

Education Committee

JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: HB-5468 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

Title: AN ACT CONCERNING THE PROVISION OF EQUIVALENT INSTRUCTION.

Vote Date: 3/18/2026

Vote Action: Joint Favorable Substitute

PH Date: 3/11/2026

File No.: 420

***Disclaimer:** The following JOINT FAVORABLE Report is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose.*

SPONSORS OF BILL:

Education Committee

REASONS FOR BILL:

This bill creates a phased framework for documenting and supporting equivalent instruction to ensure all children receive an adequate education. It requires basic documentation, periodic updates, and opportunities to demonstrate academic progress. It also includes a child safety measure requiring coordination with DCF during certain withdrawal situations to help ensure children are not placed in unsafe circumstances. Overall, it represents a step toward introducing oversight into a system that currently has none, while still maintaining flexibility in how children are educated.

SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE (IF APPLICABLE):

The substitute (1) adds a funding mechanism for school districts to implement the bill's provisions; (2) requires DCF to also check if a parent withdrawing their child appears on the child abuse and neglect registry; (3) extends the timeframe for DCF to respond to school districts' requests from 2 to 5 business days; (4) specifies that a school's request to DCF for the checks the bill requires does not constitute a report of child abuse or neglect; (5) allows, rather than requires, a school board to permit children receiving equivalent instruction to participate in classes or school activities; (6) prohibits a child who withdraws from school to receive equivalent instruction from participating in sports for the rest of the school year and for the next year.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

Christina Ghio, Acting Child Advocate for the Office of the Child Advocate (OCA)

Ms. Ghio supports this bill and references multiple investigations led by OCA regarding child abuse in her testimony. She prefaces by stating that she acknowledges the positive impact

that homeschooling can have for children and families, and that she is not broadly criticizing homeschooling. Her primary concern is with parents who exploit the state's lack of oversight to isolate their children and conceal abuse. She cites multiple cases of child abuse that occurred when parents withdrew their children from public school under the false pretense of homeschooling. Along with concerns regarding child abuse, Ms. Ghio highlights that our current law does not verify that homeschooled children are receiving an adequate education. She provides details of OCA's 2025 investigation which found that, "...during the three-year period of our review, 30% of all children under the age of 12 who were withdrawn from school for the stated purpose of homeschooling were chronically absent prior to their withdrawal. In our sample of children aged 7 to 11, we found that 22.9% of the children lived in a family with at least one accepted DCF report. 9.6% (75) lived in a family with at least one substantiated DCF investigation." Through this data, she argues that some parents who wish to harm their children use the state's lack of homeschooling regulations to do so, and that this infringes on children's right to an education and to be free from abuse and neglect. Moreover, she stresses that the state has a right to ensure the education of its citizens and protect children. Alongside the current provisions, she offers several recommendations, including an interview with the child by a qualified educator and the prohibition of a caregiver on the Child Abuse Registry from homeschooling their children. She includes additional language revision suggestions in her testimony.

Susan Hamilton, Interim Commissioner of Department of Children and Families

Interim Commissioner Susan Hamilton submitted comments on HB 5468, stating that subdivision (2) of subsection (e) of section 1 would require schools to notify DCF, if a parent seeks to withdraw a child from school to be homeschooled under equivalent instruction. She states that DCF would then be required to conduct a review to determine if the child is subject of an order for protective supervision or receiving protective services as defined in C.G.S. section 17a-93. If the family is already involved with DCF prior to a request for withdrawal under equivalent education, the Department of Children and Families, would be required to notify the school and the removal for equivalent instruction would be prohibited. Section 7 amends the confidentiality statute, C.G.S. section 17a-28, to permit DCF to provide that information to the school without consent of the parent or guardian. Commissioner Hamilton states that this section would require additional staff for the Careline to conduct reviews of records and provide the notifications to schools. Data from the State Department of Education indicates that 1500 - 2000 students are withdrawn from public school every year. She states that an influx of notices at the rate of numbers previously mentioned would be impossible to process at their current staffing levels and they would likely need at least two processing technicians to manage the additional workload. The Commissioner also stated that the 2-day review period, would not be enough time for the Department to process withdrawal requests and a 10-day review period would be more fitting. Lastly, Commissioner Hamilton states in exact language a suggestion to reduce the Department's caseload. "We believe it would be helpful if the statute included language that reads, "If the Commissioner of Children and Families determines that the child is not the subject of an order of protective supervision or receiving protective services, as defined in section 17a-93 of the general statutes, the Commissioner is precluded from taking any additional action related to the notification unless a report is made pursuant to 17a-101a."

TJ Nuccio, Children's Policy Analyst for The Commission on Women, Children, Seniors, Equity and Opportunity (CWCSEO)

The Commission supports this bill and believes that it establishes a narrowly tailored safeguard for children while maintaining the rights of homeschooling parents. They stress the importance of these safeguards and reference both national and Connecticut child welfare data that reveal that a significant number of children withdrawn from school may have experience with child protective systems. The 2025 Office of the Child Advocate Report and the 2023 Child Maltreatment Report from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services highlight the pervasiveness of child neglect and interactions with child protective systems, and they argue that this warrants coordination between educational and child welfare agencies to protect at-risk children. They maintain that they support thoughtful policies that balance parental autonomy with safeguards to protect children from abusive environments.

Commissioner Charlene Russell-Tucker, CT State Department of Education

Commissioner Charlene Russell-Tucker testified in opposition to HB 54688. The Commissioner states that in 2025 1,800 students left the public school system for homeschooling. She states that within the next 6 years the number of the students to leave the public education system for other options, could exceed 10,000, requiring schools to expand the staffing capacity to compensate for the addition of paperwork, produced by this proposed legislation. The Commissioner states that HB 5468 contains language that requires schools to process forms that document a student's transition from the public school system to other non-public education. This would also include processing the equivalent education forms and instruction paperwork. She points out that this situation is further complicated by the inclusion of students who qualify for English Learner status, part-time scheduling, assistance mandated under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. She states that this would increase the fiscal, technological, and staffing burden to public school systems as they would have to anticipate the schedule differences and increased caseload of ESL teachers, the transportation of these part-time and / or profoundly disabled students and make continuous changes and updates to the Information and Technology systems. Commissioner Tucker also states that inclusion in extra curriculums such as sports must also be taken into consideration as the associated cost for these programs would increase. She also states that the schedule modification included in this bill would extend to magnet schools and that would cause an issue with lottery seat placement system. She notes that this could be rectified if the language were to indicate that this part-time student can only be granted a placement after the lottery is closed and if there were any open seats in the intended school left. In conclusion, the Commissioner states that the school system is currently struggling with student absenteeism and the proposed changes in this bill would place more burden on municipalities and the Department as a whole to conduct outreach to these students as well as keeping track of the processing and management of these other specialized programs. She states that the added financial burden would also fall on the municipalities and to residents as the additional costs raised by these changes were not included in the Governor's Budget.

