risk Audit Plan below offers local communities is *knowledge*. This plan provides a handy tool for measuring the promotion of homosexuality at any local public school district. Once the extent of the “homosexual agenda” directed to children is discovered, local parents, grandparents and citizens can alert the community and the media, and notify the schools themselves. Parents will then clearly understand their responsibility to hold schools accountable for removing pro-homosexual material and, if this is not done, to move children to a different educational environment.

Won't you please help in your community?

Why Homosexual Activism in Schools Endangers Students

Every school district in the United States has an absolute responsibility to the community to *protect* children while they are at school. This also means that school districts have an absolute obligation to *do no harm to the children entrusted to their care*.

An alarming number of public schools in this country are routinely violating these minimal expectations because of the unthinking and irresponsible embrace of homosexuality as an acceptable lifestyle for students and teachers.¹

This is a simple issue: There is *no* legitimate rationale for giving or implying endorsement of homosexual, bisexual or gender-variant behaviors among children of any age. It is not a viewpoint, but a high-risk, and often lethal, behavior. The issue is not one of rights, or opinions, but of health and social stability.

Regrettably, advocates of homosexuality, including teachers, students, administrators, teachers' union delegates and school board members, are now permitted to promote homosexuality in a variety of ways in many school districts. Curricular materials and extra-curricular programs that imply or proclaim acceptance of homosexual behavior are becoming more and more common. These are frequently initiated through school alliances with influential homosexual pressure groups such as GLSEN (Gay, Lesbian and

¹ In this document, “homosexuality” is often used as a short-hand way of referring to all so-called “sexual minorities,” i.e., those who call themselves “gays, lesbians, bisexuals, and/or transgendered.”

Straight Education Network) and PFLAG (Parents, Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays). Local resistance is suppressed as advocates receive pro bono legal support from the American Civil Liberties Union, the Lambda Legal Defense Fund, the National Education Association's legal defense for homosexual teachers, and other groups.

Most of this is flying under the radar of parents and communities, yet this betrayal of trust has become a public health and social stability issue for virtually every community. The majority of students educated in public or secular schools, even if raised in Christian homes, are being successfully indoctrinated with the belief that engaging in homosexual behavior is a right and is relatively harmless. The truth is otherwise.

With homosexual behavior comes a host of significant health and lifestyle risks. Whether this conduct is a result of homosexual desires, or contributes to developing them, or some of both, is anyone's guess. The fact remains that teens engaging in homosexual behavior are participating in a lifestyle that, for males:

- reduces life expectancy at age 20 by at least 8 to 20 years;
- increases by at least 500 percent the risk of contracting AIDS;
- increases the risk of contracting a sexually transmitted disease by nearly 900 percent;
- increases by 4,000 percent the risk of developing anal cancer.

For females:

- substantially increases the risk of contracting bacterial vaginosis, breast cancer and ovarian cancer.

For both sexes:

- substantially increases the likelihood of smoking, mental health disorders (other than same-sex attraction), "domestic" violence, and alcohol and drug abuse;
- substantially increases the likelihood of contracting hepatitis and other gastrointestinal infections;
- has high levels of participation in sadomasochism, coprophilia, fisting, and other dangerous, deviant sex practices;
- involves extraordinarily high levels of promiscuity.

As it now stands, each child enrolled in a public school is likely to receive numerous direct and implicit messages at school that homosexual behavior should be accepted as normal. The underlying (and erroneous) **assumptions** of these messages are:

- Homosexuality is inborn and inevitable for some students and teachers, and therefore a matter of "rights." *There is no body of credible scientific research that establishes this proposition.*
- Homosexual behaviors are no more risky than current trends in heterosexual behavior. This is not supported by public health data or common sense.

Homosexuality is a *viewpoint* and should be protected by “free speech” constitutional protections. Like smoking, it is actually a high-risk behavior. Schools should no more permit homosexual behavior to be presented to children as “normal” and “acceptable” than they should permit smoking or drug use to be presented to children as “normal” and “acceptable.”

