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Introduction

Our government schools are graduating:
• voters who are unprepared to self-govern
• legislators who don’t understand our Constitution or history
• journalists who no longer seek or report on the truth
• scientists who put public policy and consensus ahead of facts
• entertainers who create movies and TV programs that stand in opposition to the values we treasure, all the while lecturing us on their moral superiority.

A June 2018 Gallup poll reports a record low 47% are extremely proud to be American. In our very own schools, our children are being taught that we are an oppressive nation, founded by rich, white slave owners and that socialism is preferable to the free market.

Our Founding Fathers understood the importance of education. The Northwest Ordinance encouraged education: “Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.”

Our enemies understand the importance of education. The Communists, the Marxists and the Islamists all seek to control the minds of our children. The Fabian Socialists determined that it was much easier to indoctrinate a child in socialism, than to force it upon a well-educated, liberty loving populace.

Education is a winning issue for candidates. You would be hard-pressed to find a voter that believes failing schools are good or that indoctrination is preferable to education. Hope for their children’s future unites rich and poor, black and white, democrat and republican.

On the following pages, you will find information about education ranging from Common Core to Social Emotional Learning. It is designed to present information in quick, easy to digest bullet points but additional, more depth information is available. Please let us know how we can help you understand this vital issue.

“The philosophy of the schoolroom in one generation will be the philosophy of the government in the next.” attributed to Abraham Lincoln
Defining Education

Below see the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) which defines education in Washington State. Based on the definition of education, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) develops the state learning standards.

RCW 28A.150.210
Basic education—Goals of school districts.

A basic education is an evolving program of instruction that is intended to provide students with the opportunity to become responsible and respectful global citizens, to contribute to their economic well-being and that of their families and communities, to explore and understand different perspectives, and to enjoy productive and satisfying lives. Additionally, the state of Washington intends to provide for a public school system that is able to evolve and adapt in order to better focus on strengthening the educational achievement of all students, which includes high expectations for all students and gives all students the opportunity to achieve personal and academic success. To these ends, the goals of each school district, with the involvement of parents and community members, shall be to provide opportunities for every student to develop the knowledge and skills essential to:
(1) Read with comprehension, write effectively, and communicate successfully in a variety of ways and settings and with a variety of audiences;
(2) Know and apply the core concepts and principles of mathematics; social, physical, and life sciences; civics and history, including different cultures and participation in representative government; geography; arts; and health and fitness;
(3) Think analytically, logically, and creatively, and to integrate technology literacy and fluency as well as different experiences and knowledge to form reasoned judgments and solve problems; and
(4) Understand the importance of work and finance and how performance, effort, and decisions directly affect future career and educational opportunities.

Questions to consider:

How much money does it take to fund an “evolving” program of instruction? When do you know you have spent enough?

Do the terms “responsible” and “respectful” encourage free speech or political correctness?

Why is WA funding education for “global citizenship” instead of American citizenship?

Which is more important: truth or “different perspectives?”

Is the goal of education to teach knowledge or happiness? How do you know when a student is proficient at achieving a “satisfying life?”
Common Core

Unfortunately, the unconstitutional, take-over of education, known as Common Core Standards is scarcely discussed anymore - even by the Secretary of Education. The reason is, that the 2015 ESSA codified many of the requirements. Additionally, the publishing companies, which stand to make billions and were instrumental in pushing for the standards, have now aligned their textbooks and tests to the standards. Nevertheless, it is important to know what Common Core is and to stand against this flawed federal intrusion into education which seeks to abolish the local control intended by the framers of our Constitution.

- Common Core standards are not rigorous, evidenced-based or internationally benchmarked.

- Common Core, an unconstitutional federal intrusion into education, eliminates the power of locally elected school boards, teachers and parents.

- By the 7th grade, Common Core math standards have our students two years behind high-performing countries.

- Common Core English standards replace whole works of classic literature and poetry with excerpts, questionable contemporary literature, and dry informational texts.

- Extensive data mining follows your child permanently, is released to private organizations and is vulnerable to hacking.

- Common Core standards were not voluntary but are instead an untested and unwritten set of standards foisted upon our students as a result of state acceptance of Race to the Top grants.

- While gifted students are left unchallenged by Common Core standards, it is our poorest children and those with language differences or delays that are the most damaged.

- Common Core standards are a huge revenue generating opportunity for the corporations that developed the standards and encouraged their adoption.

- Math and language experts refused to validate the Common Core standards which were written in secret by special interest groups.

- Common Core’s developmentally inappropriate curriculum and high stakes testing destroy our children’s trust and love of learning.
Personalized Learning

Who could argue against an educational system that claims to be “optimized for the needs of each learner,” with learning objectives, instructional approaches, and instructional content “based on learning needs” so that activities are “meaningful and relevant to learners?” It all sounds wonderful but pleasant words and lofty intentions often mask something very different and perhaps sinister…

- Personalized learning is often used synonymously with concepts like “competency-based learning,” “adaptive learning,” “digital learning,” “blended learning” and others.

- **Personalized learning relies heavily on technology**, allowing each student to move forward at their own pace. That technology is often adaptive, meaning that a child that is proficient, for example, with their multiplication tables can move quickly while the child that is struggling, gets additional problems. That might work for something measurable like math facts but what about other literature, history or science? What if the designated content is global warming, the benefits of communism or gender fluidity? How many times must a child be presented with the material, until he is “proficient” and moves on?