Melissa Willette, New England Regional Liaison, U.S. Department of War

Ms. Willette opposes this bill because of the negative impact she says that it will have on military families. She testifies that military families homeschool their children at nearly twice the rate of civilian families due to frequent relocations. Homeschooling allows the children in military families to have a stable and consistent learning environment, which she says is essential to avoid disruptions in their education. The Department of War proposes a change to section 1, subsection 3 regarding the timeline for families to personally appear at a school district to file an intent to educate form. This change would be a 30-day grace period to allot

active-duty military families the necessary time that they need to understand and fulfil homeschooling requirements so that they can avoid the penalties of noncompliance. She states that this would also assist children in these transitions and reduce interruptions in their education.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

Bobby Sanchez, Mayor of New Britain and Jessica Vargas, Alderwoman of the City of New Britain

Mayor Sanchez and Alderwoman Vargas voice their support for this bill and state that the City of New Britain continues to mourn the tragic loss of Jacqueline “Mimi” Torres-Garcia. They stress that it is crucial to ask how something like this can happen while looking for ways to prevent it from happening again, such as through the establishment of a framework that ensures that no child in the state can disappear without someone asking questions. By creating a simple registration process with the local school district and establishing clear communication between educators, school administrators, families, and state agencies, they argue that warning signs would not be missed, and vulnerable children would remain visible to the systems designed to protect them. This in turn would create a stronger system where children would not slip through the cracks, and they believe that the state owes this protection and advocacy to every child in the state.

John Stewart, Director of Programs for the Coalition for Responsible Home Education (CRHE)

The CRHE, a national organization that advocates for an approach to homeschooling that is grounded in children’s rights, strongly supports this bill, and believes that it ensures that homeschooled children receive quality education in safe environments. They support the notification requirement, disqualification provisions for those subject to ongoing abuse investigations, and equivalent instruction provisions. Regarding the notification requirement, they cite a ProPublica investigation in Illinois which found that the lack of a notification requirement created a loophole that prevented chronic absenteeism from being identified and responded to, thereby creating an environment where children can disappear without a follow-up. Additionally, they cite their own Homeschooling’s Invisible Children database that identified over 500 publicly documented cases of abuse and neglect that led to over 230 fatalities of homeschooled children in the U.S., and from their perspective, this necessitates the disqualification provision. They also argue that the equivalent instruction section is crucial to maintaining a quality education because the often-cited research that homeschooled children perform better than their public-school peers has been repeatedly discredited due to its methodology. In reference to a national-scale study, they state that homeschooled students were two to three times more likely to report being behind the grade levels of their peers. They address the opposition to this bill by voicing their belief that those against regulations through safeguards are not following evidence or clear jurisprudence, and express alarm regarding the Homeschool Legal Defense Association's founder, Michael Farris, who has previously defended parents using corporal punishment against their children. It is their stated objective that they are urging the legislature to prioritize the interests and rights of children over what they see as extremism.

Tess Ulrey, Executive Director of the Coalition for Responsible Home Education (CRHE)

Ms. Ulrey cites her positive homeschooling experience along with her work with the CHRE as her motivation for supporting this bill. She says that the state has a responsibility to use

legislation to ensure that homeschooled students have an outcome similar to hers, and to avoid the experience of other homeschooled alumni who contact CRHE as adults because they received inadequate education. To properly balance parental rights and safety regulations in future legislation, she points to the Supreme Court cases *Pierce vs. Society of Sisters* and *Meyer v. Nebraska*, which found that while the state cannot prohibit parents from making educational choices for their children, the choices still can be reasonably regulated. Additionally, she references the *Wisconsin vs Yoder* Supreme Court case that calls for the balancing of parental rights with other interests and maintained that parents' interests were not absolute and therefore could be regulated. She states that, "CRHE believes Connecticut's current approach to homeschooling leaves a gap of misunderstanding and hostility, and without a framework, everyone loses. Non purposeful homeschoolers - those who use loopholes to cover abuse and neglect - have no distinction from the purposeful homeschoolers." Lastly, she argues that abuse happens in both public school and homeschooling, thus necessitating greater oversight and accountability in both educational environments.

Kate Dias and Joselyn DeLancey, President and Vice President of the CT Education Association (CEA)

The CEA supports this bill and contends that while equivalent instruction can be achieved through homeschooling, there is no procedure to verify that it is taking place. Concerns such as educational neglect and abuse, they argue, warrant the need for a registration process. Additionally, they raise several considerations for sections 4 and 5, noting that it is unclear if the student would be included in enrollment counts for federal funding, eligible for special education service, or Section 504 accommodations. They believe that the bill is also unclear about how a student who is seeking to enroll in high school or middle school courses that require a pre-requisite would be treated and how their appropriate course placement would be determined.

Wilma Barbosa, Councilwoman for the New Britain City Council

The Council woman voices her support for this bill and explains that the bill does not attack homeschooling families. She raises concerns with the lack of an oversight system that accounts for all children to ensure that they are safe. Furthermore, she references teachers, counselors, nurses, and other public-school staff as a line of defense to identify if a child is enduring abuse or neglect. She states that, "Basic reporting, oversight, or periodic check-ins are not excessive government control. They are reasonable protections to ensure that no child falls through the cracks." In her role as a public official, she emphasizes her responsibility to balance parental rights and child protection.

Richard D. Dixon, Esq.

Attorney Dixon, who was formerly a middle school and high school teacher and is now an adjunct professor in the University of New Haven teacher certification master's program and lawyer, supports this bill and believes there are misconceptions surrounding its text. He argues that nothing would take away a parent's right to homeschool their child or remove a parent's ability to be the primary responsible party to choose the course of education for their child. While acknowledging the testimony of homeschooled children who speak positively of their experience, he highlights that this bill is intended to help students who are having a negative experience or are not receiving adequate education. He maintains that this bill would address these issues without excessive burdens on families. Moreover, he testifies that in his time at juvenile court, the discovery of child abuse often happened in a timely

manner because of children attending public school and being around more community members. However, he does raise several concerns. The first is the intent of the word “withdraw” in the statute, which could be interpreted to only apply to children who were in public school and then withdrawn instead of covering all school-aged children in the state. Additionally, he is hesitant about DCF involvement and the potential for it to result in unwarranted intrusion by the Department. Regarding Section 2, he states that some of the concepts are too vague and offers legal language suggestions for clarification in areas of the bill such as demonstration options, periodic reporting, standardized tests, enforcement, and the rights of families to appeal findings.

