

Protecting LGBTIQS Youth in the Media¹

Mara C. Hughes and Amy Moran
CUNY Graduate Center

Between March 2009 and May 2010, the authors were involved in a series of exchanges with a national lesbian and gay student advocacy organization about changing the ways that queer students are sought for interviews in the media. Unfortunately, the authors' numerous communication attempts with the group about repeated incidents of potentially dangerous exposure of LGBTIQS students to media representatives yielded no policy change.

This note from the field demonstrates that the efforts of a well-known national queer student advocacy organization to gain media attention encourage it to distance itself from the teens for whom it advocates. This distancing can result in danger to gay teens who are approached by the media for interviews. The note serves as a case study of the ways in which large institutional advocacy organizations can, in general, become disassociated from grassroots youth protection because of their focus on large-scale fundraising, networking, media outreach, and organizational branding.

As public school teachers and advocates of LGBTIQS students, we describe our actions attempting to protect our students from unsafe media exposure, then offer a series of recommendations for large-scale organizations seeking to interact synergistically with local youth workers and the young people with whom they work.

LGBTIQS Student Advocacy: Local and National Structures

Public schools support LGBTIQS students in many ways, typically through the work of a few adult allies. Adult allies might work to expand queer inclusivity in curricula, conduct staff development to raise teacher consciousness about homophobia and heterosexism in school, or act within the context of a student-oriented Gay Student Alliance (GSA) to provide support and leadership opportunities to queer students while attempting to develop a respectful school climate. Being an LGBTIQS-identified person in a public school—whether as a student or as an adult ally—can be isolating and lonely. Therefore, the local interactions within and across GSAs can have vitally supportive and uplifting effects. Here, LGBTIQS students find each other, create networks of support, and validate each other's experiences as LGBTIQS people, while GSA advisors—gay or

¹ LGBTIQS stands for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender/transsexual, intersexual, queer or questioning, and straight allies.

straight—might connect with other schools’ other advisors, teachers, and counselors and collaborate about best practices for LGBTIQS student advocacy.

At the national level, organizations can offer essential assistance to students by, for example conducting nation-wide school climate surveys, organizing nation-wide action, and coordinating regional events for local GSAs. Perhaps most importantly, national organizations have the capability of attracting media coverage of the ways in which LGBTIQS students nation-wide are often not guaranteed fair and safe educations.. The national organization referred to here has enjoyed national media recognition of its work for the safety of LGBTIQS students in schools, and its executive staff includes a number of individuals who act as liaisons to the community and the media. The group’s involvement with the media has three arms: staff members are regularly quoted in journalistic pieces, data from the organization’s research is used widely in the media and in policy development, and—as we discovered—the organization seeks to connect media representatives with students whose stories and identities lend diversity and authenticity to media projects. The national group’s involvement with the media, then, is multi-layered, entrenched in its operations, and a major part of its mission and day-to-day work.

Both local and national student advocacy organizations prioritize LGBTIQS student safety within schools; however, unlike the adults who work for larger groups, the adult allies in schools (teachers and GSA advisors) have the additional responsibility of protecting the well-being of individual students. Members and staff of a national organization are far likelier to encounter members of the media in the course of a day’s work than they are to encounter LGBTIQS teens. This note from the field provides a chronology of how media coverage of LGBTIQS students’ experiences was sought by a national organization without regard for the safety measures required by local GSA advisors to protect their students from unsupervised encounters with strangers and from potential media exploitation.

March 2009

In the weeks preceding the March 2009 GSA Summit in northern New Jersey (which was organized in part by co-author, Amy Moran), the national organization approached Amy about allowing access to the Summit to television crews from New York City’s WABC, and the PBS program *In the Life*. The footage was to be used to highlight the importance of programs that bring youth together for positive social and educational goals. In this case, all parties saw the opportunity for media exposure as very valuable: the national group hoped to raise awareness, the media groups wanted to engage viewers and provide topical programming, and the local adult organizers hoped to facilitate the opportunity for interested teens to personally advocate for the safety and empowerment of their LGBTIQS peers. In order to make the program happen, however, significant safety precautions had to be in place, as mandated by district policy.

