



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: ARNIE C. "HONEST-ABE" DIENOFF-STATE PUBLIC ADVOCAT		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: arniedienoff@yahoo.com	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 11:57 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

I am in Support of this Bill on its surface to protect Organizations and Religious Organizations on a College or University Campus.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025	
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: BYRON KEELIN		PHONE NUMBER: 314-402-0655	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: FREEDOM PRINCIPLE MO		TITLE: PRESIDENT	
ADDRESS: PO BOX 2			
CITY: BALLWIN		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63022
EMAIL: freedomprinciplemo@protonmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 7:19 AM	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

The Freedom Principle MO backs this bill. Over the past year, we have seen the intolerance of college campuses towards students of the Jewish, and Catholic religions and students with conservative values. These students of faith, particularly the Jewish students, were harassed by pro-Hamas sympathizers. They were threatened, even physically attacked and the administrations condoned this violence, and in some universities lent safe harbor to these protestors. Catholic students were denied the ability to set informational tables promoting their pro-life message—conservatives at the St. Louis University Campus were denied the ability to form a Young America Foundation (YAF) Chapter because the radical student president at SLU deemed the YAF a hate group. While this bill only pertains to public universities, how many other YAF or conservative organizations are being denied the ability to set up informational tables or conduct recruitment events on campus because these radicalized student associations are supported by their administration? This bill would protect conservative organizations by prohibiting the administration and/or student association organizations from denying them the ability to organize and it allows these organizations to seek legal remedies to fight this discrimination.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025	
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: CURTIS LEE COLE		PHONE NUMBER: 417-353-8367	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: CHI ALPHA CAMPUS MINISTRIES USA		TITLE: CAMPUS ACCESS SPECIALIST	
ADDRESS: 1445 N. BOONVILLE			
CITY: SPRINGFIELD		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65802
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 12:00 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: CYNTHIA L. JONES		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: singingblonde@hotmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/30/2025 5:56 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

I support this bill as it will help eliminate viewpoint discrimination in public institutions of higher education.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025	
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: DARLENE BROOMAN		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: darbrooman@yahoo.com		ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/30/2025 3:25 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025	
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: GREGORY JAO		PHONE NUMBER: 917-572-1779	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: INTERVARSITY CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP/USA		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: 203 SOUTH KENILWORTH AVENUE			
CITY: ELMHURST		STATE: IL	ZIP: 60126
EMAIL: greg.jao@intervarsity.org	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/28/2025 12:33 PM	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Chairman Christ and members of the committee, InterVarsity Christian Fellowship/USA supports over 1000 student-led chapters on over 750 campuses across the country. In Missouri, we sponsor 31 student- and faculty-led chapters on 16 campuses. InterVarsity welcomes all students to participate in our activities and to join our groups as members. All that we ask is that the leaders of our diverse groups—fifty-four percent of whom are students of color or international students—embrace our faith in Jesus Christ. Unfortunately, increasing numbers of universities are interpreting otherwise good non-discrimination policies in ways which prohibit religious groups from using religious criteria in leadership selection (e.g., prohibiting Christian student groups from requiring their leaders to be Christian or banning Muslim student groups because they require their leaders to be Muslim.) Missouri students should be protected from this kind of behavior. Therefore, we support SB 160 (the “Bill”) because religious student organization need protection from this kind of administrative overreach by universities and colleges. Recently, three of our chapters which serve the University of Iowa faced derecognition because they require their leaders to be Christians. InterVarsity was not the only religious group that was targeted. In July 2018, when the University of Iowa officially deregistered InterVarsity, it also deregistered other student groups, including the Sikh Awareness Club, the Chinese Student Christian Fellowship, the Imam Mahdi Organization, Geneva Campus Ministry, and the Latter-day Saint Student Association. And on February 1, 2019, the university admitted in federal court that it has placed 32 religious groups—and only religious groups—on a type of probationary status pending the resolution of ongoing litigation. To be clear, InterVarsity supports good non-discrimination policies and believes that they should be used to protect against invidious discrimination. But those otherwise good policies are being misinterpreted in ways which selectively prohibit religious groups from using religious criteria in leadership selection. It makes no sense to prohibit Christian student groups from requiring their leaders to be Christian or ban Muslim student groups because they require their leaders to be Muslim. Non-discrimination requirements should protect rather than penalize religious groups that want to retain their distinct religious character. Unfortunately, this problem is not limited to our InterVarsity chapter at the University of Iowa. InterVarsity recently faced similar problems nationwide, including at Michigan’s Wayne State University (where we have filed a similar lawsuit after the university abruptly derecognized a 75-year old chapter), University of New Mexico, University of Montana, University of Maryland-Baltimore County, Harrisburg Area Community College, and Northern Colorado University. InterVarsity values a tolerant, inclusive, welcoming campus environment; therefore, our groups welcome all students to be active participants and members. In fact, nearly 26% of InterVarsity’s active participants do not identify as Christians. It’s partially for this reason that religious student groups require clear religious-based criteria for leadership. 1. Religious-based leadership criteria help religious student groups remain faithful to their original religious tradition,

purpose, and goals even as large numbers of non-adherents participate in the group. 2. Every religious tradition lays down specific requirements for their religious leaders. The Bill protects the right of students to select their religious leaders in a manner that is consistent with their faith, which reflects the best First Amendment jurisprudence and the highest aspirations of a tolerant and diverse campus environment.3. Religious leadership requirements describe the necessary skills and conditions for student religious leaders to accomplish their religious leadership responsibilities. They insure that religious meetings—bible studies, prayer meetings, mentoring new converts, worship times—are led by people who embrace that religion. These leadership requirements are akin to the skill requirements commonplace in intercollegiate athletics or in music and drama clubs. Some with political motives will mischaracterize this bill as a “right to discriminate” bill. We disagree. This bill ensures that university non-discrimination policies achieve their purpose of creating a robust diversity of viewpoints and student groups, including religious student groups.1. Religious student groups make their most distinct and valuable contribution to campus life when they remain true to their religious purposes. This requires leadership that embraces and embodies specific religious purposes. Religious student groups should be permitted to create leadership teams who can lead worship, prayer, and scripture study with integrity.2. The bill protects students from state-sponsored overreach. The state of Missouri should not entangle itself in the internal organization of religious groups, and state-sponsored actors like public university administrators should not be permitted to determine how religious groups interpret and apply their religious teachings (including how they select their religious leaders). True separation of church and state means that Missouri should not pick pastors, rabbis, imams or other religious leaders – or the spiritual leaders of religious student clubs.3. Universities that value inclusion should welcome religious communities that authentically represent their religious traditions. They should use non-discrimination policies to encourage, not inhibit, these groups.4. The Bill requires universities to apply their non-discrimination policies equitably, giving religious groups (which require leaders to hold conforming religious beliefs) the same deference they offer to fraternities and sororities (which make membership decisions along gender lines), intercollegiate athletics or performing arts groups (which make membership decisions based, in part, on gender and able-bodied status), and non-religious advocacy groups (which can limit leadership to members who reflect the group’s creed or mission.) 5. To the extent that Missouri universities and colleges already act in accordance with this bill, it affirms their current practice, imposes no financial cost, and creates no new administrative burden. Without the protections of the Bill, students in Missouri will find it increasingly difficult to find a safe, authentic, and welcoming religious community on campus. This will hurt all students. I urge you and your committee to approve the Bill and send it to the full House for a vote. Also, I respectfully request that this letter be included in the record for this Committee’s hearing on SB 160. Gregory L. Jao Senior Assistant to the President InterVarsity Christian Fellowship/USA



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025	
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: JAMIE MORRIS		PHONE NUMBER: 573-635-7239	
REPRESENTING: MISSOURI CATHOLIC CONFERENCE		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: 600 CLARK AVE.			
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65102
EMAIL: morrisj@mocatholic.org	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 2:23 PM	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