- **Countries which have invested heavily in education technology have seen no noticeable improvement in their performance on international assessments in reading, mathematics or science** (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development).

- While there is no evidence that there is an improved outcome from digital learning, we do know about some negative influences: shortened attention span, need for constant reinforcement, reduced opportunity to engage socially, obesity and addiction.

- Key strokes are monitored. Personal data is recorded. Assessments that have not been proven to be reliable or valid are stored.

- **Building higher order thinking and deep, conceptual understanding requires “intensive teacher-student interactions.”** Yet educators are being encouraged to be “facilitators,” rather than “teachers.” At what point might teachers be replaced with clerks and technology support workers?

- “At its most innocent, it [personalized learning] is a renewed attempt at bringing back behaviorism and operant conditioning to make learning more efficient. At its most sinister, it establishes children as measurable commodities to be cataloged and capitalized upon by corporations.” (Philip McRae, Rebirth of the Teaching Machine through the Seduction of Data Analytics: This Time It's Personal)
Social Emotional Learning (SEL)

In 2016, Washington was chosen as one of eight states to participate in the Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning’s Collaborative States Initiative. This essentially translates to our children being used in an experimental program, collecting personal and subjective data to be used by the federal government to make decisions about our children and their futures.

- Time spent in SEL programs dealing with feelings, attitudes and other subjective, non-cognitive endeavors is **time taken from academic and fundamental skill instruction**.

- Implementation of SEL programs **puts overburdened and untrained teachers into the position of serving as mental health professionals**.

- Data collected on children in SEL program is sensitive, personally identifiable and **may result in improper labeling which can end up in the child’s permanent file**.

- The government has no constitutional, statutory or moral right to collect subjective data on our children. Researchers in the field warn about the inappropriateness of using this data for school and teacher “accountability.”

- SEL exploits the fear of loneliness, using politically correct agendas and “group think” to replace thoughtfulness and open conversation.

“Should the monolithic public school system have a nationalized mandate to tell children how to feel and to relate to someone?” Stella Morabito
Data Mining our Children

As a condition of getting massive federal funds from Race to the Top and stimulus packages, states were required to build longitudinal data bases that connected with other states.

More than 400 data points are already being collected on our children including discipline records, test scores, family income, child's bus stop, religious affiliation, political association and more.

As schools venture into questionable areas such as “Social Emotional Learning,” data is being collected on personality traits and psychological profiles are being developed (by people with limited or no training in the field). It is anticipated that this data will follow the student throughout his school and into the student’s job placement.

Physiological data is being collected via facial expression cameras and a variety of biofeedback devices, including brainwave technology. Children are being fingerprinted and having their irises scanned.

In 2008 and again in 2011, the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) was revised by the US Department of Education, without Congressional approval, allowing schools and districts to share personally identifiable information (PII) without parental consent with anyone designated as a “school official,” (including contractors, consultants, or volunteers etc.) and representatives of any companies that claim to improve academic or behavioral improvement.

Intimate, personally identifiable information (PII) is not only made available to agencies and companies that claim to be doing “research” for “educational purposes” but is vulnerable to hacking. Student data is particularly valuable to hackers for the purposes of identify theft because very few students have negative credit histories.
School to Work

No parents want their 30-something unemployed children living in their basements because they got a degree in gender studies, puppetry or underwater basket-weaving.

On a superficial level, there may be an appeal to “school to work” or “college and career readiness” programs that purport to prepare children for the “jobs of the future” in a globalist society. However, the purpose of education is not to train Americans to code for technology giants or to operate drones for delivery services, but to open their minds to truth, knowledge, beauty and wisdom - to prepare them to self-govern in a free society.

For what future “job” are we preparing our children? In my day, if you wanted the “job of the future,” you trained to be a key-punch operator. How did that work out for them? There was a time when there was a plethora of jobs for horse-wranglers, buggy-whip makers and gas-station attendants. How will central planners know how many bakers, bankers and biochemists we will need in 5 years or 12 years? We simply do not know what the future holds and the only way to prepare for it is to be well-educated, not well-trained.

There is a marked change in how government bureaucrats and educators refer to our children. They are now referred to as “human capital.” In a third-grade textbook, the following line was found: “One day, you will add to a business owner’s human capital if you work hard in school.” Let us not allow our children’s worth to be defined by how much money they make for a business owner!

David Rockefeller said: “I don’t want a nation of thinkers, I want a nation of workers.” Established in 1903, the first mission statement of the Rockefeller General Education Board included this:

“We shall not try to make these people or any of their children into philosophers or men of learning or men of science. We have not to raise up from them authors, educators, poets or men of letters. We shall not search for embryo great artists, painters, musicians, nor lawyers, doctors, preachers, politicians, statesmen, of whom we have an ample supply.

“The task is simple. We will organize children and teach them in a perfect way the things their fathers and mothers are doing in an imperfect way.”

The Trump administration is recommending that the Department of Education be merged with the Department of Labor. This would further reinforce the terribly misguided idea that education is about workforce training. The key to ending the unconstitutional federal intrusion into education is not to merge one bloated bureaucracy with another, but to return its activities to where they belong: the local level. Education is not about prepping for employment but to prepare children to be adult human beings with all the dignity, duty and divine purpose that entails.