The adult organizers checked with the local school administrators at the high school hosting the Summit, who insisted that only students whose parents or guardians

signed specific release forms could be filmed. Although the national group did not have release forms ready at the onset of the discussion, the forms were obtained from both media groups and were emailed to GSA advisors whose groups had been invited. The advisors disseminated them to the youth participants. Signed release forms were brought to the GSA Summit, and only students with releases were filmed. Both post-production footage reached wide audiences and helped expand awareness of the salience of school safety issues for queer youth. In fact, the WABC piece was re-broadcast on Sunday, October 10, 2010, as a response to the tragic death of Tyler Clementi, a Rutgers University student who committed suicide after being 'outed' as gay via footage on the internet.

April 2009

Not all media interactions would be policed so scrupulously, though. In April of 2009, one month after the GSA Summit, the same national organization reached out to some local adult allies for the purpose of helping connect a nationally-recognized journalist with GSA advisors and middle school students to write a feature article about coming out in middle school.. One of the co-authors, Amy Moran, was excited about the project, and exchanged several emails with the reporter about her work with young teens in a middle school, particularly her tutelage of a young man who'd experienced several incidents of harassment for his sexuality and gender expression. However, Amy ceased working with the reporter when he expected to be put in contact with the student for an unsupervised interview and when, in response to her question about his publication's parental consent process, he wrote, "I've interviewed young people for more than 5 years at the [weekly publication] and have never used a consent form. When we don't have parental consent...we make sure the student isn't identifiable."

As Amy explained to the reporter, her status *in loco parentis*—as the minor's guardian in the absence of his parents—required her to act in the child's best interests as though she were his own parent, and that meant demanding that his safety and privacy be protected. As a minor, the student was not eligible to make the decision to be interviewed by a stranger, even if his identity would not be disclosed in the interview or published article. It should go without saying that no public school teacher is legally permitted to offer a socially vulnerable student to a reporter of any kind for a private interview in an undisclosed location. Although the reporter's intentions in planning the article were undoubtedly good, he revealed a fundamental ignorance of the realities of individual student protection, the responsibilities of public school teachers, and the potential fallout LGBTIQS students could face from media coverage long after reporters have left town.

In all fairness, it is important to note, that a reporter is not a youth worker. The reporter's job is to get a good story, while the teacher's job is to protect her students. In retrospect, it is more troubling that the national organization referred the reporter to so many youth advisors before vetting his readiness to protect minors and ensuring that a school-appropriate protocol for interviewing students—including release forms and appropriate supervision—was in place. Subsequent to her exchanges with the reporter,

Amy spoke by phone with a representative of the national group to discuss the absence of an adult consent form from the reporter's appeal. Rather than reaching out to the reporter or his publication to resolve the issue or educate them, the representative produced a relatively generic one-page release form—not under the publication's letterhead but under its own—and emailed it to Amy. The organization encouraged Amy to continue arranging an interview for her student, although the reporter soon stopped responding to her requests for a parental consent form from his employer. Ultimately, the article was published with some fanfare. Nowhere in the article did the author address his methods of obtaining access to the middle school-aged students he interviewed.

October 2009

Six months later, co-author Mara Hughes attended a different regional GSA conference with her students. She was accompanied by Ashley, a former student and GSA alumnus, who—at age 21—was serving as a second chaperone to the group of nine students. During the lunch break, nearly 200 students were present when the conference organizer introduced a reporter who had come to the conference seeking students to interview for a story he was writing on LGBTIQS athletes in high school. The conference organizer invited students to speak to him if they were interested in participating.

Ashley was attending college on a softball scholarship, so she introduced herself to the reporter and shared some of her observations about college women's sports. The reporter noted that he was really hoping that Ashley could share her contacts with him. He requested access to any high school players she might know, or, failing that, any college freshmen. Ashley told him that she would have to talk to her friends before giving out their information, and returned to the group. Later, Mara asked one of the conference co-sponsors about the reporter. Like Amy, Mara praised the goals of the article but asked about parental consent forms for minors. As at the previous spring's GSA Summit, these media releases should have been provided to advisors in advance if the reporter hoped to speak to youth during the event.

Mara reminded the organizers that because most of the youth were minors, they could not give him their contact information without parental consent, and she indicated that the reporter should submit parental media releases to the schools or GSA advisors if he desired access. In her follow-up call to the national organization's central office, she was told that they were surprised to hear about the reporter's presence, despite the fact that the reporter had cited a member of their staff in his introduction at the GSA conference.

In the months between March and October 2009, the authors started to notice a trend: the national organization repeatedly sought out LGBTIQS youth for media coverage that would benefit the organization's public relations, but without safeguards in place to ensure that youth interactions with media would be appropriately and safely monitored.

