

BENCHMARK SPECIFIC COMMENTS (July 17th, 2025)

KINDERGARTEN -- SEXUAL HEALTH STRAND

Page 14, Code 0.4.1.02 –The State will require as a condition of grade advancement that every 5-year-old will **“Identify different ways that [sexual] disease-causing germs are transmitted.”** (The bracketed word is added to clarify that it is in the Sexual Health strand). Move the original text of this standard into the Personal Health strand. As written and placed in Sexual Health, this appears to be “safe sex for 5-year-olds”.

Page 14, Code 0.4.1.03 – **“Identify ways to prevent the spread of germs that cause [sexual] infectious diseases.”** (The bracketed word is added to clarify that this benchmark is in the Sexual Health strand). Move the original text of this benchmark into the Personal Health strand. This appears to be “safe sex for 5 year olds”.

Page 14, Code 0.4.1.04 – **“Recognize the range of different family and peer relationships.”** Move this into Personal Health or Mental Health and Emotional Health strand.

In the context of this draft and the documents it sources material from, this presupposes the need to explore the very large “range” of possibilities endorsed by the progressive LGBTQIA movement. As written and placed in the Sexual Health strand, this appears to intentionally begin dissolving the binary, heteronormative, nuclear family model as an oppressive structure that children need to be liberated from (before they learn otherwise or reach the age of reason). If this is the State’s intention, simply say it so parents can be appropriately alarmed.

Page 14, Code 0.6.1.01 (Violence Prevention strand) – **“Identify correct anatomical terms for private parts of their bodies.”** This should be moved into the Sexual Health strand.

Page 15, Code 0.6.1.03 – (Violence Prevention strand) **“Explain what ‘private parts’ or ‘off-limit’ areas are.”** Move to the Sexual Health strand.

FIRST GRADE – SEXUAL HEALTH STRAND

Page 16, Code 1.4.1.01 –**“Describe how to say ‘yes’ and ‘no’ to people, behaviors, or {sexual} situations that could make you uncomfortable or unsafe.”** (Bracketed word added since this is under Sexual Health.) Strike saying “yes” to uncomfortable or unsafe sexual situations. We do NOT want to teach first graders good sexual health entails saying “yes” to things that threaten them! As written and placed, this standard is inconsistent with, and contrary to, statutory charges to teach harm prevention. (See M.S. 120B234 regarding sexual abuse.)

Page 16, Code 1.4.4.01 (NOTE code number repeats. Typo?) **“Demonstrate how to effectively communicate [sexual?] needs, wants, and feelings in healthy ways to promote healthy family and peer relationships.”** (The bracketed word is added to clarify this is in the Sexual Health strand). Move the original text of this benchmark into the Personal Health strand or clarify what sorts of sexual “needs, wants and feelings” our first graders are discussing *and with whom?* As written, this sounds like grooming behavior described on page 73 of the Draft regarding M.S.120B.234. If the intent is to sexually profile 6-year-olds and gain their trust, please say so plainly.

Page 17, Code 1.4.4.02 – Six-year-olds are required to **“Demonstrate how to effectively tell a trusted adult when they or someone they know has a [sexual] health symptom or question.”** (The bracketed word is added to clarify that it is in the Sexual Health strand). Insert the words “parents and” when listing who to tell and then move this into Personal Health or Mental Health and Emotional Health strand.

As written, note the absence of the word “parents” and the start of focusing students on “trusted adults” who are perhaps more reliable in their worldviews than parents.

SECOND GRADE – SEXUAL HEALTH STRAND

Page 20, Code 2.4.2.01 – All 7-year-olds must **“Identify how family can influence [sexual] relationships.”** (The bracketed word is added to clarify that it is in the Sexual Health strand). Move the original text of this benchmark into the Personal Health or Mental Health and Emotional Health strand. As written and placed, one wonders what sorts of sexual health matters are being addressed.

Note the absence of the word “parents” and the continuation of telling children to focus on “trusted adults” who are perhaps more reliably share the State’s worldviews than parents.

Page 20, Code 2.4.2.02 – **“Explain why it is wrong to tease or bully others based on personal [sexual] characteristics.”** (The bracketed word clarifies that it is in the Sexual Health strand). Drop the words “based on the personal characteristics of others and them move this into Personal Health or Mental Health and Emotional Health strand.

As written and placed, and in the context of this document and its source materials, the word “bullying” is weaponized to mean not affirming and supporting self-defined marginalized victims. In this privileged versus marginalized world view, one gains opportunity, voice, resources and power over those accused of privilege by identifying as being part of one or more victim groups. Those accused of having privilege are expected to comply with the demands of

those accusing them. “Social justice” is achieved when the self-declared marginalized victims are satisfied.

