Representative Kasha Kelley, Chair of the Kansas House Education Committee, asked anyone who wished to speak for or against Common Core to bring real data, not supposition, to the battle over defunding CCSS in Kansas. From several sources, here are the links to documents for all to understand what is taking place with reference to CCSS being integrated into Kansas education. This information is primarily about the SLDS database that KSDE has agreed to use for Kansas students. I believe this is a vast intrusion into private information and must be stopped as part of CCSS.

First is page 19 of the paper "Common Core-Controlling Education from the Top" by Emmett McGroarty and Jane Robbins. "In 2009 the federal government created a State Fiscal Stabilization Fund, accessible only by states that agreed to build broad state longitudinal data systems (SLDS) to collect data on public-school students. To be eligible for stimulus money, all fifty states agreed to build an SLDS." The name of the document is "Alignment of secondary school graduation requirements with the demands of 21st century postsecondary endeavors and support for P-16 education data systems." Here is the link. http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/USCODE-2011-title20/pdf/USCODE-2011-title20-chap78-subchapIV-sec9871.pdf

The Department intends these SLDS to "capture, analyze, and use student data from preschool to high school, college, and the workforce."

What kinds of data might be included in the SLDS? According to the National Education Data Model, a myriad of information such as health-care history, disciplinary record, family income range, family voting status, and religious affiliation – over 400 data points in all. Here is the link to the data model. http://nces.sifinfo.org/datamodel/eiebrowser/techview.aspx?instance=studentElementarySecondary

"Until recently, federal student-privacy law protected personally identifiable information (PII) from disclosure to outside entities. That changed, however, in January 2012, when the Department issued new regulations eviscerating the protections contained in the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). The new regulations allow transmission of students' PII – without parental consent – to any governmental or private entity designated by the Department and others as an "authorized representative," for the purpose of evaluating an education program. Any PII the Department (or any other educational entity) acquires can now be shared with, for example, labor and public health agencies. The student's parents would have no right to object; indeed, they would probably never know the disclosure had been made. These other agencies would then have access to a wealth of personal data."

"The Department suggests there is nothing to worry about, at least with respect to the federal government, because the data it acquires from the state and local educational authorities are aggregate, not personally identifiable. But the assessment scheme aligned with Common Core is designed to change that. In exchange for federal funding of the PARCC and SBAC assessments, the cooperative agreements between the Department and those consortia explicitly require PARCC and SBAC to "develop a strategy to make student-level data that results from the assessment system available on an ongoing basis for research, including for prospective linking, validity, and program improvement studies; [sic] subject to applicable privacy laws."

"These demands go beyond assessing the effectiveness of funded programs; in fact, the Department claims the right to use the data – without parental permission – in future research projects. This is in keeping with various initiatives such as the recently announced joint venture between the

Departments of Education and Labor, the stated purpose of which is to conduct more effective research and to better evaluate education and workforce training programs. The Department of Labor makes no bones about what these agencies are doing: "developing or improving state workforce longitudinal data systems with individual level information [and] enabling workforce data to be matched with education data to create longitudinal data systems . . . ." With access to PII through the Common Core assessments, and with the new regulations that gut FERPA, the primary "challenges" to this effort have been swept away."

"Common Core, then, is an essential component of a broader economic and workforce plan to track and analyze students. It is bad enough that all states are now building SLDS in return for Stimulus money; it will be far worse if they adopt national standards and assessments that open up their students' private information to public and private entities throughout the nation."

VI. Conclusion

"The story of the Common Core Standards has been one of disdain for the American people. The federal government and private organizations have imposed the Standards on the states. They have done so in a manner that denied the people and their elected legislators a meaningful chance to review the Standards and to consider the implications of participation in the Common Core Standards system, including assessments and data collection."

The final chapter of this story, we believe, will be a rededication to the principle of government by the people. The American people are now awakening to the reality that their states have surrendered control to "experts," who are delivering a product that falls profoundly short of its billing. State elected bodies now have the chance to reverse this. They have the chance to reassert the people's right to self-determination. For the sake of our founding principles, they should do so.

Here is an article from Reuters about a tech show touting a K-12 database already in existence holding data from several million students.

http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/03/04/us-education-database-idUSBRE92204W20130304