The Missouri Catholic Conference supports SB 160, a bill intended to provide open access to campus facilities for religious student groups. America is a pluralistic society where people of various faith traditions live alongside one another in a state of respectful harmony. In such a pluralistic society, there should be space for on-campus religious groups to operate freely and in accord with their faith tradition, be that Christian, Jewish, Muslim, Buddhist, or atheist. This is especially so in the university setting, where the free exchange of ideas is encouraged as a means of seeking the truth. In recent years, religious groups have been denied access to on-campus facilities and means of communication on some college and university campuses because they ask their membership, and in particular those in leadership, to adhere to a religious system of belief or manner of behavior. From the perspective of the religious groups, the denial of access to campus facilities is unjust and represents discrimination based upon their sincerely held religious beliefs. On the typical American university or college campus, certain political, social, and moral views will be less popular, but they shouldn't be excluded altogether because they may be in the minority. It isn't deemed unjust discrimination for a women's acapella singing group or sorority to limit its membership to women. It shouldn't be deemed unjust discrimination for a Muslim or Christian campus group to ask those seeking a leadership position to sign a statement of faith or belief. Preserving the distinct denominational and religious character of campus religious groups by permitting them to operate in accord with their faith tradition increases the diversity of the university community; it does not diminish it. On-campus religious groups provide benefits to the university community in their acts of charity and service to the wider community, as well as by providing a safe space for students seeking a place to worship and practice their faith. A pluralistic society like ours should permit on-campus religious groups space to operate freely, space which acknowledges these aspects: (1) respect for freedom of conscience as a prime expression of human dignity; (2) toleration for religion and religious teachings, especially when they are seen as countercultural; (3) civility; (4) a respect for the truth and a common desire to search for objective truth concerning the dignity of the human person and the common good of society; and, (5) a respect for healthy pluralism. SB 160 would provide on-campus religious groups the space to operate consistent with their faith tradition and beliefs. The MCC urges this committee to support SB 160.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: JANET HENNESSEY		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: yodabird1@hotmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/30/2025 9:20 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025	
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: LANCE KINZER		PHONE NUMBER: 202-682-1201	
REPRESENTING: 1ST AMENDMENT PARTNERSHIP		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: 1730 M STREET			
CITY: WASHINGTON		STATE: DC	ZIP: 20036
EMAIL: lkinzer@1stamendmentpartnership.org	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DATE: 3/28/2025 9:57 AM	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

March 28, 2025 Hon. Brad Christ , Chair House Emerging Issues Committee Missouri House of Representatives
 SUBJECT: SB 160 Dear Chairman Christ & Members of the Committee: My name is Lance Kinzer, and I am the Policy Director for 1st Amendment Partnership where we are privileged to work with some of the nation’s largest faith communities with respect to their common commitment to First Amendment freedoms. Across the country, public universities have attempted to prohibit student organizations from requiring that students who wish to lead a student club actually share that club’s beliefs. Universities have almost exclusively enforced such limitations against belief-based groups, but not against other groups with selective leadership criteria, like sororities and fraternities. Unfortunately, as happened in nearby Iowa before they passed a protective statute, this often results in divisive and expensive litigation between students and their own universities. Indeed, in Iowa the taxpayers ended up bearing the cost of an almost \$2 million dollar judgement due to discrimination against faith-based groups by the University of Iowa. In that instance the United States Court of Appeal for the Eighth Circuit (the Circuit Court in which Missouri is located) ruled in favor of the student organizations because: “Employees of the University of Iowa targeted religious student organizations...” and because “There is no dispute that the University of Iowa created a limited public forum by granting RSOs official recognition and access to a variety of benefits. See *BLinC II*, 991 F.3d at 981. And when a university does, it may restrict access to that limited public forum so long as the “access barrier [is] reasonable and viewpoint neutral.” *Martinez*, 561 U.S. at 679. “If a state university creates a limited public forum for speech, it may not ‘discriminate against speech on the basis of its viewpoint.’” *Gerlich*, 861 F.3d at 704–05.” *InterVarsity Christian Fellowship/USA v. University of Iowa*, No. 19-3389 (8th Cir. 2021) Even when student groups win in court, much of the harm to the educational experience of the impacted students is already done. No judicial remedy can adequately address the harms that universities inflict when they target student organizations, and thus their members, based upon their religious beliefs. SB 160 is designed to prevent such litigation by providing a clear legal standard that simply preserves the right of belief-based student groups to choose leaders who agree with their purpose and mission. It is commonplace for belief-based organizations to require that their leaders affirm and live consistently with the principles around which the group was formed. For decades, the right of student organizations to do just this was clear as a matter of constitutional law. A long line of United States Supreme Court cases held: that student groups can’t be denied recognition by a public university merely because of their beliefs (*Healy v. James*, 1972) ; that belief-based student groups must be provided access to facilities under the same standards as other groups (*Widmar v. Vincent*, 1981), and; that student activity fee funds cannot be withheld from a group merely because they promote or manifest a particular belief system (*Rosenberger v. University of Virginia*, 1995). As amended on the Senate floor SB 160 makes specific reference to *Healy*, indicating that the provisions

of SB 160 do not extend beyond Healy with respect to protection against viewpoint discrimination. In this regard it is worth noting that under Healy, even abhorrent viewpoints are protected. As the Court noted, “The College, acting here as the instrumentality of the State, may not restrict speech or association simply because it finds the views expressed by any group to be abhorrent.” Only actions/conduct that is unlawful or disruptive to the educational mission of the institution can justify a limit on freedom of speech or association under Healy. In this regard the Court wrote, “The critical line heretofore drawn for determining the permissibility of regulation is the line between mere advocacy and advocacy ‘directed to inciting or producing imminent lawless action ... [and] likely to incite or produce such action’”, or actions that, “‘materially and substantially disrupt the work and discipline or the school’ or substantially interfere with the opportunity of other students to obtain an education.” [See Healy]. The Senate floor amendment to SB 160 should be understood within these narrow confines. The Widmar case is worthy of special mention because it occurred in Missouri. In that case, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled 8-1 in favor of student equal access on the UMKC campus. The Court held that religious student groups at all public universities must be afforded equal access to meeting space, without discrimination against the religious content of their speech. The State’s interest in “strict separation” of church and state was held not to justify the denial of student freedom of speech, association, and free exercise of religion. Unfortunately, in more recent years many universities have attempted to take advantage of an ambiguity in the case law created by another US Supreme Court case, *Christian Legal Society v. Martinez*, (2010). That case dealt with the very uncommon situation where a university adopts a policy that says student groups cannot have any standards whatsoever for who may serve as their leaders. For obvious reasons, such a standard is unworkable and so almost no university has adopted and applied a true “all-comers” policy. But attempts by universities to expand the scope of *Martinez*, have resulted in needless litigation that harms the very students that universities exist to serve. Students at Missouri’s public universities should never be forced to litigate against their own schools in order to exercise basic constitutional rights. Fortunately, the *Martinez* case itself was clear that universities and state legislatures are free to adopt policies that safeguard the right of belief-based student organizations to choose leaders who agree with the group’s mission and beliefs. Twenty states (including Utah in 2025) have already passed laws that provide this kind of protection to students attending public colleges and universities. These include Missouri’s neighbors in Iowa, Kansas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Tennessee and Kentucky. Increasingly, support for such legislation has been bi-partisan. Indeed, last year similar legislation passed in New Hampshire with unanimous support in the State Senate, and with significant bi-partisan support in the House. In 2022 in Indiana similar protective legislation passed with unanimous support in both legislative chambers. Moreover, Louisiana Governor John Bell Edwards (D), signed such protections into law in 2018. The kind of protection offered to belief-based student organizations by SB 160 is commonplace in analogous provisions of both federal and state law. The basic reasoning of the U.S. Supreme Court in the *Widmar* case referenced above was statutorily codified for public secondary schools in 1984 when Congress adopted the Equal Access Act, 20 U.S.C. 4071, which protects the right of public high school students to develop associations based on shared values and core convictions. The U.S. Supreme Court upheld the Equal Access Act in a 9-0 decision in *Westside Community Schools v. Mergens*, (1990). In that opinion, the Court was clear that in granting equal access for student associations to use school facilities, the state does not establish religion (nor endorse any viewpoint an organization may hold) – it merely upholds freedom. SB 160 extends this basic idea, codified for public secondary schools for the last 41 years under the Equal Access Act, to public university campuses in Missouri. In another analogous context, federal and state nondiscrimination law both typically recognize the right of religious organizations to choose leaders on the basis of their religious beliefs. At the federal level, by way of example, Title VII explicitly provides that religious associations may use religious criteria in hiring decisions. In three separate provisions, it exempts religious associations from its general provisions on religious discrimination: 1) 42 U.S.C. 2000e-1(a) (Act does not apply to a religious association with respect to employment of an individual to perform work connected with carrying on the associations’ activities); 2) 42 U.S.C. 2000e-2(e)2) (Act does not apply to a religious educational institution with respect the employment of employees that share that institutions religious convictions, where the institution is directed toward the propagation of a particular religion); 3) 42 U.S.C. 2000e-2(e) (1) (Any employer may hire on the basis of religion where religion is a bona fide occupational qualification). These accommodations were upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Corporation of Presiding Bishop v. Amos* (1987). Moreover, in *Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church and School v. EEOC* (2012), the Court unanimously rejected the argument that federal nondiscrimination laws could be used to trump religious association leadership decisions. As Justice Alito and Justice Kagan stressed, while nondiscrimination laws are “undoubtedly important”, “religious groups are the archetype of associations formed for expressive purposes, and their fundamental rights surely include the freedom to choose who is qualified to serve as a voice for their faith.” This same basic point was more recently affirmed by the Court in *Our Lady of Guadalupe School v. Morrissey-Berru* (2020). SB 160,