Training our children for jobs as part of the “school to work” pipeline, may produce children capable of using science to clone a human being, but will they know if it is right or wrong? They might code the next “social media app” but will they have anything worth saying? They might be able to read the word “liberty” but will they yearn for it?
Textbooks and Curriculum

Sun Tsu in The Art of War says: “If you know the enemy and know yourself you need not fear the results of a hundred battles.” The social studies textbooks in our schools ensure that our children know neither our enemies nor themselves. This is how our citizens learn to embrace socialism and hate America. This is why Americans are tearing down historical monuments and vote for candidates that reject constitutional principles.

Below are just a few examples things that can be found in our children’s textbooks (examples taken from textbooks reviewed by volunteers from Truth In Textbooks, an organization working to identify factual errors, bias, slant, omissions and opinions disguised as fact, in order to ensure that our children get the most accurate and informative social studies textbooks possible.):

America is an oppressive bigoted nation.
• From a 5th grade social studies textbook:
  “Even today, Asian Americans report being told to “go back” to where they came from.”

Communism is sanitized while capitalism is demonized.
• From a 5th grade social studies textbook:
  “…How about the fact that the wealthy get the goods and services while the poor go without. As I said, not a perfect system but hey, that’s capitalism.”

Students are lead to believe that slavery is a uniquely American tradition, with no mention that the Muslim slave trade existed for centuries.
• From a high school economics textbook:
  “The voyages of Columbus led to the colonization of the Americas by European sea powers and to the development of the African slave trade.”

A decided lack of understanding about how the Separation of Powers works.
• From a 5th grade American history textbook:
  “The Supreme Court also proved to be initially uncooperative and declared some New Deal legislation unconstitutional.”

Repeated references glorifying Islam and denigrating Christianity.
• From a 5th grade social studies textbook:
  “Backed by the Catholic Church, Christian monarchs, waged the Crusades in the Middle East to drive Muslims out of Jerusalem.”

Global citizenship is emphasized over American citizenship.
• From a 3rd grade social studies textbook:
  “Nearly all of us can do something to help others in our global community.”

Climate change is an accepted fact.
• From a 5th grade social studies textbook:
  “Carbon dioxide (CO2) in the air from cars and factories has risen by one-third since the 1700s. This causes global climate change.”

Children are treated as meaningless cogs in a school to work pipeline.
• From a 3rd grade social studies textbook:
  “One day, you will add to a business owner’s human capital if you work hard in school.”
School Choice and Charters

While charter schools and school choice/vouchers hold some potential to loosen the stranglehold on our children held by the government school monopoly, there are some inherent challenges in their application. While not insurmountable, implementation must be approached carefully or we will simply be replacing one poorly conceived system with another:

1. **Where government* monies flow, government regulations go.** How can we prevent poor government policy like Common Core, Social Emotional Learning, sex-education etc. from following children to private schools, thereby eliminating “choice” from parents that chose to pay for their children to go to private schools, for the very purpose of escaping government intrusion into education?

2. **When “government” money becomes readily available, what prevents poorly managed, ill-conceived schools from proliferating?** Will the glossiest brochures win? Will the government establish agencies to regulate those private schools, just as they did the government schools?

3. Currently, when parents choose to leave the government schools for private schools, they vet them with their hard-earned dollars and history of results. **How will parents judge the new schools popping up in a No Vendor Left Behind education system?**

4. As children are scattered across towns attending the latest thing in STEM schools, Sustainability Schools or Social Justice schools, **what will replace the friend-neighbor connection where parents support each other** and give advice regarding teachers and support when issues arise?

5. We support the free market for restaurants, hardware stores and dry cleaners because we understand that if we don’t like the menu, prices or results, we simply don’t go back a second time. **How long must a child stay in a school that is not living up to its promises before the parents try something else?** How much damage is done when kids are moved from school to school “that just isn’t working out?”

6. **Can the public school system be saved?**
   - What if we return to techniques that actually work, like phonics and standard math algorithms?
   - What if we return our schools to local control?
   - What if we loosen the hold of teacher unions that work for teachers but don’t give much thought to the students?
   - What if we take back the schools of education and end the political indoctrination and the endless coursework on pedagogy (teaching techniques) and ensure that teachers are well educated in content?
   - What if we consider changes to teacher certification and training that allows good teachers to teach?

---

*government monies: dollars that have been confiscated from taxpayers to be funneled through inefficient systems to be spend by political elites who believe they know more than the people who earned the money.*
The following articles and sources will allow you to read more about the topics previously presented.
In his 1984 *book about American education*, Samuel Blumenfeld pointed out that "[n]othing has mystified Americans more than the massive decline of literacy in the United States. Children spend more time at school and the government spends more money on education than ever before. Yet, reading ability keeps declining. What has gone wrong?"

You have probably heard this lament. But here's where it becomes really alarming. Blumenfeld looked back seven decades to the year 1915. That's when the literacy figures for 1910 were published by the U.S. Bureau of Education and quoted in a weekly publication, *School and Society*, edited by James McCain Cattell, one of the luminaries in the Progressive education movement. *School and Society* stated that:

Statistics compiled by the Bureau of Education for use at the Panama-Pacific Exposition, show that of children from 10 to 14 years of age there were in 1910 only 22 out of every 1,000 who could neither read nor write[.] ... The following states report only one child in 1,000 between ages of 10 and 14 as illiterate: Connecticut, District of Columbia, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Oregon, Utah, and Washington[.]. It is evident that the public schools will in a short time practically eliminate illiteracy.

