

Public Notice

Education

State Board of Education

Notice of Receipt of Petitions for Rulemaking

Managing for Equity in Education

N.J.A.C. 6A:7

Petitioners: Janet Coley-Lima, Pamela A. Russell, Elizabeth, Arlene F. Petri, Kevin Towers, Lisa DeMarco, Diana Tantleff, Toby Doe, Dana Kennedy, David Brown, Camile Kluge, Rhiannon Mindas, Thomas Crane, Maja Bednarski, Lois Furrevig, Alyssa Bashaw, Chris Alvarez, Scott Jones, Louis A. Perrotta, III, Laura Pence, David Americo, Michael Minaides, Robyn Miller, Michael J. Eadicicco, Vera Olinski, Christine Birmingham, Brigitte Formolo, Grace Pietrangelo, Judith Hyer, Ted Geuther, Ruben Dominguez, Ryan Day, Dian Koster, Stephanie Bally, Elizabeth Martinez, Elizabeth Erin Czar, DO, Arturo Moreno, PaulaAnn Fazio Escudero, Marguerite Ciccolella, David Chin, Ph.D., Ruth Feliciano, Danielle Dill, Jennifer Farrell, Mike DeCastro, Kristi Hanson, Rachael Hull, Dina Artale, Kimberly Pachman, Francine Abel, Carol Gaynor, Melissa Talamo, Christina Fisher, Veronica A Colombo, Martha Anderson, Tania Pinho, Kathy Muscillo, Donna Hart, Melissa Kiel, Franklyn D. Pennell, Jr., Kathy A. Mandel, Vanessa Panagiotopoulos, Diane Badessa, Patricia A. McTague, Christin Cerullo, Patrick Earley, Meghan Caputo, Selena Perry, Patricia L. Wenzel, Marjorie Padilla, Angela Robertson, Allan Simonovich, Edwin Lima, Lisa Werdal, Martha Torres, Keri Wilkes, Peter J. Pappas, Cassandra Anderson, Merissa Borawski, Carol Lewant, Yan Katsnelson, Timothy McQueen, Cindy Santora, Jennifer Reppert, Kerri Sirinides, Victoria Shields, Noelle Sciacca, Steven Mottola, Lauren Mottola, Joan Schiller, Jooyun Riviezzo, James Ripley, Theresa Loda, Denise

Hirschhorn, Kristina Pawelko, Melissa Silva, Tom Lewandowski, Christine Flaherty, Maria Argen, Grazyna Zwiercan, Jennifer Bida, Alma V. Conkling, Kristin Tencza, Tatiana Garcia, Eveleth Roderer, Adriel Bastos, Alicja Nowicka, Krystyna Dudej, Brian Edwards, Carol Eng, Nikole Braud, Stephen Murray, Christine Fusco, Jean Barrett, Donna Marie Suszynski, Wildenys Lozada, Paul C. Szesko, Mark Bishop, Taryn McGrane, Daniel Morales, Carolyn Hill, Christina Fochi, Stephen Farrell, Gina Salzman, Drew Cifrodelli, Christopher Antonio Jimenez-Ferreto, Erin Sweeny, Nisha Mathew, Rachele Hearst, Lori Mears, Frank Petrino, Lauren Blauvelt, Kristine Monaco, Vanessa Petrucelli, Marisa Perilli Soto, Evelyn Kaveski, Hilary Jersey, Matthew Timmerman, Dorothy Turse, Linda Dougherty, Ann Michele Dillon, Philip Salerno, Natalie Timmerman, Renee Martins, Kristine Wark, James R. Bosma, Lenore Conklin Mohamed, Kenya Warren, Dina Salerno, Karen Speer, Cindy Brennan, Shulamit Lazarus, Maria Carin, Sandra Mei Armstrong, Renee Travers, John Owen, Adam Braun, Elizabeth Trebus, Elisa DeVitto, Jessica Mascolo, Carol Gallentine, James Sarkar, Sue Cappel, Katalina Sánchez, Nancie Shauger, Heather O'Neill, Mary Ferns, Maria Quigley, Charissa Murray, Isabel Nieves de Caimares, Michael Inganamort, Kholood Ziada, Amr Eldessouky, Inas Hassan, Hoda Sayed, Safya Eldessouky, Nivien Eltarrani, Faten Attiah, Embarek Alwedi, Munera, Mariam Gandour, Hayat Jaoudar, Mohamed Abdallah Mahmoud Hassan, Amanie Khalil, Edwin Black, Alshaimaa Mohamed Abdelfattah, Samina Yasin, Ahmed Bedewy, Joseph Belnome, Touria Ansaisse, Saleh Elahwal, Salma Kaleem, Andrew S. Craven, Hala Eldessouky, Wagdy Ziada, Mohamed Nassim, Hazem Adham, Intesar Awadallah, Tarek Warraky, Imran Siddiqui, Ahmed Amer, Mariam Saleeb, Sana Ali, Yasir Farooq, Hader Hamza, Jasur Koshchanov, Maged Hegazy, George Saleeb, Hayat Ouziatine, Hossam Elfeky, Iman Rezk, Sanaa El Maslouhi, Asmae Raissi, Sherry Samuel, Alsaied Alboraey, Trista Kay, Hoda Sheishaa, Adel Mansour, and Carlo Fioranelli.