Sarah Eagan, Executive Director of the Center for Children’s Advocacy

Ms. Eagan supports this bill while raising several concerns. She begins by referencing SDE’s Circulate Letter C-14 from 1994, stating that it recommended that districts require parents to file a detailed notice of intent to homeschool and for the districts to hold an annual portfolio review. However, she testifies that no districts follow the letter’s guidance, resulting in no follow-up on withdrawn children. Regarding the bill’s statutory obligations, she raises issue with the ambiguity of any liability that a district could incur if they do not follow up with students to ensure that they are receiving equivalent instruction. She also notes that DCF is given few instructions on how to fulfill their obligations and caseworkers do not have precise state law to follow as protocol in these situations. In summation, she stresses that this lack of clarity impedes on the enforcement of these laws to both protect parental rights and ensure children’s safety. To support the rest of the bill, she emphasizes the life and death consequences of the state’s lack of statutory directives, specifically citing several recent child abuse cases in the state. She affirms that she is advocating for a clarification of state and local responsibilities to guarantee safety and education for the state’s children, not the removal of the right to homeschool. In her view, by implementing these statutes, children who are enduring abuse in their homes and are pulled out of public school would be given necessary protection through oversight and accountability measures.

Heather Dean, Special Education Teacher

Ms. Dean supports this bill and cites her experience as a director and owner of a licensed childcare center who worked under the oversight of the Department of Public Health and the Office of Early Childhood. She emphasizes that she chose to remain licensed and regulated because she values the benefits that oversight brought to her students. By undergoing inspections, she states that she was able to find areas for improvement and ensure that her staff was engaging in the best available practices, which allow them to provide a nurturing and efficient educational environment for her students. She argues that this bill should be viewed as a tool that validates the work of homeschooling parents and protects children from falling through the cracks.

Jenna F.

Jenna voices her support for this bill and argues against the opposition. She cites the historical evolution of education in the United States, beginning with the Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1642. She explains that while America did not have a state-run public school system that mirrors what exists in the present, there were substantial regulations in the form of mandates, duties, inspections, and penalties on private actors. Moreover, she notes that New England colonies throughout the seventeenth century created mandates for towns and parents to abide by to ensure that children received an education. She quotes several Founding Fathers who emphasize the need for widespread education, and herself states that,

“By the time of the American Founding, this colonial tradition had matured into a widely shared political principle that republican government depended on an educated populace, and the states bore responsibility for ensuring it. Founding-era leaders did not view education as a matter of indifference to the state, nor as an exclusively private choice insulated from public oversight.” With this historical context, she believes that this bill is a part of the country’s educational tradition and thus advocates for these regulations alongside the expansion of resources that homeschooling families need.

Nusie Halpine, LCSW

Ms. Halpine, who was a school social worker for 28 years, voices support for this bill. She commends parents who homeschool their children and provide them with a high quality education. However, she reports that she witnessed parents pull their children out of school when she knew that they were not capable of teaching their children due to mental health concerns or a lack of education, such as parents who did not graduate from high school or have a GED. She expresses grave concern about the isolation and educational neglect that these children faced, and testifies that parents would re-enroll their children and then withdraw when they became angry with the public school staff. It is her hope that this bill will prevent any more tragedies regarding child abuse in these cases and ensure access to necessary education.

Madeline Homar, Stay-at-home Mother

Ms. Homar cites her experience in the foster care system, along with her role as a wife and mother, to support this bill. She says that this legislation is a safeguard, not a punishment of homeschooling families. When she was a child in the foster care system, DCF conducted routine welfare checks to ensure her safety, and she states that she did not perceive those visits as negative. She, along with the other children, viewed it as a way to make sure that the environment that they were in was safe. Through these check-ins, she believes that children have the opportunity to be seen and heard, especially those in vulnerable situations. She suggests including a wellness check on the entire household along with other resources for families in the bill, as she notes the emotional and financial pressures that parents often face and views additional support as a source of stabilization for families and communities. This, from her perspective, would help avoid the misconception that check-ins are a governmental accusation that should be feared. Lastly, she offers other recommendations to implement the inclusion of faith-based community organizations in the provisions.

Steve Kennedy, Homeschooling Parent

Mr. Kennedy is a homeschooling parent who supports the bill and references the positive impacts that homeschooling has had on his family and those of his friends. He believes that this bill demonstrates the Committee’s willingness to protect children and support families. However, he offers several suggestions for language changes to expand access to public resources for homeschooling families because home education requires a significant amount of resources that not all families are able to access. He recommends the inclusion of a remote option for parents to notify school districts along with greater detail regarding compliance and enforcement parameters for SDE to follow. Additionally, he suggests that the notification process be run directly through SDE to ease administrative burden on school districts. While supporting this bill, he also emphasizes that it is necessary to have a framework that preserves the flexibility and personalization of homeschooling that enables it to be successful.

An additional 29 individuals support this bill, stating that it is crucial to keep education consistent for students regardless of their method of education. They argue that it does not violate parents' rights and instead offers them support. Additionally, they highlight the negative long-term impacts on homeschooled children when they are not educated properly, such as decreases in literacy rates that can impede on their political participation, and believe that this bill would ensure that children receive a holistic education while protecting children from abuse by those who exploit the state's lack of regulations. While acknowledging the benefits of homeschooling in different circumstances, some also warn about educational neglect that they personally experienced that put them at a disadvantage when entering adulthood. They also express concern regarding homeschooled children's lack of socialization opportunities, which they believe would hinder them in adulthood. Moreover, they express concern that there is not a way to determine if homeschooling children are receiving adequate education if there is a lack of an accountability structure, and they note several child abuse cases in the state as just cause for regulations and periodic check-ins. In their view, this bill contains modest regulations that work to provide all Connecticut children with quality education while still respecting parental choice.

<u>Mickey Kramer, RN MS, Former Associate Child Advocate</u>	<u>Dr. Ada Fenick, Pediatrician at Yale School of Medicine</u>	<u>Carissa Own, Homeschooling Mother</u>	<u>Omayra Robledo, UConn Master of Social Work Student</u>
<u>William Sarris, formerly homeschooled child</u>	<u>Dominica Benyi</u>	<u>Terence Corcoran</u>	<u>Philip Dooley</u>
<u>Sydney Glasgow</u>	<u>Margaret Grey</u>	<u>Leanne Harpin</u>	<u>Beth Lapin</u>
<u>Richard Lee</u>	<u>Joyce Lynch</u>	<u>Zoe Martin</u>	<u>Eric Rizzo</u>
<u>Luna Rosado</u>	<u>Joy Talotta</u>	<u>Carla Wirta</u>	<u>Anonymous 1010</u>
<u>Anonymous 1270</u>	<u>Anonymous 1528</u>	<u>Anonymous 1717, CT Homeschooling Alumni</u>	<u>Anonymous 428</u>
<u>Anonymous 552</u>	<u>Anonymous 553</u>	<u>Anonymous 950</u>	<u>Anonymous</u>
<u>Anonymous</u>			