According to the Bureau of Education, U.S. students were at least 99% literate a century ago. Blumenfeld concluded:

So apparently they knew how to teach children to read in 1910. Also, there was no such thing as 'functional illiteracy,' that is, a kind of low, inadequate reading ability which is the product of faulty teaching methods in our schools. The illiteracy of 1910 was the result of some children having no schooling. Functional illiteracy is a result of the way we actually teach children to read in our schools, for our teachers today, whether they know it or not, have been deliberately trained to produce functional illiteracy.

Admittedly, these were U.S. government figures presented to the world; maybe chauvinism was at play. But even if you tinker with the stats, the collapse is still catastrophic. The vast majority of children were reading and writing 100 years ago. Now, thanks to deliberate policies of our Education Establishment, we have two thirds testing below proficient.

Blumenfeld commented:

To believe that such massive functional illiteracy is an unplanned phenomenon beyond the control of anyone is to believe that our educators with all their doctoral degrees literally don't know what they are doing. After all, teaching children to read is no big mystery. Teachers have been doing it for the last 3,000 years, and as the US government's own statistics show they were doing it well in 1910 and up to about the 1930s when the big switch took place in teaching methods.

That was when our Education Establishment (most probably, I would suggest, influenced by Comintern subversives) abolished phonics and made children memorize words by their shapes. This approach has been a disaster, yet the public has been persuaded to accept it until this day.

I and others write constantly against this development, with less than the hoped for effect. Our society, and especially the people at the top, seem all too comfortable with rampant illiteracy. How is that possible?
Ayn Rand perfectly captured the country's predicament in these few words: "[t]he hardest thing to explain is the glaringly evident which everybody has decided not to see."

That's where we are. The glaringly evident escapes notice. Most Americans have been conned into not seeing that our Education Establishment (i.e., the professors in charge) must be the chief cause of illiteracy and other educational failure. Truthfully, nearly all of these pretend educators should be fired for demonstrated incompetence.

The power of our Education Establishment to maintain its destructive nonsense is frightening. These shifty people have put the leaders of the country in straitjackets, apparently. Even President Trump and Betsy DeVos cannot speak the obvious: children should learn to read in the first grade. Anything else is unacceptable.

If you hear about children bringing home lists of sight-words to memorize, start screaming. That's where illiteracy begins: sight-words. If literacy is the goal, children should memorize the letters of the alphabet and the sounds they represent.

To save the country, we first have to save the public schools. To do that, we have to save reading. This is easy because reading is easy.

Coda: The Samuel Blumenfeld book quoted several times in this article is NEA: Trojan Horse in American Education. This book is scholarly, relentless, and – for most readers – shocking. Published about 35 years ago, it argues that the National Education Association promotes everything bad in public education. It is the enemy within.

Bruce Deitrick Price's new book is Saving K-12. He deconstructs educational theories and methods at Improve-Education.org. Support his work on Patreon.
Common Core standards are not rigorous, evidenced-based or internationally benchmarked.

Dr. Sandra Stotsky is credited with helping to develop and revise the K-12 standards of Massachusetts, considered not only the best in the United States but one of the best set of standards in the world. One of 5 members of the 23 member validation committee who refused to sign off on the standards, she made repeated requests for evidence of international benchmarking since 2009. She received no confirmation. The Common Core website has wiped the phrase “internationally benchmarked” from its site and has replaced it with “internationally informed”. Dr. Stotsky refers to the Common Core English Language Arts (ELA) and reading standards as an “empty skill set” and reports that their “college readiness” standards weaken the base of literary and cultural knowledge needed for authentic coursework.

Jason Zimba, the lead writer for the Common Core math standards testified in front of a public meeting of the Massachusetts State Board of Education in 2010 that Common Core is designed to prepare students only for a non-selective community college, not a university.

There is no research that demonstrates that national standards produce improved academic outcome. Every drug produced by pharmaceutical companies is required to go through years, sometimes decades, of study to determine efficacy and potential side effects. However, the one-size-fits-all Common Core standards, aligned-curriculum and assessments were imposed upon 50 million children simultaneously, making the children of America: the largest collection of “guinea pigs” in history. The leading financier of writing and promoting the standards, Bill Gates, has said: “It would be great if our education stuff worked, but we probably won’t know for a decade.” Do we want to give up 10 years of the lives of our innocent children to see if their “education stuff” worked?

Common Core, an unconstitutional federal intrusion into education, eliminates the power of locally elected school boards, teachers and parents.

The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 established the role of government in education with the sentence: “Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.” Our founding fathers realized the importance of education and the ordinance established the mechanism by which public education could be financed (i.e. reserving land within each township for the purpose of education), but as the CATO Institute explains: “The Founders feared the concentration of power. They believed that the best way to protect individual freedom and civil society was to limit and divide power. Thus it was much better to have decisions made independently by 13–or 50–states, each able to innovate and to observe and copy successful innovations in other states, than to have one decision made for the entire country.”

The word education is not even mentioned in the United States Constitution. The 10th amendment states: “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people”. This one amendment removes all doubt about the requirement for the federal government to keep out of education.

Senator Mike Lee has labeled Common Core as the “Obamacare of education”. It is a “DC takeover of education that will dumb down standards and cheapen the education our children receive.”

By the 7th grade, Common Core math standards have our students two years behind high-performing countries.

Regardless of race or socio-economic status, students who complete a course beyond Algebra II are twice as likely to complete their Bachelor’s Degree; students who complete calculus are 28 times more likely to be “high achievers” in their post-secondary work. Nevertheless, Common Core Standards top out at Algebra II.