Take notice that on September 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, 2023, the New Jersey State Board of Education (State Board) received petitions for rulemaking from the above petitioners, requesting the State Board repeal amendments adopted at N.J.A.C. 6A:7 as part of the recent readoption with amendments (see 55 N.J.R. 1877(a)).

The purpose of N.J.A.C. 6A:7 is to ensure all students, regardless of housing status, socioeconomic status, immigration status, or any protected category as stated at N.J.S.A. 10:5-1 et seq., such as race, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, age, marital status, civil union status, domestic partnership status, affectional or sexual orientation, genetic information, pregnancy or breastfeeding, sex, gender identity or expression, religion, disability, atypical hereditary cellular or blood trait, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or nationality, are provided equal access to educational activities and programs by district boards of education. The educational activities and programs include the teaching of challenging curriculum based on the New Jersey Student Learning Standards (NJSLs), differentiated instruction, formative assessments aligned to the NJSLs, qualified teachers, and professional standards for teachers and school leaders. The rules specify standards for district boards of education in establishing policies and procedures for the provision of educational activities and programs for all students, pursuant to: Article I, Paragraph 5 of the New Jersey State Constitution; the New Jersey Law Against Discrimination (NJLAD) (N.J.S.A. 10:5-1 et seq.); N.J.S.A. 18A:35-1 et seq., 18A:36-20, and 18A:38-5.1; Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. §§ 2000d et seq. and 2000e et seq.); Title IX of Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. §§ 1681 et seq.); Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. §§ 701 et seq.); and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (20 U.S.C. §§ 1400 et seq.).

Petitioner Arlene F. Petri disagreed with the adopted amendments but did not indicate on what grounds.

Petitioner Linda Dougherty asserted that there is a lack of equal access to resources at her school, and specifically requested the repeal of N.J.S.A. 18A:4-15.

Petitioners Chris Alvarez, Jennifer Farrell, Kathy Muscillo, Patricia A. McTague, James Ripley, Stephen Murray, and Angela Robertson asserted that the adopted amendments should revert to the original wording. Petitioner Patricia A. McTague also asserted that there are only two sexes male by birth and female by birth and men in women's sports is extremely unfair to women. Petitioner Angela Robertson also asserted that this is unconstitutional and morally reprehensible as well.

Petitioner Andrew S. Craven asserted that eliminating gender pronouns is disorienting for children.

Petitioner Daniel Morales asserted that simplifying biological sex classifications to accommodate a broader spectrum of gender identities can be confusing and potentially harmful for students.

Petitioner Maria Quigley asserted that these amendments will foster more division, spark legal action, and impose great costs on every school district.

Petitioner Victoria Shields asserted that the adopted amendments are extremely controversial because they defy logic, ethics, science, and God.

Petitioner Noelle Sciacca asserted that the adopted amendments contradict scientific facts and the very laws created for the board members themselves.

