



## NOTICE OF LEGAL NONCOMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL EXECUTIVE ORDER

September 26, 2025

**To:** Melissa Kalinowski

**CC:** Linda McMahon, Sec. of Education; Office for Civil Rights (HQ); Craig Trainor, Acting Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights; OCR Chicago Regional Office; U.S. Attorney's Office, District of Minnesota; Doug Seaton, Esq; Marissa Fallon; Carlondrea Hines; Jason Boll; Cam Muata; Colin Cox; Josie LaVoi; Constance Robinson; Michaela Chambers; Sen. Eric Lucero; Sen. Glenn Gruenhagen; Sen. Nathan Wesenberg; Rep. Mary Franson; Rep. Kristin Robbins; Rep. Jeff Backer; Rep. Peggy Bennett; Sen. Paul Utke; Sen. Julia Coleman; Rep. Larry Kraft; Sen. Ron Latz

**RE: Legal and Financial Exposure** from Pronoun Usage in Classrooms per EO 14190

***Note:** I'm copying relevant federal enforcement officials to ensure this matter receives immediate review. I've shared this entire correspondence with my advisors for awareness. Formal legal questions may be directed to District Counsel through the Superintendent's Office.*

Principal Kalinowski:

This serves as notice that St. Louis Park Middle School—and the St. Louis Park school district—is putting itself at **federal legal** and financial risk by violating a federal executive order.

### **Pronoun Usage in Violation of Executive Order 14190**

On the first day of school, Ms. Josie LaVoi instructed students to go around the room and state their pronouns. This deliberate ideological exercise **violates federal law**.

The pronoun round-robin in Ms. LaVoi's classroom happens to be the one I've been made aware of, but this unlawful behavior is likely taking place in other classrooms at St. Louis Park Middle School.

**EO 14190 (Jan. 29, 2025)** explicitly prohibits school staff from facilitating the social transition of minors, with examples including the use of pronouns inconsistent with biological sex. By prompting students to declare pronouns, Ms. LaVoi directly introduced gender ideology into the classroom and created an environment where such "social transition" is solicited and affirmed.

Whether labeled “optional” or not, a public, sequential identity-disclosure exercise in front of peers exerts inherent social pressure and results in **compelled speech** forced disclosure. “Optional” disclaimers do not cure coercion in a captive audience.

Let’s be clear: The issue is not what Ms. LaVoi called the activity; it is what the activity did. In a compulsory setting, students reasonably experience pressure to conform and to speak. That coercive effect persists **regardless** of any claim that participation was “optional.”

The district must prevent compelled or coerced disclosures and protect students who decline to participate, without inquiry or penalty.

Now that this line has been crossed and federal law violated, the district is fully exposed legally, financially, and criminally. EO 14190 makes clear that when such practices are extended to students, educators using preferred pronouns or names inconsistent with biological sex:

- Can be criminally prosecuted for **sexual exploitation of a minor**.
- Can be criminally prosecuted **practicing medicine without a license**.

Additionally, schools found in violation could have their **federal funding revoked** because it constitutes facilitating the social transition of a minor.

Before I go further, I want to make it **abundantly clear** that despite the labels and slurs that “the woke” like to sling at people like me, I can tell you with certainty that many in the gay community are not asking for this circus. As I told you and Jason at our sit-down meeting last year, friends of mine who are openly gay want nothing to do with pronoun politics. They simply want to live their lives without being dragged into a manufactured agenda that misuses their identity as political cover. They see this ridiculous push for pronoun usage not as inclusion, but as **coercion**. And they resent being used in an ideological crusade that has nothing to do with their rights and they want to be left alone.

Dragging them into this sick and twisted obsession insults their dignity and cheapens the real struggles they’ve faced. Many of them feel that it’s grooming. Because yes, that’s what it is...**grooming children**. So you need to stop hiding behind the gay community to justify this indoctrination.

**Back to the risks you face.** This isn’t speculation—enforcement is already happening. Virginia districts have been designated “high-risk” for tolerating pronoun policies and they’re now being forced to front their budgets without federal support. That is a direct, costly, and dangerous consequence of the same behavior now occurring in the St. Louis Park district.

This isn’t an isolated misstep by one teacher, it’s a **failure of district leadership**. Either you’re knowingly allowing staff to run pronoun exercises in defiance of EO 14190 or you’re so ignorant of the law that you don’t understand the **catastrophic ramifications**. Neither excuse is acceptable.

### **Additional Pronoun Usage in School Environment**

While none of the behaviors in the following list crosses the line of EO 14190 specifically, they unmistakably plant pronoun ideology into official school communications and environments and are a countdown clock to this district losing federal funding.



### **Email signatures**

Every pronoun in a teacher's signature normalizes pronoun usage in the school environment, creating a direct runway to the very conduct EO 14190 prohibits: applying alternate pronouns or names to students.