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

Rep. Mark DeCaprio, 48th Assembly District: Rep. DeCaprio opposes this bill and testifies that he has received a significant number of emails and phone calls regarding it. He explains his experience as a homeschooling father and the benefits that it had for his children and family. In reference to CGS Section 10-184, he argues that it sufficiently tasks parents with ensuring their child's education and deciding their educational path. In his view, this bill is governmental overreach in a way that diminishes parental authority. He cites the Supreme Court decision *Mirabelli v. Bonta*, which grants parents the primary authority to determine the care and education of their minor children. Additionally, he states that parents choose to homeschool their children for a variety of reasons, and that they understand their children's learning styles and unique needs more than others. He also believes that it allows parents to teach their children to think critically without public schools undermining familial beliefs. Regarding this bill and SB6, he argues that these bills saddle DCF and SDE with greater responsibilities while they are already strained. He hopes that these two agencies will instead focus on the public-school student population to address truancy and bullying, and believes that this would better achieve the objective of ensuring child safety.

Dr. Matthew Conway, Jr., Superintendent of Schools for Derby Public Schools: Dr. Conway opposes this bill and raises concern regarding the personnel and funding required to carry out these provisions, stating that districts are experiencing financial pressures and staffing shortages. He testifies that most districts do not have personnel with the experience that is needed to review educational portfolios, maintain records, communicate with families, evaluate evidence of instruction, and ensure compliance. Moreover, he worries that allowing students who receive equivalent instruction to enroll in certain public school classes could create issues regarding the accountability structures that are in place to support student behavior, attendance, and accountability since homeschooled students are not subject to the same framework. An additional concern he raises is the lack of inclusion of students who attend magnet, technical, charter, or private schools in these public school classes, which could create inequities. Lastly, he highlights several areas of the bill that require further clarification and detail, such as the new calculations within the Education Cost Sharing formula, interscholastic athletic eligibility, operational and liability considerations for student supervision and accountability, and those who are in an individualized special education program. He urges the Committee to ensure appropriate oversight while retaining resources for the state's public school system.

Dr. Susie Da Silva, Superintendent of Schools in Ridgefield Public Schools: Dr. Da Silva appreciates the intent of the bill, but does not believe that the bill as currently written will achieve its objectives. She feels that the monitoring and regulatory responsibilities would not solve the issues at hand, all while being operationally impractical and inequitable for local school districts. The responsibilities in the bill, from her perspective, signify an unsustainable expansion at the local level for roles that are designated to the state level. She notes that the proposals create an unfunded mandate and could give rise to conflicts regarding class size, scheduling, staffing, inequality in extracurricular activities, and assisting students with disabilities. Due to these problems, she argues that this bill should not pass in its current form and urges the legislature to research different solutions while preserving the appropriate roles of parents, the state, and local school districts.

Len Corto, Executive Director of the CT High School Coaches Association (CHSCA): Mr. Corto and the CHSCA oppose section 4 of the bill regarding interscholastic athletics. He states that when a student is not fully enrolled in a public school, it poses challenges for coaches and administrators to verify academic eligibility, attendance, and compliance, alongside difficulties with creating fair rosters that ensure participation opportunities and team development. Additionally, he says that the state has policies that are designed to establish competitiveness and equitable eligibility standards, and the provisions within the bill would limit the flexibility of schools to manage athletic programs within those existing structures. He believes that interscholastic athletic decisions should stay under the authority of local school districts and the existing local governance.

Samantha Dill, Homeschooling and Special Education parent: Ms. Dill states that the current regulations in the state are sufficient to ensure that children are receiving access to high quality education, and references her experiences with a public school neglecting her child's Individualized Education Program (IEP) program. She testifies that homeschooling allowed her child to succeed, and she worries that the vague definitions in this bill would enable the public school system to impede on how they teach their children. Concerns that she raises include unclear portfolio and demonstration requirements, how the needs of special education

students will be addressed, the inadequacy of a public school benchmark, and unequal testing expectations for public versus homeschool students. She argues that the existing regulations are adequate and that additional portfolio or testing mandates would be redundant and ineffectual.

Kate Cima, Homeschool Parent: Ms. Cima voices opposition to this bill and cites her experience as a mother of a neurodivergent child in her testimony. She expresses concern that the bill removes flexible and reasonable regulation, such as CGS 10-184, which she argues would jeopardize the homeschool education of children with special needs. The provisions of this bill could damage rather than support a high standard of education for homeschooling, and she worries that this is a one-size-fits-all approach negatively impacts the educational paths of those who have been harmed by the public school system. She emphasizes the need for flexibility, and urges the Committee to oppose this bill to prevent constraints on homeschooling methods.

Several members of the public oppose this bill and argue that Supreme Court cases such as *Pierce v. Society of Sisters* and *Wisconsin v. Yoder* established the constitutional rights of parents to choose the educational path of their children. Additionally, they believe that the child abuse cases in New Britain and Waterbury are being mischaracterized as homeschooling failures as opposed to misconduct by the state's child protective services. They also reference data surrounding DCF audits, public school bullying, literacy rates, and academic performance gaps to underscore their concerns with the public school system and the state's child protective services. From their perspective, the state should allocate attention to addressing the issues with the public school system and DCF, and not to those who choose to homeschool.

Michael R. Criss, First Selectman, Town of Harwinton

Shelley Connor

Stephanee Cousimano

Donna Cook, CPA: Ms. Cook opposes this bill and notes several legislative and policy changes made by the state government with little warning to residents. She references the public benefits charge from PURA, HB5222 regarding certified public accountants, the planned establishment of a prison in Tolland, and HB5468 as instances where unnecessary burdens were placed on constituents without adequately notifying the public. Citing language proficiency data for Connecticut, she believes that the state's public school system is not an attractive option for families who want to educate their children as they see fit.

Linda Corning, Homeschooling Parent: Ms. Corning opposes this bill and describes her position in the debate surrounding homeschooling. She argues that while many homeschoolers justifiably fear regulation due to governmental overreach, she maintains that it would be harmful to insist that abuse and neglect cannot occur in homeschooling settings. Moreover, she states that when the community does not allow for discussion or room for dialogue, it sends incorrect signals to legislators that there is no room for meaningful engagement. While she strongly opposes the equivalent instruction provision, she offers the opportunity to have a conversation about how the state can flexibly verify that children have access to the necessary materials and experiences by using a benchmark that is designed with homeschooled children in mind. She states that DCF needs meaningful reform, and testifies regarding her son's positive experience with homeschooling that allowed him to learn outside of a rigid system of instruction.

