

Educational Equity Implementation Thompson School District:
An Abbreviated Review
Rev. Edward D. Seely, Th.M., Ph.D.

Preface

The Thompson School District (TSD) in Loveland, Colorado, USA, has established a Department of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI). In the process, it has produced a document that comprises the work of five different Equity Implementation Planning Committees related to the district's Educational Equity Policy: Multilingual Communication, Inclusive Family/Guardian and Community Input, Culturally Competent and Diverse Staff, Equitable Resource Allocation, and Professional Growth for Equity. These committees were composed of school board members, district staff, parents, community members, and students throughout the district. The work of these five committees was brought together in a 30-page document that was put on the district's Website with the invitation for public response. It should be remembered that the 30-page paper has been presented as a working document, the final version of which could be changed. The following is my review of the original document and the related subdocuments that were included with hyperlinks in the original version. I have sent this review that follows to the director of the EDI department, with whom I also had a pleasant meeting to discuss the review. I am posting it here for those who have asked me for it and for the use of others who's public school systems are in the process of implementing similar proposals.

Observations

This report contains much that looks positive. It is clear that the plan to produce an education that is equitable for all students is constructed with an orientation to care for all students. For example, in the section, "[FAMILY/SCHOOL PARTNERSHIP IN EDUCATION](#)," the statement that "all district schools and programs will:... Collaborate with students, parents, guardians, families, and community partners through on-going, meaningful, multidirectional communication to build a shared understanding of the educational process and the role of trusted adults in supporting student achievement," (p. 1) sounds good.

It is also good to see statements pertaining to the desire to include all people in the community, e.g., people who don't have children in TSD, faith-based organizations, and local businesses. Nevertheless, key unanswered questions include these: "How will this collaboration occur? Specifically with whom? How truly representative of the population will the collaborators be? It is important to identify and address minority needs, but in so doing are the needs of the majority compromised in any way?" Justice is for all.

At the same time questions arise. Is the planning for equity, diversity, and inclusion taking into account the distinction between biology and ideology? In our current society, movements are actively promoting equity, diversity, and inclusion of many identities, but some exist due to biological and racial characteristics and others on ideology. Careful science research reveals that the latter espouse and promote values and practices that are counterproductive to the health and well-being of the individuals in those groups and to society. We need to make these distinctions and teach the truth about those distinctions.

While all people bear the image of God and are thereby deserving of respect, not all of their values are deserving of affirmation, much less promotion. Of considerable concern pertaining to this matter is the last bullet point on page 28 which stipulates, “Create affinity groups for LGBTQAI+, Employees of Color and other historically marginalized groups that reach employees and provide support and address retention efforts”. Likewise, see the first bullet point on page 29: “Gather input from multiple diverse student and family groups (including LGBTQ+, SES, etc.) about their needs as they relate to a culturally-rich and diverse learning environment at school”. There is no apparent distinction between racial groups and ideological, nonbiologically based, groups, such as the LGBTQ+ people, whose needs should be addressed and who should be treated fairly but whose values that result in [scientifically demonstrated counterproductive practices](#), e.g., that are extremely unhealthy, should not be advocated. See also the last bullet point on page 30: “Foster a culture in which staff feel job-secure when reporting on working conditions related to cultural diversity and have opportunities to share their personal experiences”. LGBTQ+ teachers should not use these occasions to promote their value system and lifestyle; they should teach the subject matter they’ve been hired to teach.

While it is admirable and necessary to include the opinions of all groups, logical errors such as the naturalistic fallacy and the unsound premise must be avoided. Notice the many emphases throughout the [TSD Equity, Diversity, & Inclusion](#) plan to be inclusive, diverse, and equitable but without distinction and critique. See, e.g., the statement on the importance to make and “maintain meaningful systems and structures for active involvement, engagement, and decision-making of students, families, staff, and community members that reflect the diversity of the student body.”¹ TSD is an education organization, which means that while public opinion is important, it can be uninformed and biased,² and when that occurs corrective feedback and other instruction is needed. Therefore, does TSD distinguish between a criterion reference and a norm reference³ standard for curriculum design, construction, and instruction? If so, does it have a criterion, and if so, what is the criterion or what are the criteria? What TSD input is given to guide policy and inform staff, students, and the public at large of important information from the moral and religious sphere⁴ on which this nation is based, especially the Bible on which the Founders relied far more than any other source in establishing their philosophy of government and which makes it unique;⁵ the field of logic; and the importance of discerning sound science from flawed science?

