

A New Civil Rights Campaign? Policies and Practices to Support Students' Gender Diversity

Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership
2018, Vol. 21(3) 48–60
© 2017 The University Council
for Educational Administration
Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/1555458917741173
journals.sagepub.com/home/jel



**Janalee Barnard¹, Kristopher M. Goodrich²,
and Allison M. Borden²**

Abstract

Ms. Barnard is faced with a complex dilemma. The district administrator in charge of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) initiatives and support was presented with a case of a transgender student who wished to attend an overnight field trip and share a room with other students based on her gender identity. Although the district had made previous headway in formatting district policies to fit the needs of transgender students, no procedural directive was available to respond to this new situation. In addition, the superintendent of the district was unsupportive of transgender students. The case was developed for an educational leadership course so that students can discuss the legal issues, role and value conflicts, and theoretical perspective informing policy and practice.

Keywords

social justice leadership, transgender, school counseling

Case Narrative I

The Beginning Phases

Albuquerque Public Schools (APS) is the largest public school system in New Mexico (NM), serving more than a quarter of NM's youth, and the 34th largest public school system within the United States. The district has 141 schools consisting of 13 million

¹Albuquerque Public Schools, Albuquerque, NM, USA

²The University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, USA

Corresponding Author:

Kristopher M. Goodrich, The University of New Mexico, MSC 05 3040, 1 University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131, USA.

Email: kgoodric@unm.edu

square feet of instructional space and covering 1,200 square miles. APS serves 84,000 students, with 73% of students eligible for free or reduced lunch. Seventeen percent of students are English Language learners, 15% identify as having a disability, and 7% are involved in the gifted program. The majority of students in the district identify as Hispanic (67%), with 21% identifying as Caucasian/White, 4% American Indian, 2% African American, 2% Asian, 1% Other, and 3% as multiracial.

It was 2009, and as Ms. Barnard reflected on her work supporting lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) students in APS, she felt very satisfied with the accomplishments that had been made thus far. In 2001, she had begun the Safe Zone program for all middle and high schools in the largest school district in NM, and it was the first such program in the state. She had built strong community partnerships with two of the local LGBT organizations, which had eventually led to the formation of a GLBT Task Force¹ made up of internal and external stakeholders whose purpose was to make recommendations to the superintendent regarding support for LGBT students. As a result of that task force, gender identity had been added to the nondiscrimination policy by the Board of Education in 2005 and all administrators in the district had been required to attend training on LGBT issues.

Ms. Barnard was grateful she had been allowed to retain the work of district administration for LGBT issues regardless of the various positions in the district she had assumed over the years (from the administrator for School Counseling programs to Director of Title IX Programs, with others in between). By maintaining ownership of the work, it had allowed her to (a) train schools regarding “LGBT 101,” upon request; (b) provide consultation support to schools and district administrators regarding LGBT issues; (c) continue coordinating the APS Safe Zone program; and (d) use the knowledge and history of where they had been and where they still needed to go to further the work. APS was making a lot of strides, and two other districts in the state had contacted her for help in furthering their own support for their LGBT students, namely, asking for assistance in how to start their own Safe Zone program.

The “T” in LGBT

Although APS had long included gender identity and expression in their nondiscrimination statement, transgender students were just beginning to surface in the district. The transgender student Ms. Barnard was aware of, Tara (a pseudonym), was in upper elementary school, and Ms. Barnard had had multiple meetings at various times with Tara’s mother and school staff to provide support. Tara had been assigned male at birth but identified as female. Although she passed as her identified gender, or “blended,” she had a couple of rocky years but was finally settled in at a middle school with lots of support. In fact, it was the first year Ms. Barnard did not receive multiple calls from school staff where direction was needed due to gender identity issues. Then, in the spring of Tara’s sixth-grade year, Ms. Barnard received a call that was to impact the rest of her professional career in APS. The school principal stated that Tara would be attending an out-of-state field trip over spring break. The principal inquired to Ms. Barnard, “Who was Tara supposed to room with, the girls or the boys?”

Ms. Barnard did not have an answer for that question, as it had never come up within the district before. There was no procedural directive in the district that pertained to the issue of transgender student room placement during field trips, even though a policy of nondiscrimination based upon gender identity existed. She immediately called a meeting with one of the assistant superintendents, the Office of Equal Opportunity Services, and Risk Management. Together, they decided that the GLBT Task Force would be revamped and reconvene to come up with a solution. As such, the Transgender Task Force was born. It consisted of district and site personnel; members of the local community, including a representative from Parents, Family, Friends of Lesbians and Gays (PFLAG); one from the state's transgender resource center; and a retired university professor. Although it seemed clear to the members of the group that Tara should be allowed to room with the girls in order not to discriminate, their hands as decision makers were tied.

