

A SURVEY OF STATE LAWS AND
POLICIES REGARDING SEX EDUCATION

by 632

BARBARA JEAN DAVIS

B. S., Kansas State University, 1967

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1970

Approved by:


Major Professor

LD
2668
R4
1970
D35
C.2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION.	1
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.	5
PROCEDURES USED IN THE STUDY.	5
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY.	6
FINDINGS.	6
Table 1. Information Concerning the Official Policies or Laws About Sex Education	7
States Reporting No Law or Policy	9
States Reporting Only Laws.	13
States Reporting Both Policies and Laws	14
States Reporting Only Policies.	23
SUMMARY	49
APPENDIXES.	55
A. Questionnaire	56
B. Statements of National Organizations in Support of Sex Education: Cited by the Iowa Department of Public Instruction	57
C. General Objectives of Family Life and Sex Education: Developed by the Illinois Sex Education Advisory Board. .	59
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	63
A. PERIODICALS	64
B. STATE AND ORGANIZATION PUBLICATIONS	64
C. CORRESPONDENCE.	66

INTRODUCTION

"A burgeoning national interest in sex education has resulted in numerous conferences; a proliferation of curricula, outlines, and teaching aids; the formation of the national Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS); and active expressions of interest and concern from many other organizations."¹ Sex education is not as new as all of the recent interest would indicate. In fact some sex education programs go back twenty or thirty years but the majority of them date just back to the early 1960's.² In 1964 SIECUS, a non-profit organization was founded to aid interested persons in preparing for sex education courses. In 1966 the United States Office of Education made funds available for the inclusion of sex education into their curriculum as well as training the needed teachers.

All of this happened without too much turmoil but as Rowan and Mazie have stated, "Within the past year [1969], sex instruction has become perhaps the most explosive topic in elementary and secondary education since John Scopes went on trial in 1925 for teaching evolution."³ Many people still support sex education (in a 1969 Gallup poll 71 percent of adult Americans polled approved of some form of sex

¹Lester A. Kirkendall and Greg J. Miles, "Sex Education Research," Review of Educational Research, XXXVIII (December, 1968), 582.

²Carl T. Rowan and David M. Mazie, "Sex Education: Powder Keg in Our Schools," Reader's Digest, XCV (October, 1969), 74.

³Ibid., p. 73.

education)¹ but there have been a growing number of people and organizations opposed to any program of sex education.

The campaigns against sex education started as local people in two widely separated parts of the country became distressed over what was being presented in their local programs.² It became a national campaign when the Christian Crusade and the John Birch Society joined in late 1968.³ It was from these organizations that the anti-sex education campaign got ". . . the push needed to create the mass indignation and confusion confronting school boards today."⁴ Since then there have been numerous organizations formed to keep sex education out of the schools. In Minnesota and California we find Parents Opposed to Sex Education (POSE), in New Jersey there is a group known as People Against Unconstitutional Sex Education (PAUSE). In Oklahoma the SOS (Sanity on Sex) organization is working.⁵ In the August, 1969 issue of the American School Board Journal there are twenty-three organizations listed as being opposed to sex education.⁶

A Sacramento, California board member, Adolph Maskovitz, has cited the following as common claims made by sex education critics:

¹"Playboy Interview: Dr. Mary Calderone," Playboy, XVII (April, 1970), 64.

²Joanne Zazzaro, "The War on Sex Education," American School Board Journal, CLVII (August, 1969), 12.

³Rowan and Mazie, op. cit., p. 75.

⁴Zazzaro, "The War on Sex Education," op. cit., p. 7.

⁵Walter Goodman, "The Controversy Over Sex Education," Redbook, CXXXIII (September, 1969), 78.

⁶Zazzaro, "The War on Sex Education," op. cit., p. 13.

1. Sex education is a communist plot to destroy the morals of youth. . . ., 2. Sex education is an invasion of the God-given right of parents alone to teach the subject. 3. Sex education is presented exclusive of God, moral values, and clear delineation of "rights" and "wrongs". 4. Some sex education is good, but this particular program goes much too far, starts too early, and may be psychologically damaging. 5. Schools don't have qualified personnel to teach so delicate a subject as sex education.¹

One or more of these reasons are used by the various organizations opposed to sex education.

Not all organizations concerned with sex education are against it. In the September, 1969 issue of the American School Board Journal eighteen national organizations are listed which support sex education in the schools. The American Medical Association, the National Council of Churches, the Sixth White House Conference on Children and Youth, and the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare are but a sample of those listed.² The National Education Association asked its members to cooperate ". . . in establishing sex education programs as an integral part of the school curriculum."³

In spite of the number and stature of the organizations supporting sex education those opposing it are having some success. The actual extent of this success is not known. Joanne Zazzaro has stated, "So successful have sex education antagonists been in organizing local opposition that latest estimates show at least thirty-five states and

¹Ibid.

²Joanne Zazzaro, "Critics or No Critics, Most Americans Still Support Sex Education in Schools," American School Board Journal, CLVII (September, 1969), 32.

³Ibid.

more than 100 cities experiencing difficulty. . . ."1 Reader's Digest reports that, "More than 15 states have passed or are considering laws to prohibit, control or investigate sex classes."2 Christianity Today states that ". . . more than a score of state legislatures are now considering the subject, and undoubtedly some of them will act either to bar or to sharply curtail such programs."3

U. S. News and World Report gives specific examples of state actions. "In New York the State Legislature passed a bill that cuts off health-education funds from sex instruction."4 Another case was in California, ". . . the upper house passed a bill permitting parents to remove children from classes in which reproductive organs and their functions and processes are described, illustrated or discussed."5

All of this turmoil has caused much uncertainty as to what is being taught, or what should be taught in the field of sex education. In fact, ". . . some school boards unable to cope with the sex education controversy without losing their cool have delayed expanding their sex education program and have beseeched state education departments to develop a statewide sex education curriculum."6

1Zazzaro, "The War on Sex Education," op. cit., p. 7.

2Rowan and Mazie, op. cit., pp. 73-74.

3Harold Lindsell, "Sex, SIECUS, and the School," Christianity Today, XIV (January 30, 1970), 11.

4"Why the Furor over Sex Education," U. S. News and World Report, LXVII (August 4, 1969), 44.

5Ibid.

6Zazzaro, "The War on Sex Education," op. cit., p. 17.

Upon completion of a survey of the literature no published account had been found as to what position the various state boards or departments of education have taken on sex education.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem was to discover the official status of sex education on the state level. What states have official policies on sex education? What are these policies? What states have laws regulating sex education? What are these laws? Have either laws or policies been rejected? Are there any regional trends? Has there been either a trend to be more or less restrictive?

PROCEDURES USED IN THE STUDY

To seek the answers to these questions a questionnaire was mailed to the State Department of Education (or like department) of each of the fifty states and the District of Columbia.

The following questions were asked: "Does your State Board of Education have an official statement of policy concerning sex education in your public school? When was this policy adopted? If none has been adopted has one been proposed? Has your state passed any laws regulating the teaching of sex education in the schools? When? If none has been passed, have any been introduced into the legislature? When? Results?" A request for a copy of any policies or laws was also made. (Appendix A).

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This investigation is limited by the fact that all states did not respond to the questionnaire. Another limiting factor was that of the states that did respond some failed to answer all of the questions.

Sex education is not a commonly defined term and therefore the various state policies may use other terms which would be included in the definition of sex education that is used in this report. For this report it is defined as Joanne Zazzaro defines it: "The term 'sex education' is used. . . to include broad family life and human sexuality courses, only a portion of which cover sex in its popular sense as well as more limited sex education taught as part of other subjects such as physical education, health, biology or home economics."¹

FINDINGS

Replies were received from forty-two of the fifty-one departments of education to which questionnaires were sent. The following facts are shown in Table 1 (pages 7 and 8). Of the states that replied twenty-three indicated that they had an official policy concerning sex education. Three of these states having an official policy also had a state law regulating sex education. Two states had no official policy but did have a state law covering sex education. One of these states had adopted a policy but encountered so much dissent that it was not possible to implement it. Sixteen of the forty-two responding states had neither an official policy nor laws covering sex education.

¹Ibid., p. 7.

TABLE 1

Information Concerning the Official Policies
or Laws About Sex Education

States	Policies		Laws		
	adopted	proposed	adopted	proposed	result of proposed
Ala.	none	none	none	1969	voted down
Alas.	1970		none	?	
Ariz.	1970		?	?	
Ark.	none	none	none	none	
Cal. *					
Colo.	none	yes	none	?	
Conn.	4-1968		none	?	
Del.	1969		none	yes	defeat. in com.
D.C. *					
Fla.	1969		none	?	
Ga.	none	none	none	none	
Ha. *					
Ida.	10-23-1969		?	?	
Ill.	3-1967		1965		
Ind.	7-1970		none	?	
Iowa	8-15-1968		none	?	
Kan.	1-1970		none	none	
Ky.	none	yes ⁺	none	1970	defeat. in com.
La.	none	?	1970		
Me.	none	none	none	none	
Md. *					
Mass.	none	?	none	?	
Mich.	8-1970		1965		
Minn.	11-1970		none	none	

? Question not answered.

* No reply to questionnaire.

⁺ Under consideration.

TABLE 1 (cont.)

States	Policies		Laws		
	adopted	proposed	adopted	proposed	result of proposed
Miss.	none	?	none	?	
Mo.	1969		none	none	
Mont. *					
Neb. *					
Nev.	1969 ⁺		1965		
N.H.	2-12-1970		none	?	
N.J.	1-4-1967		none	none	
N.M.	none	yes [‡]	none	?	
N.Y.	yes		none	?	
N.C.	11-1968		?	?	
N.D.	none	none	none	none	
Ohio	none	?	none	?	
Okla.	1970		none	1969	not passed
Ore. *					
Penn.	1969		none	1969	to com.
R.I.	none	yes	none	68-69&69-70	not passed
S.C.	none*		none	none	
S.D.	1-1969		none	none	
Tenn. *					
Texas	none	yes	none	none	
Utah	none	?	none	?	
Vt.	none	none	none	none	
Va.	8-19-1970		none	?	
Wash.	1-1970		1970		
W.Va.	none	none	none	none	
Wis.	4-1969		none	1969	not passed
Wyo. *					

?Question not answered.