Petitioner Christopher Antonio Jimenez-Ferreto asserted that the adopted amendments promote gender ideology and should be removed.

Petitioner Alma V. Conkling asserted that this matter of gender language to be used in public schools should be done by legislation where voters can voice their opinions and beliefs.

Petitioner Frank Petrino asserted that the adopted amendments are not based on science, but rather on rapidly changing fringe ideologies. Petitioner Frank Petrino also asserted that the failure of schools to both recognize and teach that biology dictates that there are two sexes of humans, and that gender is intimately correlated with sex, is an indictment of how far schools have strayed from reality and truth.

Petitioner Brian Edwards asserted that the adopted amendments are backed by no substantial scientific rigor, evidence, or credible studies that would justify such a drastic change to school sports and sex education and are dogmatic in nature rather than grounded in logic.

Petitioner Krystyna Dudej asserted that the adopted amendments violate parental rights and are fundamentally anti-science and anti-reality. Petitioner Krystyna Dudej also asserted that adopting legislation that purposefully removes traditional, binary gender pronouns is tremendously harmful for young people.

Petitioner Jean Barrett asserted that the State Board of Education has overstepped its boundary from education, and intruded into each family's personal, moral and ethical business by imposing a highly contested social agenda on school policy without the benefit of a debate or input from the families of New Jersey. Petitioner Jean Barrett also asserted that the adopted amendments have been made without thought of the damages and future implications these policies will have on children and that there are no clear boundaries for these changes and no explanation given as to why these changes needed to be made. Petitioner Jean Barrett also asserted that there already exist laws protecting every child from discrimination and extend "equal" opportunity education for all.

Petitioner Hilary Jersey asserted that the adopted amendments are just not in alignment with how our country functions — where success is based on effort, skills, and talents.

Petitioner Hilary Jersey also asserted that the adopted amendments are not what is needed for children to be safe, successful, and grow into productive adults.

Petitioner Carol Lewant asserted that it is harmful to remove normal pronouns from the schools and wrong to allow biological males in girls' locker rooms and on girls' teams. Petitioner Carol Lewant also asserted that there is a difference between girls and boys that has to be respected.

Petitioner Shulamit Lazarus asserted that the removal of biologically based gender language and the addition of all pronouns of others who identify themselves as “they” or “them” or any other word they wish to be called and which the teacher will be forced to use if this chapter is amended will confuse children who are just starting to learn about their own biologically based gender. Petitioner Shulamit Lazarus also asserted that to replace equality with equity codifies a removal of competition and merit.

Petitioners Camille Kluge, Rhiannon Mindas, and Maja Bednarski asserted that the adopted amendments should move away from the so-called diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) sociological and political movements.

Petitioner Christopher D'Onfrio asserted that the adopted amendments should be categorized by physical gender.

Petitioner Peter J. Pappas asserted that it is inappropriate to change gender designations.

Petitioner Sue Cappel asserted that male and female are not social constructs, but instead biological fact.

Petitioner David Brown asserted that the adopted amendments would allow public schools to separate sports and sexual education by gender identity.

Petitioner Yan Katsnelson asserted that children should not be separated based on sexual identity for sports but instead the separation should be based on their biological sex. Petitioner Yan Katsnelson also asserted that leftist gender ideologies should not be pushed in public schools and that parents, not government agents, should be the primary people who talk about issues of gender identity with their children.

Petitioners Tarek Warraky asserted that forcing children to affirm gender identity goes against religious beliefs and biology and is unconstitutional.

Petitioner Grace Pietrangelo asserted that the adopted amendments leave pronouns for gender.

Petitioner Elizabeth Erin Czar, DO asserted that the adopted amendments are an attempt at inclusion or avoiding discrimination is by default discriminating against biological male and female students. Petitioner Elizabeth Erin Czar, DO also asserted that to not discriminate against any student, educate them all for their specific biological anatomy individually (for example, in an online forum or class that is private and could be personalized) and have an addendum for children with gender dysphoria to address their specific concerns.