Eva Costabile, CT Homeschool Graduate: Ms. Constabile testifies regarding her positive experience with homeschool while having a visual impairment. She studied opera and classical music, and she stated that her experience in the public school system hindered her love of learning. Once she was homeschooled, she states that she was able to receive a quality education without feeling different from others. In addition, she and her brother excelled in college, which she credits to her homeschooling education. She expresses worry that the bill would eliminate opportunities for children to have a similar learning experience as her and her brother.

Anonymous: An anonymous testifier supports the sections of the bill that allow homeschooled students to participate in music and sports programs in public schools, but opposes the remainder of the bill. She testifies that both her parents, herself, and her children have experience in both public and private educational institutions. While she acknowledges the benefits of public school, she notes that issues regarding bullying, sexual abuse, and a lack of diversity of opinion exist in these spaces. She emphasizes that homeschooling has allowed her children to engage in curiosity and debate while tailoring lessons to her children's specific needs. In addition, she says that there are studies that show that homeschooled children fare better academically and emotionally than their public school peers. She believes that the burden should fall on public schools to prove that they are providing equivalent instruction to homeschooling. With regard to child safety, she describes her negative experiences with DCF when her child had a traumatic accident that required hospitalization, and her family was reported to the Department and followed for several months, which created pain and distrust of the Department. Lastly, she states that homeschooling families invest in their children and work to build a strong society, arguing that families should be encouraged to advocate for their children and that this bill follows a pattern of the state's hostile legislation towards children.

Christina Dustin: Ms. Dustin opposes this bill and stresses her frustration with the bills that the legislature has passed within the last 7 years regarding education and vaccination. She argues that the recent child abuse cases in the state are a result of the failures of DCF, and not the homeschooling community. Additionally, she cites Commissioner Tucker's testimony that the bill violates FERPA, which could cause the state to lose federal funding, and emphasizes that this would harm all CT children. Lastly, she addresses the evaluation of the Office of the Child Advocate report by UConn statisticians which highlights that, "From a statistical perspective, there is too little information presented in the report for any inference to be made. To make inference, we would need information about DCF reporting rates from traditional school settings (acting as the comparison group). This report can be described as a purely descriptive report, but it still lacks key information...Ultimately, there is no statistical analysis in this report that could be used to make any inference about the impact of homeschooling on DCF referral rates and whether the rates differ between homeschooled children and traditionally schooled children." Based on this information, she urges the Committee to vote against the bill in its entirety.

Diane Eng Swanson, Executive Director of the Pratt Nature Center: Ms. Swanson opposes this bill and requests that the Committee reconsider its equivalent instruction provisions. She states that research in neuroscience and child development demonstrate that children learn best through play, exploration, and social interaction as opposed to rigid instructional models. In addition, she cites research by the American Academy of Pediatrics and the National Institutes of Health that reveal that outdoor play improves attention, self-regulation, physical health, emotional resilience, and healthy brain development. Moreover, she provides

information from the Stanford Center for Education Policy that indicates that delaying desk-based academics until age 7 improves behavioral and mental health along with academic performance. She contends that programs such as hers at the Pratt Nature Center allow for this type of educational environment and thus help children learn and grow in a way that is backed by developmental psychologists. Through this bill, she worries that it would restrict access to the diversity of high-quality learning environments that meet children’s developmental needs. She hopes that the Committee will adjust the equivalent instruction provisions so that programs such as those at the Pratt Nature Center can continue to educate children according to the science of childhood development.

An additional 149 members of the public voice opposition to this bill and state that it is an overreach of government authority and establishes unnecessary oversight. Additionally, they testify regarding the positive impacts of homeschooling on the children in their lives, and some homeschooling students themselves testify, stating that it allows them to be more creative, flexible, and engaged with their education, especially for children with disabilities. From their perspective, they believe that this bill is using DCF to profile homeschooling parents instead of treating them with kindness and respect, and some reference previous negative experiences with mandated reporters. Regarding child safety, they stress that the recent child abuse cases in the state were a failure of DCF, and do not warrant restrictions on homeschooling. They reference challenges they encounter at the municipal level, such as community centers requiring umbrella insurance policies for certain events, as examples of barriers that homeschooling communities already face. Therefore, they state that the provisions of this bill would further burden parents and take time away from teaching their children. Additionally, they cite frustrations with the public school system that led them to homeschool their children, such as issues with vaccination mandates, overworked staff, and a lack of resources, and thus argue that the state should focus on fixing public schools through equivalent instruction standards rather than regulating homeschooling families. They argue that the decline of language proficiency rates and standardized test scores amongst public school students are a major source of concern. They also reference the 2021 state law that removes religious exemptions for vaccinations as a point of contention which drove more families to homeschool their children. Moreover, they believe that the definition of equivalent instruction is too vague and could undermine the efficacy of homeschool education. In addition, some testifiers reference research that does not find a difference in rates of abuse and mistreatment between public and homeschooled students, and believe that CGS 10-184 provides sufficient regulation while arguing that any additional provisions would not address child abuse or increase homeschooled children’s academic achievement. Alongside these concerns, they state that these new unfunded mandates will create financial and administrative burdens for both local and regional boards of education and homeschooling families, and would impose on religious freedoms through restricting religious teachings. They feel that this is an initial step in establishing further regulatory powers by the state and has major privacy violations regarding FERPA and several Supreme Court decisions such as *Wisconsin v. Yoder* and *Mahmoud v. Taylor*.

Dr. Charlotte Duffee	Matthew Costell, Associate Professor at the University of Hartford	Marc A. Ciarleglio	Marina Cintron
Amanda from Wallingford	Frances Clark	Melissa Clark	Sandra Clark
Gustavo Claudio	Richard Clavet	Sandra Cloutier	Jennifer Coe
Randall Coe	Elizabeth Coello	Christopher Cohen	Sebastian Colbert

