



August 16, 2021

Rachel Pokrandt
Office of the President
Umpqua Community College
1140 Umpqua College Rd.
Roseburg, Oregon 97470

Sent via U.S. Mail and Electronic Mail (Rachel.Pokrandt@umpqua.edu)

Dear President Pokrandt:

The Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE) is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization dedicated to defending liberty, freedom of speech, due process, academic freedom, legal equality, and freedom of conscience on America's college campuses.

FIRE is concerned by Umpqua Community College's (UCC's) decision to remove a student from the nursing program because of the content of her contribution to a writing assignment, which asked students to imagine a patient with a chronic disease whose caretaker is suddenly absent and to write, from the patient's perspective, what happened and what it meant for the patient. While the depiction of spousal abuse and violence described in the student's assignment may be offensive to some, it does not fall into a category of speech unprotected by the First Amendment, which bars UCC from punishing protected expression.

I. Factual background

The following is our understanding of the pertinent facts. We appreciate that you may have additional information to offer and invite you to share it with us. To these ends, please find enclosed an executed privacy waiver authorizing you to share information about this matter.

In the 2021 winter term, Kaylyn Willis was a student in the Registered Nursing program at UCC. Willis was enrolled in a class titled Chronic 1, taught by instructor Patrick Harris. On February 15, Willis posted in an online discussion forum as part of an ongoing assignment for the course. Each week, students were instructed to use their "critical imagination" to write from the perspective of people suffering from chronic diseases or disorders in response to a given prompt.¹

During the sixth week, the prompt ("Week 6 - Loss and Coping") called for students to reflect on the support systems of individuals suffering from chronic illness and how a person with a

¹ Marjan Coester, *Grievant's Prehearing Statement of Proof* (April 29, 2021) (on file with author).

chronic illness would respond to the sudden and unexpected loss of this support system.² Willis responded to this prompt with an imagined scenario in which an individual living with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS), also known as Lou Gherig's disease, a fatal disease that causes loss of muscle control, shot and killed her husband.

As required by the prompt, Willis put herself in the shoes of this imaginary person to reflect on the deterioration of her mental health caused by her illness and the support resources that would be available to her while incarcerated. Willis' post drew from a publicized case where an individual was found not guilty for murdering his wife and sister-in-law because of ALS-related mental health issues.³ A copy of both the prompt and Willis' response are enclosed.

On February 24, Willis received her grade for the discussion post assignment, a zero for the sixth week prompt, and emailed Harris to discuss it. Harris responded to Willis, writing, "Do you honestly think that your post on a nursing school assignment was appropriate? Joking about killing your husband? I'm really questioning your critical thinking if you think this was an appropriate discussion post."⁴ Harris indicated that he interpreted the post as making light of gun violence, which he viewed as particularly offensive because of the 2015 shooting that occurred on UCC's campus; Willis first enrolled in the nursing program in 2019.⁵

On the evening of February 24, Willis received an email from Director of Nursing April Myler informing her that her discussion post represented "a breach in professional conduct" and that she needed to meet with Myler, Harris, and Assistant Professor Chelsea Gillespie-Towne the next day.⁶

At the February 25 meeting, Willis was informed that she was being removed from the program. Willis was told her post constituted a violation of RN Program Student Procedures Handbook Administrative Procedure 5520, prohibiting "[a]cts which are dishonest, disrespectful, or disruptive," and that the post was found to have violated several policies in the student handbook.⁷ This was Willis' second behavioral strike, the first stemming from an unrelated incident, so Willis was removed from the program as per the terms of the handbook.⁸

On February 26, Willis initiated the UCC Grievance Process in an attempt to appeal her removal from the program.⁹ Her appeal was ultimately denied by the UCC Grievance Panel on

² *Id.*

³ See Catherine Saint Louis, *Doctors worry acquittal in ALS murder case could further stigmatize the disease*, N.Y. TIMES, April 30, 2015, <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/30/health/doctors-worry-acquittal-in-als-murder-case-could-further-stigmatize-the-disease.html>.

⁴ E-mail from Patrick Harris to Kaylyn Willis (Feb. 24, 2021, 12:56 PM) (on file with author).

⁵ See Patrick Harris, transcript of testimony at Kaylyn Willis' grievance hearing, 15:00 (May 3, 2021); Kaylyn Willis, transcript of testimony at Kaylyn Willis' grievance hearing, 00:47 (May 3, 2021).