- Objections to homosexuality are a threat to the welfare of students who are assumed to be “born gay.” As is so often the case with politically correct “conventional wisdom,” exactly the reverse is true. Objections to homosexual behavior actually save lives and improve mental and physical health by providing hope for change to normal, healthy sexual behavior.

Hijacking the Language of Civil Rights

By posing as a part of the civil rights movement, homosexual activists have succeeded in attaching their message to the message of “human rights” and “tolerance” already incorporated into countless lessons in a typical curriculum, e.g., in social studies and literature classes. Homosexual advocacy takes the idea of being kind and civil and perverts it. Homosexuals, bisexuals and cross-gender practitioners are falsely alleged to be illegitimately discriminated against, even “oppressed” by the majority.

A “safe school” becomes one that doesn’t threaten the “homosexual” student or teacher with disapproval—so *all* students and staff members are forced to stifle any objections to homosexual behavior or be vilified as “homophobes” and potential threats.

Propagandistic claims that “GLBT” (gay/lesbian/bisexual/transgendered) students are at higher risk of suicide and are often the targets of bullying cow school boards into accepting homosexual clubs, “anti-harassment” policies and tolerance programs. The truth is that many students are targets of bullies, and not all of them demand a totalitarian regime of their classmates’ mental re-programming to stop this. The reality is that the behaviors involved in homosexuality are the real risk to these children.

Overview: The Risk Audit Project

In May and June 2005, more than 50 state pro-family groups formed an alliance to encourage the Southern Baptist Convention (SBC) to use its influence to protect children from school districts that are promoting acceptance of homosexual behavior. As a result, the SBC passed a resolution that encouraged local SBC churches to investigate, among other things, whether their school district is betraying parents, children and the community by collaborating with homosexual activists. In cases where the school district was found to be collaborating, the resolution urged parents to hold the school districts accountable and demand discontinuation of such morally offensive programs and materials.

To assist this investigative effort, we are offering this survey instrument to implement what we call the **Risk Audit Project**. The **objectives** are to:

1. Gather information about school districts throughout the U.S. regarding whether and how the districts promote acceptance of homosexual behavior to students;
2. Summarize this information through use of a uniform research instrument;
3. Communicate the results to the public through various media;
4. Hold the identified schools accountable to make needed changes in curricula, school programs and policies, and teaching.

How and Where the Risk Audit Will be Implemented

The Risk Audit Project will use a detailed, uniform research instrument/questionnaire. The next Section outlines the type of information needed.

Local volunteers will complete the research instrument after they gather the needed information. They will forward the completed audits to the pro-family group(s) and/or churches leading that particular team of volunteer researchers, in most cases at the state level. Then, the team leaders will report to the media and the public the audit results for the school system(s) selected.

Prayer Support

As a critical support for these efforts, prayer partners should be recruited to pray regularly and fervently for the success of the Risk Audit Project in revealing information. Prayers should ask that officials and teachers be convicted about the dangers involved and do their part. Each state team should make this a priority from the project's beginning.

Background on Questionnaire

This section provides background that researchers will need for using the **Risk Audit Questionnaire**. The actual Questionnaire, without much detail but with simply space for data, follows this Section. You may want to put this section next to the actual Questionnaire and go through them side by side.

Background on School Policies (Section 1 of questionnaire)

The first section of the questionnaire asks for information about *current school policies that pertain to "sexual orientation."* The goal is to find out which of the following types of policies the school district has adopted. Research these types of policies:

- 1. An anti-harassment, anti-bullying or "safe schools" policy that includes the category "sexual orientation."** The term "sexual orientation" may be included in a laundry list of other classifications, e.g., "... on the basis of race, religion, age, sex, nationality, *sexual orientation ...* ." (Emphasis added.)
- 2. Nondiscrimination policy based on "sexual orientation" (may also cover "gender identity") for students and/or teachers, staff.** Such a policy may be spelled out just for

staff/teachers and may be phrased as a “non-discrimination” policy (again, with a laundry list of classifications, as in #1) or it may be a section of the staff hiring procedures. Sometimes, even if “sexual orientation” is not explicit, there may be a provision for “minority” hiring, and it will be necessary to get a written assurance that this includes racial and ethnic minorities only, not “sexual” minorities (another term used for homosexuality, etc.).