Mona Colwell	Diana Comeau	Francis Conlan	Carrie Connell
Patricia Constantino	Shelley Cooper	Courtney Cope	Alyssa Cortez
Steven Costa	Heather Costabile	Nick Costabile	Michael Costanza
Karen Costanzo	Jayne Cote	Laryssa Cour	Samantha Craigie
Erika Crawford	Cheryl Crevier	Harold Crevier	Denise Cruz
Nikki Cruz	Jessica Cubito	LuAnn Cullen	Linda Czaplinski
Alana D.	Anna D.	J.D., Current CT Homeschooling Student	Justin D.
Karina D., Mother and LMSW Student	L.D., Current CT Homeschooling Student	Matthew D.	Nicole D.
Tammy D.	Hannah D.	Aga Daek	Janet Dahlberg
Shaneeka Dailey	Dr. Linda Dalessio	Lynda Dalton	Christine Damu
Melissa Darr	Kimberly Daun	Greg Davis	Cathryn DeCaprio
Stephanie DeCiantis	Anna Decker	Scott Decker	Theresa Deecken
Jennifer DeGirolomo	Mary Del Re	Jacob Dell, Pastor at First Church Woodbury	Jesika DeMatteo
George Deming	James Dempsey	Samantha Dempsey	Bridgette Deniger
James Deniger	Abigail Denison	Cathy Denison	Jaclyn Denison
Josh Denison	Raymond Denison	John Derewianka	Michele DeRosier
Chelsea Deschaine	James DesRocher	Diane DeVito	Frank DeVito
Paul DeVito	Zach Dexter	Amber Diaz	Anya Diaz, Current CT Homeschooling Student
Melissa Diaz	Suzanne DiBiase	Len DiCostanzo	Patricia DiCostanzo
Laura DiDominzio	Krista DiGioia	Mark DiGioia	Denise Dill
Kimberly Dillingham	Laura DiMasso	Luigi DiRubba	Caitlyn Doenges
Jenna Donovan	Erin Dolittle, former Special Educator and Family Therapist	Leyna Doran	Stacy Dourado
Brianna Drake	William Drouin	Crista Drozdenko	Elizabeth Drysdale, Minister for Christian Global Outreach Ministries
Kathryan Drysdale	Becky Duff	Jini Dugan	Jessica Dugas
Marjean Douglas, Homeschooling Student	Nina Dugas, Homeschool Graduate	Philip Dugas, Homeschooling Father	Sky Dugas, Homeschool Graduate
David Dunford	David Dustin	Cathy Dvorsky	Matthew Dwyer
Sarah Dzialo	Wendy E.	Megan Eagan	Jaclyn Eaton
Nancy Eaton	Maureen Eberly, Retired Educator	Rebecca Ebert	Katherine Eckhart
April Edens	Anonymous Former Educator	Michael Edwards, Law Enforcement Officer	Victoria Eisenhauer
Lana El	Stephanie Elder, Teacher	Amanda Elizabeth	Wendy Ennis
Alisa Epstein	Jessie Erdmann	Deborah Ericksen	Katherine Erismann
Priscilla Escobar	Deb Espinosa	Ams Estelle	Ariana F.
Jackie M.	William Stanley		

[Sarah Dzialo opposed all but one section of the bill]: Ms. Dzialo supports the section of the bill that allows homeschooled children to take two classes at a public school and allow participation in extracurricular activities and athletics. She says that this allows homeschooling families to use resources that they pay for through property taxes.

Three Superintendents acknowledge the intent of the bill, but believe that it moves in the wrong direction. They express concern regarding the unfunded mandates that would significantly burden local boards of education and district staff due to the substantial expansion of the role of public school districts. One states that the DCF notification raises practical and privacy concerns that may cause complications with the withdrawal process. Additionally, they argue that asking districts to evaluate the education of a child that is occurring outside the public school system when they do not have meaningful access to the totality of their educational experience is not a coherent way to establish oversight, stating that portfolio review without clear standards would hinder any academic transparency. Regarding extracurricular activities and athletics, they raise the issue of homeschool students not being subject to the same requirements or being evaluated under the same GPA systems as other students, and this works against fairness, equitable participation, accountability, and order within those programs. They emphasize that this would create a flawed and inequitable system that disadvantages public school students. Furthermore, they worry that there are legal and operational hurdles from this bill, specifically regarding special education students, which could create confusion and liability for schools. To ensure child safety, one urges the legislature to address the concern at the state level, such as SDE accepting primary responsibility for registration and oversight. He suggests that SDE should create an online statewide registration portal that would contain a central database, establish uniform procedures, and ensure statewide consistency; and local districts may be tasked with annual follow-ups and communicate their findings with SDE and DCF.

Bryan Luizzi, Superintendent of Schools for New Canaan Public Schools

Steven Madancy, Superintendent of Schools for Southington Public Schools

Dr. Christopher J. Tranberg, Superintendent of Schools for Branford Public Schools

Douglas Marchetti, Director of Athletics for Norwalk High School: Mr. Marchetti strongly opposes section 4 of the bill based on four points of contention. To begin, he states that there are GPA requirements for students to be eligible to participate in athletics to ensure their academic progress and graduation, and therefore this bill could allow homeschooling parents that issue their children's grades to bypass the academic guardrails and standards that are in place to maintain student success. Additionally, there are administrative concerns regarding how the behavior and decorum standards to which public school children are subject would translate to homeschooled children, and the financial burden that it would have on school administration budgets when taking homeschooled students into account. Moreover, he worries that a non-enrolled student would take the roster spot of public school students who are contributing members of their public school system through attending classes and engaging with different programs. An additional concern that he has is the more flexible schedule of homeschooling students, as he believes that the stricter schedules of public school students help to reinforce accountability with student athletes. Lastly, he emphasizes the importance of teacher-coach connections when it comes to the overall success of student athletes, and he states that they work closely together along with other school staff to monitor students. By having access to more information about the student athlete, such as academic data, the

coaches can provide better support and keep academically-challenged students engaged in their studies; this would be significantly more difficult with homeschooled children, as coaches do not have the same access to their academic data and support networks.

Anne LaMonica, Associate Director of the CT Catholic Public Affairs Conference (CTCPAC): The Conference opposes this bill because of the equivalent instruction provision. They state that using the bill's definition, nonpublic schools are unrelated to this provision and thus the students enrolled in these schools should not be subject to the in-person requirements in the bill. To address this issue, they make several recommendations for changes and considerations. To begin, they urge the Committee to remove the in-person appearance requirement to submit an intent to educate form to attend a nonpublic school, or establish an alternative form for those schools to ensure parental consent and evidence of enrollment. In addition, they raise concerns regarding the bill's potential FERPA violations; and they instead suggest that when a child under DCF supervision enrolls in a public or nonpublic school, DCF should inform the school's administrators, and those administrators should be tasked with informing DCF if the child were withdrawn from school. Furthermore, they disagree with the portfolio review because it could conflict with the religious teachings of Catholic families and mandate compulsory public school education, and argue that Supreme Court decisions such as *Pierce v. Society of Sisters* and *Mirabelli v. Bonta* protect this method of instruction. Regarding section 4, they request that nonpublic school students should be able to participate in public school extracurricular and athletic activities. Lastly, they recommend that the Governor should opt CT scholarship organizations into the Federal Scholarship Tax Credit if the state seeks to encourage enrollment in traditional, in-person schools. They say that these scholarships can be used for public, nonpublic, and charter schools along with special education services, tutoring, and after-school programs.