⁶ E-mail from April Myler, Dir. of Nursing, to Kaylyn Willis (Feb. 24, 2021, 4:43 PM) (on file with author).

⁷ Umpqua Cmty. Coll., Registered Nursing Program Student Procedures Handbook 2020-2022, (on file with author).

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ Letter from Kaylyn Willis to UCC Grievance Panel (Feb. 26, 2021) (on file with author).

May 19.¹⁰ Willis remains expelled from the program and is unable to seek admission to any other Oregon Consortium Nursing Education programs because of her removal.

II. The First Amendment Bars UCC from Punishing Willis for the Speech at Issue

It is well-established that the First Amendment does not make a categorical exception for offensive expression, and equally well-established that it constrains public colleges in penalizing student expression. Willis' depiction of a wife shooting her husband may be offensive to others, but it does not fall into any exception to the First Amendment.

A. The First Amendment Applies to UCC as a Public Community College

It has long been settled law that the First Amendment is binding on public colleges like UCC.¹¹ Accordingly, the decisions and actions of a public community college—including the pursuit of disciplinary sanctions,¹² recognition and funding of student organizations,¹³ interactions with student journalists,¹⁴ conduct of police officers,¹⁵ and maintenance of policies implicating student and faculty expression¹⁶—must be consistent with the First Amendment. UCC's decision to remove Willis from the nursing program falls within this realm of decisions and is unconstitutional in light of First Amendment jurisprudence.

B. The First Amendment's Student Speech Doctrine Limits Sanctions for Subjectively Offensive Speech.

Willis' discussion post may be offensive to some who read it. However, whether speech is protected by the First Amendment is “a legal, not moral, analysis.”¹⁷

The Supreme Court has repeatedly, consistently, and clearly held that expression may not be restricted on the basis that others find it to be offensive. This core First Amendment principle is why the authorities cannot outlaw burning the American flag,¹⁸ punish the wearing of a jacket emblazoned with the words “Fuck the Draft,”¹⁹ penalize cartoons depicting a pastor

¹⁰ Letter from Dr. Debra Thatcher to Kaylyn Willis (May 19, 2021) (on file with author).

¹¹ *Healy v. James*, 408 U.S. 169, 180 (1972) (“[T]he precedents of this Court leave no room for the view that, because of the acknowledged need for order, First Amendment protections should apply with less force on college campuses than in the community at large. Quite to the contrary, ‘the vigilant protection of constitutional freedoms is nowhere more vital than in the community of American schools.’”) (internal citation omitted).

¹² *Papish v. Bd. of Curators of the Univ. of Mo.*, 410 U.S. 667, 667–68 (1973).

¹³ *Bd. of Regents of the Univ. of Wis. Sys. v. Southworth*, 529 U.S. 217, 221 (2000).

¹⁴ *Stanley v. Magrath*, 719 F.2d 279, 282 (8th Cir. 1983); see also *Rosenberger v. Rector & Visitors of the Univ. of Va.*, 515 U.S. 819, 829–30 (1995).

¹⁵ *Glik v. Cunniffe*, 655 F.3d 78, 79 (1st Cir. 2011).

¹⁶ *Dambrot v. Central Mich. Univ.*, 55 F.3d 1177 (6th Cir. 1995).

¹⁷ *Animal Legal Def. Fund v. Reynolds*, 353 F. Supp. 3d 812, 821 (S.D. Iowa 2019).

¹⁸ *Texas v. Johnson*, 491 U.S. 397, 414 (1989) (burning the American flag was protected by the First Amendment, the “bedrock principle underlying” the holding being that government actors “may not prohibit the expression of an idea simply because society finds the idea itself offensive or disagreeable”).