Dr. James Milgram, professor emeritus from Stanford University refers to Common Core math standards as a “joke”. As the only content expert in mathematics on the Common Core validation committee, Dr. Milgram refused to sign off on the standards, citing multiple problems. Professor William McCallum, one of the three authors of Common Core’s
math standards, said: “overall standards wouldn’t be very high” and “not up to the standards of other nations.” By the end of 7th grade, Common Core has our students two years behind high achieving countries. Common Core math standards do not prepare students for science, technology, engineering or math (STEM) careers.

**Common Core English standards replace whole works of classic literature and poetry with excerpts, questionable contemporary literature, and dry informational texts.**

You might be pleasantly surprised by extent of the English standards and the breadth of reading materials addressed by the Common Core textbook; however, Alfred Tennyson once said: “A lie that is half-truth is the darkest of all lies”.

Dr. Terrence Moore of Hillsdale College in his book *The Story Killers*, gives an example of how literature is addressed by Common Core. In the Pearson textbook, *British Traditions*, 17 pages are devoted to Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*. Of those seventeen pages, two are written by a modern author that talks about scary movies she saw as a child. Three pages are written by Shelley - from her introduction, not from the book itself. One page is devoted to a picture of Frankenstein. Five pages are devoted to a Saturday Night Live (SNL) parody of Frankenstein. And since I went to school before Common Core, I can do the math: SNL has two more pages than Mary Shelley herself. In the parody, there is the obligatory race card pulled (he is, of course - green), and Frankenstein calls the villagers a bunch of “fascists”. The teacher is scripted to explain the use of the term fascist: “Explain its traditional political meaning and how it has been extended to refer to any right-wing extremist group.” This unit has students dressing up as monsters, acting out parodies, discussing scary dreams and writing autobiographies of monsters - but they never read so much as a sentence out of the novel. Scared yet?

Common Core English reduces the ratio of literature to informational text to 50:50 in elementary school and down to 30:70 in high school. In place of classic literature by Nathaniel Hawthorne, Mark Twain and John Steinbeck - they will be required to read new classics such as “The Cost Conundrum: Healthcare Costs in McAllen, Texas” and the EPA’s thriller “Recommended Levels of Insulation.”

Reading great literature exposes our children to adventure, humor, complex characters and battles between good and evil. Literature is how we explore the great stories of a great civilization. Without it, could we end up with a generation that is capable of creating advanced weapon systems but without the wisdom to know when to use them? Or will our “global workers” have the skill set to harvest the organs of aborted babies but not the moral education to know that it is wrong?

**Extensive data mining follows your child permanently, is released to private organizations and is vulnerable to hacking.**

In truth, Common Core doesn’t require data collection on our children because that was done by its nasty predecessor. Obama’s Race to the Top initiative was the carrot dangled before the states. During the economic meltdown, the states were hungry for money and the Obama legislation promised lots of money to be transferred from the taxpayer, in return for four demands, two of which were: 1. Accept the as yet unwritten Common Core standards and 2. The “Adoption of better data systems to provide schools, teachers, and parents with information about student progress”.

Even George Orwell would be stunned at the amount of data collected from our children and shared, not only with the Federal government, but with private companies doing “research”. There are currently more than 400 points of data being collected on our children including family income, the child's bus stop, religious affiliation, health history and much more. Has your child ever been disciplined at school? Discipline records are now part of your child’s permanent record that will follow him into the workforce. A juvenile can commit a felony and have his record sealed but if your second grader bit his pop tart into a shape the teacher thought looked like a gun, his “record” will be made available to future employers.

**Common Core standards were not voluntary but are instead an untested and unwritten set of standards foisted upon our students as a result of state acceptance of Race to the Top grants.**
Common Core advocates paint a picture of the nation’s governors getting together to demand a set of standards designed to improve education in their states. In reality, that couldn’t be farther from the truth. In 2002, No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation, coauthored by Senator Kennedy was signed into law by President George Bush. This act was a serious escalation of federal intrusion into education. Its emphasis on high stakes testing and punitive actions for poorly performing schools prepared the way for Common Core. In 2009 states desperately scrambling for money to stay afloat, eagerly accepted 4.35 billion dollars of taxpayer money from the “stimulus” in the form of Race to the Top grants. One of the strings attached included signing on to adopting a "common core of internationally benchmarked standards in math and language arts" that had not yet been written. They were further “encouraged” to blindly adopt this set of unknown standards by the waiving of the onerous regulations imposed by NCLB. The adoption of Common Core standards was about as "voluntary" as handing over your keys to a carjacker, to get him to stop beating you.

While gifted students are left unchallenged by Common Core standards, it is our poorest children and those with language differences or delays that are the most damaged.

In the traditional classroom, children are exposed to a myriad of concepts and facts culminating with a norm-referenced test that separates children into subgroups of mastery, along the bell-curve. Some children will fail but others will excel. Common Core and its antecedents have learning outcomes determined in a distant location by faceless bureaucrats upon which the child’s graduation and the school’s ability to remain open, is based. Not surprisingly then, teachers will focus their efforts on the narrow skills mandated and tested so that their average and below average students can pass. Of course that leaves the most capable students unchallenged and bored.

Our schools serve students with language delays, those who are not exposed to a rich vocabulary or variety of cultural experiences at home, and students for whom English is a second language. Math is the great equalizer that gives these students a chance to shine. Traditionally, math has focused on calculation and reasoning which is relatively independent of language skill. However, Common Core requires not just calculation, but also explanation of reasoning and work to arrive at a consensus with peers. Students with language differences or delays are put at a great disadvantage and are often not able to take advanced math classes allowing them to pursue post-secondary education.