Petitioner Mike DeCastro asserted that the adopted amendments should be reverted to its original wording. Petitioner Mike DeCastro also asserted that when ports are not divided on the basis of biological sex, you place students in danger.

Petitioner Trista Kay asserted that the adopted amendments violate all definitions of biological reality, human sexuality, and parental authority.

Petitioner Francine Abel asserted that the adopted amendments are extremely unfair to young biological females. Petitioner Francine Abel also asserted that she has school aged children and wants to talk to her children about these things directly.

Petitioner Tom Lewandowski asserted that the adopted amendments eliminate gendered nouns and remove all equality

Petitioner Christina Fochi asserted that by removing local control from parents and communities regarding issues of sex, gender, sports teams, sex ed classes, bathroom policies, and other items, the State Board of Education will seriously violate parental rights by sidelining parents, and elected school board members, from having any control or decision-making power on these issues.

Petitioner Sandra Mei Armstrong asserted that the adopted amendments violate parents' rights by making it illegal for schools to notify parents if children want to change gender identities, pronouns, names, bathroom preferences, and participation in sports teams.

Petitioner Arturo Moreno asserted that the adopted amendments would cause the loss of parental rights and are an affront to family integrity.

Petitioner Heather O'Neill asserted that the adopted amendments would be a grave disservice to children by not letting their parents know when their child is struggling, and that these amendments strive to destroy the nuclear family.

Petitioner Patrick Earley asserted that it is not the place of the Department of Education to address the needs of his child and it should continue to focus on educational not social issues.

Petitioner Joan Schiller asserted that the adopted amendments violate parental authority as recognized by 14th amendment, section 1.

Petitioner Theresa Loda asserted that the government cannot usurp parental authority and responsibility.

Petitioner Tatiana Garcia asserted that her rights as a parent are not being respected. Petitioner Tatiana Garcia also asserted that the adopted amendments are pushing ideas into our young children's mind that she does not approve of as a parent.

Petitioner Wildenys Lozada asserted that her rights as a parent are not being respected. Petitioner Wildenys Lozada also asserted that there's partiality to the LGBTQ community.

Petitioner Michael J. Eadicicco asserted that the adopted amendments are not in the best interest of New Jersey children and their parents.

Petitioner Alyssa Bashaw asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional and violate religious freedoms. Petitioner Alyssa Bashaw also asserted that parents have the right to know what is happening with their children and that there are two genders.

Petitioner Paul C. Szesko asserted that the adopted amendments violate his religious beliefs that there are only two sexes, male and female, and will be harmful to impressionable young children. Petitioner Paul C. Szeko also asserted that the adopted amendments violate parental rights.

Petitioner Cindy Santora asserted that the adopted amendments violate parental rights, religious beliefs, are unconstitutional, and not based in biology.

Petitioner Jessica Mascolo and Melissa Silva asserted that there are two genders and that these topics should not be taught to children.

Petitioner Grazyna Zwiercan asserted that children should not be in locker rooms or bathrooms with transgender individuals.

Petitioner Maria Argen asserted that the adopted amendments are based on political and social influence rather than science and that schools should instead focus on staffing challenges,

poor proficiency numbers Statewide, and teach kids to read cursive, basic math, financial responsibility, and critical thinking.

Petitioner Gina Salzman asserted that as a tax-paying parent in a free public school that provides appropriate education, changing this is not ethic, moral, or appropriate.

Petitioner Lois Furrebig asserted that schools need to teach reading, writing, and arithmetic, not LGBTQ+ and other related woke ideology. Petitioner Lois Furrebig also asserted that the State should leave parenting to parents.

Petitioner Judith Hyer asserted that schools need to teach reading, writing, and arithmetic, and the State should allow parents to use their authority to have discussions with their children about gender and sexual orientation.

Petitioner Dina Artale asserted that the adopted amendments take away a parent's right to know extremely important information about their child and it harms the child because they will not be able to receive the appropriate care since their parent will be denied this information. This is extremely dangerous and neglectful for the State to do. Petitioner Dina Artale also stated that public schooling is the right of all citizen taxpayers; and children need to learn reading, writing, math, history, and unbiased science.