merely seeks to codify these same kind of common sense accommodations for belief based student organizations at public colleges and universities. Such institutions should welcome diverse student groups as part of vibrant campus life. In 2023 this same premise was reiterated by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *Fellowship of Christian Athletes v. San Jose Unified School District*. In that case the Court noted that its reasoning in favor of a high school student club would apply equally to a college student association and that, “Anti-discrimination laws and policies serve undeniably admirable goals, but when those goals collide with the protections of the Constitution, they must yield—no matter how well-intentioned. *303 Creative LLC v. Elenis*, 143 S. Ct. 2298, 2315 (2023) (“When a state public accommodations law and the Constitution collide, there can be no question which must prevail.” (citing U.S. CONST., Art. VI, cl. 2)). Even if the views held by FCA may be considered to be out-of-date by many, the First Amendment “counsel[s] mutual respect and tolerance . . . for religious and non-religious views alike.” Kennedy, 142 S. Ct. at 2416.” By creating a clear standard, SB 160 promotes the important goal of pluralism, avoids needless litigation, and makes it certain that university administrators cannot decide who is entitled to recognition as a student organization based upon which beliefs those administrators favor or disfavor. Respectfully, Lance Y. Kinzer
Director of Policy & Government Relations
1st Amendment Partnership



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025	
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: MARILOU CAWOOD		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: mlcawood10@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written		SUBMIT DATE: 3/30/2025 4:26 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

I support SB 160 to ensure that ALL (without exceptions) student associations & organizations are afforded equal rights & privileges. I would also support the inclusion in the bill that violations would result in the loss of state privileges &/or funds.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025	
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: MATT SHARP		PHONE NUMBER: 770-339-0774	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: ALLIANCE DEFENDING FREEDOM		TITLE: SENIOR COUNSEL	
ADDRESS: 1000 HURRICANE SHOALS ROAD NE, SUITE D-1100			
CITY: LAWRENCEVILLE		STATE: GA	ZIP: 30043
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 12:00 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: PEGGY BANKS		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: pspbanks2@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/30/2025 1:53 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

I fully support this bill as I have grandkids moving into higher education soon and do NOT want them exposed to any adverse actions from those institutions because of their personal beliefs.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025	
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: SANDRA L ENO		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: lynneno@swbell.net		ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 11:13 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025	
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: SHEILA KEATING		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: sheilak1986@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written		SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 10:56 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

Three first Amendment of the US Constitution already makes it clear that we are to have freedom of religion, to assemble. There should be no discrimination at public places, allowing some groups, but not others based on their religious beliefs.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025	
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: STEVEN MCFARLAND		PHONE NUMBER: 703-894-1041	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: CHRISTIAN LEGAL SOCIETY		TITLE: DIRECTOR	
ADDRESS: 8001 BRADDOCK RD., SUITE 302			
CITY: SPRINGFIELD		STATE: VA	ZIP: 22151
EMAIL: smcfarland@clsnet.org	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/28/2025 8:23 AM	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Christian Legal Society (CLS) supports SB 160, which will provide much needed protection for the ability of religious students to meet on college/university campuses. By passing SB 160, the Missouri Legislature will conserve taxpayer dollars by preventing costly litigation that has resulted in other states when public universities adopted policies to exclude religious student groups because the groups require their leaders to share their core religious beliefs. This problem has arisen on many college campuses nationwide and, in 2016, at a public university in Missouri. I respectfully request that this letter be included in the record for the hearing on SB 106 before the House Committee on Emerging Issues Monday, March 31. As this letter will explain:

- SB 160 is a commonsense measure to protect religious students who wish to meet on Missouri college campuses.
- SB 160 allows Missouri public universities to maintain whatever policies they choose so long as their policies permit religious student organizations to choose their leaders according to their religious beliefs.
- SB 160 conserves scarce tax dollars by preventing costly litigation against colleges that adopt policies that exclude religious groups.
- SB 160 would add Missouri to the expanding list of states – Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Montana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Virginia – that have enacted similar protections for religious or belief-based student groups.

I. For Four Decades, Christian Legal Society Has Defended Religious Student Organizations’ Access to College Campuses. CLS is a national association of Christian attorneys, law students, and law professors. CLS has attorney chapters located in cities throughout the U.S., including St. Louis and Kansas City. CLS has student chapters at law schools nationwide, including at the University of Missouri - Kansas City, University of Missouri - Columbia, and Washington University. CLS law student chapters typically are small groups of students who meet for weekly prayer, Bible study, and worship at a time and place convenient to the students. All students are welcome at CLS meetings. As Christian churches have done for nearly two millennia, CLS requires its leaders to agree with a statement of faith, signifying agreement with the traditional Christian beliefs that define CLS. CLS has long believed that pluralism, essential to a free society, prospers only when the First Amendment rights of all Americans are protected regardless of the current popularity of their speech or religious beliefs. For that reason, CLS was instrumental in the passage of the federal Equal Access Act of 1984, 20 U.S.C. §§ 4071 et seq., that protects the right of all students, including religious student groups and LGBT student groups, to meet for “religious, political, philosophical or other” speech on public secondary school campuses. Christian Legal Society’s religious freedom advocacy arm, the Center for Law & Religious Freedom, has worked for over forty years to secure equal access for religious student groups in the public education context, including higher education. Its staff has testified twice before the Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice of the Judiciary Committee of the United States House of Representatives on the issue of protecting religious student

organizations on college campuses. II. Religious Student Associations Need the Protection that SB 160 Will Provide. SB 160 is a commonsense measure intended to protect belief-based student organizations, including religious student associations, on college campuses by prohibiting public college administrators from taking any adverse action against such a student association that requires its leaders or members to:

- adhere to the association's sincerely held beliefs;
- comply with the association's sincere practice requirements;
- comply with the association's sincere standards of conduct; or
- be committed to furthering the association's religious mission.

Of course, it is common sense – and basic religious freedom – for a religious association to expect its leaders to agree with the association's religious beliefs, practices, standards of conduct, and mission. It should be common ground that government officials, including college administrators, should not interfere with religious associations' religious beliefs, practices, standards of conduct, or mission. Unfortunately, this is a recurrent problem on many college campuses across the country. SB 160 would prevent such problems from recurring in Missouri by protecting Missouri students' basic religious freedom. In so doing, Missouri would join a growing list of states that have adopted similar protections for religious student associations.

