

Question #2: Were procedures followed that enabled all voices to be heard?

One member of the Review Committee, Ms. Jenifer MacFarland, left no doubt as to her extreme dissatisfaction with the procedures and operations of the Review Committee. Her comments were read by Mr. CM during the **Public Comments on Agenda Items** prior to the vote on *Gender Queer* at the 3/28/2022 WCASD board meeting.

Note: When Mr. CM (one of two committee parents and the original objector to having *Gender Queer* in our HS libraries) could not attend the meetings due to work conflicts, Ms. Jenifer MacFarland attended the Feb. 22 and March 3 meetings in his place. Although there are 17 members listed, Mr. CM. and Ms. MacFarland had a single vote, so technically there were 16 votes allotted for the decision. Her statement is given below.

Ms. MacFarland's Statement Documenting her Extreme Dissatisfaction with Committee Procedures and Operations

"After introductions, the February meeting set committee norms. The usual norms were transcribed on a white board, but one norm WAS MISSING, so I asked for it to be added. Some on the committee objected, but I insisted that DATA be considered as well.

The norms were set and the meeting was ended. I sent a follow up e-mail to Dr. Reynolds requesting data critical to the discussion.

I also advised that I would be happy to provide an overview of brain and human development for the committee to ensure a deeper understanding of the issues at hand. There was no response until February 28th, which was an invitation to discuss the issue in person, but the scheduling did not work. The request for the data WAS IGNORED.

At the March meeting, a meeting agenda was provided on PowerPoint. We quickly reviewed the norms and went to slide 4 – allegedly Webster's definition of the word "pornography", which by the way – is completely different from the one I copied here from WebsterDictionary.net:

Por`nog´ra`phy

1. Licentious painting or literature; especially, the painting anciently employed to decorate the walls of rooms

devoted to bacchanalian orgies.

2. (Med.) A treatise on prostitutes, or prostitution.

3. obscene pictures, writings, drawings, motion pictures, videos, or the like intended primarily to cause sexual arousal and having little or no artistic merit; also, the content of such materials.

While the Pornography definition slide was SHOWN – it WAS NOT DISCUSSED. Also, not shown nor discussed, was the next slide labeled "Obscenity Factors" – as we moved directly to a Quick Write on Padlet (the next slide) on what our initial thoughts and rationale were.

After the quick write, Dr. Reynolds began to move on to small groups, but I objected – saying that a FULL DISCUSSION of the issue could not be held until the group had some understanding of child and brain development. After the small group discussion, students presented data, and then I proceeded to share the information I had. When I was done, Dr. Reynolds went directly to voting on the recommendation to the board.

*THERE WAS NO LARGE GROUP DISCUSSION – OF ANYTHING – AS STATED IN THE SLIDES THERE WOULD BE. **WHY NOT**?*

How was the group to make an informed, educated decision on something WITHOUT ANY DISCUSSION of district policy, Webster's definition of Pornography, or a discussion of the book itself and how it relates to both?

This was a very poorly run meeting with a clear agenda to rush this book through the committee and recommend it to the board for approval. Indeed, the last item on the circulated agenda was “confirm recommendation” – and this was BEFORE the committee met.

...and that, my friends, was the intention all along, wasn't it?”