Petitioners Ryan Day asserted that the adopted amendments violate parents' rights. Petitioner Ryan Day also asserted that the adopted amendments go against his religion.

Petitioner Christine Flaherty asserted that the adopted amendments reflect a sort of secular religion in which principles which are antithetical to those of people who adhere to a religion where there are two sexes or genders. Petitioner Christine Flaherty also asserted that these rules thereby exclude the vast number of families who identify as adhering to any of the major monotheistic religions where there are only two genders or sexes.

Petitioner Ruben Dominguez asserted that the adopted amendments go against his religious beliefs to even start these conversations with our children. Petitioner Ruben Dominguez also asserted that parents should and need to have the right to decide the nature and substance of the education they receive.

Petitioners Janet Coley-Lima and Pamela A. Russell asserted that the adopted amendments violate parental and religious rights.

Petitioner Carol Gallentine asserted that the adopted amendments violate all definitions of traditional human sexuality as well as parental authority. Petitioner Carol Gallentine also asserts that the adopted amendments violate religious freedom and harmful to minor children.

Petitioner Evelyn Kaveski asserted that the adopted amendments are harmful to children. Petitioner Evelyn Kaveski also asserted that human beings are biologically either male or female and to encourage and teach otherwise causes psychological confusion, is scientifically false, and goes against her religious beliefs.

Petitioner Elizabeth Martinez asserted that the adopted amendments harm children and provide false input based on education they have already learned as well. Petitioner Elizabeth Martinez also asserted that the adopted amendments are seeking to erase male and female terms and restrict teacher of notifying parents regarding their child's gender identity.

Petitioner Louis A. Perrotta, III asserted that the adopted amendments would allow public schools to separate sex education by gender identity rather than biological sex. Petitioner Louis A. Perrotta, III also asserted that leftist gender ideologies should not be pushed in public schools and that parents, not government agents, should be the primary people who talk about issues of gender identity with their children.

Petitioner David Chin, Ph.D., asserted that the adopted amendments are not based on science, but instead on ever-changing sociological ideas and political influence. Petitioner David Chin, Ph.D. also asserted that biology dictates that there are two sexes of mammals and humans, males and female, and that publicly funded entities straying away from basic science into such ideologies, will clearly harm, not help, our children.

Petitioner Edwin Lima asserted that the adopted amendments are government overreach, violate religious freedom, unscientific and take away the rights of parents to be informed by schools of major issues that are impacting their children and their lives. Petitioner Edwin Lima also disagreed with the use of terminology "sex assigned at birth," and asserted that this is contrary to all human history and that people are male and female.

Petitioner Lori Mears asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional, an example of unscientific governmental overreach, and are not based on science, but instead on ever-changing sociological ideas and political influence. Petitioner Lori Mears also asserted that biology dictates that there are two sexes of mammals and humans, male and female, and that publicly funded entities straying away from basic science into such ideologies, will clearly harm, not help, our children.

Petitioner Erin Sweeny asserted that the adopted amendments are government overreach and political in nature, jeopardizing the natural development of our children. Petitioner Erin Sweeny also asserted these amendments will cause emotional and mental distress amongst majority of children and these standards will worsen this crisis.

Petitioner Lisa Werdal asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional, anti-science, socialist in nature, violate religious freedoms, exhibit government overreach and are harmful to children. Petitioner Lisa Werdal also asserted that the adopted amendments are not

based on science, but instead on ever-changing sociological ideas and political influence and that biology dictates that there are two sexes of mammals and humans, males and females.