A. In its landmark decision in *Widmar v. Vincent*, the U.S. Supreme Court held that the University of Missouri - Kansas City could not condition campus access on religious groups' promise not to engage in religious speech. In the late 1970s, some university administrators began to claim that the Establishment Clause would be violated if religious student groups were allowed to meet in empty classrooms to discuss their religious beliefs on the same basis as other student groups were allowed to meet to discuss their political, social, or philosophical beliefs. The administrators claimed that merely providing heat and light in these unused classrooms gave impermissible financial support to the students' religious beliefs, even though free heat and light were provided to all student groups. The administrators also claimed that college students were "impressionable" and would believe that the university endorsed religious student groups' beliefs, despite the fact that hundreds of student groups with diverse and contradictory ideological beliefs were allowed to meet. In the landmark case of *Widmar v. Vincent*, the Supreme Court rejected these arguments by the University of Missouri - Kansas City. In an 8-1 ruling, the Court held that UMKC violated the religious student associations' speech and association rights by "discriminat[ing] against student groups and speakers based on their desire to use a generally open forum to engage in religious worship and discussion. These are forms of speech and association protected by the First Amendment." In other words, religious student groups have a First Amendment right to meet on public university campuses for religious speech and association. The Court then held that the federal and state establishment clauses were not violated by allowing religious student associations access to public college campuses. The Court ruled that college students understand that simply allowing a student group to meet on campus does not mean that the University endorses or promotes the students' religious speech, teaching, worship, or beliefs. As the Court observed in a subsequent equal access case that protected high school students' religious meetings, "the proposition that schools do not endorse everything they fail to censor is not complicated." The Supreme Court has reaffirmed *Widmar's* reasoning in numerous cases. In each case, the Court ruled that an educational institution did not endorse a religious association's beliefs simply because it provided the religious association with meeting space. Access does not equal endorsement.

B. Discrimination against religious student groups continues. After the Supreme Court made clear that the Establishment Clause could not justify exclusion of religious student groups, some university administrators began to claim that university nondiscrimination policies were violated if the religious student groups required their leaders to agree with their religious beliefs. These administrators began to threaten religious student groups with exclusion from campus if they required their leaders to agree with the groups' religious beliefs. It is common sense and basic religious freedom – not discrimination – for religious groups to expect their leaders to share the groups' religious beliefs. Nondiscrimination policies serve valuable and important purposes. Ironically, one of the most important purposes of a college's nondiscrimination policy is to protect religious students on campus. Something has gone seriously wrong when college administrators use nondiscrimination policies to punish religious student groups for being religious. Exclusion of religious student groups actually undermines the purpose of a nondiscrimination policy and the good it serves. Such misuse of nondiscrimination policies is unnecessary. Nondiscrimination policies and students' religious freedom are eminently compatible, as shown by the many universities with nondiscrimination policies that explicitly recognize the right of religious groups to require that their leaders share the groups' religious beliefs. Unfortunately, some universities have chosen to misuse their nondiscrimination policies to exclude religious student associations from campus. Alternatively, some universities have excluded religious student associations by claiming to have what they call "all-comers" policies, which purport to prohibit all student associations from requiring their leaders to agree with the associations' political, philosophical, religious, or other beliefs. However, a true "all-comers" policy rarely, if ever, actually exists. By way of example, in the 2015-2016 academic year, Indiana University announced that it intended to change its policy. Under the new policy, the university specifically stated that a religious

student group “would not be permitted to forbid someone of a different religion, or someone non-religious, from running for a leadership position within the [religious group].” Only after months of criticism from alumni and political leaders, as well as the threat of litigation, did Indiana University revert to its prior policy of allowing religious student groups to choose their leaders according to their religious beliefs. Also in the 2015-2016 academic year, a religious student organization at Southeast Missouri State University had its recognition revoked by the student government because it refused to insert a newly required nondiscrimination statement into its constitution. The group tried to persuade the student government to allow religious groups to have religious leadership requirements; however, the student government voted against adding language to its bylaws to protect religious groups’ right to have religious leadership requirements. After this vote, additional religious groups communicated to the administration that they would not remove their religious leadership requirements from their constitutions. After several months, the administration sent the religious organizations letters stating that the student government had voted to “abandon their non-discrimination statement and to replace it with the University’s non-discrimination statement.” However, university policies still lack written protection for the right of religious groups to have religious leadership requirements. In 2021, student governments at the University of Idaho and the University of Virginia similarly tried to penalize religious student groups because they required their leaders to agree with their religious beliefs. Because the Idaho and Virginia legislatures had the foresight to pass laws to protect religious student groups on public university campuses, the university administrators expeditiously reversed the student governments’ discriminatory actions against the religious student organizations in both instances. The universities not only avoided needless litigation, but also sent religious students (and their parents) the reassuring message that they were welcome on their campuses. SB 160 would allow Missouri’s public universities and colleges to have whatever policies they wish. SB 160 would only require that whatever policy a college chooses to have must respect religious student groups’ right to choose their leaders according to their religious beliefs. SB 160 thereby would protect Missouri public colleges/universities, and the taxpayers that fund them, from costly litigation. Equally importantly, SB 160 would protect religious students from discrimination on Missouri campuses and secure their basic freedoms of speech and religion. C. SB 160 would avoid the problems that other states have experienced and that some states have addressed through similar legislation.

1. California State University excluded religious student associations with religious leadership requirements from its 23 campuses, including religious groups that had met on its campuses for over forty years. The California State University comprises 23 campuses with 437,000 students. In 2014, Cal State denied recognition to several religious student associations, including Chi Alpha, InterVarsity, and Cru. For example, the student president of a religious student association that had met on the Cal State Northridge campus for forty years received a letter that read: This correspondence is to inform you that effective immediately, your student organization, Rejoyce in Jesus Campus Fellowship, will no longer be recognized by California State University, Northridge. The letter then listed seven basic benefits that the religious student association had lost because it required its student leaders to agree with its religious beliefs, including: (1) free access to a room on campus for its meetings; (2) the ability to recruit new student members through club fairs; and (3) access to a university-issued email account or website. As the letter explained, “[g]roups of students not recognized by the university . . . will be charged the off-campus rate and will not be eligible to receive two free meetings per week in [university] rooms.” As a result, some religious student groups faced paying thousands of dollars for room reservations and insurance coverage that were otherwise free to other student groups. The problem arose because Cal State re-interpreted its nondiscrimination policy to prohibit religious student groups from having religious leadership requirements. But in announcing that religious student groups could not have religious leadership requirements, Cal State explicitly and unfairly allowed fraternities and sororities to continue to engage in sex discrimination in selecting their leaders and members.
2. The Tennessee General Assembly passed legislation similar to SB 160 after Vanderbilt University excluded fourteen Catholic and evangelical Christian organizations from campus, including a Christian group because it required its leaders to have a “personal commitment to Jesus Christ.” In 2011, Vanderbilt University administrators informed the CLS student chapter at Vanderbilt Law School that the mere expectation that its leaders would lead its Bible studies, prayer, and worship was “religious discrimination.” CLS’s requirement that its leaders agree with its core religious beliefs was also deemed to be “religious discrimination.” Vanderbilt told another Christian student group that it could remain a recognized student organization only if it deleted five words from its constitution: that its leaders have a “personal commitment to Jesus Christ.” The students left campus rather than recant their commitment to Jesus Christ. Catholic and evangelical Christian students patiently explained to the Vanderbilt administration that nondiscrimination policies should protect, not exclude, religious organizations from campus. But in April 2012, Vanderbilt denied recognition to fourteen Christian organizations. While religious organizations could not keep their religious leadership requirements, Vanderbilt permitted fraternities and sororities to engage in sex discrimination in selecting leaders and members. After Vanderbilt