3. Requirements for teacher/staff training on “diversity,” “tolerance,” “sensitivity.”

What training (indoctrination) about homosexuality does the school require of its staff? Some have accepted the idea that unlearning attitudes that object to homosexuality is necessary, because such attitudes are thought to be bigoted and lead to illegitimate “discrimination” and mistreatment of homosexual students or other staff members.

4. Objectionable material in library and parent-resistant selection input. Some novels and books for children have become explicit on this topic, and some award-winning selections openly advocate homosexuality. Many librarians now assume there is no harm in children reading books with (misleading) information on this topic, and that sexually explicit material is simply a part of some literature and social science books that should be made available for students. Parent input is sometimes unwelcome.

5. Teachers who are openly homosexual and sometimes associated with “gay” activist groups. A district “nondiscrimination” policy makes it much easier for a staff member to reveal a homosexual, cross-gender or other “sexual minority” preference/lifestyle. In the not-too-distant past, schools would not hire anyone who was openly homosexual. That has changed in many school districts. Are open homosexuals teaching these students?

6. School district has formal relationship with “gay” activist groups. In some districts, schools have gone to the extreme of accepting formal consulting contracts with “gay” activist groups, most prominently GLSEN (Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network) and PFLAG (Parents, Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays). The contract can cover teacher training workshops or direct student activities, such as speakers, workshops, etc. A standing district committee may also retain a consulting relationship with such a group.

Background on Government Regulations and Grants (Section 2 of questionnaire)

1. Local or state laws: Local or state laws may determine or influence what is taught at the school level. Some *states* have public school “non-discrimination” laws that include “sexual orientation” and also, in some cases, “gender identity.” At present, those we know about are: California, Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Vermont and Wisconsin.

In addition, many of the *cities/counties* in those and other states also have sexual orientation non-discrimination laws. And such laws exist in some university towns throughout the United States.

Anti-harassment or anti-bullying laws for schools now exist in many states as well. Those that include “sexual orientation” (some also include “gender identity”) are Washington, Maine, California, Maryland, New Jersey and Vermont.

2. Federal funds: Federal grants for “safe sex,” “safe schools,” “tolerance,” “anti-bias” or drug prevention programs may be the funding sources of pro-homosexual lessons in your school district. The agencies most likely to give money to your school for objectionable programs are:

a. *Centers for Disease Control, Adolescent Health*, for health education or HIV education. This often translates into instruction in homosexual sex practices in the classroom.

b. *U.S. Department of Education (USDOE), under the “Safe and Drug Free Schools” program*, gives grants to schools to “prevent hate crimes.” This can include education to prevent crimes centering on sexual orientation. These funds have been used for a variety of “tolerance” and “anti-bias” curricula. Some funding under this program may be given as a block grant to a “Safe and Drug Free Schools” department of your state Department of Education, which then makes grants to local schools in your state.

c. *U.S. Department of Justice, Juvenile Justice office*, often teams up with the USDOE to fund “Safe Schools” programs. One of these is called “Civil Rights Actions Teams.” It’s a “peer mediation” project, where kids monitor their classmates at the middle school level, including watch-dogging and then reporting on overheard “homophobic slurs.”

d. *National Institutes of Mental Health (NIMH) and its agency Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration (SAMSA)* sometimes make grants to states and local schools. This may or may not pertain to the area of sexual orientation or counseling.

3. State funds: As mentioned above, state agencies are often “pass through” mechanisms for federal “safe sex” and HIV education grants, which almost always include details about homosexuality and imply acceptance of and “safe” management of high-risk behaviors. Your state’s Department of Health may be the agency through which health education grants come like this. Sometimes, they come through the state Department of Education. Occasionally, a county health department may be the source of a program on HIV/AIDS education at a local school.