¹⁹ *Cohen v. California*, 403 U.S. 15, 25 (1971).

losing his virginity to his mother in an outhouse,²⁰ or disperse civil rights marchers out of fear that “muttering” and “grumbling” white onlookers might resort to violence.²¹ Speech that depicts violence remains within the realm of First Amendment protection as well.²² In ruling that the First Amendment protects protesters holding insulting signs outside of soldiers’ funerals, the Court reiterated this fundamental principle, remarking that “[a]s a Nation we have chosen . . . to protect even hurtful speech on public issues to ensure that we do not stifle public debate.”²³

This principle applies with particular strength to public institutions, dedicated to open debate and discussion. Take, for example, a student newspaper’s front-page uses of a vulgar headline (“Motherfucker Acquitted”) and a “political cartoon . . . depicting policemen raping the Statue of Liberty and the Goddess of Justice.”²⁴ These words and images—published at the height of the Vietnam War—were no doubt deeply offensive to many at a time of deep polarization and unrest. So, too, were “offensive and sophomoric” skits depicting women and minorities in derogatory stereotypes,²⁵ “racially-charged emails” to a college listserv,²⁶ and student organizations that the public viewed as “shocking and offensive.”²⁷ Yet, “the mere dissemination of ideas—no matter how offensive to good taste—on a state university campus may not be shut off in the name alone of ‘conventions of decency.’”²⁸

Willis’ post is protected under the First Amendment, and the potentially offensive nature of the post does not change this. Willis’ post was a sincere response to the prompt of the assignment, which asked students to use their “critical imagination” to write a fictional story, so it is evident that her intent was not to offend Harris or other readers. However, even if Willis’ intent were to offend, the content of the post would still be protected.

C. UCC’s Reliance on Oyama’s Narrow Professionalism Standard is Misplaced

To avoid application of the default rule that the speech of students enrolled at public institutions is afforded robust protection under the First Amendment, the UCC Grievance Panel principally relied on the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit’s decision in *Oyama v. University of Hawaii*.²⁹ That reliance is misplaced: *Oyama* was the result of a claim lacking “easy categorization” because of the university’s role in offering certification for public employment.³⁰ Even if *Oyama*’s certification standard extends beyond the context of public employment, there are clear distinctions in the circumstances of Willis’ removal that

²⁰ *Hustler Magazine, Inc. v. Falwell*, 485 U.S. 46, 50 (1988).

²¹ *Cox v. Louisiana*, 379 U.S. 536, 557 (1965).

²² *Brown v. Ent. Merchants Ass’n*, 564 U.S. 786, 793 (2011).

²³ *Snyder v. Phelps*, 562 U.S. 443, 448, 461 (2011).

²⁴ *Papish*, 410 U.S. at 667–68.

²⁵ *Iota Xi Chapter of Sigma Chi Fraternity v. George Mason Univ.*, 993 F.2d 386, 388–392 (4th Cir. 1993).

²⁶ *Rodriguez v. Maricopa Cnty. Comm. Coll. Dist.*, 605 F.3d 703, 705 (9th Cir. 2009) (the First Amendment “embraces such a heated exchange of views,” especially when they “concern sensitive topics like race, where the risk of conflict and insult is high”).

²⁷ *Gay Students Org. of Univ. of N.H. v. Bonner*, 509 F.2d 652, 661 (1st Cir. 1974).

²⁸ *Papish*, 410 U.S. at 670.

²⁹ Thatcher, *supra* note 9; *Oyama v. Univ. of Hawaii*, 813 F.3d 850 (9th Cir. 2015) (“*Oyama*”).

³⁰ *Oyama* 813 F.3d at 860.

preclude *Oyama*'s application under both student speech doctrine and the Ninth Circuit's certification program standard.

i. Willis' speech is subject to the student speech doctrine because *Oyama* does not apply to degrees for non-public employment.

As a threshold matter, *Oyama* does not apply to Willis' speech—and, therefore, given UCC's status as a public institution, the default student speech doctrine applies—because *Oyama* concerned a student's certification for public employment. That precondition is not found here.

In *Oyama*, the University of Hawaii program would have provided the student teacher with a “certification that would allow him to work as a public school teacher.”³¹ As a result, the matter defied “easy categorization” precisely because the student's “position at the University combined the characteristics of both a student and a public employee.”³² The Ninth Circuit's holding, then, was expressly cabined to “the mixed characteristics of *Oyama*'s claim.”³³

Willis' matter lacks these mixed characteristics. Unlike the student in *Oyama*, Willis was a student candidate in a degree program, not a program that specifically licensed students for public employment as in *Oyama*. Students who complete the UCC RN program are awarded the degree of Associate of Applied Science and must afterward test and apply for licensing separately from the degree program before entering the profession. Unlike the student in *Oyama*, Willis' enrollment in the RN program did not automatically make her a candidate for public employment, as nursing is not an entirely public field, and awarding her this degree would not guarantee job placement in the field of nursing absent satisfaction of post-graduation requirements.³⁴ Further, the *Oyama* court was careful to observe that the “law distinguishes between academic dismissals and disciplinary dismissals,” and that the student teacher's dismissal was an “academic decision,” citing the college's consistency in its communications emphasizing that its decision was based on professional standards.³⁵ UCC was not consistent in its approach to Willis, charging her for “[a]cts which are dishonest, disrespectful, or disruptive” under the college's standards of student conduct.³⁶