Clarissa Jones, Homeschooling Parent: Mrs. Jones voices her opposition to the bill and says that she chose to withdraw her daughters from public education due to their negative experiences along with what her husband witnesses as an employee for the Stratford Board of Education and the state's Judicial Detention Center. Based on his experience, she states that he now understands why children end up in prison and pushed through the judicial system. Due to these concerns, amongst others, she chose homeschooling and testifies that it allowed her to move at an appropriate pace for her children in a way that builds their confidence and skill. Her 7-year-old has reading difficulties, and she says that she did not receive adequate support from the public school system. By homeschooling her daughter, it has allowed her to provide her child with the resources that she needs. Lastly, she believes that homeschooling parents should not be punished because the government has not properly addressed issues within the public school system.

Michelle Jordan, Homeschooling Parent and Previous Public School Teacher: Ms. Jordan holds a Master's degree in education and opposes this bill, and stresses that public policy designed to protect children should be evidence-based, targeted, and respectful of civil liberties. She believes that this bill expands government surveillance of families who have done nothing wrong, and therefore erodes parental rights and civil liberty. Additionally, she expresses concern regarding the opposition submitted by CT superintendents that warn that this bill would impose impractical administrative, legal, and logistical burdens. She also worries about the impact on students with disabilities and the possibility of their families being flagged for their children not meeting standardized benchmarks. Moreover, she states that these provisions that expand surveillance disproportionately impact families that face systemic

barriers, such as low-income families and families of color, thereby exacerbating inequities. She also notes the UConn statisticians' review of the OCA report, which concludes that the report had no statistical methodology and that there is no evidence to support the inference that homeschooling increases DCF referrals. To achieve child safety, she believes that the issues with DCF need to be addressed instead of expanding surveillance on homeschooling families.

Asher K., Homeschool Student: Asher is a 10th grade homeschooling student and has studied team policy debate. He says that the bill fails on two stock issues, solvency and significance. Regarding solvency, or the efficacy of the plan in removing harm or solving a problem, he believes that the bill is centered on equivalent instruction and therefore does not address the issue of child abuse that legislators cite as a driving force behind the bill. For significance, or the indication that there is a serious issue with the current system, he argues that the data being used to support this bill is outdated and has a small sample size, so reliable conclusions cannot be drawn from it. Therefore, he maintains that this policy is unjustified and should be opposed.

Julie Kieras, Homeschooling Parent: Mrs. Kieras opposes this bill and raises several points of contention. To begin, she says that state law along with Supreme Court rulings grant parents the primary authority to direct their child's education, therefore placing this bill in conflict with legal precedent. Additionally, she worries about the lack of evaluation standards for the equivalent instruction provision, which could lead to inconsistent interpretation and arbitrary enforcement. She believes that the administrative burden on districts along with privacy concerns regarding FERPA are additional sources of concern that could negatively impact both homeschool and public school students. Furthermore, she states that the data being used to support this bill is not reliable or representative, and that families acting in bad faith would not follow the provisions, and thus the bill would fail in its goal to ensure child protection.

K. Kramer, Homeschooling Parent: Ms. Kramer is opposed to this bill because the language is too vague and she doesn't believe that the provisions will protect children or provide support to families. She testifies that many in the homeschool community are members of the LGBTQ+ community, disabled children, children with mental health struggles, and families of color who have been harmed by the public school system. For children with disabilities, she worries that the standardized testing would not take the child's condition into account. Moreover, she says that portfolio reviews cannot fully capture the depth or pace of a child's learning, and that this may interfere with parents who are trying to help their children learn at their own pace. She emphasizes that policies meant to protect children should not unintentionally create fear or barriers for these families, and urges the legislature to approach homeschooling oversight carefully to protect children while also avoiding any additional burdens on vulnerable and marginalized families.

Eun-Jin Lee, Former Public School Student and Current Homeschooling Parent: Ms. Lee states that homeschooling her children has required a significant amount of sacrifice, and that she chose it to be able to provide a personalized education for their child that properly nurtures them. She is a Christian parent, and says that she teaches a curriculum that aligns with her faith. Regarding the equivalent instruction provision, she expresses concern with the lack of clarity surrounding its definition and worries that it could be used to restrict parental freedom in choosing their children's curriculum. She cites the portfolio reviews and standardized test-taking processes for other states such as NY and PA with homeschooling regulations, and

believes that these reveal how general oversight language is used to detailed regulatory systems that place substantiation administrative and fiscal burdens on both homeschooling families and local districts. Moreover, she references studies that suggest that the degree of state regulation has no significant impact on the academic outcomes of homeschooling students. She argues that the current state law allows for reasonable freedom, and also feels that regulations would not achieve their stated goal in child protection. She references research that suggests that there is no evidence that stricter homeschooling regulations reduce abuse rates. Lastly, she worries that the regulations would place additional strain on already overwhelmed educators and could create conflict that would impede on both homeschooled and public school children's education.

Three constituents oppose this legislation due to the vague nature of the provisions alongside the questions that they find that the bill does not answer. Several of their questions include: Who decides what equivalent instruction is? How will part-time enrollment work? Will the legislature be challenging the CT Interscholastic Athletic Conference's rules that prohibit homeschooled children from participating in public school sports programs? What standards will homeschooled children be held to? How will special education students be treated? Where are the extra monetary and staffing resources for the reporting, reviewing, and testing of homeschooled students? How will the state enforce compliance, and what will this mean for privacy and reporting?

Shawna Lamont
Brittany Landry
Katherine Thorp

Cheryl Loftus, Homeschooling Parent: Ms. Loftus testifies regarding her personal experience with both the homeschooling and public school environments. She cites the positive experiences that her son and other children experience with the different teaching methods that the homeschool community uses, and states that this allows her children to learn in a safe and supportive environment. Regarding public education, she states that when her son went to preschool, he experienced physical aggression from other students that was not addressed by staff, and says that when she was in public school as a child, many of the faculty were involved in abuse against children. She raises concerns for her child's health, primarily due to his health issues and the violence that occurs at public schools, and this worry has grown with the use of social media and the Internet. Moreover, she states that her son is excelling in his homeschooling and that there are many different avenues that she utilizes to ensure socialization, such as through other homeschool families and Taekwondo. She urges opposition to this bill because she believes that *Pierce v. Society of Sisters* recognizes the right of parents to direct the education of their children, and that the current laws in CT allow families to successfully educate their children in a way that meets their needs.

Bethany M., CCSU Student: Bethany states that she graduated from a CT private school and is now attending Central CT State University, but was homeschooled until 9th grade. She testifies that her academic achievements, such as graduating as valedictorian and being the president of the Student Council, were the result of her homeschooling experience. She is currently an elementary education Honors student, and has earned several merit scholarships along with a part in CCSU's pilot program introducing SeaPerch Robotics into the elementary education program. Regarding this bill, she expresses grave concern that it attacks the constitutional rights of parents and assumes guilt to parents who withdraw their children from public school. She emphasizes that she wants to bring her homeschool-based knowledge to

the public school system to help her future students. Moreover, she believes that this bill would put unsustainable demands on public schools and DCF, which she says has failed her friends who have interacted with the agency. Regarding children's safety, she argues that in her experience as a mandated reporter, homeschooled children and families are very active in academics, extracurriculars, churches, co-ops, athletics, and other programs, and are thus surrounded by mandated reporters that ensure their safety. She urges the Committee to oppose this legislation and instead address the systemic issues in the public school system such as absenteeism and bullying.