Petitioners Adel Mansour, Hoda Sheishaa, Diane Potts, Alsaied Alboraey, Sherry Samuel, Asmae Raissi, Sanaa El Maslouhi, Iman Rezk, Imran Siddiqui, Ahmed Amer, Mariam Saleeb, Sana Ali, Yasir Farooq, Hader Hamza, Jasur Koshchanov, Maged Hegazy, George Saleeb, Hayat Ouziatine, Hossam Elfeky, Tarek Warraky , Hala Eldessouky, Wagdy Ziada, Mohamed Nassim, Hazem Adham, Intesar Awadallah, Touria Ansaisse, Saleh Elahwal, Salma Kaleem, Alshaimaa Mohamed Abdelfattah, Samina Yasin, Ahmed Bedewy, Kholood Ziada, Amr Eldessouky, Inas Hassan, Hoda Sayed, Safya Eldessouky, Nivien Eltarrani, Faten Attiah, Embarek Alwedi, Munera, Mariam Gandour, Hayat Jaoudar, Mohamed Abdallah Mahmoud Hassan, and Amanie Khalil, asserted that the adopted amendments force students to affirm the State of New Jersey's religious views.

Petitioner Laura Pence asserted that the adopted amendments go against religious freedom.

Petitioner Kerri Sirinides asserted that the adopted amendments go against her religious beliefs.

Petitioner Kathy A. Mandel asserted that the adopted amendments trample on the rights of a very large population of a person's right to religious beliefs. Petitioner Kathy A. Mandel also asserted that her grandson is in public school and is a believer of his Catholic faith and should not be forced to comply with this agenda; do not violate his rights to exercise his freedom of religion.

Petitioners Rachael Hull, Carol Gaynor, Timothy McQueen, Rachelle Hearst, Carolyn Hill, and Merissa Borawski asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional.

Petitioners Pamela A. Russell, Dana Kennedy, Camile Kluge, Isabel Nieves de Caimares, Katalina Sánchez, Maria Carin, and Steven Mottola asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional and violate religious freedoms.

Petitioner Tania Pinho asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional and against religious beliefs to remove the distinction of male and female.

Petitioner Denise Hirschhorn asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional and should instead keep the words male and female in.

Petitioner Michael Minaides asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional and violate religious freedoms, and it harms all children in legislating lower outcomes for all. Petitioner Michael Minaides also asserted that the adopted amendments insert Marxist equity into New Jersey education and are anti-American and anti-freedom.

Petitioner Nancie Shauger asserted that the adopted amendments supplant all references to “equality” with the misleading and highly politically charged term "equity"; eliminating the use of male/female pronouns; and allowing schools to separate sports and sex education by gender identity rather than biological sex; all serving to undermine the fabric of this nation and rewrite New Jersey educational policy in order to incorporate Marxist ideology.

Petitioner Eveleth Roderer asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional; anti-science; and are completely contrary to our religious beliefs. Petitioner Eveleth Roderer also asserted that the adopted amendments changes have everything to do with indoctrinating our children to a Socialist, Fascist, Marxist way of thinking and take away from the pursuit of academic excellence, remove the parents from having a say in the curriculum and are attempting to reinforce a practice of Affirmative Action that has just been struck down by the U.S. Supreme Court as illegal.

Petitioner Robyn Miller asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional, do not allow for religious freedom, and harm children. Petitioner Robyn Miller also asserted that the State of New Jersey and school districts should not play any role in keeping information from parents.

Petitioner Mark Bishop asserted that the adopted amendments violate parental rights, as well as constitutional rights, and religious freedoms.

Petitioner Renee Travers asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional and anti-science.

Petitioners Janet Coley-Lima, Diana Tantleff, Toby Doe, and Maja Bednarski asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional, anti-science, a violation of religious freedom, and harmful to children.

Petitioner Christine Birmingham asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional and dangerous for children.

Petitioner Martha Torres asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional and harmful to children.

Petitioner Kristi Hanson asserted that the adopted amendments harm teachers and students, are unconstitutional and go against religious rights.

Petitioner Selena Perry asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional and incorrect based on the factual evidence of biology. Petitioner Selena Perry also asserted that this is government overreach.

Petitioner Keri Wilkes asserted that the adopted amendments mimic modern culture trends, are unconstitutional, anti-science, violate religious freedoms, and exhibit government overreach. Petitioner Keri Wilkes also asserted that the adopted amendments further alienate every student who is not following social media and living according to family, religious, and decades of traditional teachings, and that schools should limit their teaching to fact-based math, science, history, language arts, and physical education.