adopted its new policy, the University of Tennessee reportedly claimed to have a similar policy. In response, the Tennessee General Assembly enacted T.C.A. § 49-7-156 to protect the right of a religious student association on a public college campus to “require[] that only persons professing the faith of the group and comporting themselves in conformity with it qualify to serve as members or leaders.”³ The Kansas Legislature passed legislation similar to SB 160 to protect religious student associations at Kansas public universities. In 2016, the Kansas Legislature enacted K.S.A. §§ 60-5311 – 60-5313 in order to ensure that Kansas taxpayers’ money would not be spent on unnecessary litigation resulting from its public universities misinterpreting existing policies – or adopting future policies – to exclude religious groups from campus because they had religious leadership requirements. In 2004, the CLS student chapter at Washburn School of Law had allowed an individual student to lead a Bible study. But it became clear that the student did not hold CLS’s traditional Christian beliefs. CLS told the student he was welcome to attend future CLS Bible studies, but that he would not be allowed to lead them. Even though the student admitted that he disagreed with CLS’s religious beliefs, he filed a “religious discrimination” complaint with the Washburn Student Bar Association, which threatened to penalize CLS for its refusal to allow a student who disagreed with its religious beliefs to lead its Bible study. Only after CLS filed a federal lawsuit did the Student Bar Association reverse course.⁴ The Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation similar to SB 160 to protect religious student associations at Oklahoma public universities. In 2011, the University of Oklahoma Student Association sent a memorandum to all registered student organizations that would prohibit religious student associations’ religious leadership and membership criteria. After unwelcome publicity, the university disavowed the student government’s memorandum. In 2014, the Oklahoma Legislature enacted language similar to SB 160. The “Exercise of Religion by Higher Education Students Act,” 70 Okl. St. Ann. § 2119, protects students’ religious expression at Oklahoma universities and colleges. It protects religious student organizations from exclusion from state college campuses because of their religious expression or because they require their leaders to agree with the organizations’ core religious beliefs.⁵ The Idaho Legislature passed legislation similar to SB 160 after Boise State University threatened religious student associations with exclusion. In 2008, the Boise State University student government threatened to exclude several religious organizations from campus, claiming that their religious leadership requirements were discriminatory. The BSU student government informed one religious group that its requirement that its leaders “be in good moral standing, exhibiting a lifestyle that is worthy of a Christian as outlined in the Bible” violated the student government’s policy. The student government also found that the group’s citation in its constitution of Matthew 18:15-17 violated the policy. The student government informed a religious group that “not allowing members to serve as officers due to their religious beliefs” conflicted with BSU’s policy. In response to a threatened lawsuit, BSU agreed to allow religious organizations to maintain religious leadership criteria. In 2012, however, BSU informed the religious organizations that it intended to adopt a new policy, which would exclude religious organizations with religious leadership requirements. In response, the Idaho Legislature enacted Idaho Code § 33-107D to prohibit colleges from “tak[ing] any action or enforc[ing] any policy that would deny a religious student group any benefit available to any other student group based on the religious student group’s requirement that its leaders adhere to its sincerely held religious beliefs or standards of conduct.” In 2021, the University of Idaho College of Law student government delayed recognizing the CLS student organization because of its religious leadership requirements. After CLS’s counsel wrote a letter to the University administration noting the Idaho law, the University administration granted recognition to the CLS students as an official student organization.⁶ The Ohio Legislature passed legislation like SB 160 after The Ohio State University threatened to exclude religious student associations if they required their leaders to share the associations’ religious beliefs. In 2003-2004, the CLS student chapter at the OSU College of Law was threatened with exclusion because of its religious beliefs. After months of trying to reason with OSU administrators, a lawsuit was filed, which was dismissed after OSU revised its policy “to allow student organizations formed to foster or affirm sincerely held religious beliefs to adopt a nondiscrimination statement consistent with those beliefs in lieu of adopting the University’s nondiscrimination policy.” Religious groups then met without problem from 2005-2010. In 2010, however, OSU asked the student government whether it should change its policy to no longer allow religious groups to have religious leadership and membership requirements. The undergraduate and graduate student governments voted to remove protection for religious student groups. In response, in 2011, the Ohio Legislature prohibited public universities from “tak[ing] any action or enforc[ing] any policy that would deny a religious student group any benefit available to any other student group based on the religious student group’s requirement that its leaders or members adhere to its sincerely held religious beliefs or standards of conduct.” Ohio Rev. Code § 3345.023.⁷ The Arizona Legislature passed legislation to protect religious student associations and students’ religious expression. In 2011, Arizona enacted A.R.S. § 15-1863, which protects religious student associations’ choice of their leaders and members. In 2004, Arizona State University College of Law had threatened to deny recognition to a CLS student chapter because it

limited leadership and voting membership to students who shared its religious beliefs. A lawsuit was dismissed when the University agreed to allow religious student groups to have religious leadership and membership requirements.⁸ The Virginia General Assembly, North Carolina General Assembly, Kentucky Legislature, Louisiana State Legislature, and Arkansas General Assembly also have passed legislation to protect religious student associations' religious freedom. To protect religious student organizations that had sometimes been threatened with exclusion from various University of North Carolina campuses, the North Carolina General Assembly enacted N.C.G.S.A. §§ 115D-20.1 & 116-40.12. The law prohibits colleges from denying recognition to a student organization because it "determine[s] that only persons professing the faith or mission of the group, and comporting themselves in conformity with, are qualified to serve as leaders of the organization." N.C.G.S.A. § 116-40.12. The Virginia General Assembly passed a similar law in 2013 (Va. Code Ann. § 23-9.2:12), as did the Kentucky Legislature in 2017 (Ky. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 164.348 (4)), the Louisiana State Legislature in 2018 (LSA-R.S. 17:3399.33), and the Arkansas General Assembly in February 2019 (A.C.A. § 6-60-1006).⁹ The Alabama Legislature, Iowa General Assembly, and North Dakota Legislative Assembly have passed legislation to protect all student associations. In 2019, Iowa enacted legislation to ensure all student organizations receive the same benefits, regardless of their viewpoint or leadership requirements. The law prohibits public institutions of higher education from denying "benefits or privileges available to student organizations based on the viewpoint of a student organization or the expression of the viewpoint of a student organization by the student organization or its members" and from denying "any benefit or privilege to a student organization based on the student organization's requirement that the leaders of the student organization agree to and support the student organization's beliefs . . . and to further the student organization's mission." Iowa Code § 261H.3(3). The Alabama Legislature passed similar legislation in 2020 (Ala. Code 1975 § 16-68-3(a)(8)), as did the North Dakota Legislative Assembly in 2021 (N.D. § 15-10.4-02(h)).¹⁰ The Montana State Legislature, New Hampshire General Court, South Dakota Legislature, and West Virginia Legislature have passed legislation to protect student associations with political, religious, or ideological beliefs. To ensure student associations and are not discriminated against because of their beliefs, the South Dakota Legislature enacted S.D. Ch. § 13-53-52. The law ensures institutions of higher education will not "discriminate against any student or student organization based on the content or viewpoint of their expressive activity" or "prohibit an ideological, political, or religious student organization from requiring that its leaders or members of the organization affirm and adhere to the organization's sincerely held beliefs, comply with the organization's standards of conduct, or further the organization's mission or purpose." S.D. Ch. § 13-53-52. The Montana State Legislature passed a similar law in 2021 (Mont. Code Ann. § 20-25-518). In 2024, the New Hampshire General Court (N.H. Rev. Stat. § 188-J) and the West Virginia Legislature (W.V. Code § 18B-20-5) did the same. D. SB 160 aligns with federal and state nondiscrimination laws that typically protect religious organizations' ability to choose their leadership based on religious belief. No federal or state law, regulation, or court ruling requires a college to adopt a policy that prohibits religious groups from having religious criteria for their leaders and members. To the contrary, federal and state nondiscrimination laws typically protect religious organizations' ability to choose their leaders based on their religious beliefs. The leading example, of course, is the federal Title VII, which explicitly provides that religious associations' use of religious criteria in their employment decisions does not violate the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and its prohibition on religious discrimination in employment. In three separate provisions, Title VII exempts religious associations from its general prohibition on religious discrimination in employment. 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-1(a) (does not apply to religious associations "with respect to the employment of individuals of a particular religion to perform work connected with the carrying on" of the associations' activities); 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(e)(2) (educational institution may "employ employees of a particular religion" if it is controlled by a religious association or if its curriculum "is directed toward the propagation of a particular religion"); 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(e)(1) (any employer may hire based on religion "in those certain instances where religion . . . is a bona fide occupational qualification reasonably necessary to the normal operation of that particular business or enterprise."). In 1987, the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of Title VII's exemption against an Establishment Clause challenge. Concurring in the opinion with Justice Marshall, Justice Brennan insisted that "religious organizations have an interest in autonomy in ordering their internal affairs, so that they may be free to . . . select their own leaders, define their own doctrines, resolve their own disputes, and run their own institutions." In 2012, in *Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church and Sch. v. EEOC*, the Supreme Court unanimously rejected the federal government's argument that federal nondiscrimination laws could be used to trump religious associations' leadership decisions. The Court acknowledged that nondiscrimination laws are "undoubtedly important. But so too is the interest of religious groups in choosing who will preach their beliefs, teach their faith, and carry out their mission." In their concurrence, Justice Alito and Justice Kagan stressed that "[r]eligious groups are the archetype of associations formed for expressive purposes, and their fundamental rights surely