A different superintendent was now in place than the one when all past initiatives to support LGBT students had been successful, as she had moved to another district outside of NM. The current superintendent made it clear that he would not support transgender students using the bathroom of their gender identity. Ms. Barnard knew this as the superintendent served in various roles within different state advisory councils and used his platform to advocate for policies toward transgender student athletes that she saw as regressive. In addition, she knew several persons in key district leadership positions who were conservative Christians and opposed to recent social movements to support and affirm lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer/questioning (LGBTQI+) persons. When discussing this with others, these key leaders noted their concern about their, and others', eternal fate, and spoke with fear and passion about how opposing traditional structures may negatively influence their eternal salvation. They spoke about their care and support of students but rooted themselves in their faith as the path to do this in the most just and moral way. Obviously, then, there was no question that higher-ups within the district would not support allowing transgender students to room with other students based upon their gender identity. This then became an issue of discrimination for Ms. Barnard based upon practice but not policy. The policy said there was to be no discrimination based upon gender identity; however, institutionalized practices and senior leadership indicated otherwise. Instead, senior leadership wanted students to use bathrooms and room based on the sex assigned on their birth certificate. Ms. Barnard saw this as in conflict with the district's nondiscrimination statement, which directly addressed gender identity, best practices in the field, and the expressed needs of Tara, the student.

The Transgender Task Force was then forced to respond based upon the demands and restrictions provided by the superintendent and key leadership staff; as such, they created a watered-down version of a procedural directive on gender identity to address different issues within the limited scope they were given (i.e., how to go about changing students' names, gender on school records, etc.). The watered-down procedural directive was by no means perfect, but it was better than having inconsistency among the 140+ schools in the district. Ms. Barnard and her team could only trust that a transgender student would be supported if there were a sympathetic principal.

Unfortunately, in addition to tying the hands of the Transgender Task Force regarding bathrooms, the superintendent made a crucial change to the proposed procedural directive at the last minute during the summer when much of the group was not on contract; he edited the draft document to indicate that the birth certificate should be used as the default in making decisions about bathroom use, field trip rooming situations, and so on. The result, of course, was that students could not be identified by their gender identity unless it was aligned with their assigned sex at birth. When the Transgender Task Force heard this, they were angry and frustrated. Basically, this would create a district procedure that would, in fact, require schools to discriminate against all transgender identified students as the state's law did not allow transgender people to change the sex on their birth certificate until they had gender reassignment surgery. Those surgeries are not performed until someone is 18, so the procedure discriminated against the students in the K-12 system who were below 18. This was also inconsistent with the district's previously established nondiscrimination policy, which included gender identity.

As all of this work was going on, Ms. Barnard received a phone call from Tara's principal. They needed to know within the next 2 weeks what to do—the field trip was coming—and the school had to make plans about how to proceed with Tara. No procedural directive was in place, and the superintendent was not in agreement with the established Transgender Task Force about how best to proceed. At the same time, the Board of Education for the school district was preparing to meet to consider the procedural directive. What should Ms. Barnard say to the school in need of an answer? And how should the district's Board of Education make their determination about how to proceed? They have a superintendent expressing his beliefs that schools in the district should make their determinations one way, based on the student's sex assigned at birth, and a district-appointed task force of experts suggested a different way, to consider the student's gender identity. What is a district, and their Board of Education, to do?

Teaching Notes to Case Narrative I

This case is a composite example of a situation faced by district-level administrators when conflicting values around multicultural issues are held at the school district level. The case was developed for use in an educational leadership course to encourage dialogue among students around legal frameworks, roles and values, and theoretical perspectives that could inform practice surrounding transgender students and other emergent populations in a school district. The activities that follow are designed to support such a dialogue. Instructors can either utilize one or two activities for a whole group discussion, or divide the course members into small groups to provide deeper discussion into specific elements of the case.

Activity 1: Legal frameworks. The purpose of this activity is for students to explore the legal frameworks present in the case. School leaders should always consider the potential legal consequences of any decision they make regarding policies, procedural directives, or practices at the school district level.