Common Core standards are a huge revenue generating opportunity for the corporations that developed the standards and encouraged their adoption.

In April 2009, the National Governor’s Association (NGA), and the Chief Council of State School Officers (CCSSO) commissioned Achieve Inc., a corporation founded by the NGA, to have a draft of the standards ready by the end of the summer of 2009 and to have grade-to-grade standards completed by December of that year. These standards that are to guide the education of 50 million American children were hastily written in private by a committee from a private corporation that was staffed almost entirely by employees of Achieve Inc., testing companies (ACT and the College Board) and pro-accountability groups. Of the more than 65 people involved in the Common Core design and review, only one was a classroom teacher and none was a school administrator.

A study by Accountability Works, a nonprofit education advocacy group has estimated that schools will need $6.87 billion for technology, $5.26 billion for professional development, $2.47 billion for textbooks and $1.24 billion for assessment testing during the first seven years of Common Core implementation. Perhaps it should come as no surprise that testing companies helped write the standards and that the Gates Foundation (yes, Bill Gates of Microsoft) has spent as much as $2.3 billion dollars to make sure Common Core is implemented. It appears that a new gold rush has started but instead of precious metal, people will be mining the precious minds of our children.

Math and language experts refused to validate the Common Core standards which were written in secret by special interest groups.

While we have limited information about the development of the Common Core standards because their meetings were all done in secret - this is what we DO know.

* While the writers included test and curriculum development companies, no parents, state legislators, school board members, high school mathematics or English teachers, English professors, scientists, engineers or child development experts served on the committee.
• The only mathematician on the Validation Committee, Dr. James Milgram, refused to approve the standards.
• The only ELA Standards expert on the Validation Committee, Dr. Sandra Stotsky, refused to approve the standards.
• Common Core standards cannot be changed because they are copyright protected by the NGA and CCSSO.

It appears that a set of experimental standards, written in secret by an unelected group that lacked expertise and whose primary motive may have been to gain control and money for their private corporations, has been imposed upon the children of an unsuspecting nation.

Common Core's developmentally inappropriate curriculum and high stakes testing destroy our children's trust and love of learning.

Early childhood education experts have severely criticized the Common Core standards for K-3 as developmentally inappropriate. The American Federation of Teachers has called for these early standards to be revamped. The experts from “Defending the Early Years” project explain how Common Core standards were written by mapping backwards from graduation requirements rather than building from what is known about child development. They devalue the whole child and the importance of social-emotional development, play, art, music, science and physical development, requiring young children to learn facts and skill for which they are not ready. As a result, both teachers and our children are universally experiencing greater levels of stress.

Psychologist and Fabian Socialist, John Dewey is known as the “Father of Progressive Education.” He believed that, like Pavlov’s dogs, “students could be conditioned for a new social order.” When American parents send their precious children to school, they don’t want them to be conditioned for a new social order. They want their children to learn how to employ the scientific method to find the next cure for cancer. They want their children to learn their own heritage and how the American experiment in self-governance produced an unheralded period of liberty and prosperity. They want their children to laugh and cry with the characters of classic literature as they read the stories of a great civilization. We send our dogs to obedience school; we demand something better for our children!

Madam Chairman and members of the committee:

My name is Jane Robbins, and I’m with the American Principles Project Foundation, which works to restore our nation’s founding principles. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you today about protecting citizens’ privacy when evaluating government programs, especially in the area of education.

The Commission on Evidence-Based Policymaking was created to pursue a laudable goal: To improve analysis of the effectiveness of federal programs.(1) We all certainly agree that public policy should be based on evidence, on facts, not on opinion or dogma. So unbiased scientific research, for example, is vital for policymaking.

But the problem arises when the subjects of the research and analysis are human beings. Each American citizen is endowed with personal dignity and autonomy and therefore is entitled to respect and deference when it comes to his or her own personal data. The idea that the government should be able to vacuum up mountains of personal data and employ it for whatever purposes it deems useful – without the citizen’s consent, or in many cases even his knowledge – conflicts deeply with this truth about the dignity of persons.

Bear in mind that the analyses contemplated by the Commission go even further than merely sharing discrete data points among agencies. They involve creating new information about individuals, via matching data, drawing conclusions, and making predictions about those individuals. So in essence the government would have information about a citizen that even he or she doesn’t have.

Our founding principles, which enshrine the consent of the governed, dictate that a citizen’s data belongs to him, not to the government. If the government or its allied researchers want to use it for purposes other than those for which it was submitted, they should get the owner’s consent (in the case of pre-K-12 students, parental consent). That’s how things should work in a free society.

But according to well-funded organizations(2) with a vested interest in accessing citizen data for their own purposes, it’s simply too limiting to have to get consent to use that data. Especially in the area of education data, they argue, important things could be done if the government were allowed to combine various repositories of data to track student outcomes. This consolidation of data need not be in one physical location – allowing or requiring agencies to link to each other’s data will have the same effect.