Petitioner Nisha Mathew asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional, detrimental to the wellbeing of children, beyond the scope of the State Board's authority, discriminatory to those who identify as male and female, prohibit the free exercise of religious liberty of students, teachers, and public-school staff, and eliminate the public's First Amendment Rights. Petitioner Nisha Mathew also asserted that the board should be spending resources and time on how to improve our state's testing standards in English, math, and writing.

Petitioner Kevin Towers asserted that the adopted amendments violate religious rights, the Establishment Clause in the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and equal protection under law, and deny parents fundamental liberty interest in caring for, and guiding, their children. Petitioner Kevin Towers also asserted that the adopted amendments are not based in reality or on science.

Petitioner Alicja Nowicka asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional, infringe on parental rights, and are anti-science.

Petitioner Rhiannon Mindas asserted that the adopted amendments are harmful to children and teachers, goes against religious freedoms, and are unconstitutional.

Petitioners Carlo Fioranelli and Kristina Pawelko asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional, a violation of religious freedom, and harmful to children.

Petitioner James Sarkar asserted that the adopted amendments are harmful, unconstitutional, go against religion and science, and are confusing for children, parents, and teachers.

Petitioner Christine Fusco asserted that the adopted amendments look to erase the terms male and female in schools, are harmful to children, families, and teachers, are unconstitutional and infringe on religious freedoms.

Petitioners Vera Olinski Ted Geuther, Joseph Belnome, Edwin Black, PaulaAnn Fazio Escudero, John Owen, Adam Braun, Elisa DeVitto Ann Michele Dillon, Matthew Timmerman, Danielle Dill, Donna Hart, Diane Badessa, Patricia L. Wenzel, Kristin Tencza, Adriel Bastos, Drew Cifrodelli, Vanessa Petrucelli, Christin Cerullo, Allan Simonovich, Jooyun Riviezzo, Cassandra Anderson, Nikole Braud, Marisa Perilli Soto, Karen Speer, Renee Martins, James R. Bosma, Kenya Warren, Natalie Timmerman, Lenore Conklin Mohamed, Philip Salerno, Kristine Wark, Dina Salerno, Cindy Brennan, and Jennifer Reppert asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional, anti-science, violate religious freedoms, harm children, government over-reach, and socialist in nature.

Petitioner Kristine Monaco asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional, government over-reach, violate religious freedom, infringe on individual morality, violate parental rights, and are rooted in Marxism. Petitioner Kristine Monaco also asserted that the focus should instead be on teaching the children math, English, reading, science, and real history.

Petitioner Brigitte Formolo asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional; an example of government overreach that is taking away parental authority over their children; expose our young children to sexually inappropriate content in the school curriculum; and promote gender confusion and transgender ideology.

Petitioner Scott Jones asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional and against their rights as a parent and guardian of a child or student.

Petitioner Veronica A. Colombo asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional and against parental rights and assist the government in alienation against parents.

Petitioner Vanessa Panagiotopoulos and Shana Marie Russo asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional and take away parental rights.

Petitioner Marguerite Ciccolella asserted that the adopted amendments are completely unconstitutional and violate parental rights. Petitioner Marguerite Ciccolella also asserted that this is unsafe.

Petitioner Taryn McGrane asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional and harmful to all children. Petitioner Taryn McGrane also asserted that parents and legal guardians should be included in all serious matters involving the well-being of their children.

Petitioner Donna Marie Suszynski asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional, harmful to children, a violation of religious freedom, against their parental rights, and will cause harm to that the family dynamic.

Petitioner Martha Anderson asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional as it removes my parental rights and also conflicts with my protected freedom of religion. Petitioner Martha Anderson also asserted that there are two genders, male and female, and if her child has any issues, it will be privately discussed with professionals trained not educators.

Petitioner Ruth Feliciano asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional and harms children's mental health.

Petitioner Melissa Talamo asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional and harm teachers and children.

Petitioner Melissa Kiel asserted that the adopted amendments go against the Constitution's first amendment of religious freedom, are very dangerous, and a catastrophic mistake.