See Exhibit A. This is just one example.

Now that this line is crossed, the district will be fully exposed to federal enforcement, loss of funding, and legal liability. Allowing it now is reckless, and the responsibility sits squarely with district leadership.

### **Signs outside of classroom doors**

It's impossible to miss: the vast majority of teachers at St. Louis Park Middle School have pronoun signage outside their classrooms. This is not "individual expression," it's a district-wide endorsement of gender ideology. When it's on classroom doors, it's not private speech, it's *official school property being used for political messaging*.

See Exhibit B. This is just one example.

It normalizes pronoun practices across the entire building, creating an atmosphere that pressures students to comply and plants the expectation that staff will adopt and affirm alternate pronouns for children.

This is exactly the environment EO 14190 was written to stop. The moment a staff member applies this ideology to a student, the district is in direct violation, facing criminal exposure for staff, and the loss of federal funding for the system as a whole. By tolerating and encouraging this display, the district has crossed the line from neutrality into unlawful indoctrination and inviting federal enforcement.

### **Accessory pins**

Ms. LaVoi was also wearing a pronoun pin. I'm going to assume she's not the only staff member wearing these ridiculous embellishments. It's not harmless jewelry, it's a political statement broadcast from the front of the classroom, sanctioned by the district through silence and tolerance.

It's not an accessory, it's the district daring federal law to come knocking and it's no different than plastering ideology on the classroom wall: it's district-sanctioned ideological propaganda and sends the same coercive message to children that pronoun politics are expected and normal. By allowing staff to turn their bodies into billboards for gender ideology, the district is actively

cultivating the environment that EO 14190 prohibits. The moment a teacher extends this to a student, the district will be in direct violation, facing federal enforcement, loss of funding, and staff exposure to criminal liability.

Students don't need identity branding shoved down their throats and these multiple avenues of inappropriate and unprofessional injection of ideology have no place in taxpayer-funded education.

Every pronoun a teacher pushes is not self-expression, it's this district gambling that it's untouchable and it's putting students' education, taxpayers' money, and staff employment at risk.

Federal law doesn't stop at the schoolhouse door and **you don't get to write your own rulebook**. The federal government has made it clear: permitting pronoun usage in classrooms isn't a harmless gesture. This is happening on your watch and you've either endorsed it or turned a blind eye. In both cases, responsibility rests squarely on your shoulders.

It must end immediately and I demand the following without delay:

1. A district-wide prohibition on staff inserting personal pronouns in the classroom or any official communication.
2. Issue updated guidance reinforcing that all communication must remain strictly academic and professional.
3. Acknowledge the risks outlined above and provide parents with assurance that the district will not expose itself—or its families—to financial or legal jeopardy.

This is your opportunity to act responsibly and proactively. Failure to do so will signal willful disregard for both professional standards and federal law.

Sincerely,



Jill Grunewald | 612.840.2034

**Included below:**

- 1) Counsel Statement Regarding Non-Discrimination
- 2) Exhibit A
- 3) Exhibit B

## **Non-Discrimination and Non-Retaliation**

The student must receive full and equal access to all classes, activities, honors, field trips, athletics, and other benefits of school participation regardless of the Parent's directives.

The school and its agents shall not:

- Penalize, stigmatize, isolate, or otherwise treat the student differently due to the Parent's directives;
- Condition participation or privileges on the waiver of these directives; or
- Engage in direct or indirect retaliation (including adverse notations in records).

**Compliance Standard.** Compliance must align with EO 14190, which prohibits school staff from facilitating the social transition of minors, and with applicable federal civil-rights obligations. Nothing in these directives authorizes discrimination against the student or any other person.

**Privacy and Limited Distribution.** Parent reserves the right to privacy and to be free from retaliation in any form—including at athletic events—arising from these directives or related correspondence. These directives are not for gossip, circulation, or “hallway chatter.” District staff and agents shall not disclose, circulate, or reference Parent directives except to those with a strict need to know for implementation. Any breach of this obligation will be considered a violation of Parent rights and pursued accordingly.

## **Implementation Requirements**

- **Point of contact:** Designate a single administrative point of contact for compliance questions and provide the Parent that contact in writing.
- **Staff guidance:** Train relevant staff to follow these directives in routine operations (e.g., classroom activities, signage, email signatures, pins/accessories, assignments, discussions).
- **Escalation:** If any staff member believes a requested action would violate law or binding policy, do not proceed without written administrative review and written notice to the Parent identifying the specific law/policy at issue.

## **Reservation of Rights**

These directives remain in effect unless and until revoked or modified in writing by the Parent. The Parent expressly reserves all rights and remedies, including administrative review, grievance procedures, and judicial relief for noncompliance.

## **EXHIBIT A**

Denise Victora de Meireles (she/her)  
7th and 8th Grade Math Teacher  
St. Louis Park Middle School

## EXHIBIT B