Late October 2009

After Mara's run-in with the un-vetted reporter who wanted to interview students without parental consent at the GSA conference, the national organization's communications public ally contacted Amy and shared that a *different* reporter from a *different* local paper had approached the group about doing a story regarding gay high school athletes in the New Jersey area. She wrote that her manager "gave me your information and said you would be an excellent person to contact. The angle of this story would be discussing how the athletes' orientation does or doesn't affect their team interactions and overall sports environment. Do you know of anyone who fits this description and would be willing to do an interview?"

This time, Amy responded to the national organization in the following way:

I can offer several strong leads with regard to viable adult interview candidates. But here are some concerns I have regarding youth interview candidates, *especially* LGBTIQS ones:

1. Interviewing minors and parental consent
2. Interviewing protocol and school-based supervision
3. Using teachers (who are charged with students' care/protection in parents' absence) to identify students for journalistic purposes
4. Targeting vulnerable students by the private/personal demographic of sexual orientation (rather than the kid who scored 5 touchdowns, the kid who won the debate, the kid who...all of which are public events held under school supervision)
5. Anonymity, outing, and confidentiality of students who may care to share their experiences but without the personal identifiers

Yet that explicit request did not yield a blueprint for the media relations procedure that the reporter would be following. The organization's communications public ally responded vaguely:

[The reporter's] idea for the story will focus on an out student who is comfortable speaking about his or her experience as a student athlete. He understands the sensitivity surrounding the subject and that parental consent, along with additional protocol, will be necessary before moving forward. I hope this helps answer some of your questions.

It did not help. The point that the organization kept avoiding was that clear ethical boundaries are broken when adult journalists ask to speak with LGBTIQS students privately, particularly about issues relating to personal sexual orientation or gender identity and expression. Amy wrote back:

As GSA advisors and teachers, we're in the business of keeping kids safe in schools....We all know how a bad situation in the press creates more bad press which turns litigious which creates more bad press....Along the way, lives get trashed and hard-earned, gay-positive school culture is sanctioned. It's his gig, but it's we who would pay the price.

Please let [the journalist] know we (a community of GSA advisors) are interested in clear, effective solutions to the challenges presented within the broad context of simply writing a story about gay student athletes. The kind of watertight 'safe-professional-journalism-with-gay-kids-within-public-schools' protocol that we feel is required here may not yet exist. If it doesn't, we feel confident that [the journalist] will pioneer one.

The communications public ally never responded, and the local newspaper reporter never contacted Amy to conduct appropriate interviews with LGBTIQS student athletes. We thought the issue was finished.

April 2010

Mara and Amy brought LGBTIQS students from their respective GSAs to the next regional GSA Summit in April 2010, which was co-sponsored by the same national organization. There, yet again, a reporter was introduced to a huge crowd of LGBTIQS teens. Attending as advisors to their students and as guests of the chapter and the hosting school, Mara and Amy became acutely conscious of the limits on their control over the access to the students in attendance that this media representative would have, despite their conscientious safeguards. As they tried to find a balance between trust and appreciation for the local coordinators and protective instincts as youth workers, they bore witness to an exchange that they could not accept. Amy wrote the following field notes:

We witnessed [the reporter] announce to a crowd of rapt teens that he would like to speak with gay youth athletes about their experiences for an article he would be writing about them. We stood next to him as a male teen (whom we did not know) approached him and gave him his name and phone number. And, after we immediately questioned [the reporter] about the journalistic safeguards put in place for minors, we listened to him tell us he *assumed* the number given was that of the parents and that permission would be acquired at some later date. In fact, [the reporter] indicated shock at our inquiries, given that he was invited to the event to solicit student participation by someone at [the national organization's headquarters]. We have no way of knowing what his interaction was or will be with that boy, and we cannot have something like that happen again.