Petitioner Franklyn D Pennell, Jr. asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional and harmful to children.

Petitioner Meghan Caputo asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional and go against her family's religious beliefs as you try to remove gender nouns and pronouns and terms for identifying gender to address one's sex or gender in our public schools.

Petitioner Marjorie Padilla asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional. Petitioner Marjorie Padilla also asserted that it is unconstitutional to remove female and male from the schools where those are the biological terms.

Petitioner Charissa Murray asserted that the adopted amendments are anti-science, violate religious freedoms, harm children, and are government over-reach.

Petitioner Mary Ferns asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional, anti-science, socialist in nature, violate religious freedoms, and exhibit government overreach.

Petitioner Lauren Mottola asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional, anti-science, violate religious freedoms, exhibit government overreach and harm children.

Petitioner Camille Kluge and Maja Bednarski asserted that the adopted amendments are not based on science, but instead on ever-changing sociological ideas and political influence. The petitioners also asserted that the amendments do not help students, they further confuse them.

Petitioner Lisa DeMarco, Diana Tantleff, Toby Doe, Dana Kennedy, and Maja Bednarski asserted that the adopted amendments represent government overreach.

Petitioner Elizabeth Trebus asserted that the adopted amendments are government overreach and that children are in schools to learn academics.

Petitioner Lauren Blauvelt asserted that the adopted amendments represent government overreach, and it violates parents' rights.

Petitioner Kimberly Pachman asserted that the adopted amendments go against her beliefs and basic humanity. Petitioner Kimberly Packman also asserted that the adopted amendments are not up to government control.

Petitioner Janet Coley-Lima also asserted that the adopted amendments will harm the relationship between students, teachers, schools, and parents.

Petitioner Maja Bednarski asserted that the adopted amendments will create an adversarial relationship between child and parent, parent and teacher, potentially fueling a dangerous and life-threatening environment.

Petitioner Stephanie Bally asserted that the adopted amendments harm children mentally and promote bad relationships with parents.

Petitioner Michael Inganamort asserted that the adopted amendments were hastily adopted, politically driven, antithetical to established science, and could have far worse long-term impacts on young students. Petitioner Michael Inganamort also asserted that the adopted amendments will drive a wedge between children and their parents, putt teachers in an awful position to tackle moral and sexual topics outside their domain and interest areas and erode trust in school leadership.

Petitioners Carol Eng asserted that the adopted amendments are unconstitutional, unscientific, and dangerous to the female population. Petitioners Carol Eng also asserted that policies aimed at promoting equity will inadvertently lead to unfairness or discrimination themselves.

Petitioners Janet Coley-Lima, Diana Tantleff, Toby Doe, and Maja Bednarski also asserted that the adopted amendments are socialist in nature.

Petitioner Dian Koster asserted that the adopted amendments chose equity over equality and are following a Marxist path. Petitioner Dian Koster also asserted that when schools treat all

students equally, all students get the same education and when equity is used it is an excuse to force racist ideas.

Petitioner Dorothy Turse asserted that the adopted amendments would cause harm to children by erasing equality for equity. Petitioner Dorothy Turse also asserted that the adopted amendments would lead to an indoctrination into Marxist philosophy, the eradication of parental and religious rights, and the erasure of differences between the sexes.

Petitioner Dana Kennedy asserted that the replacement of equity eliminates merit-based achievement goals, and instead focuses on categories of protected civil rights status as the determinant of educational services. Petitioner also asserted that collecting information on protected categories enumerated at “N.J.A.C. 6A:7-1(a)” (sic) is a violation of individual privacy rights, and also most of these have little to no relevance to children.

Petitioner Stephen Farrell asserted that the adopted amendments take away girl's and women's rights and are harmful to children.

Petitioner Christina Fisher asserted that the adopted amendments are harmful to children.

Petitioner Thomas Crane asserted that the adopted amendments affect child safety and health.

In accordance with N.J.A.C. 1:30-4.2, the Department of Education shall subsequently mail to the petitioners, and file with the Office of Administrative Law, a notice of action on the petition.