⁺Not implemented.

*No reply to questionnaire.

[‡]In process of revision.[#]Furnish guidelines on request.

Twelve of the states that had no policy answered the question ". . . has one been proposed?" Three of these states have considered one or more policies but had not adopted any of them. Two were revising or considering a policy.

Thirty-four states reported not having a law regulating sex education. Of these states, twenty-one responded to the inquiry if any law had been introduced in the legislature. In seven legislatures one or more laws were considered but not passed.

States Reporting No Law or Policy

Those states reporting no law nor policy were Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Mississippi, North Dakota, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Vermont, and West Virginia.

Alabama has never considered an official policy but a law was proposed in 1968. It was voted down. They did not enclose a copy of it so its content is not known.

The Colorado Department of Education has had policies proposed several times but none were accepted. They did not indicate if a law had ever been introduced into the legislature.

A bill to ban sex education in grades one through eight in Kentucky schools was defeated in committee in 1970. A policy statement had been submitted to the chief state school officer and a committee was set up to study the question of sex education but the policy had not been adopted as of September, 1970.

Claude Ivie, director of Curriculum of the Georgia State Department of Education stated: "We have been discreet and factual--

no furor over this area."¹ Apparently because of this Georgia has not adopted an official policy or law, nor have they proposed either.

Arkansas, Vermont, North Dakota, West Virginia and Maine also have not considered a policy or law. However, according to Maine's Health Consultant, sex education was being taught on a voluntary basis as part of Health Education (which is required by law).²

Massachusetts, Mississippi and Ohio lacked a law or official policy on sex education. However, they failed to indicate on their questionnaires whether one had ever been considered.

In New Mexico a policy statement was in the process of revision in September, 1970. Since they have no official policy to date and they have no law, the local districts determine their own curriculum in the area of sex education. There was no indication if any laws had ever been considered, but none were passed.

The Rhode Island Legislature failed to pass laws regulating sex education in both the 1968-1969 and the 1969-1970 sessions. The contents of these bills were not reported. Even though an official policy was proposed none was adopted.

The South Carolina Board of Education has not adopted an official policy regarding sex education. The Health Education Consultant has sent out letters in answer to inquiries on sex education.³

¹Based on correspondence between Claude Ivie, Georgia Department of Education, Director of Curriculum, and the writer.

²Based on correspondence between W. W. LaFountain, Maine Department of Education Health Consultant, and the writer.

³Based on a letter from South Carolina Health Education Consultant the subject of which was "Inquiries on Sex Education Materials," July, 1969.

A statement was issued with the supplementary material recommending that those schools that wished to use the materials make careful selection and the information be given to only the well prepared teacher. Family life and sex education is included as a natural part of growth and development and family living in a South Carolina State Department of Education Guide for the Teaching of Health, Grades K-12.¹ Policy statements from various national organizations are made available to those persons studying the subject of sex education. A statement was issued in 1969 by the South Carolina Joint Health and Education Committee.² It stated that they concurred with the philosophy of the Joint Committee of the National School Boards Association and the American Association of School Administrators, which is as follows:

The Committee is unanimous in its belief that the only effective way in which the school can fulfill its responsibility for meeting the health needs of youth is through a comprehensive program of health education in grades K through 12. Such a program established the organizational framework for meeting the health needs, interests, and problems of the school-age group as well as preparing them for their role as future parents and citizens.

Such a program places a responsibility on local school boards and administrators, state departments of education, and teacher training institutions to provide qualified teachers, adequate time for instruction, authoritative and up-to-date materials, and supervisory assistance for health education commensurate with other curriculum offerings.

The Committee recommends a coordinated attack on all health problems with a comprehensive health education program extending from K through 12 and encompassing the total scope of such a program.

¹Ibid.

²South Carolina Joint Health and Education Committee, "Health Education-A Comprehensive Program Grade K Through 12," September, 1969.

Health is a unified concept. It must be approached with consideration of total human being and the complexity of forces that affect health behavior. It is concerned with knowledge, attitudes, and practices--that is, health behavior in its totality. This cannot be achieved with a piecemeal approach.

This Committee recognizes the pressures from groups interested in single health areas such as family life and sex education. The Committee believes, however, that including family life education with the other health topics in one sound, interrelated, and sequential program not only saves time in an already crowded curriculum, but assure that all topics will be part of a long-range program and will receive more complete and detailed consideration at the appropriate level of the student's development.¹

South Carolina has no laws regulating sex education nor had one been introduced in the state legislature.

As of September, 1970 Texas was leaving the policy on sex education to the local school board. There had been an official state policy proposed, but it was not adopted. No laws were proposed to govern sex education in Texas.

Utah does not have a state policy covering sex education. There are two units in the State Curriculum which would cover this area, but they avoid calling it sex education. These units are "Growing and Developing into Maturity" in the junior high, and "Health and Physical and Emotional Understanding of Sex" in the senior high health classes. Although these are in the State Curriculum they are not always taught.

¹"Health Education and Sex/Family Life Education," A statement issued by the Joint Committee of the National School Boards Association and the American Association of School Administrators.

States Reporting Only Laws

Sex education in Louisiana and Nevada was reported as regulated solely by laws. In Louisiana a bill was passed by the 1970 legislature that stated, in essence, ". . . that all books and materials purchased by schools must be screened by the State Department of Education and other agencies to insure that pornographic materials would not get in the hands of children through the schools."¹ Mr. Rex C. Pearce of the Louisiana Department of Education stated, "Since sex education is not in our state approved program of studies, the only information and materials now available is through our conventional classes and textbooks."²

In Nevada a law was passed in 1965 in regard to sex education but a copy of it was not supplied with the return of the questionnaire; therefore, its contents cannot be reported. A policy was adopted in 1969, but Mr. Paul Cohen, the Health, Physical Education and Recreation Consultant of the State Department of Education stated that there was too much dissent for it to be implemented. The Nevada State Department of Education is allowing the school districts to use their own discretion for programs in sex education. Mr. Cohen also stated that the two large counties in Nevada have excellent courses in sex education.³ These two facts would indicate that the law passed in 1965

¹Based on correspondence between Rex C. Pearce, Supervisor, Secondary Education, Louisiana Department of Education, and the writer.

²Ibid.

³Based on correspondence between Paul Cohen of the Nevada State Department of Education, and the writer.

would not have been one to prohibit sex education in the schools of Nevada.

States Reporting Both Policies and Laws

Of the forty-two states that replied only three have both a law and an official policy covering sex education in their schools. These states are Illinois, Michigan, and Washington.

Illinois. In 1965 Illinois passed a Sex Education Act which was permissive instead of mandatory. The final decision whether or not to teach sex education was left to the local board. This act established a Division of Sex Education in the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The Division of Sex Education was to promote and aid in development of programs for teacher training, and to encourage the establishment of teaching workshops and institutes for in-service training.¹ The Sex Education Advisory Board, established by the legislature has recommended that local boards establish written policies concerning exemption from sex education, if there are to be any such exemptions.

The Sex Education Advisory Board believes that the need is urgent for effective sex education in Illinois schools because of the challenging of traditional cultural patterns and standards, and the existing problems, such as venereal disease and illegitimate births. The need for constructive use of human sexuality is seen as another reason for sex education. Some other reasons cited are:

¹Illinois Sex Education Advisory Board, Policy Statement on Family Life and Sex Education, issued by the Office of the Illinois Superintendent of Public Instruction, March, 1967, pp. 9-10.

1. The former practice of teaching the structure and function of all systems of the body except the reproductive system, by its very nature tended to make sex indecent and aroused curiosity in the minds of students.
2. Parents frequently fail to realize how early their children become aware of sex. For this and other reasons they often do not give any sex information in the early years when it is most necessary for forming attitudes and ideals. In addition, their own emotional involvement makes it extremely difficult for many of them to provide sex information to their children at any time.
3. Many churches also are likely to do this kind of teaching on a too little too late basis.
4. Playmates and peer associates usually give the child most of his information about sex long before he has had any type of formal education and, unfortunately, almost all of this peer group oriented information tends to stress vulgarity, indecency, and the grotesque; almost always it is biologically, socially and psychologically incorrect information. The child may form undesirable attitudes on the basis of this information.
5. The adolescent gets most of his or her sexual instruction through the mass media or through "bull session"--and here again the unwholesome and negative aspects of sex usually are emphasized.¹

This is the most extensive justification for sex education that was given in any material reviewed for this report. It shows the depth of thought and amount of effort that the Sex Education Advisory Board put forth. It also certainly expresses how very important they feel sex education is.

In addition they have prepared twenty-six general objectives for family life and sex education (Appendix B). So that local schools can accomplish these objectives the Sex Education Advisory Board has formulated sixteen guiding principles to aid in the development of family life and sex education in the schools of Illinois. These principles are:

¹Ibid., pp. 13-14.

1. Sex education programs, to be really effective must be carefully and thoughtfully planned at the local community level, under the general administrative authority, responsibility, and direction of the local board of education and school administration. . . .

2. Sex education involves the home, school, church, and community. . . . the school. . . has an important role in sex education, because many parents are not prepared to meet the developmental needs of their children for sex instruction

3. Sex education should include the biological, psychological, social, and moral aspects of sex, because human sexuality and sexual conduct involve the whole person and his or her life style

4. Family life and sex education in schools should be a continuous process, based upon a sequential, spiral learning progression flexibly planned for grades 1 through 12

5. Family life and sex education is concerned with both facts and values. Sex education should be broadly conceived and planned as an integral part of education for personality and character development, guided by positive ideals and goals as well as by negative restraints and social sanctions. . . .

6. Illinois youth should be sex-educated, not merely sex-informed or indoctrinated. . . . They need to be sex-educated so they can meet and adjust to current conditions by making intelligent choices and sound decisions--based upon progressive acceptance of moral responsibility for their own sexual conduct as it affects themselves and others--when faced with alternative standards and patterns of sexual behavior. . . .

7. Sex education must not be an isolated special facet of education but must be integrated into the total school program, instead of being departmentalized. . . . In addition, it is desirable to have a one-semester pointing up course on preparation for marriage, parenthood and family life. . . .