There was a further surprise at the Summit. The keynote speaker, a minor celebrity and an activist for LGBTIQS members of the military, was at the time being filmed for a sensational cable reality show, and had brought his camera crew to the Summit. While the event coordinator from the national group had been informed about the camera crew prior to the Summit, he admitted later that although he'd worked with them for several years—as a student, a board member, and a volunteer staff member—he had never received training about media relations or student safeguards. Mara and Amy, along with other GSA advisors, found themselves acting as the sole line of defense for their students against potentially risky, invasive media contact at the event. They

asked the reporter *not* to speak with their students and insisted that the camera crew position itself in such a way that no student's likeness could be filmed during the talk. To his credit, the event organizer recognized the problematic position that students and their adult allies had been placed in, and disallowed the keynote speaker's camera crew from filming at the last minute. On that day, the national organization's failure to establish a uniform, widely disseminated media relations policy pushed the responsibility to manage such interactions onto individual adult allies of LGBTIQS students, who were able to prevent a potentially dangerous situation.

Frustrated with these repeated occurrences, Amy, Mara, and the lead organizer of the 2010 regional GSA Summit penned an email to the executive director of the national organization:

We are teachers, GSA advisors, and youth advocates charged with protecting individual LGBTIQS students and our ever-fragile GSAs within the context of often litigious and hostile administrative environments. This tenuous balancing act makes us, whose lives and livelihoods are intrinsically connected to ethical and proper engagement with youth, ever conscious of the risks facing young people and their adult caregivers in the age of new media. In this charged climate, we are extremely concerned by [NQSASO's] willingness to permit journalists access to GSA-sponsored events and the vulnerable youth who attend them.

Giving names and contact information for underage students to reporters would, in no uncertain terms, be a breach of ethical bounds. Exposing those same young people to reporters for communicative purposes without prior parental consent is both a legal and a safety issue.

When journalists or other media representatives are permitted on school property (whether or not school is in session) to solicit participation from minors during school-, GSA-, or [nationally]-sponsored events, it exposes students, teachers and advisors—as well as the schools themselves—to influences that can have dreadful effects. Presuming that media outlets will enforce an adequate standard of protection is unrealistic, and expecting individuals and chapters to independently evaluate media inquiries on an inconsistent, case-by-case basis invites disaster.

Eager to forge a good working relationship with the national group and to establish a forward-looking project of policy development, we emphasized that we did not want to review past instances of poor management of media relations. We were acutely aware that while the national group was responsible for creating an appropriate, wide-ranging protocol, it was most often under the direct supervision of local chapter coordinators that complex media exchanges took place. The group can refer media to the chapters, but only chapters that are actually in contact with GSA advisors and vulnerable youth on a day-to-day basis. As such, only local activities become sites for risky media contact. We were resolved to avoid circumstances in which other adult allies could be blamed for inappropriately exposing students.

The National Group Responds

As one might expect, since media and community relations have such high priority with this national organization, the executive director responded to our concerns via an email about having “strict policies regarding any contact between youth and members of the media, including prior consent from parents or guardians for any interviews with minors” and wrote that “[m]embers of the media are never allowed unmediated access to students at events, and all interview requests are carefully vetted.” Over the course of fourteen months and through the many incidents described here, the authors had seen no evidence to that effect.

On a positive note, the executive director agreed to meet with us to discuss the local impact of their invisible policies around LGBTIQS students and media. On May 5, 2010, the day before our scheduled meeting, we were told that she would be represented by the senior director of programs who is “directly responsible for oversight of our youth-related policies” and that they looked forward “to meeting with all of [us] to review this matter and to inform our further thinking around these issues.” She also thanked us very much “for reaching out and for moving this dialogue forward.” This was deeply heartening to us, as we felt that a bridge was being built between the national group and local GSA advisors.

Later that day, we received an email from the senior director of programs at the national group, who thanked us for our “ongoing involvement and commitment to supporting safety for LGBT students.” She wrote:

Our understanding is that the reporter was invited to attend the Summit, relevant information and guidelines were appropriately communicated to the Summit participants as per [our] media policy, and that nothing problematic occurred in terms of student interaction with the reporter. If the organization’s guidelines had not been followed or if there was a negative student consequence that had occurred as a result of media presence, we would certainly want to quickly follow-up and respond. *It appears, however, that your concerns are based primarily on a difference in philosophy about how to best support student empowerment and agency in relation to the news media* [our emphasis]. I don’t therefore recommend that we schedule a meeting with you and [our] staff. I do invite you, however, to share any additional feedback you may have about [our] student media policies and practice with [the] Communications Director.

Shocked that our meeting was cancelled because of what the senior director of programs (who is in charge of oversight of the national group’s youth-related policies) considered a “difference in philosophy,” Mara responded on May 7, 2010.