School policy. Schools are responsible to uphold and follow the policies that they have established in their school district. If schools are found to not uniformly and consistently follow policies that they have established, they can be found legally liable. This has been found to be true in cases related to sexual orientation and gender identity. For example, *Flores v. Morgan Hill Unified School District* (2003) upheld that school officials need to fairly and consistently apply policies when dealing with a student who others thought was gay. School district officials either minimized or ignored the harassed students' complaints, and they were later sued by the student's family for the lack of response and inconsistent application of established school policy surrounding harassment.

Title IX. Title IX is a statute of the Education Amendment Act of 1972, which protects persons from discrimination on the basis of sex. Specifically, persons are protected from being "excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Case law has extended Title IX protections to students based upon perceived sexual orientation or gender identity. For example, *Doe v. Bellefonte Area School District* (2004) explicitly addressed that student harassment can be extended to harassment based on gender nonconforming behaviors. Further, in 2015, the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights, published a "Dear Colleague" letter and resources, which explicitly stated that Title IX included protections against discrimination based on failure to "conform to stereotypical notions of masculinity and femininity" (p. 1).

First Amendment (U.S. Constitution). The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution states,

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people to peaceably assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. (Hachiya, Shoop, & Dunklee, 2014, p. 26)

Henkle v. Gregory (2001) extended the right of free speech for students to be out in schools, and *Doe v. Brockton School Community* (2000) extended First Amendment rights to transgender students for their right for gender expression in school. In addition, it was addressed that the school principal violated sexual discrimination protections provided by the state where the student and school were located (the Commonwealth of Massachusetts).

14th Amendment (U.S. Constitution). The Fourteenth Amendment of the US Constitution defines citizenship for born and naturalized citizens, and provides protections for citizens, which include equal protection under the law and due process. It has been recently written that equal protection does not consist of universal solutions to issues; instead, students' unique needs need to be considered related to their educational experiences (Croteau &

Lewis, 2016; Thomas, Cambron-McCabe, & McCarthy, 2009). Case law has also been written, which extended the equal protection clause to students based on gender assumptions (e.g., real or perceived sexual orientation). For example, *Nabozny v. Podlesny* (1996) extended the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment for students who experienced gendered harassment in school due to the student's sexual orientation.

Discussion. After reading the case narrative and the legal frameworks provided, discuss the potential legal consequences of any decision that may have been made during the timeline presented in the case. Questions that students should consider include the following:

- Given established school policy, Title IX, and the First and 14th amendments to the U.S. Constitution, what is the school legally required to provide to the transgender student wishing to go on the field trip?
- What other foreseen or unforeseen legal consequences can come from the district's policy and recently established procedural directive?
- In efforts to provide equal protection to all students, how have administrators considered the identified students' needs in relation to their educational experience?
- Considering that the "Dear Colleague" letter was issued from the Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights, during one presidential administration (and could be seen as an executive order), how might different presidential administrations or directives from the Department of Education influence your decision as a school administrator?

Activity 2. This activity is focused on analyzing the actions (or inactions) of different key players throughout this case narrative. Imagine yourself in the different roles presented in the case and consider whether or not you would have acted in a similar manner at that time in the case study. Consider the following questions as you begin your discussion:

- If you are Ms. Barnard, when is an appropriate time to advocate for students, and when is an appropriate time (if any) to step back? How and why would you have responded if faced with opposition from upper administration?
- As procedural directives are based around established policy and not required to be heard by the School Board, would you pursue having them reviewed and endorsed by this school body? Why or why not?
- As there was a great deal of history behind the procedural directive and challenges presented in the case, how might you act to update or prepare new administrators to understand or address these issues as they take on new roles with the school district?
- One administrator (Ms. Barnard) had a long history of work with LGBT student issues and policies at the district level. How should Ms. Barnard go about succession planning for the time when she will no longer be with the district to ensure that the history and progression does not get stopped?

- As a parent, how might you respond if the district takes a greater or lesser role in serving the need of your child in school?
- If you are a community member, how might you respond if you spent time on a task force or committee, and found out that district administrators changed the language of your recommendations and presented the work to the School Board without your prior knowledge or consent?

Preamble to Case Narrative 2

Having read the first case narrative and completed the associated exercises, instructors can then direct their students to Case Narrative 2. Students can be informed that any decisions that are made can have numerous effects, some anticipated and some not. Case Narrative 2 presents what transpired following the conclusion of Case Narrative 1, but offers new directions for students to think about the impact and influence of their work.