include the freedom to choose who is qualified to serve as a voice for their faith.”E. SB 160 will conserve taxpayers’ dollars by preempting costly lawsuits.SB 160 would help Missouri’s colleges avoid costly litigation for which the taxpayers and students foot the bill. SB 160 would protect colleges from adopting policies that are highly problematic. Such policies expose colleges – and state taxpayers – to costly lawsuits. As seen in Section C, sometimes the impetus for policies that harm religious groups comes from student government rather than university administrators. SB 160 would provide administrators with a substantive reason for resisting student government’s potential harassment of, and discrimination against, religious student associations. Judge Kenneth Ripple of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit has explained why misinterpretation of nondiscrimination policies places a particular burden on religious groups:For many groups, the intrusive burden established by this requirement can be assuaged partially by defining the group or membership to include those who, although they do not share the dominant, immutable characteristic, otherwise sympathize with the group’s views. Most groups dedicated to forwarding the rights of a “protected” group are able to couch their membership requirements in terms of shared beliefs, as opposed to shared status.Religious students, however, do not have this luxury—their shared beliefs coincide with their shared status. They cannot otherwise define themselves and not run afoul of the nondiscrimination policy.... The Catholic Newman Center cannot restrict its leadership—those who organize and lead weekly worship services—to members in good standing of the Catholic Church without violating the policy. Groups whose main purpose is to engage in the exercise of religious freedoms do not possess the same means of accommodating the heavy hand of the State.The net result of this selective policy is therefore to marginalize in the life of the institution those activities, practices and discourses that are religiously based. While those who espouse other causes may control their membership and come together for mutual support, others, including those exercising one of our most fundamental liberties—the right to free exercise of one’s religion—cannot, at least on equal terms.ConclusionSB 160 is needed to ensure that religious students continue to be welcomed and respected on Missouri campuses. If university students are taught that the government can dictate to religious groups what religious beliefs their leaders may or may not hold, religious freedom will be diminished not just for the religious students on campus, but eventually for all Missourians whose religious freedom will be at risk if their fellow citizens hold such an impoverished understanding of this most basic human right.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: TERESA STONE		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: tomnterri85@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/30/2025 10:50 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

No government funded schools of higher education should discriminate against belief based student groups. Political, ideological and or religious based groups



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025	
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: TIMOTHY FABER		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: tfaber@mobaptist.org		ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 11:58 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

Thank you for allowing me to address you this afternoon. I am here to speak in favor of SB160, more clearly, I am here to speak in favor of religious liberty. The first Amendment to our United States Constitution states that . . . Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances. While it does say Congress, and not the state legislature, I would hope that this Legislature would conduct themselves in keeping with the principles set forth in this great Constitution that has guided our nation and protected our rights for nearly two and a half centuries. With that in mind, the government has no right to prohibit the free exercise of religion. Thus if a religious body determines that certain tents of faith are to be upheld, the government has no right to override that – except in very rare and clearly defined cases set forth by the Lemon Test. Students are not exempt from this free exercise of religion. If a student organization determines to follow the tenets of a particular faith they have the right – as citizens within these United States, to practice that religion and to determine who can be the leaders of that organization according to those religious tenets. Additionally, the first amendment guarantees the right of freedom of speech. If an organization has taken a public position on some topic, that position cannot be denied or restricted or compromised by demanding that certain persons holding different views be allowed to be a part of that organization, and certainly not as leaders. To force any organization to allow leadership which disagrees with their own tents and public positions is to force a message on that organization that violates its own freedom of speech collectively, and of its members individually. The first Amendment also guarantees the right of the people to peaceably assemble. But if any organization is forced to allow members who are in disagreement with it, and to even allow them to serve as leaders, how can that be peaceful? The organization would have internal conflict and the rights of those who originally formed the organization would be trampled upon. Certainly as an organization carries out its purpose over time, it may adjust its own parameters for membership and leadership, and they have the right to do so. But for the government – or any government funded entity – or really for anybody outside of that organization to force such changes is a violation of the people’s right to peacefully assemble. Thus, this bill, SB160, is merely clarifying and codifying what the first amendment to the US Constitution already guarantees because there are apparently some who need to be reminded of it. Now, if any of that sounded familiar, it because it is. An identical bill – HB875 – has already been voted “do pass” by this Committee (10-3) on February 5th of this year, and on February 27th, the full House voted to pass HB875 by a vote of 108-47. So I anticipate that this will also pass. But I would invite those who voted no previously to join the majority on this great cause of freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and right to peacefully assemble.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: AMANDA EHLL		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: savapanda@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/30/2025 10:34 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

I'm asking the committee to oppose SB 160. It would allow higher education student groups with discriminatory membership policies to receive taxpayer funds for their student group.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: CHRISTEN SANTOSCOY		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: Mommyx275@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/30/2025 7:09 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: COLLEEN RICHMOND		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: richmonjr@yahoo.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/30/2025 8:32 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

This bill is discriminatory and I am opposed. Belief-based organizations should not be allowed to discriminate against members seeking leadership positions. Can we please stop taking the state of Missouri back in time???



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: CORY DEWALD		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: corydude1116@yahoo.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 6:03 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025	
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: DAVA-LEIGH BRUSH		PHONE NUMBER: 314-600-6018	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: MISSOURI EQUITY EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP		TITLE: PAL TEAM LEAD	
ADDRESS: PO BOX 1352			
CITY: ST CHARLES		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63302
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 12:00 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: DIANE LYNN KASTEN		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: dianekasten@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 3:08 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

I (and our forefathers) believed in the separation of church and state. For that reason, I OPPOSE this bill.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: DON CROZIER		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: doncrozier@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/30/2025 11:17 AM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

This bill is bad for Missourians. It allows belief-based organizations to discriminate against members seeking leadership positions. This will be harmful if allowed to pass.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: ERIN ROBBINS		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: erob1212@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/29/2025 10:52 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

I respectfully submit this testimony in opposition to SB 160. While the bill is framed as protecting student organizations' rights, it effectively permits publicly funded institutions to recognize and support groups that discriminate based on religion, political beliefs, sexual orientation, or gender identity. This undermines existing non-discrimination policies that are essential to creating inclusive, welcoming environments on Missouri's public college campuses. Allowing student groups to exclude others while still receiving institutional benefits sends a harmful message and compromises the values of equity and access in higher education. I urge lawmakers to reject SB 160.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: HEATHER FLEMING		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: hsteacher.fleming@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/30/2025 9:19 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

So, we're back to allowing discrimination? Why are you all not working to create laws that make the lives of Missourians better? At a time when we are just trying to make enough money to pay our bills and provide for our families, you all are focusing on nonsense that will make the lives of some Missourians harder. We are tired of it.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025	
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: JEFF DEWALD		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: injeffective@gmail.com		ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 5:13 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: JESSICA BURGETT		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: jessicaborrini@hotmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/30/2025 7:09 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

I oppose



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: JILL GATCOMBE		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: jgatcombe@hotmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 11:28 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

I am opposed to this bill as presented as it does not go far enough to protect organizations.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: JOHNDA R BOYCE		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: johndaboyce@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 3:09 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

Please don't allow taxpayer funds to go to student groups that practice discrimination. If the group's policies or bylaws or statement of purpose are discriminatory against any group, they do not deserve our support.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: JULIE LYNN HIGH		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: blufrogme@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 1:16 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

With DEI being dismantled and colleges and/or universities no longer receiving federal funding because of the this, the very same should hold true for student groups on college campuses – student groups with discriminatory membership policies should not be able to receive taxpayer funds either.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: JULIE STEENSON		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: Julie.Steenson@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 6:16 AM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

It is unclear how this Bill is additive to the US and Missouri Constitutions, which already protect religious freedom.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025	
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: KATHERINE KEHOE		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: kit_kat_mew@yahoo.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 9:26 PM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

There's no place for discrimination on college campuses – student groups with discriminatory membership policies should not be able to receive taxpayer funds.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: KATHRYN CHIPPERFIELD		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: kathrynachipperfield@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/30/2025 11:17 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

The bill is outright discrimination !