Perhaps my last email was misleading. Because the [regional] GSA Summit is over, and its fallout is contained, we are only peripherally interested in the question of how [your group] and its chapters have acted without regard to youth safety in exchanges with the media. Dr. Moran and I initiated our contact with [you] because we don’t want future events to be marred by inappropriate media exposure.

Like you, we share the desire to foster authentic media coverage of LGBTIQS issues that privileges youth voices, but our priority is ensuring that that coverage is not obtained at the expense of individual student safety or the well being of our GSAs.

The email proceeded with a point-by-point review of the chronology explored above, emphasizing at each step the involvement of staff members from the national group. It was clear that representatives of the group at all levels had repeatedly approached representatives of the media, offering encouragement and local-level contacts (including with the authors), without scrutinizing credentials or discussing consent and safety protocols. Mara found it particularly important to highlight the October 2009 and April 2010 GSA Summits—the events at which student minors had been in closest contact with un-vetted media representatives. She wrote:

Both events were organized with input from and the sponsorship of active chapters[of the national organization], and attended by [their] staff—including a keynote address by [their executive director] at the October event. Both included [the national organization's] name specifically in their flyers and promotional materials. Different locations, different organizers, and different themes, nearly six months apart; same problem. When—out of delicacy—I affirm that advocacy organizations are faced with an ongoing challenge resulting from the evolution of media, I don't mean it in an abstract or philosophical way. Once is an accident, but more than twice is a pattern. Are these the only transgressions of this kind this year? How many more will there be?

It was a difficult decision to make specific statements about individual instances of poor judgment on the part of high-ranking individuals at the national organization, but Mara wanted to make it clear that their assertions that strong policies in place were, in fact, false. Mara continued:

Minimizing the absence of such policies as a “philosophical difference” in light of the many and repeated practices of coupling adult journalists with gay youth in unmonitored ways is irresponsible and dangerous. This is the time to make a proactive statement in the form of collaboration with GSA advisors to develop a media relations guide. Making reactive statements about what could have or should have been done and placing blame on chapters, advisors, event organizers, and misguided members of the media would be unnecessary if such a guide were in place.

The email concluded:

Our jobs, teaching licenses, and roles as trusted adults in the lives of LGBTIQS youth are at stake when we make the decision to trust that [an] event sponsored by [your organization] is a safe space for our kids.... We look forward to an opportunity to discuss ways in which we can collaborate with [you] to produce an accessible, transparent, reproducible media guide to assist GSAs in creating safe interactions with media representatives at events for LGBTIQS youth. Until such a guide is available with inspired polices that lead to safe and consistent practices, advisors like us will be unable to help

facilitate enlightening media coverage of the very real struggle toward social justice our LGBTIQS students experience daily in schools.

Unsurprisingly, this email generated an immediate response from the director of programs, who promised a thorough response within the week. The email contained no details, but seemed intended to prevent any possible escalation or expansion of our involvement. We clearly had hit a nerve. Ironically, Mara had written precisely the sort of email that, if leaked to the press, could create a serious public relations and legal problems for the group. Unfortunately, couching the discourse of student vulnerability in the language of blame—as mismanagement ripe for litigation, rather than as a project of thoughtful advocacy and policy revision as the authors had hoped—had become the only way to reach their executive staff. It seemed that only when they experienced the same anxiety the authors had felt were they willing to deal with the situation.

Finally, the director of programs followed through on her word and responded on Friday, May 14, 2010. Her response was short, but it alluded to the kind of commitment that the authors had hoped she and her group would come to since the outset of these exchanges.

Hello Mara and Amy:

Thank you again for your valuable input about [our] protocols regarding students' interactions with the media. As I mentioned last week, I am emailing now to update you on our response to your concerns.

We are currently in the process of evaluating and revising all of our student-related policies and procedures.

As a result of your input, we have prioritized the evaluation and revision of our policies and procedures related to student interaction with the media and this work is currently underway.

The concerns you have outlined in your emails will certainly inform this process. In addition, we are consulting nationally with GSA Advisors, [our organization's] Chapter leaders, school personnel, as well as a number of partner student/youth serving organizations to ensure that [our] procedures meet both legal and best practice standards regarding student safety and privacy. We will be sure to solicit input from school personnel about issues unique to school-sponsored activities. Please do send us any additional information, especially from the school perspective, that you would like us to consider.

We are most appreciative of your efforts in bringing your concerns to our attention and assisting us with this important work.

Many thanks!