4. Private Grants: Some public schools now solicit or accept private grants to fund a variety of projects. This varies too widely to provide any guidance but watch for this as a source of possible funding for HIV/AIDS education or “violence, anti-bias or anti-bullying” prevention, which may include lessons to accept homosexuality. Even some “character” education programs may include acceptance of homosexuality.

Background on Curricular Content (Section 3 of questionnaire)

The term “curriculum” relates to actual lessons taught to students in their classrooms. Schools have subject matter departments, committees and many other oversight areas through which curricula are determined. Schools choose both from materials prepared outside the school (textbooks, workbooks, videos, lesson plans) but often develop and adapt them to their own school district’s priorities.

1. Programs on tolerance, diversity, “hate” or “bias”: These are usually taught beginning at the late elementary school or at the middle/high school level, as a part of social studies. In middle or high school, they may be a social studies/language/literature combination.

The titles vary: “Tolerance,” “Diversity,” Anti-Bias, Anti-Bullying or “Multi-Culturalism.” Sometimes they are part of a study on “differences.”

2. Lessons on different types of families: This is the most common method for the early elementary grades to receive pro-homosexual instruction. *Love Makes a Family* is a video that combines worthy messages of accepting families headed by grandparents, single moms, or multi-racial families, with the unacceptable message of accepting two lesbians or two men as heads of families. Outside speakers, such as two homosexuals who live with children, address the class. Units sometimes center around a book on this subject.

3. Pro-homosexual stories/novels on suggested reading lists in literature classes: These stories involving homosexuality, often sexually graphic in nature, are assumed to provide necessary “support” for students who “are” homosexual, and indoctrinate all students to accept this lifestyle. Some well-known titles are:

Elementary grades: *My Two Uncles; The Duke Who Outlawed Jellybeans; Daddy’s Roommate; Heather Has Two Mommies; One Dad, Two Dads, Brown Dad, Blue Dad; Asha’s Mums; King & King; Who’s in a Family?; Oliver Button is a Sissy; Belinda’s Bouquet.*

Middle school and high school: *Am I Blue?; Annie on My Mind; Athletic Shorts; Who Framed Lorenzo Garcia?; Keeping You a Secret; Kissing Kate; Tommy Stands Alone; Two Teenagers in Twenty; Invisible Life; Just As I Am; Deliver Us From Evie; My Father’s Scar; Rainbow Boys; Rainbow High; So Hard to Say; Entries from A Hot Pink Notebook; Boy Meets Boy; The Perks of Being a Wallflower.*

4. HIV/AIDS and “safe sex” education programs: These lessons assume all students are at risk of AIDS; that all students need to be taught about use of condoms for “safe sex.” Acceptance of acts common to homosexuals, such as anal sex, is implicit in these so-called “neutral” programs.

5. Political science/ history/civics classes on current issues: At the senior high level, most high schools offer courses that explore current social and political issues. Even as electives, if they teach the “tolerance” message about homosexuality, these courses send a message to every student implying school endorsement. History courses and textbooks have also been used to promote the “mainstreaming” of homosexual behavior. Houghton Mifflin’s *A History of Western Society*, for example, is used in some high school advanced placement courses and instructs children that homosexual behavior was acceptable to early Christians.

Background on Extracurricular Activities (Section 4 of questionnaire)

1. A homosexual student club: The names of such clubs vary. The most common term is “gay/straight alliance” or GSA. It may also be called a GLBT club (for “gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered”), a human rights club, a rainbow club, an anti-bias club, a pride club, or an anti-violence club. An easy way to research whether a school district is betraying the community’s trust by allowing homosexual clubs is to go to the GLSEN Web site (www.glsen.org) and click on the “resources” for students. There you will see a locator that identifies homosexual clubs in middle schools and high schools on a state by state basis. Bear in mind, though, that many clubs are probably not listed.

2. Special school speakers /assemblies/films/health fairs: Speakers or films may be brought into the school for one-time special programs that deal with homosexuality, or HIV/“safe sex” education. Some schools also routinely hold a “health fair” where pro-homosexual material is made available to students.