8. Sex education should be planned to take into account individual differences and to anticipate the developmental needs of children and youth, to avoid the "too little, too late" approach which has characterized too much sex education in the past. . . . Individual counseling should be provided in addition to classroom instruction

9. So-called "sex education booby traps" such as teaching students: (1) specific methods of birth control, (2) specific methods of VD prophylaxis, and (3) sexual techniques, should not be included in sex education in the Illinois schools

The school, in handling controversial issues in family life and sex education, should be mindful of the varying moral, ethical, and religious belief of students and their parents . . .

10. Since instruction is the most important factor in the success or failure of sex education in the school, teachers should be carefully selected and adequately prepared

11. Family life and sex education may be taught either in mixed classes of boys and girls . . . or in separate classes for boys and girls However, it may be desirable to teach family life and sex education in mixed classes in senior high school, grades 10 to 12, so that both the masculine and feminine points of view may be taken into account when basic problems and issues are discussed. . . .

12. The instructional methods used in family life and sex education should be based upon sound educational principles as related to the established objectives. The sex education materials . . . should be carefully selected and used on the basis of acceptable criteria. . . .

13. Sex education films are only educational aids; they are not a substitute for a sound program of family life and sex education. . . .

14. Evaluation and improvement of the sex education program on a continuing basis is essential. Evaluative and testing procedures should be planned and used as an integral part of family life and sex education. . . . It is difficult to evaluate or measure attitudes, practices, and sexual conduct--especially if students' grades are involved; and the seeking of such evaluative information may violate personal privacy and have serious legal and ethical implications. . . .

15. It is recommended that pilot programs be established. . . .

16. Family life and sex education programs in schools should be paralleled by a sound community program of sex education for adults, to help them make constructive use of sex in their own lives and to assist them in providing better parental guidance for their own children on sexual matters.¹

In addition to the extensive policy statement the Illinois Sex Education Advisory Board prepared, they have also prepared two booklets entitled Steps Toward Implementing Family Life and Sex Education Programs in Illinois Schools² and Resource Materials.³ Illinois would appear to be able to give more help to local districts wanting to establish a sex education program than most other states.

¹Ibid., pp. 14-19.

²Illinois Sex Education Advisory Board, Steps Toward Implementing Family Life and Sex Education Programs in Illinois Schools, issued by the Office of the Illinois Superintendent of Public Instruction, March, 1968.

³Illinois Sex Education Advisory Board, Resource Materials: Family Life and Sex Education, issued by the Office of the Illinois Superintendent of Public Instruction, July, 1968.

Mr. Thomas M. Janeway, director of the Illinois Department of Health Education, has noted that ". . . the Illinois Policy Statement was the first such document to be issued by an individual state in the United States."¹ Minnesota had issued a position statement in November of 1966 in a letter from the Commissioner of Education, so Illinois' statement was not the first policy, only the first extensive document that was published. Many of the recommendations made in the Illinois Policy Statement appear in other state policies.

Michigan. Michigan has a long history of laws regulating sex education. In 1919 a law was passed prohibiting the teaching of sex hygiene. In 1937 this restriction was lifted and provisions were made so that parents could have their children excused from such classes. The law was again changed in 1949 to prohibit the teaching of birth control or any information in regard to birth control (this is still in effect). In 1968 a law was passed that permits, but does not mandate, sex education. The provision for excusing students from sex education is repeated. It was felt that this would then prohibit sex education from being integrated into other courses. This act also instructed the department of education to establish sex education programs for elementary and secondary education, higher education and adult education; to establish a library of educational materials; aid in establishing educational programs for instruction of teachers; and provide leadership

¹Thomas M. Janeway, "Sex Education-- A Status Report," Illinois Journal of Education, LX (March, 1969), 4.

for sex education including guidelines for family planning information.¹

The basic policy of the State Board of Education, set forth in August, 1970, is that sex education is a decision for the local community. But the Department of Education has the responsibility to provide leadership so that meaningful sex education programs can be developed throughout the state.

The State Board of Education sees four areas to be considered in organizing a sex education and family planning information program. The first is the administrative responsibilities. The Board feels that the school administration should participate from the start and cooperate with the community. The program that is developed should have both parental and school board approval. They also suggest that policies should be established by which prominent issues, such as teacher selection, grouping of students and controversial subjects, should be resolved. A need for in-service education for teachers is also mentioned.

The second area is school, community, and parental cooperation. A School - Community Sex Education Committee is seen as a mechanism by which this could be accomplished. It would serve as a liaison between the community and school and could recommend policies to the board of education.

The developing of the sex education program is seen as the third area. It is felt that a rationale and philosophy should be

¹Michigan State Board of Education, "Sex Education and Family Information Guidelines for Local Public Schools Choosing to Conduct a Sex Education Program," August, 1970, pp. 3-5.

developed based on the needs of the community, and stated in simple terms. This policy should be adopted by the local board. When developing the sex education curriculum the patterns that are followed when developing the total curriculum should be applied. The use of pilot programs is also suggested.

The last area is evaluation. The Board feels that evaluation of what is presented is not enough but the impact on the attitudes, behavior and knowledge of youth must also be evaluated.

Six guidelines for sex education were also set up with several points made in each. The scope of the sex education program was suggested to be from elementary to adult education in the first guideline. Both facts and values should be taught and individual counseling to be available on the secondary level. It was advised that the phasing of sex education could best be handled by the School-Community Sex Education Committee working with other curriculum committees. The Board also gave suggestions on dealing with socially deviant sexual behavior. It was urged in the elementary level so the children would be less likely to be victims of child molestation. In the secondary level it should be treated as socially deviant behavior. The Board cautioned that diagnosis of students as sexual deviants should be done only by qualified personnel. The last two guidelines were on using available resources and staffing of the sex education program. In both of these areas the emphasis was on making the right selection, choosing materials that were appropriate and teachers that were qualified.¹

¹Ibid., pp. 6-19.

Michigan's guidelines differ from Illinois' in several ways. One way is that family planning is stressed much more in Michigan; separate guidelines were established for it. Another variation is Michigan's recommendation that sex education be included in higher education on a broader scope than for just teacher preparation. The last major difference is Michigan's decision not to integrate sex education into other courses.

Washington. In the March, 1970 issue of the Phi Delta Kappan, Mr. Roger Libby has an article titled, "Washington State Board Limits Sex Education to 'the Plumbing'." In this article Mr. Libby gives the impression that Washington is teaching only what he calls ". . . the more 'safe area of anatomy and physiology of reproduction'."¹ It is true that the Washington State Board of Education has defined sex education as a study of anatomy and physiology of human reproduction. The State Office of Public Instruction states, "It should be recognized that sex education is only a small part of a larger body of knowledge dealing with human growth and development and interpersonal and family relationships."² They continue by saying, "The larger body of knowledge should be concerned with the biological, psychological, and sociological aspects of interpersonal relationships."³

¹Roger W. Libby, "Washington State Board Limits Sex Education to 'the Plumbing'," Phi Delta Kappan, LI (March, 1970), 402.

²Louis Bruno, Suggested Guidelines for Including Sex Education in School Curricula, Issued by the Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction, January, 1970.

³Ibid.

The policy of the State Board is that teaching in family life and sex education is to be determined at the local level. It should strive to convey the importance of the basic family unit. The program is to focus on giving the students ideals, standards, and attitudes.

Some of the guidelines set forth by Washington that were seen in the Illinois policy are: involvement of home, school, church, and community in the planning; educational programs for parents of pre-school age youngsters so education at home can begin at an early age; strive for behavior consistent with community values; and select professionally prepared teachers. One guideline contains an Illinois' suggestion to be aware of varying moral, ethical and religious beliefs, but carries with it the admonishment to uphold the standards of society but not advocate any specific religious belief.

For developing the program the guidelines suggested include: the scope and sequence be made available in written form in each district and it should be based on the characteristics of the students; the objectives, learning experiences and resources should be in written form in each building where such education is carried out; at the elementary level the lessons should develop naturally from everyday experiences and at the secondary they may be part of other courses.

Some regulations, similar to recommendations found in the Illinois policy, were set up by the State Board of Education. They are: that no inquiry shall be made as to elicit personal beliefs or practices of a student or parent, as to sex or religion without written consent of a parent or guardian; and that a parent or guardian can upon written request have his child removed from sex education instruction.

The State Office of Public Instruction states that,

In compliance with statutory requirements [1967] each school district shall have a written policy outlining the process for the selection and adoption of instructional materials, print and non-print, including provision for system for receiving, considering and acting upon written complaints regarding instructional materials used by the school district.¹

A copy of the law passed in 1970 by the Washington legislature was not included with the policy statement and questionnaire. Since the policy and guidelines are dated January 1970 it does not seem likely that any provisions of the law could have been included.

States Reporting Only Policies

The states which have an official policy but no law on sex education are the following: Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Virginia, and Wisconsin. Of these states Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, and South Dakota reported they had not introduced a bill in the legislature to govern sex education. Four states, Delaware, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin, had considered legislation but no laws were passed. None of the other states which have only a policy supplied the information as to whether a law had been considered.

Alaska. In January of 1970 the Alaska State Board of Education adopted an official policy of sex education. In this policy it noted that the primary responsibility in this area rests with the home.

¹Ibid., p. 7.

They also realize that parents often seek and welcome assistance in this area. Based on this they go on to say,

The Board . . . directs the staff of the Department of Education, in cooperation with local school districts, to supplement, but not supplant, the parent in matters concerning human development education and family relations. It is the Board's position that providing instruction in human growth and development is as important as instruction in other areas of basic education and other special concerns.¹

The Board has also endorsed some procedures for program development and implementation. To begin with, they offer a definition of human growth and development education. It is defined as ". . . the study of the anatomy and physiology of human reproduction, and the standards, ideals, and attitudes that may be concomitants of such study."²

The major emphasis in this program is to be on the importance of the family and the responsibilities of each member of it. In addition they state the program should aid the home and church by ". . . . giving youth the scientific anatomical and physiological information necessary for understanding sex and its relationship to the miracle of life . . ."³ and by helping ". . . youth acquire a background of ideals, standards, and attitudes which will be of value to him now and later on when he chooses a mate and establishes a family of his own."⁴

¹Alaska Board of Education, "Position for Human Growth and Development Education," January, 1970, p. 1.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

In the position statement they recommend that parents, clergy, physicians and community groups be used in all phases, from planning to revision of all programs in human growth and development. This program should be based on a school's own needs and capacity. The board directed that a parent or legal guardian should be allowed to withdraw a student from the planned instruction in this program upon written request to the school district administration. Again we see that the recommendations made are similar to those offered by Illinois.

