

Dear Chair and Members of the Committee,

I am here to speak in support of HB2690.

And, while I support the proposed change to K.S.A. 72-6316, I have to say that, in regard to **defending parents' authority over their own children**, it is disappointing that we even have this question in regard to **protection of parents' fundamental right to exercise primary control over the care and upbringing of their children**.

- That there are regular attacks on parent authority via the whittling away of parents knowing the content of instruction and other school programming is disturbing.
- That instead of schools innately being set up and operating in a manner that allows parents to direct the education of their children, they are increasingly designed to exclude parent authority, even subordinating parents to school district authority.
- That in the all-engrossing goals of government and other education interests to secure funding means, and mandate community focused programming on free individual citizens, parents are being effectively excluded from exercising primary control over their children.

In regard to this statute, I would submit that the following recommendations should also be made to the Student Data Privacy Act.

- A list of all agencies, committees, task forces, departments, 3rd parties, etc. benefiting financially or informationally from the administration of a test, questionnaire, survey, or examination must be provided to the parents, in order for them to determine *whether* to grant consent.
- A list of all funding received by any interests as a result of access to data amassed by school technology systems and via the administration of a test, questionnaire, survey or examination must be provided to the parent, in order for them to determine *whether* to grant consent to participate.
- All programming developed as a result of using the data must be disclosed. (Parents have a right to understand how their child's completion of the survey then has the potential to result in programming being mandated on their child.) The validity of the survey data is questionable.
- All agents of the school engaged in offering counseling, psychological, social, or mental programming must provide complete information on such programming and personal data amassed on children when seeking parents' consent for their children to be included in such programming or be engaged by persons acting in these capacities.

Prior year proposals to weaken this statute have largely centered around the administration of the Kansas Communities that Care Survey (KCTC). Parent's authority must not be infringed in being wholly responsible and free to determine whether to grant informed consent for their children to participate in the administration of surveys like this.

Prior to passage of the student data privacy act and in proposed changes to that act in years since, it has been and continues to be preferred by non-parent interests that there exist more "**passive**" parent associations between parents and their own children, rather than parents "**actively**" protecting and directing the up-bringing of their own children. Non-parent interests benefitting from the administration of this survey favor passive parenting over full, active parenting.

Interests, other than those of the parent or student, act to ensure their own self-preservation and goals.

They do so vigorously and to the practical exclusion of the respect for, interest, or benefit of the individual.

Our nation was established on the premise of the individual right to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. It is the task of government to secure these individual rights.

Schools administering any tests, questionnaires, surveys, or examinations in order to meet the goals of non-parent interests to the exclusion and subjugation of parent knowledge and consent are not safeguarding or protecting the rights of the individual. Children are being used and sold for the financial benefit of other interests.

Non-parent interests are so dedicated to their own self-preservation and achieving their goals that they misrepresent or exclude information. Regarding the KCTC survey:

- It is promoted as being anonymous. **This survey is not anonymous.** The KCTC collects numerous personally identifying data items.
- Past school district communications have not provided the actual survey for review.
- In the language used to market and entice participation in the survey, full disclosure is not made of the survey items where the student can **report undesirable qualities about himself, his parents, and other family members.**
- The number and types of **“ideas/concepts” introduced** (possibly for the first time) **to a child** taking this survey are disturbing, to put it mildly, and not fully disclosed. The issues include cutting school, cheating, gambling, and use of quite an extensive and specific list of drugs, to name a few.
- As well, some survey items **infer** that a child has actually done something; “suggesting” the positive occurrence of doing something illegal.
- An accounting of all the “interests” benefitting financially or otherwise and how survey information may be used, possibly to the detriment of the individual child, is not fully disclosed.

Does perceived “community” benefit negate parent authority? That is the question. If something is perceived to benefit the community, is that justification for infringing individual rights and to the potential harm to the individual? Do the “needs/desires” of government/community agents justify the diminishing of the rights of the individual?

Why is this type of activity appropriate for places of academia? I have to ask **why** is the inclusion of this type of programming deemed acceptable in our education institutions. Social emotional “learning,” mental “health,” and cooperative social skills have practically replaced the acquisition of knowledge and wisdom, evidenced by knowing how to read, write, and do arithmetic. This survey is not germane to the academic education of a student. While education institutions and community interests have taken on the mantra of the myriad of social issues and causes, shouldn’t a school employing tools in these areas only be a rare occurrence and certainly with the fully informed consent of the parent? Shouldn’t a parent have to consent to his own child being tracked and inventoried in these areas? Perhaps this has always been meant to be:

In the January 1969 issue of *Today’s Education*, journal of the National Education Association, two professors of education at Indiana University refer to schools of the 1970s as “clinics, whose purpose is to provide **individualized psychosocial ‘treatment’** for the student.”

An excerpt from *Master Plan for Public Education in Hawaii – Toward A New Era for Education in Hawaii*, published in 1969 by the State of HI Department of Education (and partially funded by the U.S. Office of Education), and what would serve as a model for the rest of the nation:

The roles and responsibilities of teachers will change noticeably in the years ahead. By 1985 it should be more accurate to term a teacher a “learning clinician” for the school will be “clinics” whose purpose is to provide individualized education and **psychological “services”** to the student.

From a Superintendent of a Kansas School District in 2018:

SEL will be integrated in the curriculum; it will not be taught separately. It is not likely that a student could “opt out” of SEL curricular efforts. For to do so, would be to opt out of a **majority of the curriculum.**

HB2690 attempts, ever so slightly, to **prohibit the infringement of parents’ fundamental right to exercise primary control over the care and upbringing of their children.**

I ask that you fully and strongly support the inherent and superior authority of parents to protect their children from harm, and direct their education, not passively, but actively.

Lisa Huesers
the Parent