Because it did not arise in the context of certification for public employment, Willis' speech is subject not to the *Oyama* certification standard, but instead to the default student speech doctrine. Considering her post fits well within the label of student speech alone, the combined rule applied in *Oyama* is inapplicable.

³¹ *Id.*

³² *Id.*

³³ *Id.*

³⁴ Umpqua Cmty. Coll., Programs, Registered Nursing: Associate of Applied Science Degree (on file with author).

³⁵ *Oyama* at 813 F.3d at 875.

³⁶ Umpqua Cmty. Coll., UCC Nursing Student Exit Interview, Kaylyn Willis (Feb. 25, 2021) (on file with author).

ii. Willis’ speech cannot be sanctioned under the *Oyama* certification standard.

Even if the *Oyama* standard for certification programs were applied, UCC’s decision would remain unconstitutional because Willis’ punishment does not serve UCC’s mission. Even if it did serve that mission, UCC’s decision was driven by disagreement with Willis’ reference to violence—disagreement based not on a determination that her speech forecasted an inability to care for patients, but on the fact that her speech reminded administrators and faculty of a tragic act of violence at the college.

In *Oyama*, the Ninth Circuit held that under limited circumstances, public institutions may regulate student speech made in the course of professional certification programs.³⁷ The Ninth Circuit found that a certification program’s decision to regulate student speech was appropriate where it “related directly to defined and established professional standards, was narrowly tailored to serve the University’s core mission of [professional evaluation], and reflected reasonable professional judgment.”³⁸ These decisions must be “based on defined professional standards, and not on officials’ personal disagreement with students’ views.”³⁹

a. UCC’s decision to punish Willis relied primarily on internal standards and a single national standard that was not narrowly tailored.

UCC’s decision to punish Willis for the post did not constitute a narrowly defined application of clearly defined and established professional standards. In punishing Willis’ speech, UCC relied primarily on internal guideposts set by the college rather than defined and established external standards, a distinction that was central to *Oyama*. Unlike *Oyama*, where the student was punished based on state and federal law regulating who was fit to enter the teaching profession, Willis’ punishment was “based on school policies untethered to any external standards, regulations, or statutes governing the profession.”⁴⁰ Aside from one broadly worded National Student Nursing Association provision applied to Willis, UCC otherwise relied only on internal standards, or in the Ninth Circuit’s words, “its own idiosyncratic view of what makes a good” nurse.⁴¹ UCC’s failure to primarily consider national or even state standards of professionalism in the field of nursing reflects another shortcoming in its decision to punish Willis.

Furthermore, the national standard UCC relied on was so vague as to fail to give Willis notice that her speech could fall within its scope. In its documentation of Willis’ removal, UCC cited the following national standard:

³⁷ *Oyama*, 813 F.3d at 876.

³⁸ *Id.* at 855.

³⁹ *Id.* at 867–68.

⁴⁰ *Id.* at 870.

⁴¹ *Id.*

National Student Nursing Association - Competency Standards -
 NSNA - 6. **Actively promote the highest level of moral and ethical principles and accept responsibility for our actions.**⁴²

UCC's invocation of this single, extremely broad standard fails to fulfill *Oyama's* requirement of narrow tailoring. *Oyama* does not permit a school to use a vague external standard concerning the promotion of "moral and ethical principles" as carte blanche to regulate speech it finds offensive or inappropriate according to its own internal standards or judgment. Otherwise, the broad scope of the standard's language could justify a multitude of possible regulations written by UCC that censor constitutionally protected student speech. This would open the doors for UCC to craft internal standards regulating clearly protected student speech on topics such as religion or politics, so long as UCC couched violating those standards as a failure to "promote the highest level of moral and ethical principles" or "accept responsibility for [one's] actions."⁴³ But UCC cannot use a vague standard as an "open-ended license to inhibit the free flow of ideas."⁴⁴ Absent reference to external professional standards that give content to the vague "moral and ethical principles" cited by UCC, or that otherwise clearly encompass the type of speech in question, UCC cannot establish that its punishment of Willis constituted a narrowly tailored application of defined and established professional standards.

b. UCC's punishment of Willis for her post, which demonstrated empathy and compassion, disregarded UCC's mission.