Arizona. Guidelines for 1970-71 were issued by Arizona in May of 1970. They were quite a bit more restrictive than were seen in those set up by Alaska and did not encourage the establishment of sex education. In the first point of the guidelines it stated that sex education ". . . shall not be taught in the common schools of Arizona as a separate course of study."¹ They do allow an elective unit dealing with the maturing process to be taken by a student, ". . . at the discretion and only after a written request of the individual child's parent or guardian."² The second point specifies that this unit may be taught in any approved course of study where it naturally occurs. These classes may be segregated by sex when the administration believes it would be appropriate. This point also provides that no derogatory instruction be given concerning a child's or his family's religious belief or ethical convictions.

¹Arizona Department of Public Instruction, "Guideline 1970-71" (sex education), May 25, 1970.

²Ibid.

An adult program on the maturing process is provided for under point three. If such a program is established, all the materials to be used for the school unit are to be made available to the parents in this manner. The fourth point instructs that an advisory council of community citizens be established. Two-thirds of the committee are to be parents and one-third of the membership is to be changed every year in rotation. Diverse viewpoints are to be represented on this council.¹

A major difference between the Illinois and Arizona policies is Arizona's requirement that the written permission of a student's parent or guardian is required for the student to take sex education. It is also noted that Arizona has no statement of objectives or reasons for sex education in the public schools.

Connecticut. The Connecticut State Board of Education issued a quite extensive policy statement in April of 1968. It was compiled by the State Advisory Committee on Family Life and Sex Education in Connecticut Schools. They state that,

While it is not appropriate for the education system in a democratic society to indoctrinate students with any one value system--this being the function of the home and religious institutions--it is the responsibility of educators to make available knowledge and data that will aid in making value judgements leading to the consideration of alternatives and sound moral decisions.²

However, the board feels that the consequence of departure from commonly accepted values should be pointed out. The policy also points out

¹Ibid.

²Connecticut State Board of Education, "Policy Statement of Family Life and Sex Education for Connecticut Schools," April, 1968, p. 1.

that, ". . . it is important to transmit to students not only the physiological and biological facts of the reproductive process, but also the more important psychological, social, and ethical implications of sexuality."¹ In the definition given of family life and sex education, the committee felt that ". . . it may best be described as education for personality, maturation and increased self-understanding."² They continue by saying, ". . . it includes instruction designed to develop understanding of the mental, emotional, social, economic and psychological, as well as the physical phases, of human relations as these affect and are affected by male and female relationships."³

They see a real need for the school to share in family life and sex education. To fill this need the school should initiate, share and participate with the community in a cooperative effort to develop such a program. It is seen as being the school board's responsibility to interpret the program to the community. A K through 12 program should be integrated into all appropriate subject areas, based upon the local situation. An adult education program is also recommended. The teachers of family life and sex education should be well trained and qualified and have opportunities for continuing education. The curricular plan should include evaluative procedures.⁴ As can be readily seen these are strikingly similar to Illinois' recommendations.

¹Ibid., p. 2.

²Ibid., p. 3.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., pp. 3-5.

Delaware. In 1969 Delaware adopted a policy on sex education but prefer the title Family Life and Personal Living. They feel this area of study ". . . should assist the individual to develop an understanding of the attitudes, knowledge, and practices that affect his relationships with all persons."¹ They feel this can be done by not limiting the program to anatomical and reproductive information but also encompassing all wholesome aspects of family and personal living, not just presenting facts but feelings and choices as well. The policy states that each district should provide family and personal living as part of the health program. It is also recommended that the community be encouraged to participate in the planning of this program. The instructional materials are to be carefully chosen so as to be appropriate for the students using them, and relevant to the program and the community in which they are used. It is felt that a well-prepared staff is essential to the program.

Included in the policy are nine guiding principles for such a program. These are as follows: there should be support by the school board and administration in the planning, development and implementation of the program; the curriculum should be well planned; the community should be involved; the school staff should be kept informed as to the aims, objectives and progress of the program; the teachers should be well prepared; both facts and values are essential; the organization of the class could be either mixed or separated by sex depending on

¹Delaware Director of Secondary Education, "Family Life and Personal Living," February 25, 1970, p. 1.

local needs; the materials need to be carefully reviewed and evaluated; constant evaluation is needed.¹ Upon examining these it can be seen that Delaware, like Connecticut, has adopted a policy much like that of Illinois. The only new addition is the suggestion that the school staff be kept well informed.

In 1970 a law was proposed in Delaware that required public showing of unedited film, slides, pamphlets or other reading material before it could be used in the sex education program in grades K-9. If a petition, signed by more than twenty-five percent of the qualified voters of the local district, is presented to the local board within fifteen days the material cannot be used.² This bill never came out of the committee. Apparently a law this restrictive was not wanted in Delaware.

Florida. The Florida position regarding family life or sex education is,

. . . that the basic responsibility for this instruction belongs in the home, but that upon local identification of need for such a program the schools, churches, and some other community groups can play a supplementary role in reinforcing and supporting the effort of the home.³

Some guiding principles for a program in this area are also given. The first is that there be broad representation from the community in the planning and conducting of the program. The second suggests that the

¹Ibid., pp. 1-3.

²Ibid.

³Florida Department of Education, "Position Statement," (Endorsed by the Florida Medical Association School Health Medical Advisory Committee, November 2, 1969), p. 1.

materials used be selected with respect to the school and child level, and the community conditions, customs and traditions. Third is the recommendation that the schools verify the validity of sources and content before a program is used in the schools. That this instruction be an integral part of the over-all health education program is the last principle listed. The policy goes on to state that family life or sex education would be on a voluntary basis and not given undue emphasis. It is also stressed that the teachers be properly qualified and trained health education teachers.¹ This policy was adopted in November, 1969.

By looking at the Florida guidelines their policy seems similar to the Illinois policy. However, Florida has merely set up guidelines in case a school wants to teach sex education; they do not seem to be encouraging schools to start programs as was Illinois.

Idaho. The Idaho State Board of Education passed a resolution in October of 1969,

...that the State Board of Education support the responsibility of the home for family life education through a supplementary program of education established in the public schools by:

1. Including this instruction as a part of the health education program.
2. Involving parents and concerned members of a community in the development of a curriculum to be used at the determined grade levels; using instructional staff members qualified to teach the courses established; . . .²

¹Ibid., pp. 1-2.

²Idaho State Board of Education, "Resolution" (on sex education), October 23-24, 1969.

The policy also continues by directing the State Department of Education to develop guidelines to help local districts to incorporate this program. These guidelines differ from Illinois' by way of omission of points. Those listed are in agreement with Illinois' recommendations.

Indiana. The State Superintendent of Indiana, Richard D. Wells, appointed a committee to study the sex education programs in the public schools and to make recommendations to the General Commission on Education of the State Board of Education. After receiving this Mr. Wells expressed the opinion that,

. . . we need to spend less time [in the schools of Indiana] on such matters as Sex Education and more time on reading, writing, and arithmetic and other skills essential to educational success and citizenship in general.¹

Based on the Committee's recommendations he issued nine recommendations for the teaching of sex education. In the first one the schools, in the primary grades, were encouraged to identify the male and female roles in family and social situations. No information of the reproductive process should be given in the grades 1 through 6 but the ". . . wonder of creation of life and its spiritual implications. . ." ² should be stressed. Secondly, instruction concerning menstruation for girls and puberty for boys should be given but the grade level might vary locally. The next recommendation is that sex education should be

¹Richard D. Wells, "Message to General Commission Members Regarding Sex Education," (from Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction), May 29, 1970, p. 1.

²Ibid., p. 2.

integrated into home economics, health, science, and physical education courses in the junior and senior high school levels rather than be taught as a separate course. Numbers four through seven seem to be stronger than just recommendations.

4. Individual schools must provide information to the parents concerning all programs within these areas. . .

5. Methods and techniques of contraception, abortions, descriptions and positions of sexual intercourse shall not be taught. .

6. Specific and graphic illustrations and descriptions of sexual deviations, masturbation, and homosexuality shall not be used.

7. Sensitivity training, questionnaires, group encounters, or any other form of activity, the purpose of which is to alter values or the divulging of private information relative to home life and family standards and beliefs, shall not be used.¹

The eighth recommendation states that it must be possible to excuse a child from the program if it is requested by a parent or guardian.

The last recommendation stresses the importance of reviewing all materials used in or as supplements to the program.²

Basically Indiana's policy is similar to Illinois though in some places the wording Indiana uses seems to be more commanding. The real difference between the two is seen in the introductions. Where Illinois sees sex education as an important function of the school, Mr. Wells thinks the time would be better spent on something else.

Iowa. The Iowa Department of Public Instruction has issued a book titled, A Guide to Develop Programs for Family Living and

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

Personal Growth.¹ It is a book that would be very helpful to those people establishing such programs both in and out of the state of Iowa. This book contains Iowa's policy statement, statements of national organizations that support this type of policy (see Appendix C), the rationale behind the policy and the objectives it seeks to fulfill. Also included are steps for developing a program in family living and personal growth, recommendations for orientation and in-service education of the staff, and evaluation procedures and processes. The last half of the book contains suggested curriculum guidelines for the primary through senior high level and learning resources for these various levels, as well as for the teacher. A glossary of terms is also included.

The policy statement that was adopted in August of 1968 contains not only their attitude toward, and definition of sex education, but also some recommendations for establishing such a program. This policy is as follows:

We believe that sex education, as a part of family living, should be included and be a definite part of the curriculum in the schools of Iowa inasmuch as they are important agencies in the development of healthy habits of living and moral values. Sex education is herein being described as education for the masculine and feminine roles in society. Parents have a basic responsibility for sex education; the schools and certain other community agencies have supplemental roles.