Specific to Sexual Health, the LGBTQIA declare themselves to be marginalized victims at the hand of straight people (i.e., binary heteronormative people). Hence, they claim status to make demands and expect everyone to comply, without exception.

Throughout Minnesota those not conforming to the demands of the LGBTQIA in school are regularly accused of “bullying” if they do not “affirm” LGBTQIA+ beliefs. Those self-identifying as being marginalized members of the LGBTQIA assert they cannot “feel safe” at school in the presence of others having rival worldviews, culture and values. Adult LGBTQIA advocates assert LGBTQIA students must “feel” safe to learn so universal compliance with their demands is a school goal. Hence, everyone must conform their language, actions, and even their beliefs to those demanded by the self-identified “marginalized.” This is the position of the State of Minnesota under Governor Walz’s administration as presented in the 2017 MN Department of Education publication “A Toolkit for Ensuring Safe and Supportive Schools for Transgender and Gender Nonconforming Students”.

This is wrong and this sexual health item should not be deployed to teach peer enforcement of LGBTQIA beliefs on others under the guise of “bullying” and “safety.” Not in the second grade or any other.

THIRD GRADE – SEXUAL HEALTH STRAND

Page 23, Code 3.4.1.01 –**“Identify *characteristics of a trusted family member or caregiver.*”** (emphasis added) Delete this milestone. In the alternative add the word “parent” to the list for the 3rd grade child to assess as trustworthy. Then remove the edited text of this benchmark from the Sexual Health strand and put it into Personal Health or Mental Health and Emotional Health strand.

As written and placed in the Sexual Health strand, and in the context of this Draft and its source documents, one should reasonably expect that *a “trustworthy” adult is one that endorses and promotes the LGBTQIA worldview, culture and values.*

This is plainly stated in the SHAPE America’s 2024 Guidance Document “Appropriate Practices in School-Based Health Education.” On page 21 of that document for Health teachers, SHAPE America directs “When possible, the health teacher advocates for comprehensive sexuality education and LGBTQ+ inclusive curriculum.” (See website at shapeamerica.org) This is also the expectation of the State of Minnesota under Governor Walz’s administration as presented in the

MN Department of Education publication “A Toolkit for Ensuring Safe and Supportive Schools for Transgender and Gender Nonconforming Students”.

Note the absence of the word “parents” in the benchmark presented and how the benchmark focuses students on “trusted adults” who are perhaps more reliable in their worldviews than parents.

Page 23, Code 3.4.1.02 – **“Describe internal and external reproductive body parts using medically accurate terms in a gender-neutral way.”**(emphasis added) Edit this to delete the words “in a gender neutral way.”

As written, placed in the Sexual Strand, and in the context of this Draft and its contributing documents, this is the clearly the delivery of LGBTQIA worldview dogma as a “fact” – which is untrue and recognized as such by a large proportion of the children’s families. It teaches that that some “real” boys will have girl parts and that some “real” girls will have boy parts. That is clearly the intended lesson plan.

Coercing children by threat of not advancing in grade level (as benchmarks threaten) if they do not affirm this LGBTQIA dogma is wholly inappropriate. It illegally demands the repudiation of religious upbringing of a very large proportion of parents of Minnesota public school students. The right to free exercise of religion or firmly held belief, is enshrined in both the U.S. and Minnesota constitution and statutorily protected both at the federal and state levels. The phrase “not to impinge upon the free exercise thereof” is directly contradicted by this benchmark as written.

Page 23, Code 3.4.1.02 – **“Identify when an adult or peer is making you feel [sexually] uncomfortable.”** (The bracketed word is added to clarify that it is in the Sexual Health strand). Drop this benchmark.

As written and placed, a third-grade child would be asked to identify what induces their particular sexual discomforts. This is wholly inappropriate. In the context of this document and its contributing sources, this has every appearance of building a dossier on each child to be used to individually conform their thinking to the State-approved LGBTQIA worldview. In Stillwater Area Schools (ISD 834) so-called “Identity Harm Protocols” are already adopted make use of such information. Under these protocols, if 3rd grader Jonney says on the playground that boys don’t turn into girls, the weight of “the institution” comes down on his little shoulders. Reporting, investigation, “public denouncement” and placing a black mark into the child’s school record are required. Now identified as a non-conforming dissident, counselors can customize the molding of his thinking so it gradually comes into conformity with State-approved thoughts.

Page 24, Code 3.4.1.04 – **“Describe [sexual] consent and its importance in all relationships.”**

Drop this item from this grade level for 8 year olds. Age 8 is not an age of mutual consent. It is not age appropriate as a *sexual* matter. This has the appearance of decentering and other grooming methods.