It is admirable to see a sensitivity to have teachers who represent all sectors of our society. However, pertaining to concerns raised above and on page 23 and elsewhere, it is much more important to prioritize competence and caring over biological characteristics. For example, if another Caucasian teacher is needed and a more qualified Hispanic teacher is available, the latter

¹ See “Equity Move...Inclusive Family/Guardian and Community Input: Increase diverse representation in decision-making,” page four of the document, [“Educational Equity Framework.”](#)

² Therefore, not all minority viewpoints and practices should be “recognized, honored, and respected.” See “TSD Foundational Educational Equity Beliefs,” the fourth bullet point on page three in the document, [“Educational Equity Framework.”](#)

³ For example, see statements such as the last bullet point on page 27, “A culture exists in which staff feel job secure when advocating for and reporting on issues related to cultural diversity based in survey results”.

⁴ See, e.g., the 2019 Colorado State Law HB 19-1032, Section 2. 22-1-128 (7) (a).

⁵ Donald S. Lutz, *The Origins of American Constitutionalism* (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: State University Press, 1988). David Barton, *America’s Godly Heritage* (Aledo, Texas: WallBuilder Press, 1993), pp. 23-24.

should be hired. If we're truly interested in equity for the students, teachers, and the community as a whole, we need the best person for the job.

Other Questions

1. On page one, what is the Educational Equity policy goal for addressing “athletic and activity participation?”
 - a. In the “Educational Equity Policy,” in particular the “[EDUCATIONAL EQUITY](#)” statement, the point is made that “The District believes that allocating resources equitably will support the narrowing of student opportunity gaps. Adjusting academic, athletic, activity fee, resource and supply structures across the school district will increase access and opportunity to each student.”⁶ Does the District include within that statement the possibility of biological males, with an XY chromosome and all it produces, which can never be changed, be allowed to compete with females?
 - 1) If so, with the extensive physical advantages of the biological males, how is that fair?
 - 2) In this country, where the principle of majority rule, one of the principles that has made the USA the exceptional country to which many millions of people all over the world want to immigrate, how can less than one percent of the population be allowed to harm 52% (girls and women) of the population?
 - 3) Do you know that many women, including a coalition of LGBTQ+ activists, the “[Women’s Sports Policy Working Group](#),” with well-known members such as Martina Navratilova, are strongly opposing allowing biological males to compete with biological females? [There is much more to be considered](#).
 - 4) Precisely, what are the “equity gaps in athletics” that are referred to on page 25 and elsewhere in the report?
 - b. Will biologically born males be allowed to use girls bathrooms, locker rooms, and showers?
 - 1) If so, how is the safety of girls ensured, which is a goal of the TSD according to “RATIONALE Desired Outcome 2.4” and the [Educational Equity Policy](#): “The District is committed to providing safe, inclusive, and supportive learning and work environments....”⁷
 - 2) Do you know that many girls have been abused by biological males in places that allow them to use girls and women’s restrooms?

⁶ Thompson School District, [Educational Equity Policy](#), EDUCATIONAL EQUITY, “I. Foundational Belief Statements and Commitments,” p. 1. See also other sections of the [Educational Equity Policy](#), EDUCATIONAL EQUITY, e.g., “II. Responsibilities,” 1. a. iii, p. 2 and “III. Definitions,” C. and D., depending on interpretation.

⁷ Thompson School District, [Educational Equity Policy](#), EDUCATIONAL EQUITY, “I. Foundational Belief Statements and Commitments,” p. 1.

- 3) Do you know that many girls and women, who have been abused and are frightened by males, are strongly opposed to sharing their restrooms, locker rooms, and showers with males?
2. Will students struggling with identity, including sexual identity, be treated by teachers, counseled by school counselors, and addressed by a different pronoun by administrators, teachers, and counselors without their parents knowledge or permission?
3. Specifically, how are parents involved in the EDI (Equity, Diversity, & Inclusion) decisions that affect their children, since “[The District believes that families should be welcomed, supported, and engaged in receiving information about programs available to their children and in decision-making](#)”?
4. With the name change from LCE (Language, Culture & Equity) to EDI, how much is [Critical Race Theory](#) (CRT) going to be implemented, since equity, diversity, and inclusion are key tenets of CRT? These concepts are commonly valued by all, but how they are defined and applied in practice varies widely, especially in CRT. Typically where CRT is implemented, including schools in both curriculum and instruction, the result is disunity, discord, and division and a simultaneous counterproductive decline in excellence. It is not a matter of improving technique; the underlying philosophy contains fundamental flaws. See the informative article in the hyperlink in this paragraph.
5. How will EDI affect curriculum and instruction? Specifically, what will be taught and practiced in each of these three areas (equity, diversity, and inclusion), with whom, and how?
6. How is total community input measured?
7. More resources on these subjects are available, all free, on my Websites, both of which are secure: my academic Website at <https://seelyedward.academia.edu/> and on my general Website at www.edwardseely.com, especially the [Current Issues](#) page.