Programs of sex education must be carefully planned toward helping students be responsible members of our society. Formal sex education in the schools is best taught by the classroom teachers and integrated into appropriate

¹Iowa Department of Public Instruction, A Guide to Develop Programs for Family Living and Personal Growth, 1969, p. 6.

courses, with special counseling, as needed. The basic materials included should be accurate, handled in a highly professional manner, and integrated with other course materials according to the maturation levels of the children. This instruction should be started in kindergarten and followed throughout all school levels. Students should receive frank and factual answers to their questions.

For the satisfactory implementation of this policy, teachers at all levels should receive appropriate instruction in teaching sex education as a part of family living. The Department of Public Instruction, Institutions of Higher Learning, the Department of Health, the Iowa Medical Society and other agencies can provide assistance in development of a program.¹

The similarity between the Iowa and Illinois policies can be seen in two major areas. One is the effort they have made to aid local districts in establishing sex education programs. The other is the similarity of the recommendations listed in the policies.

Kansas. The Kansas State Board of Education adopted an official policy in January, 1970. In 1969 a committee was set up to define sex education and develop a policy position with rationale and some guidelines for the board's consideration. With some minor revisions the document was adopted. The preface states that it is similar to the Pennsylvania position which was modified and adopted to meet the needs of Kansas. As will be seen, it is also very similar to the Illinois policy. The policy, in part, states,

In a concerned effort to assist young people confront the physiological, psychological, social and ethical implications of sexuality, the schools must share a definite responsibility for assuring that opportunities prevail through which accurate information and trained leadership are available. Central to such responsibility are opportunities to make responsible

¹Ibid.

choices based on facts. . . . Therefore, sex education is implicit in the school's commitment to the development of the whole personality.¹

In the definition of sex education they include not only the biological aspects of human growth and development but also the sociological and psychological aspects. They also point out that sex education should be concerned with both facts and values and should start at the primary level. There are ten points in the guidelines given for program development. Number one states that the local board of education has the authority and responsibility for administering the school program. The next point recommends that the school inform and involve the parents and community in advance. In three it is stated that the faculty should be carefully selected and prepared. It is encouraged that parallel programs for adults be made available. The sixth point states that sexual techniques should not be included in sex education. The consequence of the sex act in terms of pregnancy and possibility of venereal disease should be explained, but not specific methods of birth control, according to the seventh guideline. Sex education should not be an isolated or fragmented facet of education. It is pointed out in number nine that the teachers must be mindful of individual differences in moral, ethical and religious beliefs. The last guideline advises that the evaluation of the program and faculty be on a continuing basis.²

¹Kansas State Department of Education, Guidelines for Sex Education in Public Schools of Kansas, January, 1970, p. 2.

²Ibid., p. 3-6.

Minnesota. In the policy set forth by Minnesota, it states that the schools have a responsibility in the area of family life and sex education. Minnesota believes, as does Illinois, that sex education cannot be limited to the biological processes but must also include the psychological and sociological aspects. They believe so strongly that sex education should be included that they urge the school not to wait for the community to ask for such a program. It is felt that, ". . . the leadership of public schools. . . must initiate action that will result in citizen and community acceptance of a sound program on family life and sex education."¹

In order to allay any fears or doubts about such instruction and to help coordinate what is taught in the home, church, and school the parents should be informed exactly what is included in the program. It is felt that sex education should be presented in grades K through 12.

As possible objectives for a course in sex education Minnesota lists those given in a discussion prepared by the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States. They are:

1. To provide for the individual an adequate knowledge of his own physical, mental and emotional maturation process as related to sex.
2. To eliminate fears and anxieties relative to individual sexual development and adjustments.

¹Minnesota Department of Education, Section of Elementary and Secondary Education, "Family Life and Sex Education: A Position Statement," November, 1966, p. 1.

3. To develop objectives and understanding attitudes towards sex in all of its various manifestations. . . in the individual and in others.
4. To give individual insight concerning his relationships to members of both sexes and to help him to understand his obligations and responsibilities to others.
5. To provide an appreciation of the positive satisfaction that wholesome human relations can bring in both individual and family living.
6. To build an understanding of the need for the moral values that are needed to provide rational basis for making decisions.
7. To provide enough knowledge about the misuses and aberrations of sex to enable the individual to protect himself against injury to his physical and mental health.
8. To provide an incentive to work for a society in which such evils as prostitution and illegitimacy, archaic sex laws, irrational fears of sex and sexual exploitation, are nonexistent.
9. To provide the understanding and conditioning that will enable each individual to utilize his sexuality effectively and creatively in his several roles, e.g. (as spouse, parent, community member and citizen).¹

The policy goes on to express the opinion that it takes an especially qualified teacher for such instruction and therefore it should not be aligned with a particular subject but taught by those most capable. In-service education for the teachers is considered a necessity.²

Missouri. In Missouri sex education is merely included in what should be taught in a health class as is done with any other content area. They also ascribe to the position taken by the American Association of School Administrators (see pages 11 and 12). The

¹Lester A. Kirkendall, "Sex Education: SIECUS Discussion Guide No. 1," Issued by Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S., 1965, cited by Minnesota Department of Education, Section of Elementary and Secondary Education, "Family Life and Sex Education: A Position Statement," November, 1966, p. 1.

²Minnesota Department of Education, op. cit., p. 3.

committee feels family life and sex education should be included in a comprehensive health program extending K through 12. In this manner it will prevent further crowding the curriculum, crash programs, and piecemeal efforts.

Missouri has no law regulating sex education. A note was added to the questionnaire stating, however, that it is legal to teach about contraception but not abortion techniques. This point is the only one that can be compared with Illinois since Missouri has established no guidelines. They do disagree at this point as Illinois recommends that specific methods of birth control not be taught.

New Hampshire. In February of 1970 New Hampshire proposed a policy of sex education and it was adopted. They feel that though education about the family is a function of the home, the school must reinforce and supplement the parent in this area. Sex education is seen as an essential element of an effective K through 12 health program. These are suggested guidelines: establish a public information program; carefully review the materials; cooperate with local citizens in planning; the responsibility rests with the local board; and have qualified instructors; these have been seen in other policies. New Hampshire has also added another guideline stating, "School personnel should adopt an 'open-door policy' so that students are encouraged to seek help with school and personal problems when needed."¹

¹New Hampshire State Department of Education, "Proposed Policy Statement Relating to a Comprehensive Health Education Program," February 12, 1970, pp. 1-2.

New Jersey. New Jersey adopted an official policy on sex education in January, 1970. It stated that sex education should be shared by the home, church and school but the local board of education should determine what its role would be. The primary purpose of sex education was seen to be that of promoting ". . . more wholesome family and interpersonal relationships and, therefore, more complete lives."¹ This, they felt, could not be done by focusing on just the physiological processes of human sexuality but by ". . . relating it to the total adjustment of the individual in his family and society."²

In July of 1969 all school districts in New Jersey were advised to refrain from initiating any new programs in sex education pending an investigation by a committee of the state legislature. Upon reviewing the report of the committee the State Board of Education adopted the recommended guidelines set up by the committee. However, the board took exception to the recommendation that the school allow students to be excused from sex education classes when their parent or guardian objected in writing. The board felt that to allow this would lead to a similar demand being made for other courses. There was also a clarification made by the board on the guideline which stated that there should be no formal course of study in sex education below the junior high level. The board interprets this to mean that an informal presentation of such materials below junior high level would be acceptable.

¹New Jersey State Board of Education, "A Policy Statement on Sex Education," January 4, 1967.

²Ibid.

This statement does not limit the junior and senior highs to a formal course, however. The rest of the recommendations made by the committee concerning the local program are: the local boards review all material and teaching aids used in sex education; involve the community in the development; make a copy of proposed course of study available for review; file a copy of adopted course of study with the County Superintendent of Schools, make a copy of adopted course of study available for review; not make a sex education course required for graduation; have separate classes for boys and girls when appropriate; include courses of sex education as part of adult education program; and permit only those who are properly prepared to teach sex education courses. The Committee also recommended that the Commissioner of Education prepare a list of materials and guidelines appropriate for use by the local boards of education. They also suggested the commissioner provide in-service training for teachers in this area.¹

The major variance from the Illinois policy that is apparent in New Jersey's policy is the point concerning the excusing of students from sex education. Illinois has left it to the local boards to decide, but it is felt by New Jersey that there should be no exemptions. New Jersey has also added a point not mentioned before when they advise that sex education should not be required for graduation.

New York. New York has no law regulating sex education but there is one that states what shall be included in a health education

¹New Jersey Senate and Assembly Committee on Education, Report to the Legislature Concerning Sex Education in the Public Schools, April 9, 1970, p. 6-7.

program. Sex education is not included but the law also states that the schools are not limited to what is listed as required. Sexuality and family life education are included with personality development under the heading of Mental Health Education in the health education curriculum that was new in 1969. Mr. John Sincore, of the Bureau of School Health Education, indicated that the purpose of this aspect of the curriculum is to give definitions of masculinity and femininity and to discuss the differential psychology of sex values.¹ Mr. Sinacore urged that where the local school decided to include sex education they inform and involve the community in the plans.

In August, 1970 the commissioner of Education issued a letter to the local school boards and administrations citing the increase in drug abuse and epidemic proportions of venereal diseases in teenagers as two reasons for effective health and drug education but stated that the Governor and Legislature were strongly supporting the Department's efforts and priorities.² New York officially approves and encourages sex education but its greatest concern is with the drug problems.

North Carolina. A sex education policy statement was issued by North Carolina in November, 1968. Cited as evidence of the need for improved sex education were the rise in venereal disease, increase

¹Based on a letter from John S. Sinacore, Bureau Chief, New York Bureau of School Health Education, to City, Village and District Superintendents of Schools, Supervising Principals, High School Principals, Junior High School Principals and School Health Education Coordinators, March 11, 1969, pp. 1-2.