Page 24, Code 3.4.1.05 – **“Define gender identity and expression.”** Drop this item. Its sole purpose is to promote gender identity worldview as dogma to every child, including those who hold rival religious values.

Page 24, Code 3.4.1.06 – **“Explain the difference between sex assigned at birth and gender identity and expression.”** Drop this item. Eight year olds must not be required under force of government to embrace beliefs that are not true, and that violate the child-parent relationship, and contradict instruction from parents and the family faith community.

Page 24, Code 3.4.1.08 – **“Identify characteristics of a healthy [sexual] relationships.”** (added bracketed word since this is the Sexual Health strand) Drop this item from this grade level for 8 year olds. Age 8 is not an age to explore healthy, versus unhealthy, sexual relationships. In the alternative, move original benchmark into Personal Health or Mental Health and Emotional Health strand.

Page 24, Code 3.4.1.01 – **“List ways to [sexually] express affection, love and friendship.”** (added bracketed word since this is the Sexual Health strand) Drop this item from this grade level for 8 year olds. In the alternative, move original benchmark into Personal Health or Mental Health and Emotional Health strand.

Page 24, Code 3.4.4.01 – **“Demonstrate giving and receiving verbal consent in [sexual] interactions with family members, peers, and other adults.”** (added bracketed word since this is the Sexual Health strand) Drop this item. In the alternative, add REFUSAL as an option to demonstrate. *Do NOT have third grade children demonstrate giving sexual consent, especially to adults !!!*. In the alternative, move original benchmark into Personal Health or Mental Health and Emotional Health strand.

Page 24, Code 3.4.4.03 – **“Demonstrate effective verbal and nonverbal communication skills to promote healthy family and peer [sexual] relationships.”** (added bracketed word since this is the Sexual Health strand) Move original benchmark into Personal Health or Mental Health and Emotional Health strand.

FORTH GRADE – SEXUAL HEALTH STRAND

Page 29, Code 4.4.1.01 – **“Explain that HIV is not easily transmitted like other common infectious diseases.”** Whew, that’s one less thing to worry about when having a good time, right

nine-year-olds? *This benchmark is in direct opposition to the “prevention” education requirements of Minn. Stat. 121A.24.* Either delete this or replace it with “Explain how one gets HIV, that it is an incurable, and that it is a lifelong disease that you will have to take medicine the rest of your life to control and its physical and mental health effects “

Page 29, Code 4.4.1.04 – **“Describe ways that common [sexual] diseases are transmitted.”** (added bracketed word since this is the Sexual Health strand) Is this “safer sex for 9-year-olds? Move original benchmark into Personal Health. If the focus is on sexually transmitted disease education, move to middle school or older.

Page 25, Codes 4.4.5.01 to 4.4.5.04 –The 9-year-old student must first **“Decide when help is need to make a [sexual health] decision related to family, peer, or friend relationships;”** then **“Identify options and their possible outcomes ...”** followed by **“Choose a healthy option ...”** and **“Describe the final outcome of a [sexual health] decision related to family, peer or friend relationships.”** Given the public positions of the Walz administration and sources relied upon for this Draft, this appears to be an LGBTQIA coming-out scenario or perhaps related to choosing from an unlimited number of genders or sexual identities as puberty approaches. These benchmarks lack clarity and need to be more specific to be actionable.

FIFTH GRADE – SEXUAL HEALTH STRAND

Page 33, Code 5.4.1.01 – Ten-year-olds are required to **“Describe ways that common [sexual] infectious diseases are transmitted.”** (added bracketed word since this is the Sexual Health strand) Move original benchmark into Personal Health. If the focus is on sexually transmitted disease education, move to middle school or older.

Page 33, Code 5.4.1.02 – **“Describe ways to prevent the spread of germs that cause common [sexual] infectious diseases.”** (Added bracketed word since this is the Sexual Health strand) Apparently, this is “safer sex for 10-year-olds.” Move original benchmark into Personal Health. If the focus is on sexually transmitted disease education, move to middle school or older.

Page 33, Code 5.4.1.03 – **“Explain that HIV is not easily transmitted like other common infectious diseases.”** *This benchmark is in direct opposition to the “prevention” education requirements of Minn. Stat. 121A.24.* Either delete this or replace it with “Explain how one gets HIV, that it is an incurable, and that it is a lifelong disease that you will have to take medicine the rest of your life to control and its physical and mental health effects “

Page 33, Code 5.4.1.04 – Ten-year-olds are required to **“Define sexual orientation including sense of [sexual] identity, [sexual] attractions and related [sexual] behaviors.”** (added bracketed word since this is the Sexual Health strand) Delete this benchmark. It provides no

limits whatsoever to desensitizing and normalizing the most deviant behaviors. As written, identities tied to pedophilia, bestiality, violence and other behaviors could be part of the instruction to kill the binary heteronormative in our children. This lack of clarity again may be in opposition to Minn. Stat. 120B.234 (sexual abuse prevention).