UCC punished Willis for a discussion post that showed empathy and compassion for a marginalized individual, a decision that clearly did not serve its institutional mission. The UCC Registered Nursing Program Student Handbook includes the following statement on the school's mission: "The Registered Nursing Program prepares compassionate, competent nurse [sic] who are ready to meet our community's health care needs."⁴⁵

The content and intent of Willis' speech did not contravene the college's mission in any way. She used the assignment as an opportunity to reflect on a bleak but not unheard-of scenario, which was based on a real-life case, in which someone living with chronic illness suffers from deteriorating mental health and acts violently. Although the imaginary person Willis described acted violently and the depiction of this violence may be upsetting to some, her treatment of the individual's perspective was compassionate and realistic, a reflection of the thoughts that a person in this situation might actually experience. Her writing about the particular resources that might be available to an individual suffering from ALS while incarcerated indicates competency in appreciating the vast realm of healthcare services available to individuals in different socioeconomic circumstances. Her post was in no way rude, mocking, or joking but instead a serious contemplation of someone with a different perspective from her own. Furthermore, the substance of the post on its face was not a

⁴² Dian Rubanoff, Kaylyn Willis Student Grievance Hearing Respondent's Post-Hearing Memorandum (May 5, 2021) (on file with author).

⁴³ *Id.*

⁴⁴ *Oyama*, 813 F.3d at 871.

⁴⁵ *Supra* note 7.

reflection of Willis' own fitness to enter the nursing profession, and the perspective outlined in the post was wholly fictional, with no indicia of Willis' own character or tendencies.

If UCC purports to prepare future nurses to be compassionate and competent, punishing Willis for embracing these attributes in her assignment in a creative way directly contravenes the college's commitments.

c. Willis' post was a serious interpretation of the prompt and punishing her for it was based on personal disagreement.

The decision to punish Willis for her post was also impermissible because it was based on personal disagreement with her views rather than a reasonable professional judgment about her fitness for the nursing profession. Although UCC outlines several provisions in the student handbook as the basis for Willis' punishment, it is clear that the application of these policies was pretextual and founded on the interpretation that Willis' post was a joke and was insensitive in light of a shooting that occurred on UCC's campus several years ago. The disagreements over both the seriousness of the post and its purported insensitivity are reflected throughout the transcripts of Willis' disciplinary hearings and communications with the college.⁴⁶

While Harris and UCC administrators might have reasonably found the post offensive in light of the idiosyncratic history of the college, the decision to punish her for this speech is impermissible. UCC's decision to punish Willis was not based on a concern over her inability to care for future patients but instead on the misguided perception that she was insensitive to the experiences of UCC faculty and administrators. Consistent with the purpose of the assignment, the post was written from the perspective of another person and the actions described did not reflect Willis' own intentions or beliefs. Unlike the student in *Oyama*, whose disagreement with age of consent and disability accommodation laws suggested a risk of noncompliance in the teaching setting, Willis' post did not suggest any intent or belief in contradiction with laws or policies governing nursing.⁴⁷ The content of her post suggested no concern that she might be unfit for the profession or act inappropriately in the future, and removing Willis from the program because of it reflected a lack of professional judgment.

III. Conclusion

Under both speech code analysis and the Ninth Circuit's certification program framework, Willis' discussion post is clearly protected speech. This principle does not shield Willis from every consequence of her expression—including criticism by students, faculty, the broader community, or the university itself. Criticism is a form of "more speech," the remedy to offensive expression that the First Amendment prefers to censorship.⁴⁸ However, the First

⁴⁶ Rubanoff, *supra* note 42 ("[Harris] did not believe Ms. Willis when she said that her posting was not intended as a joke."); ("[C]onsidering the history of our campus and community, I felt that it was incredibly unprofessional. It lacked insight, and it appears to just be like, on top of that, kind of making a joke of the assignment.").

⁴⁷ *Oyama*, 813 F.3d at 871.

⁴⁸ *Whitney v. California*, 274 U.S. 357, 377 (1927).