In its wisdom, Congress has repeatedly prohibited the establishment of national education databases or other systems that would endanger student privacy. For example, section 9531 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (the No Child Left Behind iteration) prohibits “the development of a nationwide database of personally identifiable information” on students.(3) Section 182 of the Education Sciences Reform Act similarly prohibits “the establishment of a nationwide database of individually identifiable information on individuals involved in studies or other collections of data under this title.”(4) And Section 134 of the Higher Education Act
prohibits development, implementation, or maintenance of a federal student unit-record system (one that would allow the government to collect personally identifiable information (PII) on individual higher-education students and link education data to workforce data). (5)

This last prohibition is the focus of much of the current debate on use of education records. What's wrong with a unit-record system? For one thing, it's based on a faulty premise – that the “success” of a student’s education is measured solely in terms of earning capacity. While a good education may increase earning power, that isn’t and shouldn’t be the sole or even the major point. Without exploring the question of the value of a liberal-arts education rather than simply workforce training, it’s very dangerous to make policy on the assumption that a student who chooses to be a teacher or a minister or some other modestly compensated profession is less successful than one who makes more money.

The danger here is that government will look at this skewed data and conclude that students should be “nudged” in one direction or another regardless of their interests or indeed the unintended consequences for society. In fact, this social engineering is already happening in my state of Georgia, where last year the legislature changed the policy of subsidizing AP exam fees for low-income students. (6) Now, the subsidy will be limited to AP exams in STEM subjects. Low-income students interested in English or history or languages are out of luck. One legislator was quoted as saying, “The truth is that for employable skills . . . they need to be taking AP STEM courses in high school.” So now the state government is decreeing what kinds of employment Georgia students should aspire to and what they should study to get there.

Our Founders would be surprised and, I think, alarmed, that government would be pushing students in any direction, much less away from the well-rounded liberal-arts education that enabled the Founders to create the most impressive political document ever written.

No government is equipped to make these kinds of decisions for individuals. No government can make better decisions than can the individual exercising his freedom. Human beings are not interchangeable. Our country has thrived for centuries without this kind of social engineering – by leaving these millions of small decisions to free citizens -- and it’s deeply dangerous to change that now.

Beyond this philosophical problem, a unit-record system violates the Fair Information Practice Principles (7) established in the Privacy Act of 1974, (8) and also rules of ethical research, in numerous ways. The same is true of other schemes designed to increase access to education data to accomplish other goals.

First, these envisioned structures would use and disclose students’ PII without their consent – or even their knowledge that this is happening. It’s one thing to collect and use data from a student who voluntarily participates in a government program and understands that participation will expose some of his PII to program administrators; it’s quite another to forcibly suck every individual into a data-collection system simply because he enrolled in an institution of higher education or even in a public school at any level. Telling that student he must relinquish control over his personal data to promote a greater good as defined by bureaucrats and lobbyists – or even worse, just dragooning him without telling him anything – not only violates Fair Information Principles but is simply un-American.

As stated by Mr. Frank Balz of the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, “the act of enrolling in college, even for a single course, should not require
permanent entry into a federal registry.” But that’s what all proposals for a unit-record system would require.

Mr. Balz also expressed concern about future expansion of such a system, which brings us to a second problem. Fair Information Principles also prohibit “repurposing” data for things not contemplated by the citizen owners when they turned it over. But the various program-evaluation schemes under consideration in Congress would do exactly that.

The problem is that literally everything can be linked to education. So why stop with employment data? Why not analyze the connection between one’s education and his health? Or his participation in the military? Or his housing choices? Or the number of children he has? Or his political activity? Or whether his suspension from school in 6th grade might indicate a future life of crime? As education-technology companies brag, predictive algorithms can be created, and their conclusions could allow government to push students down certain paths or close off others. And every question can be justified by citing “transparency,” “program effectiveness,” or “better consumer information.”

The chances of this data being “repurposed” – provided for one purpose but then used for something else entirely – are significant. Senator Warren very recently expressed concern about this issue in the context of whether the U.S. Department of Education is misusing federal earnings data to determine how much loan forgiveness should be allowed for defrauded students.9 Regardless of how you come down on this particular question, the point illustrates that the government has a natural tendency to use this convenient data for other purposes, despite the lack of consent from the citizen who provided it.

Proof that the Big Data community wants to repurpose data in a multitude of ways comes from one witness from Booz Allen Hamilton (former employer of Edward Snowden), who testified before the Commission about the “predictive intelligence” possibilities of mining and sifting federal databases. “For example,” he said, “eligibility and participation tracked by the Social Security Administration – when combined with taxpayer data and tax subsidies from the IRS, survey data from the U.S. Census Bureau, and data from other agencies, such as HHS and HUD – could exponentially . . . enhance our potential to draw insights that could not have been derived before.” This concept is simply chilling. This is what totalitarian countries like China do. It is not what free societies do.

Schemes that would connect all these distinct silos of data violate the Fair Information Principle requiring data minimization. Under this principle, the federal government should maintain as little data – not as much data – on each citizen as possible.

And will this dossier created on every citizen become permanent? Presumably so. If the goal of providing maximum consumer information is to be achieved, both historical and current data – constantly updated and expanded – must be compiled and preserved.

Perhaps this expansion won’t happen. Perhaps the federal government, in stark contrast to its behavior over the last 100 years, will stay within its constitutional boundaries. But reality-based Americans know the government will push the envelope as far as it possibly can, as it always does. And they know that giving that government access to such a treasure trove of data is dangerous to privacy and to individual liberty.