Page 33, Code 5.4.1.05 – Ten-year-olds are required to affirm LGBTQIA+ dogma by **“Describing [as fact] the differences between sexual orientation, and gender identity and expression.”**

Delete this benchmark. This is simply the preaching of dogma from within the LGBTQIA-multi-gender-fluidity belief-system. The underlying assumption is that embracing and affirming that belief system is “healthy” and not doing so is “unhealthy”. This is the stated desire of SHAPE America and other advocates in documents supporting the preparation of this Draft 2 document. The proselytizing of this worldview in opposition to the parents of children violates Federal and State Constitutional protection, statutory protection, Presidential orders and recent Supreme Court decisions. This is elaborated elsewhere and in the Comments of others filed in this proceeding.

Page 34, Code 5.4.4.01 –Ten year olds are required to affirm LGBTQIA+ dogma as they, **“Explain how to be empathetic and compassionate toward others who are at a different stage of puberty from oneself, and who have a different gender identity and expression or sexual orientation from oneself.”** Strike the words “...and who have a different gender identity and expression or sexual orientation from oneself.” This requires 5th grade children to affirm the LGBTQIA+ worldview, culture and values even if it is in violation of their religious beliefs and those of the child’s family and faith community. This is the stated desire of SHAPE America and other advocates in documents supporting the preparation of this Draft 2 document. The proselytizing of this worldview in opposition to the parents of children violates Federal and State Constitutional protection, statutory protection, Presidential orders and recent Supreme Court decisions. This is elaborated elsewhere and in the Comments of others filed in this proceeding.

GRADES SIX THROUGH EIGHT – SEXUAL HEALTH STRAND (70 Benchmarks)

Page 45, Code 6.4.1.01 - **“Explain the importance of talking with parents, caregivers, and other trusted adults about issues related to growth and development, relationships, sex, and sexual and reproductive health services.”** Strike the words “sexual and” since obtaining “sexual services” is especially inappropriate for 11 -13 year old children. Including “Parents” in this list is a positive indicator that it can be included in every similar list in benchmarks throughout Draft 2. Do that.

Page 45, Code 6.4.1.02 –**“Describe ways to show dignity and respect for all people with regard to their gender and sexuality.”** Delete this benchmark. In the alternative strike the words “with regard to their gender and sexuality” and move to the Mental and Emotional Health strand. This benchmark requires 11-year-olds to affirm all sexuality without bounds or limits, suggesting that there are no limits to the search of one’s “authentic self” through sexual exploration. This is not true. For example, pedophilia, violent sex, or bestiality should not properly taught to 11 year old children as something to be respected and affirmed.

Page 45, Code 6.4.1.04 -- **“Describe characteristics of healthy [sexual] relationships.”** (Added bracketed word since this benchmark is in the Sexual Health strand) Delete this benchmark from the Sexual Health strand, moving the original benchmark wording to the Mental and Emotional Health strand.

Page 45, Code 6.4.1.05 – **“Describe healthy and unhealthy [sexual] sexual relationships.”** (Added bracketed word since this benchmark is in the Sexual Health strand) Delete this benchmark from the Sexual Health strand, moving the original benchmark wording to the Mental and Emotional Health strand.

Page 45, Code 6.4.1.06 –**“Describe healthy ways to express [sexual] affection, [sexual] love and [sexual] friendship.”** (Added bracketed word since this benchmark is in the Sexual Health strand) Delete this benchmark from the Sexual Health strand, moving the original benchmark wording to the Mental and Emotional Health strand.

Page 45, Code 6.4.1.07 –**“Explain the qualities of a healthy dating or sexual relationship.”** Strike “or sexual”. One might wonder what the authors consider “healthy” sexual relationships for 11-year-old children. Unfortunately the promotion of sexually explicit, and LGBTQIA picture books and novels in middle schools throughout Minnesota may suggest the answer. Explaining sexual relationships is an inappropriate benchmark for middle-school grade advancement.

Page 45, Code 6.4.1.08 – **“Describe the range of family and peer [sexual] relationship structures.”** (Added bracketed word since this benchmark is in the Sexual Health strand) Delete this benchmark from the Sexual Health strand. As a “sexual” health matter, in the context of Draft 2, this benchmark strongly suggests that 11-year-old children will be required to affirm “the range of” LGBTQIA+ dogma celebrating the overthrow of the traditional family structures as liberating. In the alternative, move the original text of the benchmark to the Mental and Emotional Health strand.