Case Narrative 2

Prior to the Board's meeting, the school in question secured outside funding for Tara's mother to attend as a chaperone so that Tara could share a room with her. Ms. Barnard was thankful that the school in question had found a work-around, but knew that luck like this would not occur in future situations that were bound to present themselves, as there was an increasing number of transgender identifying students presenting in the district. Once the Transgender Task Force had completed their work and submitted the proposed procedural directive, which the superintendent changed at the last minute, the district's Board of Education reviewed the proposed procedural directive and decided that they did not like the superintendent's revisions believing that they were not fair to students, and informed the superintendent as such. Although the board was not required to pass or endorse the document, the superintendent did not adopt it, much to the relief of the Transgender Task Force and many in the local community.

It was clear to Ms. Barnard that she needed to push the pause button on her advocacy efforts with the district's upper administration for a while, as she was concerned that any future requests might result in a rescission of the progress they had made during the prior years. Meanwhile, while no procedural directive was better than a bad one, she was concerned about the transgender students who were not in schools where there was administrative support and was also concerned about the administrators who *were* supportive because they had no specific procedures or laws supporting them in case parents or staff members challenged their decisions not to discriminate.

Interestingly enough, within NM, there was a Human Rights Act, which banned discrimination, based upon a variety of classes including gender identity; however, legal guidance at the time suggested that schools were exempt. At any rate, as parents have been known to run principals out of their schools for controversial issues such as the one they were working on, it placed those administrators in a precarious position. Nevertheless, Ms. Barnard was able to maintain the support that had already been built for LGBT students, and she continued to train and consult with schools. However, she

kept any advocacy efforts away from senior administration after that, especially as key supporters, two assistant superintendents who both had retired, were no longer there to champion at the senior leadership level.

In late December 2014, the U.S. Department of Education issued a “Dear Colleague” letter that expanded the definition of Title IX to include prohibitions based upon gender identity or stereotypical notions of masculinity and femininity. In addition, the Office of Civil Rights announced that it was investigating violations and creating Resolution Agreements with school districts that had been noncompliant. That, combined with a different School Board and new administration (the previous superintendent had abruptly resigned without reason), provided an opportunity for Ms. Barnard to have the issue circle around once again. She went to members of the community LGBT organizations and told them that it was the time for them to go to the interim superintendent and start vocalizing the needs of LGBT youth, especially those who were transgender. They all met with the interim superintendent and then began meeting on a regular basis as the newest incarnation of the district’s LGBT group; this was a much larger committee (employees, community individuals, and community organizations), and they were called the LGBT Advisory Council (LGBTAC). They provided collaboration and support for the district as a whole, while a subcommittee of the LGBTAC worked with Ms. Barnard to create a new procedural directive for gender identity and expression, which borrowed heavily from the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) Resolution Agreements as well as the Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network (GLSEN) Model Trans Policy for schools. They wanted to have a solid draft ready for when the new administration came on board and were successful in this endeavor.

Amazingly enough, after so many years in the making, it all came together. Ms. Barnard was facilitating one of the district Safe Zone meetings and had invited Board members to attend to learn more about transgender issues. The Chairman of the Board Policy committee happened to be there, and when he heard that there was a draft of a new procedural directive, he invited Ms. Barnard to send it to him so he could get it on the board committee for review. This was fortuitous because, typically, it would have taken months of groundwork to get it to that level. Meanwhile, a new administration was in place with a very supportive superintendent, along with a Board of Education whose members, for the most part, were supportive of ensuring nondiscrimination for transgender students.

While board approval for the procedural directive was not necessary as the policy was passed in 2005, as a courtesy, the superintendent presented it to the board for review and input. After incorporating input from the board and from her leadership team, the superintendent made plans to officially adopt the procedural directive. Meanwhile, as Ms. Barnard was the point person in the district for creating and implementing the new procedural directive, she invited principals and associate superintendents at all levels (elementary, middle, and high) to join a “Principals’ Advisory Committee” (PAC) to have ample input and guidance in the rollout of the new procedures. The group of about 12 people met twice to provide recommendations as to the timing of the adoption of the procedural directive (e.g., after high school graduations

but before the end of the school year), suggestions of content needed for all-administrator training (e.g., make it hands-on and prepare them for the pitfalls), forms created for Gender Support Plan meetings (originally called Individual Support Plans, it was decided the name was similar to other school teams), and the best way to have all staff (about 13,000 persons) trained. The biggest surprise to Ms. Barnard was the group felt strongly that a slide presentation should not be provided to principals to review with their staff; instead, they wanted someone from the district to provide face-to-face training for all 140+ schools, in addition to requiring a mandatory online component. While Ms. Barnard was in agreement with the sentiment, she expressed concern that she had no staff and that the bulk of her job in Equal Opportunity Services was to investigate complaints of civil rights violations. Thus, the PAC recommended she train others in the district to assist her with the trainings. Ms. Barnard followed through on all recommendations of the committee. While she did train a group of counselors and community people to help with the training when there were conflicts, she was able to facilitate the presentations for the vast majority of the district including schools and role groups (counselors, nurses, social workers, psychologists, school police, health assistants, and athletic directors). All trainings were to be completed during the upcoming school year and were finished in a timely fashion.