Although Mara and Amy were gladdened by her response and offered to donate their time by visiting their offices to help them, this was the final correspondence the authors received from NQSAO about their policy work around LGBTIQS students and media interactions. Further, there have been no announcements or updates from the national headquarters about policy changes or initiatives. To our knowledge, nothing has changed.

Policy, Procedure, and Practice

In reflecting on the exchanges we shared over 15 months between March 2009 and May 2010 with this major national organization, we posit that it is not enough to say that “strict policies” are in place to protect vulnerable students. Those policies must be made explicit on websites and in other literature. As effective policy is accompanied by good practice, large-scale youth advocacy organizations must arrive more fully into their leadership roles by providing explicit guidelines and trainings for adult allies in schools on how to facilitate safe media coverage. Concurrently, they must protect students from the unintended consequences that may result from having their experiences harvested for journalistic enterprises. Unlike student athletes, debate team members, or honor society participants—whose issues are covered in local media regularly—the local and national exposure that LGBTIQS students and their schools might receive as a result of media coverage places them in the vulnerable position of being ‘outed’ to a possibly hostile audience. Unlike university-based researchers who undergo rigorous institutional review board (IRB) scrutiny for the protection of participants, journalists are not held to the same levels of monitoring.

Simple policy work and the creation of a media relations guide could help ensure the safety of LGBTIQS students. We recommend that the following procedures be widely listed by national organizations as national policies and disseminated to their local chapters and GSAs for regular practice:

1. **Journalist/Media Vetting:** Journalists/media representatives who would like to cover LGBTIQS student experiences must be vetted by the national group. Likewise, when a national organization would like to obtain media coverage, they must thoroughly vet journalists and media outlets.
2. **Media Releases:** Media releases—with specific parental/guardian consent for minors—must include the following information:
 - a. name of the national group or other sponsoring organization
 - b. name of the media outlet
 - c. name(s) of the specific journalist(s) or media representative(s)
 - d. list of the interview question(s) and topic(s)
 - e. option for assurance of complete anonymity of student minor(s)
3. **Lead-Time for the Distribution/Collection of Media Releases:** These media releases must be disseminated *in advance* of any interaction with student minors and media representatives.
4. **Due Diligence:** Only students with correctly completed media releases may interact with media representatives. Likewise, media representatives may only interact with student minors once they have received those students’ media releases.
5. **Appropriately Monitored Interviews:** Journalists make arrangements with adult supervisors who then facilitate appropriately chaperoned interviews with students.

These safeguards would help protect students from the misuse of their interview responses. They would help teachers and GSA advisors avoid unwittingly exposing students to slanderous journalism or un-vetted journalists. They would protect school districts and administrators from liability. Finally, these policies would help make the national group's interaction with local adult allies and LGBTIQS students more legitimate and robust.

Conclusion

Ultimately, the issue here is not just preventing LGBTIQS student exposure to media representatives without appropriate supervision or even preventing possible fall-out for LGBTIQS students from the stories written about them. It is also about the nature of youth advocacy itself, and the ways in which national organizations and local individuals negotiate their relations to one another and to the young people they both serve. The project, here, of recognizing and rectifying the disconnect between top-down actions that originate with good intentions at a national level—but which lose their efficacy on the ground—is a critical part of maintaining a scrupulous commitment to the students whose very vulnerability such organizations were conceived to protect.

As this article was under review, the American media was heavily preoccupied with the rash of ten suicides by queer youth² in September and October of 2010. These tragic events emphasize the urgency for organizations to develop appropriate protective policies for LGBTIQS students who interact with media. Minors suffer when grassroots activists, advocacy organizations, school communities, and families fail to communicate their mutually respectful, sensitive awareness of one another's roles in their lives. Because of this, we have come to see a transparent media relations policy for national organizations as an essential component of a public relations profile designed to earn the trust of parents, school systems, and communities. We call on *all* youth advocacy organizations to make their policies for protecting youth transparent.

² Suicide victims include Justin Aaberg, 15, of Minnesota; Billy Lucas, 15, of Indiana; Cody J. Barker, 17, of Wisconsin; Seth Walsh, 13, of California; Tyler Clementi, 18, of New Jersey; Asher Brown, 13, of Texas; Harrison Chase Brown, 15, of Colorado; Raymond Chase, 19, of Rhode Island; Felix Sacco, 17, of Massachusetts; and Caleb Nolt, 14, of Indiana.