Page 45, Code 6.4.1.09 – **“Describe the range of dating or sexual relationship structures.”** Delete this benchmark. As written, 11-year-olds may be required to explore the range of available internet pornography to discover how many structures as might be imagined. While certain philosophies advocate for the discovery of one’s “authentic self” through unlimited and

unbounded exploration of sexual experiences, teaching this, especially to 11-year-olds, would do great and lasting harm to Minnesota's children.

Page 46, Code 6.4.1.14 – **“Explain why it is wrong to tease or bully others based on their gender or sexuality, growth and development, or physical appearance or ability.”** Strike the words “based on their gender or sexuality, growth and development, or physical appearance or ability” and move to the remaining benchmark text to the Mental and Emotional Health strand. Otherwise, this has every appearance of invoking victim-identity-group special protections as a matter of “social justice”. Further, the MN Department of Education, GLSEN, Outfront MN and others have made clear that not affirming invoked victim group status is “bullying”, hence the term has become in practice a means of enforcing universal endorsement of the progressive privileged vs victim worldview engrained in the DEI-social justice movement. A specific example of this is ISD 834 Stillwater Area School’s “Identity-Harm-Protocols”. Endorsing a social-political movement must not be a statewide requirement for grade progression as this benchmark would demand. It is already bad enough that it is a practical requirement in individual Minnesota school districts.

Page 46, Code 6.4.1.15 – **“Describe how bias, prejudice and stigma related to gender and sexuality can impact health.”** Delete this benchmark. The Anchor Standard for this benchmark says the student must enhance the health and wellbeing of ... others.” In the context of the policies of the Walz administration and Draft 2’s reliance on SHAPE America’s materials, this benchmark will demand for the good of others that every 11-year-old child affirm all LGBTQIA dogma and any and all sexuality without bounds. While certain philosophies advocate for the discovery of one’s “authentic self” through unlimited and unbounded exploration of sexual experiences, teaching this, especially to 11-year-olds, would do great and lasting harm to Minnesota’s children. Making this a requirement for every child’s grade advancement would be unconscionable.

Page 46, Code 6.4.1.16 – **“Explain the benefits of respecting individual differences in gender and sexuality growth and development or physical appearance or ability.”** Strike the words “in gender and sexuality growth and development or physical appearance or ability.” Move the remaining text to the Mental and Emotional Health strand. As written and placed in the Sexual Health strand, and taken in the context of the policies of the Walz administration and Draft 2’s reliance on SHAPE America’s materials, this benchmark will demand that every 11-year-old child affirm a peer’s “sexuality growth” as that peer increasingly embraces the LGBTQIA worldview, culture and values. While certain philosophies advocate for the discovery of one’s “authentic self” through unlimited and unbounded exploration of sexual experiences, teaching this, especially to 11-year-olds, would do great and lasting harm to Minnesota’s children. Making this a requirement for every child’s grade advancement would be unconscionable.

Page 46, Code 6.4.1.19 – **“Describe how to communicate consent for all sexual behaviors.”**

Delete this. In the alternative replace it with “Describe how to communicate refusal of, or consent for, sexual behaviors.” As written, one can imagine the extensive list of sexual behaviors that middle school children would have to be exposed to in order to practice saying “Yes!” to all of them. Further, the text does not envision saying “No” to ANYTHING! While certain philosophies advocate for the discovery of one’s “authentic self” through unlimited and unbounded exploration of sexual experiences, teaching this, especially to 11-year-olds, would do great and lasting harm to Minnesota’s children. Making this a requirement for every child’s grade advancement would be unconscionable. Further, this milestone presently describes the very boundary violations, desensitizing and conditioning by groomers described on page 73 of the Draft as child sexual abuse.

Page 48, Code 6.4.1.34 – **“Summarize which STIs can be cured and which can be treated.”**

Replace with “Summarize which STIs can be cured, which cannot be cured, and require treatment for the rest of your life.” Original text “spins” a happy picture of good only good outcomes from my getting an STI. It conveys a “don’t worry” message that contradicts education’s statutory prevention assignment in 121A.24.

Page 48, Code 6.4.1.36 – **“Describe how pre-exposure prophylaxis (Per) and post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP) are safe and effective ways to prevent HIV infection and transmission.”**

Delete or replace with “Describe how pre-exposure prophylaxis (Per) and post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP) reduce the risk of HIV infection and transmission.”

Medications are not 100% effective nor without side effects. Telling 11 to 13 year olds otherwise conveys a “don’t worry” message that contradicts education’s statutory prevention assignment in 121A.24.