Amendment limits the *types* of consequences that may be imposed and who may impose them.

We request receipt of a response to this letter no later than the close of business on Monday, August 30, 2021, confirming that UCC will drop its disciplinary charges pertaining to Willis' post and readmit Willis to the nursing program.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Anne Marie Tamburro".

Anne Marie Tamburro
Program Officer, Individual Rights Defense Program

Cc: April Myler, Director of Nursing
Robynne Wilgus, Assistant to the President

Encl.

Authorization and Waiver for Release of Personal Information

I, Kaylyn Willis, born on ██████████, do hereby authorize Umpqua Community College (the "Institution") to release to the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education ("FIRE") any and all information concerning my current status, disciplinary records, or other student records maintained by the Institution, including records which are otherwise protected from disclosure under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974. I further authorize the Institution to engage FIRE's staff members in a full discussion of all matters pertaining to my status as a student, disciplinary records, records maintained by the Institution, or my relationship with the Institution, and, in so doing, to fully disclose all relevant information. The purpose of this waiver is to provide information concerning a dispute in which I am involved.

I have reached or passed 18 years of age or I am attending an institution of postsecondary education.

In waiving such protections, I am complying with the instructions to specify the records that may be disclosed, state the purpose of the disclosure, and identify the party or class of parties to whom disclosure may be made, as provided by 34 CFR 99.30(b)(3) under the authority of 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(b)(2)(A).

This authorization and waiver does not extend to or authorize the release of any information or records to any entity or person other than the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, and I understand that I may withdraw this authorization in writing at any time. I further understand that my execution of this waiver and release does not, on its own or in connection with any other communications or activity, serve to establish an attorney-client relationship with FIRE.

I also hereby consent that FIRE may disclose information obtained as a result of this authorization and waiver, but only the information that I authorize.

DocuSigned by:
██████████
Student's Signature

8/16/2021
Date

Assignment

This is a graded discussion: 5 points possible

144 253

Week 6 - Loss and Coping

Many of us have several options as part of our support group but within that group there will be one particular person that provides the best or most support. And, we all like to think that our primary support person will always be there for us. That is just not necessarily the case.

Whomever you identified as your primary support person last week is no longer available to you because of death, divorce or deployment/relocation. They have to be unavailable, not just away for a short time. Using your critical imagining and reasoning, provide information on who is gone, why, how you are feeling and what you are going to do now.

This topic was locked Feb 15 at 11:59pm.



1 | 2 | 3

0

Feb 7, 2021

I never thought I would be typing these words, especially in an online support group, but I need some guidance. I am in the middle of navigating my lupus diagnosis myself and I suddenly lost my biggest support person in my life. My mom was the one person who knew me best, she could comfort me when no one else could. She understood all my struggles. She loved me when I made mistakes. She taught me new things every day. She was my everything and now she's gone. My mom was the strongest woman I knew. She taught me to stand up for what I believed in and instilled values into my life. She was young and in wonderful health. She ran 8 miles every single day up until the day before she passed. I am saddened that COVID-19 took her life. One day she was perfectly fine, and the next she was in a medical induced coma and on a ventilator. The doctors said she would not pull



Discussion Details

NRS111 Found of Nrsng-Chronic Illness - ONS 30166



...

**Kaylyn Willis**

Feb 15, 2021 at 2:56 PM

Ya'll I don't know what happened. I snapped, I completely lost it! I killed him, I shot my husband. He was my main support person. Why did I do that? What am I going to do now? Now I am in custody with no hopes of going home so it feels like I not only lost my main support person but that I have lost all of them. How am I going to survive in prison with ALS? How will I function? Instead of expecting to spend my last days at home with my family I will spend it in a cold, smelly, uncomfortable box. My attorney has been great trying to get me resources on dealing with ALS while in prison. She found an online forum for other inmates with ALS. I have already reached out and connected with another woman who is in Colorado and has been in prison for 2 years. Fingers crossed the judge will allow bond and I can stay at home as long as possible.

<https://www.alsforums.com/community/threads/in-prison-with-als.18260/>

...

Feb 15, 2021 at 3:34 PM

I write this to you all- but it doesn't seem real. My fiancé is gone. Just like that. He was in a fatal car accident the other morning on his way to work. Little did I know when he left that

◀ Pr...ous**... ▶**

Dashboard



Calendar



To Do



Notifications



Inbox