

## Testimony for Minnesota Senate E-12 Finance and Policy Committee

From: Troy Dalldorf, Concerned Homeschool Parent

Date: Friday, March 9, 2020

My name is Troy Dalldorf, and I am the parent of a ten-year-old who is being homeschooled. My wife and I have seen our son do very well in the home-school environment, and are blessed to have this opportunity, which we want to preserve. We continue to evaluate our sons progress and also appreciate the option to allow to go to a public, charter or private school as would be best for him.

We take our children's education seriously and spend countless hours whether in school or homeschooled ensuring the children are equipped for the workplace. We appreciate any and all resources and opportunities that are available to achieve this along with the privilege of choice. At the same time, we value standardized testing to validate the hard work.

That being said, the proposed changes in HF874 are concerning because of the lack of legal clarity, especially when compared to the current Minnesota Constitution, and potential implications as a result thereof. The changes are of uncertain intention because of their lack of clarity.

- I. The term "fundamental right" appears twice, however there is no mention in the Minnesota Constitution, the Declaration of Independence nor the United States Constitution of a right to an education of any sort. Not that education is not good and certainly something we should endeavor to have available to all children, but what is implied here is that a child who received a private education was being denied a fundamental right.
- II. The term "quality" is also used twice. This brings about the question of how quality would be defined, by whom, when and how often could they change? This seems to be an overreach of government. Is the current method of standardized testing insufficient?
- III. The term "fully prepare" is also wide open for interpretation. Who would define what it is to be fully prepared?

Changing the current constitution is unnecessary, and dangerous due to the introduction of terms that are sorely lacking in clarity. These changes open up the potential for litigation and interpretation.

Most people would agree that we should have a strong educational system in place, but this proposed amendment would do nothing that the current constitution does not already provide.

We encourage you to reject this proposed amendment to the Minnesota Constitution.