Throughout the rollout process, Ms. Barnard and the superintendent met regularly. Ms. Barnard felt strongly that her ability to have direct communication with the superintendent and to be supervised by her in that part of her job had a tremendous impact on the success of the rollout. There was not another layer (or more) of supervisors that she had to go through, or challenges associated with multiple layers of communication. She was able to make her recommendations to the superintendent, they discussed them, and then Ms. Barnard would go forth as directed.

An update on the plan rollout was presented to the board. Trainings were held, and one of the biggest challenges ended up being all the issues associated with student records. Ms. Barnard held numerous meetings with the Student Information Systems leadership to brainstorm and problem-solve issues associated with the confidentiality of historical records. Once a Gender Support Plan was completed and the transgender student's name and gender was changed in the regular system, the issue of how to confidentially maintain the official (legal) records as well as keep historical records (which reflected the legal name and sex assigned at birth) was challenging. The student information system builders with whom the district contracted worked on creating a private screen to house all of a transgender student's legal information, but where to house that information, while still providing access to the information associated with it (cumulative folders, old IEP's, etc.), was the subject of many discussions. It was finally decided that the principal would keep a confidential folder with all of the historical records until the private screen was ready.

Ms. Barnard was grateful for the work that had been accomplished, and as her tenure with the district was drawing to a close, she felt pleased that so many strides on behalf of the students and the district had been made. With all the principal and staff training, information systems management, gender support plans, and associated staff to provide assistance, she finally felt that after years of fighting she made progress in

supporting the needs of students she so deeply cared about. She knew it had been the work of an entire team that had brought her to this point, albeit, a team whose members changed faces over many years. However, a year following the rollout of the district's procedural directive, Donald J. Trump was elected President. During the presidential campaign, he expressed strong rhetoric that troubled Ms. Barnard. She felt if he were elected, he may eliminate some of the national safeguards that allowed her to do the work she did to support her students.

Sadly for her, very soon in his presidency, Trump issued an executive order undoing the Obama administration's executive order requiring districts to allow transgender students to use the bathroom of their gender identity and, instead, deferred the matter to local control. Ms. Barnard knew there were state and local protections already established in her state that specifically named and addressed gender identity and expression, but she also knew that the people on the other side were empowered and ready to begin the fight anew. As she moved into her final year before retirement with the district, she was left with some questions: How, if at all, do I respond to this new national directive following all the work that the district has already accomplished, and what does this mean for the future of my work, my students' experiences, and the district as a whole?

Activity 3: What about Trump? This second case narrative is a composite example of a situation faced by district-level administrators to understand the influence state and local decision making can have on a district, as well as the evolving influence and impact that national policy and trends can have on a school district. This activity explores how state and national policy can influence the decisions a district can make, and how one can balance one's desire to affirm and support students and families from diverse backgrounds while attending to state or national law or policy. Students are asked to consider the following questions as they begin their discussion:

- How might school leaders and policy makers integrate the legal frameworks provided in Activity 1 with Trump-era executive orders and policies to best work with their students?
- What influence might state-level bathroom bills and conscious clause legislation have on the operation of a school and its response to students/families who identify as transgender? How can/should building level leadership teams act proactively and within legal frameworks to be prepared to meet the needs of all students?
- What are the political strategies that principals and other educational leaders should utilize to promote social justice?

Activity 4: Role-play. Assign students to different roles in the two cases. Have a set of students role-play the positions of the Board of Education, and divide the remaining students into roles on either side of the argument. Ask students to make their case and present it to the Board to make a decision based upon school district policies as well as state and national law. Potential roles can include the following:

- Ms. Barnard, a district administrator and longtime advocate for LGBTQI+ students
- The superintendent who believes all students should use the bathroom reflecting their birth certificate
- Conservative members of the district staff, who utilize their religious faith as their compass and guide, and have concerns about their eternal fate if they question or go against the teachings of their faith
- Parents of the transgender student in question
- Tara, the transgender student
- Parents of other students who express concern about their children sharing bathrooms and other school-sponsored accommodations with students they deem unacceptable
- Members of the larger community advocating on either side (e.g., leaders of faith communities, LGBTQI+ advocacy groups, etc.)