3. Diversity day, day of silence, “gay” pride celebration day (or week), “coming out” day, etc.: Any special day or week set aside to “celebrate” or honor (even through silence) the idea that homosexual behavior is acceptable communicates this to all students, even those not directly involved.

4. Pink triangle or rainbow “safety” program: Certain schools have adopted what they call “safety” measures. Cardboard pink triangles or rainbows, both used as symbols of “gay rights,” are affixed to the office or classroom doors of some teachers or staff. The idea is that these are designated as “safe” areas for students to come if they want to privately ask questions about homosexual feelings, where they will receive sympathy and secret advice instead of warnings.

Implementation Tips, Tools

More tips on information gathering and tools for the media strategy are available in our longer Risk Audit Plan. Contact Linda Harvey at Mission America, lpharvey@missionamerica.com, for a copy of that Plan.

Risk Audit Questionnaire and Rating Table
To be completed for each school district

Please write legibly in black ink.

School Data:

1. Name of school district: _____

2. Street address of district offices: _____

3. City _____ State _____ Zip _____

4. Phone: (____) _____

5. Web site address of school district _____

6. List of schools in district to be sampled:

Elementary: _____

Middle: _____

High: _____

Special schools (describe): _____

7. Superintendent: _____

8. School board members: _____

Section 1: School Policy

1. Does the district have an anti-harassment or anti-bullying policy specifying sexual orientation?

yes no If yes, is gender identity also included? yes no

If YES, please specify which, and provide policy number from official school manual:

2. Does the district have a non-discrimination policy that specifies sexual orientation?

yes no If yes, is gender identity also included? yes no

If YES, please specify which, and provide policy number from official school manual:

3. Are there requirements for teacher/ staff training on “diversity,” “tolerance,” “sensitivity”? Please provide as much information as possible, including frequency of such training, when last workshops were conducted, and whether elementary and/or secondary teachers attended.

4. Objectionable material in library, and parent-resistant selection input. Please list (use an attachment if needed) seriously objectionable material available to students in the library on the issue of homosexuality. Please list by elementary, middle or high school and please indicate which school libraries you visited. Also please detail any input you have regarding how responsive they are to parental book/media concerns.

5. Are teachers/staff affiliated with homosexual activist groups? Examples would be GLSEN, PFLAG, Human Rights Campaign, and the NEA Gay-Lesbian Caucus.

Please list, detailing the teaching/staff positions they hold, and what office they hold in the pertinent organization.

6. Does the school have an ongoing relationship with a “gay” activist group, such as GLSEN, PFLAG or a local community group? Is this in the form of a consulting contract, or a referral relationship? Please detail. _____

Section 2: Local/State/Federal regulations /grants and private grants

1. Do local or state laws apply?

a. School anti-harassment or anti-bullying specifying sexual orientation:
___ yes ___ no If yes, please give code number(s) _____

If YES, is gender identity also included? ___yes ___no

b. Non-discrimination for school or public employment specifying sexual orientation:
___ yes ___ no If yes, please give code number (s) _____

If YES, is gender identity also included? ___yes ___no

2. Do any federal, state or local government grants use material with implied or explicit endorsement of homosexuality? Please give as much information as you have, including the name of the staff or teacher grant-contact:

Federal _____

State _____

Local _____

3. Do any private foundation or business grants contain implied or explicit endorsement of homosexuality? Please give as much information, including the name of the staff or teacher grant contact:

Section 3: School Curricular Content

1. Do lessons/books/programs as part of the school curriculum urge tolerance/acceptance of homosexuality, and imply that objections are unacceptable? Note: These are materials actually used by a teacher in a class setting with groups of students, not books simply available in the library. It may be an entire class offered at the senior high level.

Please list as much detail as you can:

Name of curriculum
Class, or book

Grade level(s)
used

At which school(s)?

2. Do classroom lessons on different types of families include endorsement of homosexual partners as heads of families?

Name of curriculum Class, or book	Grade level(s) used	At which school(s)?

3. Do reading and literature classes suggest or feature pro-homosexual stories/novels?
Note: This should be only those books required or on classroom lists of recommended reading, not books simply available in the library. Attach a separate sheet if needed.