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025	
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: KATY ERKER-LYNCH		PHONE NUMBER: 314-862-4900	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: PROMO		TITLE: ED	
ADDRESS: #201			
CITY: STL		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63104
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 12:00 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025	
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: KIMBERLY MAXWELL		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: kcm Maxwell7@hotmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written		SUBMIT DATE: 3/30/2025 5:57 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: KIMBERLY WALLIS		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: kimberly.t.wallis@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 12:05 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

I oppose SB 160 - this bill would let student groups who have discriminatory membership rules receive taxpayer funds. Taxpayer funds should go to groups and organizations that are open to everyone and that don't discriminate.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: KORTNIE HUDDLESTON		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: kortniehuddleston@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 10:49 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

I am writing to strongly encourage you to oppose SB160 (Hudson), which proposes an exemption for religious student organizations and other "belief-based" student groups from non-discrimination policies in public higher education institutions. This bill should be rejected due to its potential to legitimize discriminatory practices. Student organizations play a vital role in campus life, contributing to overall student satisfaction and success, as evidenced by research. The implementation of robust non-discrimination policies ensures that all students have equal access to various organizations and the opportunity to explore diverse ideas and identities. To prevent discrimination on campus, promote equality, and foster inclusive practices for student organizations, many public colleges and universities have adopted "accept-all-comers" policies. These policies typically withhold funding, derived from a mandatory student activity fee, and official recognition from student groups that do not welcome all students. Contrary to these policies, SB160 undermines the efforts to prevent discrimination on campus by allowing clubs to engage in discriminatory practices. For instance, a Christian student group could reject a student based on their sexual orientation or single-parent status. This bill may even provide an avenue for a white supremacist group to demand university funding and recognition. It's important to note that this legislation is not compelled by the First Amendment. Any student club can gain recognition and access funds by adhering to the school's nondiscrimination policy. If a club chooses to impose membership and leadership requirements conflicting with the school policy, it will not be silenced or expelled from campus; rather, it will simply not receive official recognition and funding. In fact, the Supreme Court, in *Christian Legal Society v. Martinez*, upheld an "accept-all-comers" policy against claims that it violated the religious freedom of Christian student groups. The Court clarified that these policies do not infringe upon the First Amendment because the denial of benefits is based on the group's conduct, not their views. It is imperative that the Missouri legislature does not endorse divisive legislation that promotes discrimination within the state's public higher education institutions. The power of these institutions to protect students from discrimination should not be undermined, and it is crucial that public tax dollars and student activity fees only support groups that are open to all students. Thank you for considering this significant matter.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: LAURA HORWITZ		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: laura.horwitz@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 11:43 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: LAUREN HERMANN		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: laurenahermann@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/30/2025 11:25 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

I am writing in opposition to SB 160. As someone who works on a college campus and interacts with students weekly, I have a genuine concern that this bill will induce undue harm. Institutions of higher learning have a duty to protect students from discrimination on their campuses. This bill opens the door for groups to widely discriminate against members seeking leadership positions based on a set of beliefs and makes it more difficult for groups to be held accountable for their actions. This is such unnecessary legislation that does nothing to make things better, safer, or less harmful to students on our college campuses.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: LAURIE		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: lvbrickey@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 1:35 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

Government must remain separate from faith based organizations. The lines are getting blurry.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: LINDA HOECHST		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: lchoechst@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/30/2025 8:46 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

I oppose SB160 and urge you to vote NO.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: LINDA JOYCE OPERLE		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: lindyo@sbcglobal.net	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 3:55 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: LISA STRADER		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: lisa.shafter@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 12:15 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

I oppose SB 160: student groups with discriminatory membership policies should not be able to receive taxpayer funds. College campuses should take a stand against discrimination of all kinds.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025	
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: LORI GREEN		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: green.collie@gmail.com		ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 11:25 AM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Student groups on college campuses should not get taxpayer funds if they're going to discriminate!



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: MAGGIE WIGGER		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: mgwigger@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 5:22 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Opposition to SB 160 is necessary because it threatens to codify discrimination under the guise of protecting belief-based organizations. By allowing these organizations to discriminate against individuals seeking leadership positions, this bill undermines fundamental American values of equality, fairness, and inclusion. While recent amendments in the Senate may introduce some minimal guardrails, they are insufficient to prevent abuse. Discrimination based on beliefs, especially when tied to leadership opportunities, promotes division and exclusion, which runs counter to the principles of equal opportunity and justice for all. This bill would set a dangerous precedent, enabling organizations to deny leadership roles to qualified individuals solely based on their personal beliefs or characteristics, rather than their ability to lead. It risks harming marginalized groups who may already face systemic barriers to advancement in society. We must oppose SB 160 because America should not support laws that institutionalize discrimination or allow any organization to exclude its own members on arbitrary grounds. This bill erodes the civil rights protections that ensure all individuals, regardless of their background, have a fair chance at leadership and participation in all aspects of society.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025	
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: MEREDITH SUMENEK		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: meredith.a.sumenek@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written		SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 10:02 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

After careful consideration and multiple readings of the proposed legislation, I cannot in good conscious support this bill as currently written. The bill as currently written affords MORE rights to religious organizations than any other comparable organization in institutes of higher learning thus making the possibility of exploitation under the law very real. All groups should be treated equally under the law and carving out special circumstances for privileged groups is anti democratic and anti American.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: MICHAEL DREYER		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: mdreyer93@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 10:49 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

I am writing to strongly encourage you to oppose SB160 (Hudson), which proposes an exemption for religious student organizations and other "belief-based" student groups from non-discrimination policies in public higher education institutions. This bill should be rejected due to its potential to legitimize discriminatory practices. Student organizations play a vital role in campus life, contributing to overall student satisfaction and success, as evidenced by research. The implementation of robust non-discrimination policies ensures that all students have equal access to various organizations and the opportunity to explore diverse ideas and identities. To prevent discrimination on campus, promote equality, and foster inclusive practices for student organizations, many public colleges and universities have adopted "accept-all-comers" policies. These policies typically withhold funding, derived from a mandatory student activity fee, and official recognition from student groups that do not welcome all students. Contrary to these policies, SB160 undermines the efforts to prevent discrimination on campus by allowing clubs to engage in discriminatory practices. For instance, a Christian student group could reject a student based on their sexual orientation or single-parent status. This bill may even provide an avenue for a white supremacist group to demand university funding and recognition. It's important to note that this legislation is not compelled by the First Amendment. Any student club can gain recognition and access funds by adhering to the school's nondiscrimination policy. If a club chooses to impose membership and leadership requirements conflicting with the school policy, it will not be silenced or expelled from campus; rather, it will simply not receive official recognition and funding. In fact, the Supreme Court, in *Christian Legal Society v. Martinez*, upheld an "accept-all-comers" policy against claims that it violated the religious freedom of Christian student groups. The Court clarified that these policies do not infringe upon the First Amendment because the denial of benefits is based on the group's conduct, not their views. It is imperative that the Missouri legislature does not endorse divisive legislation that promotes discrimination within the state's public higher education institutions. The power of these institutions to protect students from discrimination should not be undermined, and it is crucial that public tax dollars and student activity fees only support groups that are open to all students. Thank you for considering this significant matter.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: NICK GUIDRY		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: nguidry93@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 8:36 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: NICOLE WIETHOP		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: arb.nicole@yahoo.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 7:49 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: RAYMOND L. JAMES		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: raymondjames552@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 12:12 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