²Based on Message from Edwald B. Nyquist, New York Commissioner of Education, to Presidents of Boards of Education, City, Village and District Superintendents, Diocesan Superintendents, Supervising Principals, and Building Principals, August 24, 1970.

in illegitimate births, teen-age pregnancies, illegal abortions and inadequate perceptions about sex. Better interpretation of family roles and improved understanding of one's own sexuality are given as positive reasons for sex education. Such a program is recommended to supplement and support the parents' instruction. Sex education, as seen by North Carolina, should produce socially and morally desirable practices, attitudes, and personal behavior.¹ The specific objectives listed are:

- promote accurate biological information in place of myths and superstitions
- promote an attitude of reverence for life and for reproduction of life
- develop an understanding of the concept of sexuality: the sum total of those physical and biological characteristics that distinguish maleness and femaleness, as well as the more subtle distinctions of psychological and emotional patterns, social and family roles, norms of behavior and value systems
- develop an awareness of the physical, psychological, and social consequences of actions which disregard personal integrity and the norms of society.

The policy also includes guidelines for the local school districts. These include planning at the local level with community involvement; including psychological and social aspects of sex as well as the biological; integration of sex education into the total school program; individual counseling; and a K through 12 program; be mindful of various moral, ethical, and religious beliefs of students and parents; adequate teachers; and continuing evaluation. The decision to exempt students is left to the local boards. It is included as a recommendation that the students be "sex-educated" not indoctrinated or

¹North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, "Sex Education: A Policy Statement," November, 1969, p. 2.

"sex-informed." The emphasis in the program is to be the constructive use of sexuality not just the outcomes of sex misused. North Carolina also urges that an adult education program be set up to help them make constructive uses of sex education in their lives and to aid them in guiding their children even in the pre-kindergarten ages. The guidelines also remind the schools that the instructional methods should be based on sound educational principles.¹ These guidelines are another example of states following the pattern set by Illinois.

Oklahoma. The Oklahoma State Board of Education set up guidelines in 1970 for sex education. Those that are also seen in the Illinois guidelines are as follows: authority rests with local board; inform local community in advance; faculty to be carefully selected; an education program for adults; the program adapted to students and community; not offered as a separate course; be mindful of varying moral, ethical, and religious beliefs; and evaluation on a continuing basis. The Oklahoma guidelines also state, "Pornographic illustrations shall not be used."²

Although Oklahoma has not encouraged sex education by giving reasons for its establishment it appears that neither does it wish to restrict it by law. A bill was introduced in the Oklahoma House to regulate sex education but it was not passed. It would have prohibited

¹Ibid., p. 6.

²Oklahoma State Board of Education, "Guidelines for Program Development in Sex Education," 1970, p. 1.

sex education in grades K through 6 except for physical hygiene; prohibited any inquiries into the children's or parent's beliefs or practices of sex; prohibited sensitivity training; prohibited a curriculum on normal or abnormal sex activity; provided for enforcement of rules and regulations by the local board; provided for dismissal of employees violating rules or regulations; and declared an emergency so the law would become effective immediately.¹

Pennsylvania. In the policy adopted by Pennsylvania in 1969, the opinion is expressed that the schools have a fundamental role to perform in sex education. It must share the responsibility of presenting opportunities through which accurate information and trained leadership are available. The biological, psychological, social and ethical aspects of sex and sexuality should be included in sex education. It is also stated that this education should begin in the primary grades and continue in the curriculum ". . . with the underlying goal of causing children and youth to form acceptable values and to make wise decisions about their behavior."²

Guidelines similar to Illinois were established to facilitate the implementation of a sex education program. They are: the local board is responsible for administering the program; inform and involve the community in advance; the faculty should be carefully selected; adult education programs should be available; each school is to adopt

¹Oklahoma, House Bill No. 1484, 32nd Legislature, 1st Session.

²Pennsylvania Department of Education, Guidelines for Sex Education in Public Schools of Pennsylvania, 1969, p. 3.

a program to fit its own needs; sexual techniques should not be included; consequence of the sex act (pregnancy and venereal disease) be explained but not birth control or venereal disease prophylaxis; not to be taught as a separate course; be mindful of varying moral, ethical, and religious beliefs; and evaluation to be on a continuing basis.¹

There have been some attempts in Pennsylvania, too, to limit sex education. Pennsylvania had four bills introduced in the house in 1969 to regulate sex education, but none were passed. Bill number 1062 required that no course of sex education be taught unless it was adopted by the State Board of Education and the course of study arranged by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.² Numbers 1263 and 1284 sought to prohibit the teaching of sex education below the ninth grade. Also none was to be offered at the ninth grade or above without the approval of the State Board of Education and the district's school board. The written permission of a parent was to be necessary for a pupil to receive sex education.³ Bill number 1433 was to amend a flag code and require written consent from parents or guardian before a student could take a course in sex education.⁴

South Dakota. In South Dakota's position statement it is said, "If it be true that the citizen's best armament for life is education,

¹Ibid., pp. 3-4.

²Pennsylvania General Assembly, House Bill No. 1062, 1969 Sess.

³Pennsylvania General Assembly, House Bills No. 1263 and No. 1284, 1969 Session.

⁴Pennsylvania General Assembly, House Bill No. 1433, 1969 Sess.

it would appear to follow that this principle applies as well to the solution of ever increasing social problems faced by today's youth."¹ They continue, "Therefore, it is the position of the State Board of Education and the Department of Public Instruction that education in family living, including sex education, is a demonstrated need of youth in a modern society."² It is suggested that these courses be integrated into the existing curricula, K through 12, rather than being crash courses. South Dakota lists as objectives those of the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States, Inc. as did Minnesota.

In concluding, the Board of Education charged the Department of Public Instruction with the responsibility of developing guidelines for a family living program, including sex education. These are to be used in cooperation with the community with the goal of implementing family life and sex education in the curricula of South Dakota's public schools.³

Virginia. According to the policy adopted in August, 1970, by the Virginia State Board of Education the decision to include sex education is left to the local school authorities. They do state that, ". . . a locality that elects to offer sex education in one or more of its schools, must comply fully with the regulations and procedures of

¹South Dakota Department of Public Instruction, Health and Family Living Curriculum (K-12), 1969, p. 2.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 4.

the State Board of Education and should utilize the guidelines promulgated by the Board for the locality's assistance."¹ The regulations listed are: that the sole responsibility for deciding whether to include sex education rests with the local school division; only those instructional aids that have been approved by the State Board of Education may be used; all printed material made available must have been approved by the State Board; and each locality must submit its own request for review of materials even though they may have been approved for another county or city. The procedures mentioned are the means by which approval is secured for the materials to be used.

Guidelines that were established are: there should be pre-planning in the community; the PTA should understand the purpose of the program, its scope and the nature of the content and learning experiences; parents should be given a chance to review materials; periodic and systematic evaluation should be carried out; careful planning used to avoid overlapping; establishment of special courses is discouraged; certain phases should be offered only in courses which the sexes are separated.² Virginia is a state that has a different attitude on sex education than does Illinois. There is no encouragement given for sex education, and regulations are set down which seem to strictly control the material used in the classes. The few guidelines offered do not, however, vary too much from some of those Illinois has established.

¹Virginia State Board of Education, "Report on Sex Education," August 19, 1970, p. 1.

²Ibid.

Wisconsin. Wisconsin is the last of the states that have just a policy for regulation of sex education. The position statement was formulated by a committee on Family Life Education. They saw the schools as having ". . . a responsibility to provide family life education which will enable each student to relate in a meaningful manner to his present as well as his future family."¹ They believe it should be included in each grade K through 12 in each subject in which it is relevant. Family life is defined as ". . . the personal, social, and cultural relationships which exist between or among individuals."² Family life education is seen as ". . . education about and preparation for personal, social and cultural relationships. Its basic underlying concern is the reproduction, maturation and socialization of the human being."³

In planning for such a program the Committee recommended that several things be considered. These included: the needs and wishes of the young people and assisting them to determine their responsibilities in this area; the responsibility of other institutions as well as the school in family life education; the selection of priority goals appropriate for the school; developing working relationships with parents and children and encouraging them to assume their responsibilities in the home; cooperation with community agencies in family life education;

¹Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, Newsletter (reprint), "Schools Should Assist With Family Life Education," April, 1969, p. 1.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., pp. 1-2.

and the development of written policies for handling controversial topics.¹

To keep the school's part within manageable limits they suggest that it is necessary to: state goals and concepts which are recognized as basic to acceptable relationships between and among individuals; plan sequential learning K through 12; specify which subject areas should deal with aspects of family life education; provide an opportunity for summing up the concept for all students before they leave school; recognize peripheral concerns and how they can strengthen family life; plan for continuing evaluation both short and long range; and determine criteria for use in selecting resources and develop guidelines for their use.

A bill was introduced in the Wisconsin Legislature in 1969 but it was not passed. A copy of the bill was not available at the time the questionnaire was returned so its content is not known.

SUMMARY

The various state attitudes toward establishing sex education in the schools, whether expressed in laws or policies, can be classified under three general categories. These categories are: those seeking to restrict sex education; those that are passive about sex education; and those states seeing a need for sex education and encouraging the inclusion of it in the schools. Of the twenty-five states that have taken an official stand on sex education, fifteen seem to

¹Ibid., p. 2.

have chosen to encourage the inclusion of sex education programs in the public schools. These states are Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. The ten remaining states are evenly divided in the other two categories. Florida, Indiana, Missouri, Nevada, and New York all have generally left the decision on sex education to the local districts. There have been some guidelines and restrictions established to aid them should they decide to include sex education. But the official attitude of these states is not one of encouraging the schools to adopt such a program. Arizona, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Virginia, and Washington all have an official attitude that can be described as restrictive. The amount of restriction varies from almost disallowing it to just placing tight controls on what materials can be used or what can be taught.

The opposition to sex education, begun in late 1968 and 1969, does seem to be having some degree of success on the state level. None of the states that responded to the questionnaire have forbidden sex education but there has been a trend toward more restrictive measures. Prior to 1969 six states had taken an official stance on sex education. All were encouraging the inclusion of it in the school curriculum, with the possible exception of Nevada. In 1969 there were five more states which could be added to the group of supporters. But there were also two that established policies that were allowing sex education but not really encouraging it. In 1970 two more states

adopted policies that would fit into this latter category. Another five states approved policies encouraging the establishment of sex education programs. This was also the year in which all of the restrictive policies and laws were adopted.