Name of book	Grade level(s) used	At which school(s)?

4. Are HIV/AIDS and “safe-sex” education programs that teach acceptance of homosexual behavior offered?

Name of curriculum used	Grade level(s) used	At which school(s)?

5. Are political science or current issues classes teaching that acceptance of homosexuality, same-sex marriage and “gay rights” is the most desirable position?

Name of class	Grade level(s)	At which school(s)?
---------------	----------------	---------------------

Section 4: Extracurricular Activities

1. Are there homosexual clubs at any schools in your district? ___ yes ___ no

If YES, please list as indicated:

Name of club (e.g., Gay-straight alliance)	School(s) located	Name of faculty advisor
-----------------------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------

2. Has the school held a special school assembly, outside speaker(s) or a health fair that advocated homosexuality?

Describe assembly, fair, etc.	Grade level(s)	Date	At what school(s)?
-------------------------------	----------------	------	--------------------

3. Has the school held an event specifically advocating homosexuality, such as a “Diversity day,” Day of silence,” “gay” pride celebration day (or week), “coming out” day, etc.?

___ yes ___no If YES, please list the type of event, dates, etc., below.

Name of event	Date held	Grade level(s) attending	At what school(s)?
---------------	-----------	--------------------------	--------------------

4. Does any school have a “pink triangle” or “rainbow” or similar program designating pro-homosexual classes or zones of the school? ___ yes ___no

If YES, please give specifics.

Describe program	About how many areas or classrooms	At what school(s)?
------------------	------------------------------------	--------------------

Other: Include information not covered above, including relevant incidents/ anecdotes. Attach extra sheets if needed.

Ratings

Each research group will arrive at its own conclusions regarding the importance of what it finds. Nevertheless, because of the health- and life-threatening consequences to

children because of school district collaboration with homosexual activists, we recommend the following:

1. Any district with a homosexual club or any program or curriculum that would tend to influence children to regard homosexual behavior as normal or acceptable, or that has openly homosexual teachers or administrators, should be identified as a clear and present danger to children and society and should receive a failing grade. Please bear in mind, too, that it does not matter that some school districts are collaborating with homosexual activists because of state or local law. The dangers to children and society are the same whether the collaboration is required or discretionary.

2. In other cases – as, for example, where school library books might attempt to influence children to accept the homosexual lifestyle as normal – it might be more appropriate to identify the school district as one that poses a risk to the welfare of children that requires immediate correction.

3. In all cases where a Risk Audit finds collaboration with homosexual activists, parents, churches, and state and local family-oriented organizations should be alerted and asked to demand immediate corrective action from the school board. The school board’s response should be communicated clearly to the public, and if a school board promises corrective action, it is important to determine whether the school district actually follows through in good faith. Even if the school district follows through, continued vigilance is important because pressures from within the education establishment will continue to encourage acceptance of homosexual behavior.

4. We have provided a **Rating Table** below that you may wish to use.

Rating /Scoring Table

Section 1: School policies	Point Value	This school
1. Anti-harassment or anti-bullying --if gender identity also	5 2	_____ _____
2. Non-discrimination ---if gender identity also	5 2	_____ _____
3. Required “sensitivity training” (Use judgment, depending on frequency of training, i.e., just once, for 5 years, etc.)	7 - 9	_____
4. Objectionable books in library	1 pt. per book	_____

5. Teacher affiliations	2 pts. per affiliated teacher	_____
6. School contracts or linkages with “gay” activist groups	10 pts. for contract, 6 pts for referrals	_____

Section 2: Local/state/federal policies, grants

1. Local or state laws		
a. Anti-harassment or anti-bullying	5 for each	_____
--if gender identity also	2 for each	_____
b. Non-discrimination	5 for each	_____
-- if gender identity also	2 for each	_____
2. Government grants		
a. Federal	3 for each	_____
b. State	3 for each	_____
c. Local	3 for each	_____
3. Private grants	3 for each	_____