In order to receive tax payer money / support a group/ club needs to be open to all. Plenty of private spaces for a club or group that wants to exclude others.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: ROBERTA VAN NEST		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: robbievn@smtcstl.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 1:36 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

It is my opinion that student-run organizations should not be exempt from respecting the rules of the institution it is a part of, including and especially respecting the civil rights of it's own, or prospective, members and leaders. Being faith based shouldn't be a wild card allowing them to discriminate on the basis of race, sex, gender, or ideology.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: RUTH KNITTEL		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: ruthknittel55@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 1:02 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

this legislation will allow belief-based organizations to discriminate against members seeking leadership positions.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: RYUKA JOHNSON		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: ryukakokomi@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 12:05 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025	
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: SAGE CORAM		PHONE NUMBER:	
REPRESENTING: AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OF MISSOURI		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: 906 OLIVE ST., #1130			
CITY: ST. LOUIS		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63101
EMAIL: scoram@aclu-mo.org	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 9:19 PM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: SARAH FELTS		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: sarah.felts@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 7:28 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025	
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: SHAWN D'ABREU		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: mo.xtndw@simplelogin.com		ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 7:45 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

My name is Shawn D'Abreu and though I am a registered lobbyist, I am not representing any organization or individual. I'm only speaking for myself. This legislation is problematic because it makes universities and colleges vulnerable to bad faith actors. In the name of "protecting" free speech and religious liberty, these organizations will file unmerited lawsuits (or threaten to) using intimidation to secure preferences for religious organizations sponsoring or advising student groups. This will inevitably compromise the educational missions of these schools. By opening the door to religiously affiliated student group to receive taxpayer funds through the university or college, this legislature will further damage the non-establishment/no-aid to religion provisions of both the U.S. Constitution and the Missouri Constitution. Running roughshod over the letter and spirit of these constitutional principles endangers every facet of civil liberties and civil rights; especially liberty of conscience, freedom of speech and press, and freedom of assembly. The habit of nominally Christian organizations portraying themselves as victims as a pretext to doing to others as they would not have done to themselves is dangerously hypocritical and disingenuous. It is not "fairness" which is driving these efforts. Religious license is not true religious liberty. It is not the state's role to make every aspect of society "safe, welcoming, and inviting" to certain forms of sectarian Christianity and other affiliated beliefs. Replacing the Holy Spirit and a consistent, loving witness with state power will always lead to disaster for individuals and national ruin for our country. These policy are not in the best interests of students. They are a means to the end of using pretense to cover over their desire to bring higher ed institutions to heel. This bill solves no systemic problems and creates opportunity destroy important constitutional and civil protections in the name of Jesus, despite the fact He said "My kingdom is not of this world." Please reject SB160 and uphold the principles of liberty of conscience and non-establishment of religion. There is no better way to uphold your oath to support U.S. and Missouri Constitutions and to be faith your duties in office.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025	
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: STEVEN SOLOMON		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: stevesol@hey.com	ATTENDANCE: Written		SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 1:10 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

There's no place for discrimination on college campuses – student groups with discriminatory membership policies should not be able to receive taxpayer funds.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: SUSAN GIBSON		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: Onesuegibson@protonmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/27/2025 3:05 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

I have two issues with this bill. It opens universities up to having to host hate groups, and no student's university fees should be used to fund a group which they would not be welcome to join.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: THOMAS RUZICKA		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: ruzblues@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 3:36 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

I am against this legislation!



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025	
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: VICTORIA ANDERSON		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: AMERICAN ATHEISTS		TITLE: STATE POLICY SPECIALIST	
ADDRESS: 225 CRISTIANI STREET			
CITY: CRANFORD		STATE: NJ	ZIP: 07016
EMAIL: vanderson@atheists.org	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 12:33 PM	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Dear Chairperson Christ and Members of the House Emerging Issues Committee: American Atheists, on behalf of its over 1,400 constituents in Missouri, writes in opposition to SB 160, a controversial bill that would undermine the ability of public colleges and universities to protect students from discrimination under the guise of protecting the religious convictions of students. As written, this bill would allow members of student organizations, including publicly funded organizations, to discriminate against their classmates using taxpayer dollars. Rather than protect the First Amendment rights of Missouri students, SB 160 would open the floodgates to state-endorsed discrimination against members of the LGBTQ+ community, racial minorities, and anyone who does not practice the dominant religion on their campus. We strongly urge you to protect Missouri college campuses by rejecting this bill. American Atheists is a national civil rights organization that works to achieve religious equality for all Americans by protecting what Thomas Jefferson called the “wall of separation” between government and religion created by the First Amendment. We strive to create an environment where atheists are accepted as members of our nation’s communities and where bigotry against our community is seen as abhorrent and unacceptable. We promote understanding of atheists through education, outreach, and community-building, and work to end the stigma associated with being an atheist in America. American Atheists believe no young person should be denied educational opportunities due to the religious beliefs of others. The majority of public colleges and universities within the US have rules in place that require student organizations to comply with the institution’s non-discrimination policy, which generally prohibits discrimination based on race, sex, disability, sexual orientation, religion, and other categories. The U.S. Supreme Court has endorsed this practice as constitutional and in alignment with First Amendment principles of freedom of speech and of assembly. These policies are important because they create an open atmosphere on campuses and foster freedom of speech by prohibiting discrimination and allowing every student to participate fully in student organizations. Research shows that participation in student organizations contributes to overall student satisfaction and success. These organizations provide opportunities for peer-to-peer connection, reduce isolation, develop leadership skills, and relieve stress. Because of these benefits, and to foster student engagement, most public colleges and universities strive to offer a variety of student organizations and to encourage students to participate. On the other hand, if student organizations are allowed to discriminate, it limits the ability of disfavored students (whether due to their religion, sex, sexual orientation, disability, or race) from fully participating in campus life. SB 160 would undermine these critical student nondiscrimination protections for public colleges and universities by preventing administrators from enforcing policies to prevent discrimination, thereby allowing student organizations to exclude students, impose dangerous or discriminatory rules on students, or sanction harassment. Based on this language, for example, a “College Christian Club”

could form and exclude Jewish students, Black students, and even Christians with differing beliefs, such as Mormons or Catholics, or those they deem insufficiently pious. They could do so while receiving monies and resources provided by taxpayers and by other students at the institution. By framing this bill as a protection of free speech and framing it in terms of discrimination against organizations (for failing to comply with the rules), the bill masks the fact that it is simply authorizing discrimination against other students. Colleges and universities know their students and their individual cultures better than lawmakers – the state should not apply a one-size-fits-all policy on institutions of higher learning. Instead, colleges and universities and the students that attend them should be free to set appropriate nondiscrimination rules for their campuses. In fact, this bill may conflict with federal and state laws that prohibit discrimination on college campuses, including Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Finally, SB 160 would make Missouri public institutions of higher education less competitive compared to those of other states and private institutions, as students are much less likely to attend institutions where they could face discrimination, harassment, or exclusion. During a time when many Missouri higher education institutions are struggling to attract and retain students, lawmakers should focus on enacting policies that will attract — not repel — new students. Public colleges and universities should be welcoming places for all of Missouri's students – not ones where student groups are given free rein to discriminate against fellow students using taxpayer dollars. Should you have any questions regarding American Atheists' opposition to SB 160, please contact me at vanderson@atheists.org. Sincerely, Victoria Anderson
State Policy Specialist
American Atheists



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 160		DATE: 3/31/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:		
WITNESS NAME: MATT SHARP		PHONE NUMBER: 770-339-0774
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: ALLIANCE DEFENDING FREEDOM		TITLE:
ADDRESS: 1000 HURRICANE SHOALS ROAD NE		
CITY: LAWRENCEVILLE		STATE: GA
		ZIP: 30043
EMAIL: msharp@adflegal.org	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DATE: 3/31/2025 3:22 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		