There has been a trend toward more restrictions or controls on sex education in the last few years as seen in the official policies and laws. However, the statements concerning a number of state legislatures investigating sex education (see page 3) do not necessarily have to cause alarm among supporters of sex education. Some of the best planned and most extensive guidelines have come from legislative committees or committees established by law. Also, just because a state is considering a law it does not mean it will be passed. Three states in 1969 and 1970 considered restrictive legislation but these were not passed.

Upon examining the results on a regional basis some trends can be seen. In the ten northeastern states that replied, the states are about evenly divided between encouraging sex education and having no official attitude (5 to 4). There are no states with a restrictive attitude.

In the south, eight of the thirteen states responding had no official standing on sex education. Three of the southern states had taken restrictive positions.

Almost two-thirds of the midwestern states (7 of 11) were encouraging the addition of sex education to the school curriculum. The remaining states replying to the questionnaire were evenly divided between those merely allowing sex education and those with no official position.

It would be hard to identify any trend in the western states. Of the thirteen that could be so classified, four failed to return the questionnaire and three had no official policy or law. Of the remaining states two had passive and two had encouraging policies concerning the introduction of sex education into the public schools.

Although the policies and laws differ there are areas of general agreement in the guidelines or recommendations made. One point of agreement is that the local community must help plan the program. Almost all of the states have urged the involvement of the community in designing a sex education program. This urging of community involvement could be because, as has been said, "Especially vulnerable to attack are school boards not quite aware of the nature, scope and content of their district's sex education courses."¹ It is also suggested that, ". . . the uninformed school boards are the same ones that neglected to enlist parental support for sex education from the beginning and cannot expect parents to rally to their defense if trouble strikes."² It is probably felt that if the community helps in the planning of the program they will know, and may have suggested, what is being taught and therefore will not object to the program. There is disagreement, however, as to who should initiate the program. Some think it is necessary to wait for the community to recognize the need, others feel this area of instruction is so important that the school should not wait but provide the impetus.

¹Zazzaro, "The War on Sex Education," op. cit., p. 7.

²Ibid.

There is no disagreement between the states on the matter of teachers. All feel that they should be carefully selected. The material used in the course is also to be carefully selected but the states disagree as to who should do this. Some are making suggestions at the state level but leaving the choice to the local board or school. There are a few states in which the State Board or Department must approve anything that is used in sex education.

Most states agree that sex education should be integrated into other appropriate courses. Michigan is the only state in which it is specifically prohibited. This integration of sex education into other courses is usually suggested in all levels K through 12. Some states do not approve of such an early start but others suggest adult education programs so that sex education can begin in pre-kindergarten years. This and other reasons such as giving adults information that will be useful in their own lives, are given for adult education. Adult education is encouraged in many states.

Excusing of students from sex education upon written request is also a point where there is agreement in many states. The New Jersey State Board is the only one to recommend that no students be excused from such a program. The need for continual evaluation of the program is repeated frequently. This is not only evaluation of what is being taught and how it is taught, but also its effect on the students.

Some states are trying to indoctrinate students with the "accepted" moral values. Others are showing students the alternatives and the consequences, with the belief that in this way the students

will make the hoped for decision. This last major area of agreement is almost universal. Though the methods vary, the states are striving to convey social values as part of sex education.

Many of these guidelines that have been set up are designed to aid schools in obtaining local support before and after sex education actually begins in the classroom. These areas of agreement in the guidelines of states would appear then to form the basic threads of sex education programs.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire

1827 Hunting Ave.
Manhattan, Ks. 66502
September 16, 1970

Dear Sir:

I am a graduate student at Kansas State University in the College of Education working on a M. S. in Secondary Education. For my Master's Report I am seeking information on the official status of sex education in the public schools in each of the fifty states. I would greatly appreciate it if you could furnish me with the following information.

Does your State Board of Education have an official statement of policy concerning sex education in your public schools? _____

If so could you please enclose a copy of it? _____

When was this policy adopted? _____

If none has been adopted has one been proposed? _____

Has your state passed any laws regulating the teaching of sex education in the schools? _____ When? _____

If so could you please include a copy of the law(s)? _____

If none have been passed have any been introduced into the legislature? _____ Please enclose a copy.

When? _____

Results? _____

If you do not have any of the above information please advise me as to where I could possibly obtain it.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Barbara Jean Davis

APPENDIX B

Statements of National Organizations in Support
of Sex Education: Cited by the Iowa
Department of Public Instruction

. . . that the school curriculum include education for family life, including sex education. . . . the family life courses, including preparation for marriage and parenthood, be instituted as an integral and major part of public education from elementary school through high school and that this formal education emphasize the primary importance of family life.--Sixth White House Conference on Children and Youth, 1960.

The responsibility of the school in education for family life is no longer a matter of debate. The tasks of the school in supplementing and complementing those of the home and of the social structure in which children and youth are growing and developing their attitudes, character, and capabilities for relating themselves to other people, are now recognized as inescapable in total balanced education.--Elizabeth S. Force, Director of Family Life, American Social Health Association.

. . . that the schools accept appropriate responsibility for reinforcing the efforts of parents to transmit knowledge about the values inherent in our family system, and about the psychic, moral, and physical consequences of sexual behavior, and be it further resolved that this be done by including in the general and health education curriculum the physiology and biology of human reproduction beginning at the elementary level and continuing throughout the school years at increasing levels of comprehension, and that the study of venereal diseases continue to be a part of communicable disease education during early adolescence, and be it further resolved that the concept of the family as a unit of society based on mature, responsible love be a continuing and pervasive educational goal.--Joint Committee on Health Problems in Education, National Education Association and American Medical Association, March 1964.

. . . create a climate of acceptance for family life education in the schools. Encourage the inclusion of sex education for boys as well as girls in school programs in family life education.--National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 1965.

. . . Schools are not giving students an adequate education in sex; too many teachers give the once-over-lightly treatment--if any treatment at all.--National High School Youth Conference, February 1966.

APPENDIX B (cont.)

. . . urge schools to assume the responsibility of providing sound sex education including human reproduction as one part of a complete health education program. . . . urge colleges and universities to include family living instruction including sex education in the general education of all students. . . encourage churches, civic organizations, and other community groups to strongly support programs of sex education.--Resolution, Board of Directors, American Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, March 1966.

. . . If our aim is adults who will use their sexuality in mature and responsible ways, we cannot begin sex education later than early childhood. . . inasmuch as parents are also entirely unprepared to do the in-depth kind of job that is required, the schools will have to assume the main burden and responsibility for planning and carrying out adequate sex education programs.--Mary S. Calderone, M. D., Executive Director, Sex Education and Information Council of the U. S., March 1966.

. . . To assist communities and educational institutions which wish to initiate or improve programs in this area (family life education and sex education), the U. S. Office of Education will support family life education and sex education as an integral part of the curriculum from preschool to college and adult levels; it will support training for teachers and health and guidance personnel at all levels of instruction; it will aid programs designed to help parents carry out their roles in family life education and sex education; and it will support research and development in all aspects of family life education and sex education.--Harold Howe II, U. S. Commissioner of Education, August 1966.

. . . Human sexuality is a gift of God, to be accepted with thanksgiving and used with reverence and joy.

Sex education is not, however, only for the young; it is a life-long task whose aim is to help individuals develop their sexuality in a manner suited to their stage in life.

Responsibility for sex education belongs primarily to the child's parents or guardians. . . but some parents desire supplementary assistance from their church or synagogue. . . therefore each community of faith should provide resources, leadership, and opportunities for all ages to grow in the understanding of their roles as men and women in the family and society.--Synagogue Council, Council of America, the United States Catholic Conference, and the National Council of Churches, June 8, 1968.¹

¹Iowa Department of Public Instruction, op. cit., pp. 7-8.

APPENDIX C

General Objectives of Family Life and Sex
Education: Developed by the Illinois
Sex Education Advisory Board

1. To understand the meaning and significance of marriage, parenthood, and family life, so they can help strengthen the family as the basic social unit of democratic life in Illinois.
2. To make affection, sex, and love constructive rather than destructive forces in modern life.
3. To develop feelings of self-identity and self-worth, respect for others, and moral responsibility as an integral part of their personality and character development, so they can perceive their roles as marriage partners, as parents, and as mature adults in our society.
4. To understand and appreciate the sexual side of human nature, so that their own psychosexual development may occur as normally and healthfully as possible, without feelings of indecency, embarrassment or undue guilt.
5. To learn that human sexual behavior is not merely a personal and private matter but has important social, moral, and religious implications.
6. To realize that the Golden Rule also applies in sexual matters, based upon the ethical principle that: no one has a right to harm another by using him or her exploitatively as a sexual object.
7. To learn about the dangers of illicit sexual behavior; and that boys and girls do not have to engage in heavy petting or premarital sexual intercourse to make friends, be popular, get dates, or to prove their love and affection to each other.
8. To emphasize the case for premarital chastity as the sexual standard approved by our society because chastity provides a positive goal for teen-agers, linking human sexual behavior with love, marriage, parenthood, and family life and because of the individual, family, and community problems associated with premarital or extramarital sexual relations.

APPENDIX C (cont.)

9. To open channels of communication between children and their parents, teachers and counselors, and religious leaders concerning the meaning, significance, and potential values of sex and mating in human life, so that students will find it easier to seek information from reliable sources rather than rely on "hearsay," "gutter talk," or misconceptions; and so they will be able to discuss with openness and without embarrassment the problems of growing up sexually, while realizing that this is only one aspect of becoming a mature man or woman.

10. To understand that boy-girl and man-woman relationships of the right kind can add to their enjoyment and give meaning to their lives and that those of the wrong kind can result in a distorted attitude toward sex, love, and affection that may lead to undesirable consequences for the individuals involved and for society.

11. To understand the basic anatomy and physiology of the male and female reproductive systems and human reproduction; and the relationship of human mating to mutual love and affection expressed in marriage, parenthood, and family life.

12. To develop a healthy, wholesome attitude toward sex in human beings, including respect for their own bodies as an integral part of their personality, with knowledge of and respect for all body parts and their normal functions in human mating, reproduction, and family life.