Section 3: School curricular content

1. Tolerance programs, lessons	8 for each	_____
2. Families headed by homosexuals	8 for each	_____
3. Novels, stories in class	5 for each	_____
4. HIV/Safe-sex curricula	10 for each	_____
5. Political science, issue classes	8 for each	_____

Section 4: Extracurricular Activities

1. Homosexual club	10 for each	_____
2. Special assembly, film, fair, etc. (Use your judgment based on number, frequency, how many students attended, etc.)	5- 8	_____
3. Diversity Day, Day of Silence, Gay Pride, etc. (Use judgment based on	5 - 8	_____

number, level of school support)

4. Pink triangle, rainbow safety program 5 - 8 _____
(Use judgment based on extent of program)

Repeat Exposure Risk Factor:

Add 12 additional points if this district has pro-homosexual programs at elementary, middle school and high school levels. _____

Add 8 points if programs at two of the three levels. _____

Total school risk points: _____

Subtract from 100: **100**

minus school points: - _____

FINAL SCORE: _____

(Note: the final school score in extreme cases will be expressed as a negative number, for instance, -25.)

Appendix

Here are several valuable resources.

The first resources outline the health risks of homosexuality. These would be useful in preparing your reports, press materials and in meetings with the schools.

Several Web-based articles documenting homosexuality’s health risks:

“The Negative Health Effects of Homosexuality” at

<http://www.frc.org/get.cfm?i=IS01B1>

“The Health Risks of Gay Sex” by John R. Diggs, M.D., at

http://www.corporateresourcecouncil.org/white_papers/Health_Risks.pdf

Publicity goals/ideas and sample press release

Publicity tips, resources

Leaders of pro-family groups will have their own experience with press relations and their own local and state relationships with reporters. We won’t attempt to duplicate them here. They should be put to maximum use as part of the press effort.

States may want to include national media. At some point, a planned national press thrust may be advisable, and that is something to consider as we begin this effort.

For an accurate list of media by states and national networks, go to www.newslink.org.

You may also want to consider using a press release distribution service such as www.emediawire.com.

In addition, *conservative/religious media* are key to this effort. Here is a list of sources. Please consult the Internet for the latest contact information on each.

World Net Daily

CNS News

News Max

Drudge Report

AFA Radio

Janet Parshall's America

Family News in Focus (Focus on the Family)

Salem Communications Network (SRN News)

Dr. Laura show

Laura Ingram Show

Glenn Beck Show

Michael Reagan show

Ken Hamblin show

Roger Hedgecock show

Sean Hannity show

Bill O'Reilly radio show

Rush Limbaugh show

Hugh Hewitt show

Chuck Baldwin show

Michael Medved show

Washington Times daily newspaper

Human Events (weekly newspaper)

American Spectator (news magazine)

Weekly Standard (weekly news magazine)

Fox Network talk shows--*O' Reilly Factor, Hannity and Colmes*, etc.

MSNBC-- *Scarborough Country*

Insight (news magazine)

National Review (news magazine)

The Wanderer (national Catholic news weekly)

Christian Wire Service (www.christianwireservice.com)

Sample Press Release:

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

March 10, 2006

Contact: Alice A. Christian, American Family Association of (State)
Phone / Cell/ E-mail

**Family Groups Announce Results of Risk Audit of
Great American and Anytown School Districts**

(Anytown) At a press conference later today, leaders of four state family groups will announce their findings regarding the level of promotion of homosexual behavior at two prominent local school districts.

Great American and Anytown School Districts, noted for their records of high student achievement, will nonetheless receive failing marks for incorporating promotion of homosexual behavior to students at every level.

“Both of these school districts have adopted widespread programs, curricula and activities that endorse homosexuality,” said Alice A. Christian, state director of the American Family Association. “Students are at greater risk as a result.”

Christian’s group joined with Every State Family Policy Council and the state chapters of Concerned Women for America and Eagle Forum to assess these two school districts in areas such as teaching “tolerance” of homosexuality, allowing school homosexual clubs for students, and mandatory teacher training programs that endorse homosexual conduct among students and teachers. Both school districts were found to have adopted all of these activities and more.