Page 48, Code 6.4.1.37 – **“Describe the role of HIV treatment in preventing HIV transmission.”**

Replace the word “preventing” with “reduces your risk of”.

Medications are not 100% effective nor without side effects. Telling 11 to 13 year olds otherwise conveys an incomplete and inappropriate “don’t worry” message that contradicts education’s statutory prevention assignment in 121A.24.

Page 49, Code 6.4.1.45 – **“Describe what confidential [sexual or sexuality] care is and give specific instances when confidential care cannot be maintained.”** (Bracketed words clarify this is in the Sexual Health strand.) Delete this benchmark.

This Benchmark appears to require 11 to 13 year olds to describe how to hide from their parent’s sexual practices and/or procedures mentored by other adults. Its context in the “Sexual Health” strand indicates this would involve facilitating secretly obtaining birth control, the secret killing of the student’s offspring resulting from recreational or experimental sexual

activity (i.e., abortion) or the secret adoption of procedures and practices design to abandon the gender associated with the sex they were born with (i.e., “transitioning”). This contradicts parents being the primary educators and caregivers of their children. It normalizes the severing of the parent-child relationship and replaces it with another adult who has gained the child’s trust through systemic grooming as presented throughout Draft 2 Sexual Health strand. Further, this presumes legal “rights” for children to evade parental supervision exist in Minnesota.

Page 49, Code 6.4.1.46 – **“Describe young people’s rights to confidential [sexual or sexuality] services in their state.”** Delete this standard.

“In your state” shows this proposed mandatory Minnesota requirement for every 11-13 year old child is simply a thoughtlessly copied cut-and-paste advocacy from the national resources the Walz administration directed be relied upon. It is misleading. This Benchmark appears to require 11 to 13 year olds to describe how to hide from their parent’s sexual practices and/or procedures mentored by other adults. Its context in the “Sexual Health” strand indicates this would involve facilitating secretly obtaining birth control, the secret killing of the student’s offspring resulting from recreational or experimental sexual activity (i.e., abortion) or the secret adoption of procedures and practices design to abandon the gender associated with the sex they were born with (i.e., “transitioning”). This contradicts parents being the primary educators and caregivers of their children. It normalizes the severing of the parent-child relationship and replacing it with another adult who has gained the child’s trust through systemic grooming as presented throughout Draft 2 Sexual Health strand. Further, this presumes legal “rights” for children to evade parental supervision exist in Minnesota.

Page 49, Code 6.4.1.47 – **“Describe young people’s legal rights to consent to sexual and reproductive health services, including STI/HIV testing, treatment (including ART, PrEP, PEP), and contraception.”** Delete this benchmark.

This Benchmark appears to require 11 to 13 year olds to describe *how to hide from their parent’s* medical treatments intended to facilitate recreational sexual experimentation under other adult mentors. Tactful wording masks that this would not only involve facilitating secretly obtaining birth control, but also the secret killing of the minor student’s offspring (their parent’s grandchildren) that may accidentally result from recreational or experimental sexual activity (i.e., abortion) or the secret adoption of procedures and practices design to abandon the gender associated with the sex the child was born with (i.e., “transitioning”) under the guise of sexual “services”. This contradicts parents being the primary educators and caregivers of their children. It normalizes the severing of the parent-child relationship and replaces it with another adult who has gained the child’s trust through systemic grooming as presented throughout Draft 2 Sexual Health strand. Further, this presumes legal “rights” for children to evade parental supervision exist in Minnesota.

Page 49, Code 6.4.1.48 – **“Explain what to expect from youth-friendly sexual health services and providers.”** Delete this benchmark.

This benchmark appears to require explaining that there is friendly nice “trusted” grown-up available to help 11 to 13 year old children secretly implement the behaviors they have been learning in the Sexual Health benchmarks for the past 8 years. Aside from being blatant social-political advertising, this benchmark has a unique “creepiness” and predatory tone. It contradicts parents being the primary educators and caregivers of their children. It normalizes the severing of the parent-child relationship and replacing it with another adult who has gained the child’s trust through systemic grooming as presented throughout Draft 2 Sexual Health strand.

Page 49, Code 6.4.1.49 – **“Describe the importance of “time-alone” between young people and the healthcare provider to discuss sexual and reproductive health and other sensitive subjects.”** Delete this benchmark.

This benchmark *requires* 11 to 13 year old children to embrace the “importance” of severing being parented by their parents in sexual matters. As written and placed within the Sexual Health strand, its sole purpose appears to be helping children escape from parental supervision, and in the context of this document and its’ source materials, to promote recreational sexual experimentation among middle school children. Further, this presumes legal “rights” for children to evade parental supervision exist in Minnesota.

