

Written Testimony

Public Hearing

March 1st, 2019

Re: SB-874

Education Committee

Dear Education Committee

Please Oppose SB-874, Sections 17 & 18

I am against Governor's Bill No. 874, particularly Section 17, pages 20-21, making changes to Section 10-184, and Section 18, pages 21-22, making changes to Section 10-1600.

Connecticut's current statutes regarding a parent educator's obligations are clear and do not require any new legislation, especially when it is shrouded in an accumulation of unrelated changes to school governance and consolidation. Hiding new regulations regarding basic constitutional rights, which for decades have been actively and publicly fought for, is underhanded, disingenuous and contemptible.

Specifically requesting that parent educators "physically appear" to register their children with the Department of Education is blatant discrimination. Parents do not have to appear in person to register when entering Public School, or with the Department of Education to enroll their child in a private school. Insisting that only parent educators appear in person to register is profiling and discriminatory.

The purpose of this proposed bill is to ask parent educators to appear in person so they can be physically judged, along with their children, as well as have their information targeted and forwarded to the Department of Children and Families. The Office of the Child Advocate, and the Department of Children and Families, have every legal right to follow a child in public school, private school, or parent led school. What would this discriminatory physical registration of parent educators accomplish that they don't already have the ability to do?

Regarding Section 18, pages 21-22; Many parent educators use Online Education Programs, created by certified teachers, so their children are being taught at, or above, their appropriate grade levels. Having the Public School provide an "education framework" is unnecessary.

Again, I would like to emphasize my absolute opposition to SB 874. The change to Section 10-184 is profoundly discriminatory, and to Section 10-1600 unneeded.

Thank you for your time.

Wendy Brooks

East Lyme, CT