Fred Greatguy, director of the Family Policy Council, said, “While such messages are sometimes popular in educational circles, most parents are greatly disturbed when they find out their children are being deliberately taught to accept what is termed ‘gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered’ behaviors.”

The coalition recruited local volunteers who gathered data on the schools’ curricula, policies, teacher training requirements, and extra-curricular activities. In addition, they looked at offerings in the school library, and the districts’ adoption of so-called “safety” or “anti-harassment” plans.

“We found numerous examples at both schools where students were given the impression that homosexual behavior would be the equivalent to heterosexual behavior, even in families and in marriage,” said Frances Noblewoman, director of the state chapter of Concerned Women for America. “For instance, elementary classes feature stories where different types of families are described. In both schools, we found these lessons

positively portrayed households headed by two women or two men. This is manipulative and dangerously misleading, and gives impressionable children the false sense that there's nothing wrong with homosexuality."

Great American High School allowed students to form a homosexual club two years ago, and Anytown has a club called an "anti-bias" club that is essentially a homosexual club also, volunteers found. "This sends an insidious message to all students that homosexual behavior is a viable option," said Mary Strongfaith, president of the state chapter of Eagle Forum. "Even though only a few students participate, when the school allows it, every student has a false sense of security about these activities."

A numeric rating scale is being used to assess schools, and both school districts' results were poor, said Christian. The specific results will be announced at the press conference.

"While both districts did poorly there are schools in other parts of the state whose results show they are even more high-risk," Christian noted. "There have also been districts whose results were far better." During the press conference, comparative results will be reported.

The message that homosexuality is acceptable was noted throughout both districts, with virtually no information for students about the well-documented risks associated with homosexuality, including much higher rates of sexually transmitted diseases, higher rates of promiscuity, shorter relationships, and higher rates of substance abuse.

"This is like giving kids the message that running out in traffic is acceptable," said Greatguy. "Our children deserve better than this."

-30-

PRESS CONFERENCE: Thursday, March 10, 2006
10:00 a.m.
Anytown Christian Church
1776 Founders Road

At the press conference, the specific results will be announced and volunteers who gathered the information will speak. Some of the objectionable books and teaching materials used will be available for press inspection/visuals.

Some Suggested School Districts:

Initial targeted school districts

This list is suggested because of geographic distribution as well as, in some cases, specific knowledge of the school districts' past activities. Also in many cases there are known knowledgeable grassroots volunteers who could kick-start the research process.

We have also clustered some school districts around a major metropolitan area, so that the local media can be more effective.

California

Grossmont Union High School District
La Mesa

Lakeside Union School District
Lakeside

Cajon Valley Union School District
El Cajon

Colorado

Denver Public Schools
Denver

Connecticut

Consult Stephen Bennett

Illinois

Consult Peter LaBarbera

Kansas

Shawnee Mission School District
Shawnee Mission

Blue Valley Schools
Overland Park

Massachusetts

Lexington Public Schools
Lexington

Newton School District
Newton

Michigan

To be determined by
Gary Glenn.

Minnesota

South Washington County Schools
Cottage Grove

Eden Prairie Schools
Eden Prairie

New York

South Huntington Schools
Huntington Station

Three Village Central School District
East Setauket

North Carolina

Alamance-Burlington School District
Burlington

Guilford County Schools
Greensboro

Ohio

Columbus Public Schools
Columbus

Upper Arlington City Schools
Upper Arlington

Princeton School District
Cincinnati

Cincinnati Public Schools
Cincinnati

Lakota Local School District
Liberty Township

Cleveland Heights - University Heights School District
University Heights

Lakewood City Schools
Lakewood

Pennsylvania

Recommendations to come from local /state family leaders.

Texas

Katy Independent School District
Katy

Klein Independent School District
Klein

Garland Independent School District
Garland

Northwest Independent School District
Justin

Virginia

Fairfax County Public Schools
Fairfax

Falls Church City Public Schools
Falls Church

Washington

Everett Public Schools
Everett

Bellevue School District
Bellevue