Page 49, Code 6.4.2.01 – **“Explain how personal values and beliefs influence sexual relationships, practices, and behaviors.”** Delete this standard.

This Sexual Health benchmark is in children’s 7th year of State sexual indoctrination that progressive LGBTQIA+ worldview, culture, and beliefs exclusively define “healthy” and the “good” choice; that embracing these earns you a place of acceptance within your classroom and school community. Now, in this benchmark, the State requires our middle school children to confront the fact that they, their families, and faith communities may embody rival worldviews, culture and values. Every child must now choose, presenting a suitable explanation to allow grade advancement and eventually to graduate.

This is not unlike the mandatory display of State loyalty required of Stalin’s Young Pioneers or Mao’s Red Guard in order to remain in good standing and obtain access to the bounty of society. Confronted with the reality that the “trusted adults” with whom the middle school child spends most of there waking hours at school provides an alternative association and source of affirmation, the wedge is driven between the child and their parents and faith community. Often family members will only recognize this when their child later declares “their truth” is separate from what their family of origin taught -- that behaviors and beliefs promoted by the

State/school are opposed or not permitted in their family's worldview. The 11-year-old child is led to discover that the old worldview, culture and values must be replaced by the rival State-approved progressive worldview to resolve the personal cognitive dissonance being experienced.

This is also a violation of the family's right to practice its religion without State/school opposition, or the proselytizing of students into a rival belief system, even if conversion into the State worldview is presented year after year as the right, good, and healthy choice offered by "trusted" adults. (For a more complete discussion, see the books "The Religion of the Day" by the University of Mary and "Awake, Not Woke" by Noelle Mering. For an explanation of the methods systematically employed by the school, see the timeless classic "The True Believer: Thoughts on the Nature of Mass Movements" by Eric Hoffer.)

Page 49, Code 6.4.3.01 – **"Analyze the validity of sexual and reproductive health information."** Delete this standard.

The word "validity" is key. Here what is true is intended to be defined by those who insist that boys turn into real girls and that girls turn into real boys. The underlying philosophy of the sources (such as SHAPE America) used to create Draft 2 rely on subjective reality in which their wants and feelings define what is good and true. That is, their wanting something to be true, or their "feeling" it, makes it true.

Demanding 11- to 13-year-olds affirm progressive radical LGBTQIA sexual beliefs as valid (e.g., The Universal Truth, Way and Light to discover their "authentic" self and to achieve a socially just society) is an assault on the religious freedom of children and their families. It is the attempt to instill a rival State religion. (Incorporate here by reference the discussion in comments on Code 6.4.2.01 here.)

Page 49, Code 6.4.3.02 – This standard requires 11 to 13 year olds to **"Describe situations that call for professional sexual and reproductive healthcare services."** Delete this standard.

It is the prerogative and duty of the 11-year old's parents to discern the need for professional services (with very rare exceptions addressed by Child Protection laws). The term for this is "parenting." In context, this benchmark appears to be another wedge being driven between the parent and their child in favor of "trusted adults" so frequently mentioned throughout these proposed standards. When those adults acquire trust by systemic boundary violations (physically or emotionally), desensitizing victims and progressively mentoring sexual behavior of minors – the operative word is not "parenting" but "grooming" which Minnesota schools are statutory mandated to prevent, not promote (See M.S.120B.234).

Page 49, Code 6.4.3.03 – In order to advance grades and eventually graduate, eleven-year-old children are required by this standard to **“Determine the availability of valid sexual and reproductive healthcare products.”** Delete this standard.

What might be an age-appropriate “sexual product” for an 11 year old? This benchmark must be considered in the context of very, very narrow inputs for Draft 2 of these standards, and of those sources advocating the philosophy that pursuit of unlimited (liberated) sexual activity and affirmation of the LGBTQIA worldview, culture and values represents the only right and healthy path in life. This standard, and its application, will lead not only to constitutional rights being violated but to great, and irreparable physical and emotional harm being done to large numbers of Minnesota children.

Page 49, Code 6.4.4.04 – **“Demonstrate giving and receiving verbal consent for all sexual behaviors between partners.”** Delete this benchmark or at a minimum move it into the 9th grade to 12th grade levels AND alter it to read “Demonstrate refusing consent and giving consent for sexual behavior and an appropriate response to having one’s request declined.”

As written, this benchmark essentially tells middle school children to “Practice saying ‘Yes!’ to everything!” It is a remarkable exercise in degrading boundaries, desensitizing middle school children, having them practice only affirming sexual adventurism. Covering “all sexual behaviors” presents an astoundingly long list of possibilities to set before 11-year-old children, or minors of any age.