A third concern is the inappropriateness of making this gold mine available for “research” without strict controls. Research is important and to be encouraged (at least when it’s not of the
biased type frequently funded by the federal government to produce evidence in support of a pre-ordained outcome\(^{(10)}\). But in a free society governed by consent, no identifiable citizen data held by the government should be made available to any researcher without the consent of the data owner – that is, the citizen from whom it was taken. Strict rules of ethics applicable to research require no less under the principle of “respect for persons.”\(^{(11)}\)

When it comes to pre-K-12 education data, this principle is even more important because the research subjects are children who can’t give informed consent. If children’s education records are to be used in research other than in the very limited applicable exemptions, it is critical that the parents be informed and allowed to control their children’s participation. All legitimate research organizations, including applicable agencies within the Department of Health and Human Services, recognize the special protection due children in research studies.\(^{(12)}\)

When deciding how much access to allow to federal data repositories on children, it’s critical to be aware of the enormously intrusive types of information that are being collected. The most sensitive is psychological data collected through the craze of so-called “social emotional learning,” or SEL. With SEL, the government (through the school) and corporate vendors can compile data about the most personal aspects of every child who is subjected to it, including (via sophisticated computer platforms) how his mind works and what attitudes, values, and dispositions he holds.\(^{(13)}\) In fact, the federal government is itself trying to “incentivize” this highly intrusive data collection through not only the Every Student Succeeds Act,\(^{(14)}\) but also through the Strengthening Education Through Research Act,\(^{(15)}\) or SETRA (which revises the Education Sciences Reform Act). Compiling this type of data is bad enough; allowing nonconsensual access to researchers and other agencies could create a nightmare for children and their families and should be unthinkable in a free society.

Fourth, the idea that this massive repository of sensitive PII (whether it exists physically or just through linkages of data systems) will be protected against unauthorized access and breaches is quite simply delusional. Merely two years ago, hearings of the House Committee on Government Oversight and Reform\(^{(16)}\) revealed the shocking lack of student-data security throughout the U.S. Department of Education. The last few years have seen serious data breaches at other agencies including NSA,\(^{(17)}\) DoD,\(^{(18)}\) OPM,\(^{(19)}\) and SEC.\(^{(20)}\) The problems encompass both lax controls over the people allowed access to sensitive data, as well as outdated technology and inadequate security to prevent unauthorized access.

That the federal government should now consider ballooning the sensitive data contained in these insecure systems and opening it up to even more people is at best misguided and at worst, reckless. Given the difficulty or impossibility of truly securing data, ignoring the Fair Information Principle of data minimization can result in serious harm to American citizens.

This illustrates the difference between two concepts that are too often conflated in the discussion, and in fact in the Commission’s report. “Data security” means whether the government can keep data systems from being breached. “Data privacy” refers to whether the government has any right to collect and maintain such data in the first place. The Fair Information Principle of data minimization is designed to increase security by increasing privacy. A hacker can’t steal what isn’t there.

Even if the data systems were secure, the regulatory gutting of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) in 2012 means that government education officials (federal, state, and local) now have enormous leeway to disclose PII on individual students without their consent. Pursuant to the recent FERPA regulations, these officials may share private PII with other
government agencies, nonprofit entities, corporations, researchers, and literally anyone on the planet as long as the disclosure can be characterized as an audit or evaluation of a (broadly defined) “education program.”(21) FERPA needs updating and strengthening, but that’s a topic for another day.

Will the new conglomeration of student data be fair game for disclosure under these regulations? The danger is too real to dismiss.

As to the Commission’s assurances that all this data would be disclosed only with “approval” to “authorized persons,” we should ask: Approval of whom? Authorized by whom? There are myriad examples of government employees’ violating statute or policy by misusing or wrongfully disclosing data. And even if bureaucrats have only good intentions, what they consider appropriate use or disclosure may conflict absolutely with what the affected citizen considers appropriate. Again, this illustrates the necessity for consent.

Two final points: Much of what the government wants to accomplish through various so-called transparency bills can be accomplished through the free market. For example, any legitimate institution of higher education will be happy to provide statistics on graduation rates, alumni employment, etc., to applicants who ask for it. If applicants aren’t asking for it, that should tell us something about whether government should be mandating it. And the deeper problem here is that the government has taken over duties related to education and education financing that it manifestly has no constitutional right to be involved in. Having done so, it supposedly becomes necessary to add more layers of government control to ensure accountability for the results of this spending that never should have happened in the first place. I understand that this unconstitutional system won’t be dismantled any time soon, but I do think it’s critical for Congress to recognize this underlying problem and begin to address it.

In conclusion, we certainly recognize the value of unbiased research in pursuit of optimal policymaking. But we ask that Congress continue its protective policies when the subjects of such research are human beings. The goal of benefitting others in society, in vague and theoretical ways, or of “helping” citizens lead their own lives and make their own decisions, does not justify the federal government’s collection and dissemination of millions of data points on individuals – without their consent. This should not be happening in a free country. Some lines should not be crossed regardless of their supposed benefits. This is one of those lines.


10 See Emmett McGroarty, Jane Robbins, & Erin Tuttle, Deconstructing the Administrative State: The Fight for Liberty, Manchester, NH: Sophia Institute Press (2017), pp. 113-134. In addition, research that reaches conclusions contrary to what the government wants is frequently ignored (see the multiplicity of studies showing the futility and perhaps harm of the Head Start program, to which the government responds by annually increasing funding for Head Start). Allowing the personal lives of millions of Americans to be studied under a microscope to benefit a political agenda is unconscionable.


15 See https://edworkforce.house.gov/educationresearch/.
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