Recommended Resources

Affirmative Duty

Alison Bethel, *Keeping Schools Safe: Why Schools Should Have an Affirmative Duty to Protect Students From Harm by Other Students*, 2 PIERCE L. REV. 183 (2004). Available at http://scholars.unh.edu/unh_lr/vol2/iss2/7.

Transgender-Related Case Law

The Transgender Law and Policy Institute provides examples of transgender-related case law: <http://www.transgenderlaw.org/cases/>.

GLSEN—“the nation’s largest homosexual advocacy group focused entirely on reaching public school students as young as kindergarten age”: <http://www.glsen.org>.

Guidance on Supporting Transgender Students

The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) has prepared *Schools in Transition: A Guide for Supporting Transgender Students in K-12 Schools*. It can be downloaded from this website: <https://www.aclu.org/report/schools-transition>.

The U.S. Department of Education’s website provides guidance on policies and practices to support transgender students: <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oese/oshs/emergingpractices.pdf>.

Title VII

The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission’s website provides examples of court decisions under Title VII related to LGBT issues: https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/newsroom/wysk/lgbt_examples_decisions.cfm.

Transgender Students' Rights

The National Education Association has prepared a Legal Guidance on Transgender Students' Rights (2016). A PDF can be found at this web address: https://www.nea.org/assets/docs/20184_Transgender%20Guide_v4.pdf.

Book

Hachiya, R. F., Shoop, R. J., & Dunklee, D. R. (2014). *The principal's quick-reference guide to school law: Reducing liability, litigation, and other potential legal tangles*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Note

1. When the GLBT Task Force was created in 2003, it was not yet standard practice to have the L before the G. In subsequent years, the order of the letters in the acronym was changed to acknowledge women-first language. When a new version of the group resurfaced in 2015, the district referred to it as LGBT Advisory Council.

References

- Croteau, S. M., & Lewis, K. (2016). "Just like the other boys": Meeting the needs of gender diverse students. *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership*, 19, 102-113.
- Doe, v. and Bellefonte Area School District. (2004). 3rd Cir. U.S. App.
- Doe, v. and Brockton Sch. Comm. (2000). No. 2000-J-638 Mass. App.
- Flores v. Morgan Hill Unified Sch. Dist., 324 F. 3d 1130, 1132 (9th Cir. 2003).
- Hachiya, R. F., Shoop, R. J., & Dunklee, D. R. (2014). *The Principal's Quick-Reference Guide to School Law: Reducing Liability, Litigation, and Other Potential Legal Tangles*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Henkle, v., Gregory, and 150, F. Supp. 2d 1067. 2001. Nev. Dist.
- Nabozny v. Podlesny, 92 F. 3d 446 (7th Cir. 1996).
- Thomas, S. B., Cambron-McCabe, N. H., & McCarthy, M. M. (2009). *Public School Law: Teachers' and Students' Rights*. Boston: Pearson.

Author Biographies

Janalee Barnard, MS, EdS, is the director of Title IX Programs for Albuquerque Public Schools, conducting civil rights investigations as well as supporting LGBT students through the creation of policy, procedure, trainings, and programs. She began the APS Safe Zone program

in 2001 to support the District's LGBT youth and has worked to ensure the rights of transgender and gender-non-conforming students for over a decade. She has devoted her career to advocating for the rights of marginalized youth while serving in a variety of positions, including district administration as well as direct service.

Kristopher M. Goodrich, PhD, is an associate professor of Counselor Education at the University of New Mexico, where he has taught since 2010. He completed his graduate education in the CACREP accredited counseling program at Syracuse University. Dr. Goodrich has written 44 peer reviewed journal articles, co-authored or co-edited 3 books, and has contributed 18 pieces to other publications. He is the current editor of the *Journal for Specialists in Group Work*. Dr. Goodrich is also a past president of the Association for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Issues in Counseling (2015-2016), and the immediate past president of the Rocky Mountain Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (RMACES).

Allison M. Borden is an associate professor of educational leadership and a Chester C. Travelstead distinguished faculty fellow at the University of New Mexico. Her research is focused on citizenship development and democratic education in Guatemala and leadership preparation programs in the US.