While this is consistent with the progressive LGBTQIA worldview that one discovers one’s “authentic” self through unlimited sexual exploration, teaching this to 11-year-olds from families whose worldview, culture and values do not align with that violates their constitutional, statutory, and natural rights. Further, the instructor’s required actions appear consistent with the behaviors that this Draft recognizes on Page 37 to constitute “sexual abuse.” Minnesota Statute 120B.234 directs our schools to prevent child sexual abuse, not to promote it.

Page 49, Code 6.4.4.06 – This requirement to advance grades, and to eventually graduate, requires 11 to 13 year olds to **“Demonstrate *how to effectively communicate support for peers when aspects of their sexuality are different from one’s own.*”** (Emphasis added.) Delete this benchmark.

This benchmark simply applies the enforcement power of state law to coerce universal submission to a sexually radical progressive worldview, culture and beliefs under the threat of withholding further education (grade advancement).

This blatant abuse of power would undermine the institutional integrity of Minnesota’s educational system and cause great and lasting harm to Minnesota’s children

Given the context of this document and its source documents, this benchmark requires every child, regardless of religious faith or worldview, to “support” the State-favored LGBTQIA worldview, culture and values. The child must “effectively communicate support” for the State preferred dogma. This is a political loyalty test, that may require denouncing one’s own faith or religion to advance to the next grade. If one believes that there are only two genders recognized by sex, that males do not turn into real girls and that females do not turn into real boys this benchmark will require you to renounce your beliefs to effectively support what you know is not true. Or you will fail this mandatory benchmark, not advance grade level, nor graduate.

The progressive movement embraces this requirement as ensuring every child is a “good intersectional ally” to those who perceive themselves as sexual identity victims at the hands of “binary heteronormal” privileged oppressors (that is, straight people). This is part of the larger progressive movement belief in the privileged vs victim worldview. In that worldview, one gains opportunity, resources, voice and power over those accused of having privilege by aligning as part of one or more victim groups (such as the LGBTQIA multi-gender-fluidity “community”). Those accused of having privilege are expected to yield to the demands of the self-declared “marginalized” victims. This makes them a good “ally.” Social justice is achieved when the privileged have met the demands of the marginalized in the opinion of those making the demands.

Public school health class is not the place to enforce these beliefs on middle school children.

GRADES NINE THROUGH TWELVE – SEXUAL HEALTH STRAND (25 Benchmarks)

There are 25 Sexual Health benchmarks required for 9th-12th grader minors to advance grade levels and to graduate. Broadly these envision the prospects for unlimited exploration with a any number of others, including discovering all prospects for stimulation with all body parts of both sexes and an unlimited number of genders.

Thirteen years in the making, the graduating class can celebrate its liberation from parental influence in favor of “trusted adults”; from the religions of their youth; from the anchors of the binary-heteronormative world view; and expectations of long-term mutual spousal loyalty and family formation. The progressive LGBTQIA+ sexual revolution is achieved. Que the triumphant music and raise the house lighting.

Unfortunately, lighting reveals the despairing, lonely, isolated empty lives of too many of our teens. Lacking meaning or purpose, many will seek meaning in the pursuit of the progressive movements of various utopias as our schools now call “civic readiness”.

In that light, let me offer just a few select comments on these benchmarks.

Page 61, Code 9.4.1.14 – **“Analyze the relationship between using alcohol and other drugs and sexual behaviors.”** Modify this to read “Analyze the effects of alcohol and other intoxicating substances on risky behaviors.” Duplicate this under Substance Use and Misuse Prevention.

As written, this benchmark sounds like exploring strategies for combining sex and intoxicants as enhancements. That is, “Candy is dandy, but liquor is quicker.” This is a dangerously wrong and harmful message for 14- to 18-year-olds. This is completely in opposition to the schools’ harm prevention mandates in statute.

Page 62, Code 9.4.1.25 – **“Describe young people’s rights to confidential [sexual] services in their state.”** (Bracketed word added to reflect this is in the Sexual Health strand.) Alter wording to read “Describe a minor person’s access to confidential services in Minnesota.”

This is apparently another cut-and-past from the materials used to build this document. As written, this mandatory expousal by a child contradicts parents being the primary educators and caregivers of their children. It normalizes the severing of the parent-child relationship and replaces it with another adult who has gained the minor’s trust through systemic grooming as presented throughout Draft 2 Sexual Health strand. Further, this presumes legal “rights” for minors to evade parental supervision exist in Minnesota.

Mike McCarthy, Chair

Fixing Stillwater Schools

www.FixingStillwaterSchools.org