13. To appreciate the significance of the sexual differences in boys and girls and the male and female sexual roles in our society, as related to wholesome boy-girl relationships and marriage, parenthood, and family life.

14. To develop a functional graded vocabulary, acquire a knowledge of key facts and basic concepts, develop wholesome attitudes and practices, and acquire skill in the critical analysis of basic problems and issues in sex education; and for students to bring information to their parents which the adults themselves may need and want.

15. To understand how to deal with personal sexual problems such as menstruation, nocturnal emissions, masturbation, petting, and personal hygiene.

16. To learn about the legal and ethical aspects of abortion, venereal disease control, marriage, divorce, broken homes and family disintegration, illegitimate children, pornography and obscenity, and sexual behavior.

APPENDIX C (cont.)

17. To understand the key facts and basic concepts of human genetics as related to parenthood and family life; and where and how to secure "genetic counseling" if and when needed.

18. To learn the key facts and basic concepts about venereal disease; and the role of teen-agers and young adults in the prevention and control of these important communicable diseases.

19. To understand human pregnancy and the birth process; the need for good medical and public health care of mother and child before, during, and after birth; the care and rearing of small children; and the personal and social significance of the family in modern times.

20. To learn about the potential dangers of the world population explosion, and the need for an intelligent consideration of the basic issues of population growth as related to human health and welfare.

21. To consider critically the pros and cons of teen-agers going steady versus going "steadily" as related to sexual behavior and as a preparation for mate selection and marriage.

22. To understand more fully and deeply the significance, in our society and other societies, of boy-girl relationships, dating, courtship, and engagement as related to marriage, parenthood, and family life.

23. To realize that there are important major differences, as well as some similarities, between sex and sexual behavior in animals as compared with man.

24. To understand the differences between love and infatuation and immature versus mature romantic love; to identify and appreciate the traits of a prospective husband or wife, which are most apt to make for a wholesome, healthy, and happy marriage.

25. To learn how to develop and maintain as their own positive standards of behavior based upon the progressive acceptance of moral responsibility for their own sexual behavior as it affects others as well as themselves.

APPENDIX C (cont.)

26. To see clearly that progressive acceptance of responsibility for making wise decisions and moral choices in sexual matters requires an understanding of relevant facts, standards and values, alternatives and their consequences, as related to long-range as well as to immediate desires and goals.¹

¹Illinois Sex Education Advisory Board, Policy Statement on Family Life and Sex Education, op. cit., pp. 19-22.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PERIODICALS

- Goodman, Walter. "The Controversy Over Sex Education," Redbook, CXXXII (September, 1969), 78-9+.
- Janeway, Thomas M. "Sex Education-A Status Report," (Reprint) Illinois Journal of Education, LX (March, 1969), 4.
- Kirkendall, Lester A. and Greg J. Miles, "Sex Education Research," Review of Educational Research, XXXVIII (December, 1968), 528-44.
- Libby, Roger W. "Washington State Board Limits Sex Education to 'the Plumbing'," Phi Delta Kappan, LI (March, 1970), 402.
- Lindsell, Harold. "Sex, SIECUS, and the School," Christianity Today, XIV (January 30, 1970), 10-13.
- "Playboy Interview: Dr. Mary Calderone," Playboy, XVII (April, 1970), 63-78+.
- Rowan, Carl T. and David M. Mazie. "Sex Education: Powder Keg in Our Schools," Reader's Digest, XCV (October, 1969), 73-8.
- "Why the Furor Over Sex Education," U.S. News and World Report, LXVII (August 4, 1969), 44-6.
- Zazzaro, Joanne. "Critics or No Critics, Most Americans Still Support Sex Education in Schools," American School Board Journal, CLVII (September, 1969), 30-32.
- _____. "The War on Sex Education," American School Board Journal, CLVII (August, 1969), 7-11+.

B. STATE AND ORGANIZATION PUBLICATIONS

- Alaska Board of Education. "Position for Human Growth and Development Education," January, 1970.
- Arizona Department of Public Instruction. "Guideline 1970-71," on sex education, May 25, 1970.
- Bruno, Louis. Suggested Guidelines for Including Sex Education in School Curricula, issued by the Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction, January, 1970.
- Connecticut State Board of Education. "Policy Statement of Family Life and Sex Education for Connecticut Schools," April, 1968.

Delaware Director of Secondary Education. "Family Life and Personal Living," February 25, 1970.

Florida Department of Education. "Position Statement," Endorsed by the Florida Medical Association School Health Medical Advisory Committee, November 2, 1969.

General Assembly of Delaware, Senate. Senate Substitute No. 1 for Senate Bill No. 263, 1970.

Idaho State Board of Education. "Resolution," on sex education, October 23-24, 1969.

Illinois Sex Education Advisory Board. Policy Statement on Family Life and Sex Education, issued by the Office of the Illinois Superintendent of Public Instruction, March, 1967.

Iowa Department of Public Instruction. A Guide to Develop Programs for Family Living and Personal Growth, 1969.

Joint Committee of the National School Boards Association and American Association of School Administrators. Health Education and Sex/Family Life Education, statement adopted January, 1968.

Kansas State Department of Education. Guideline for Sex Education in Public Schools of Kansas, January, 1970.

Michigan State Board of Education. "Sex Education and Family Information Guidelines for Local Public Schools Choosing to Conduct a Sex Education Program," August, 1970.

Minnesota Department of Education, Section of Elementary and Secondary Education. "Family Life and Sex Education: A Position Statement," November, 1966.

New Hampshire State Department of Education. "Proposed Policy Statement Relating to a Comprehensive Health Education Program," February 12, 1970.

New Jersey State Board of Education. "A Policy Statement on Sex Education," January 4, 1967.

New Jersey Senate and Assembly Committees on Education. "Report to the Legislature concerning Sex Education in the Public Schools," April 9, 1970.

North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction. Sex Education: A Policy Statement, November, 1969.

Oklahoma. House Bill No. 1484, 32nd Legislature, 1st Sess. n.d.

Oklahoma State Board of Education. "Guidelines for Program Development in Sex Education," 1970.

Pennsylvania Department of Education. Guidelines for Sex Education in Public Schools of Pennsylvania, 1969.

Pennsylvania. General Assembly. House Bill No. 1062, 1969 Sess.

_____. House Bill No. 1263, 1969 Sess.

_____. House Bill No. 1284, 1969 Sess.

_____. House Bill No. 1433, 1969 Sess.

South Carolina Joint Health and Education Committee. "Health and Education - A Comprehensive Program Grades K Through 12," September, 1969.

South Dakota Department of Public Instruction. Health and Family Living Curriculum (K-12), 1969.

Virginia State Board of Education. "Report of Sex Education," August 19, 1970.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. "Schools Should Assist With Family Life Education," (reprint), Newsletter, April, 1969.

C. CORRESPONDENCE

Georgia Department of Education. Correspondence between Claude Ivie, Director of Curriculum, and the writer.

Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction. Message from Richard D. Wells to General Commission Members Regarding Sex Education, May 29, 1970.

Louisiana Department of Education. Correspondence between Rex C. Pearce, Supervisor, Secondary Education, and the writer.

Missouri Department of Education. Correspondence between the Missouri Department and the writer.

New Jersey Department of Education. Memorandum from Carl L. Margure, Commissioner of Education, and all Superintendents, County Superintendents and Board Secretaries, July 27, 1970.

New York Bureau of School Health Education. Correspondence from John S. Sinacore, Bureau Chief, to City, Village and District Superintendents of Schools, Supervising Principals, High School Principals, Junior High School Principals and School Health Education Coordinators, March 11, 1969.

New York Commissioner of Education. Message from Edwald B. Nyquist, Commissioner, to Presidents of Boards of Education, City, Village and District Superintendents, Diocesan Superintendents, Supervising Principals, and Building Principals, August 24, 1970.

South Carolina Health Education Consultant. Correspondence on "Inquiries on Sex Education Materials," to those inquiring on sex education, July, 1969.

A SURVEY OF STATE LAWS AND
POLICIES REGARDING SEX EDUCATION

by

BARBARA JEAN DAVIS

B. S., Kansas State University, 1967

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1970

Sex education has been in some public schools for over twenty years. But it has been since 1968 that a great controversy has arisen in this area. There are numerous articles being published arguing for and against sex education. And even more articles have been published about the dispute itself. The campaign against sex education has been lead by the John Birch Society, the Christian Crusade, Parents Opposed to Sex Education (POSE), Sanity on Sex (SOS), and numerous other organizations. These are both national and local groups. However, a long list of national education and medical organizations have endorsed sex education. Also, a number of government and religious organizations have voiced approval. Some of these are the American Medical Association, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the National Council of Churches and the Sixth White House Conference on Children and Youth.

This controversy has left many people wondering what is happening in the field of sex education. The purpose of this investigation was to survey the state laws and policies regarding sex education and to see if any patterns were evident.

To obtain this information a questionnaire was sent to the Department of Education of each of the fifty states and the District of Columbia. Of the forty-two states that replied, twenty states have an official policy on sex education, three have an official policy and a law, two have a law, and nineteen had neither. In seven states laws had been proposed but not passed.

Those states having no law or policy were Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Mississippi,

North Dakota, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Vermont, and West Virginia.

Louisiana and Nevada have no official policy on sex education but do have laws covering it.

The states having only an official policy on sex education are Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Virginia and Wisconsin.

The states of Illinois, Michigan, and Washington have both a law and an official policy on sex education.

Most of the policies that have been adopted are encouraging the local districts to establish sex education programs. Some of these are more restrictive than others. In a few cases the policies seem to discourage sex education.

Of the two states with laws regarding sex education one is very restrictive. However, two of the states with laws and policies are encouraging sex education and giving much aid at the local level. But the third state with both a law and a policy is less enthusiastic about sex education.

There is a trend toward a more restrictive attitude concerning sex education but there is no sign of any significant progress in efforts to ban it from the public schools.

There are some areas of agreement that can be found in many of the state policy guidelines. They are: planning with the community; careful selection of materials and teachers; and a K through 12 program

integrated into other classes. The one point of agreement found in almost all the policies was the desire to convey some moral or social values to the students.