Julia M., Public School and Homeschooling Mother: Julia has one older child in public school and homeschools her younger child, and raises several concerns with both the bill and the public school system. She testifies that her older child highlights issues with bullying, other students' truancy, and a lack of direction from teachers. Regarding her homeschooled child, she says that his educational experience is more immersive and better able to adapt to their family's schedule, such as doctor appointments, than that of her other child. She cites comparative statistics regarding truancy, national standardized testing, graduation rates, and college attendance rates that suggest that homeschooled students fare better than public school students. Moreover, she acknowledges that homeschooling can be difficult and that it isn't for every family, and that issues can arise similar to those with public schooling. However, she believes that this bill generalizes homeschooling parents while not addressing systemic issues related to DCF. She explains the educational process for her homeschooled child, and cites the 14th Amendment, *Meyer v. Nebraska*, *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, and FERPA as established precedent that would be violated with these provisions. Lastly, she expresses support for public school alongside the right of parents to make decisions for their children.

Amanda Mangler, Homeschooling Mother: Ms. Mangler acknowledges the intent of the legislators behind certain aspects of the bill, but voices opposition due to the data that she cites regarding homeschooling and child welfare. She maintains that while it is understandable to want to check on children who are withdrawn, she states that it creates issues such as the establishment of an unconstitutional role wherein the government can approve or deny parents' educational decisions, the presumption of guilt on the part of parents, and the compilation of student data without permission or cause. To address child safety, she suggests requiring DCF to monitor children with open cases. Moreover, she stresses that homeschooled children are not isolated, citing research that suggests that homeschooled children participate in volunteering and religious services more than public school students. She states that these students often switch between homeschooling, public schools, or private schools, and there are oftentimes different educational paths for each child within the same family. Regarding regulations, she argues that CT is not an outlier and that there are other states that have low levels of regulation, and notes that VT and NH are rolling back some of their regulations. She refers to more studies that suggest that homeschooled children perform similarly or slightly above public school children in their standardized test scores. Lastly, she highlights data regarding truancy and decreases in student proficiency in math and reading within CT public schools that SDE should address, emphasizing that no data suggests that homeschoolers require greater oversight to achieve educational equivalency.

Several constituents testify in opposition to this bill, stating that it is state interference with their parental rights and beliefs, and a step towards greater government overreach. They argue that it is a violation of their constitutional rights to impede on how families teach their children and qualifies as excessive oversight that compromises families' privacy and treats them with

suspicion, thereby creating fear and distrust from homeschooling communities and co-ops towards the state. In addition, they believe that it is in direct conflict with the state constitution, federal law, and several Supreme Court rulings such as *Mirabelli v. Bonta*, and feel that equivalent instruction would require families to teach harmful theories and ideologies while targeting and restricting religious teachings. Homeschooled children also personally describe their positive experiences with their education and how it helps them to grow, love reading, and better understand educational material alongside the volunteer opportunities that it gives them time to do. Parents emphasize the work and dedication that goes into their children’s education, and they see this bill as a hindrance to a process that works for their families and adds unnecessary bureaucracy that would also disrupt the functioning of funding- and resource-strained local school districts. They believe that public schools mandate a “one-size-fits-all” approach that fails many students, and stress that some families remove their children from public school for this reason along with faith- and value-based disagreements. Moreover, they say that private schooling and homeschooling provide better instruction and academic success than public school and have higher educational standards, which they believe makes the decision to homeschool despite paying taxes to public schools an example of the dedication of homeschooling and private school parents. They also cite frustrations with the lack of compliance on the part of public schools with IEP and 504 plans, and argue that these issues, alongside others such as the treatment of special needs students, low reading proficiency, inequities between districts, and chronic absenteeism need to be addressed by the state. Due to these issues, they feel that a public school equivalency benchmark would harm their children’s education. Additionally, they express frustration and distrust with DCF and the taxation that is used to fund the Department, asserting that new responsibilities should not be delegated to them since they are already overworked and in need of reform. Moreover, they argue that the recent child abuse cases in the state were the fault of state agencies and not homeschooling families, and thus any regulation of homeschoolers to solve this issue is misguided. Some also emphasize that CGS 10-184 is a sufficient regulation for homeschooling that requires no additional provisions. They also feel that DCF oversight is unequal if the same type of oversight does not also apply to public school families, and some state that the current mandatory reporting laws are adequate to investigate credible reports of abuse. Some testify that there is little evidence to justify the regulation of homeschooling, and that equivalent instruction and portfolio reviews would diminish their educational quality, contribute to inequities through unequal compliance by districts, and discourage innovative education. Lastly, others suggest more community resources to offer support to vulnerable public and homeschooling families.

Ryan Johnson	Aubrey Jones	Curtis Jones	Jamie Jones
Maddi Jones	Melissa Jordan	James Joyce	Sharon Jupin
Raelene Juscyk	A.K.	Coral K.	Heather K.
J.K.	Jennifer K.	Laelah K.	Morrigan K.
N.K.	Nolan K.	Emily K.	Joshua Kaiser
Renee Kaiser	Elizabeth Karnuk	Benjamin Karrass	Kevin Kauffman
Paula Kay	Christina Boisits-O’Keefe	Melanie Kellett	Frances Kelly
Teresa Kelly	Nina Kendrick	Mark Kenealy	Teresa Kenealy
Tierney Keogler	Matthew Kichar	Matthew Kieras	Richard Kijewski
Chris King	Christina King	Jim King	Julia King
Kathryn King	Brandy Klapik	Joseph Klar	Pat Kleinman

Anastacia Knight	Ryan Knopf	Adele Knotts, Homeschool Student	Corin Knotts, Homeschool Student
Cynthia Knotts	Gwendolyn Knotts, Homeschool Student	Penelope Knotts, Homeschool Student	Timothy Knotts
Finn Koenig	Leah Kollen	Erin Krepps	Mary Krieski
Genevieve Kueter	Sheena Kunkel	Dr. Walt Kupson	C. Marcella Kurowski
Lucia Kushnir, Homeschooling Parent	Micah Kvasnik	Melodie L.	Michelle L.
Vanessa L.	Andrew L.	Evan L.	H.L.
Mindy L.	Stacy L.	Shelly Labbe	Theresa LaCasse
Rachel LaChapelle	Daniel Lagan	Elizabeth Lake	Joshua Lake
Marie LaMarre	Adam Lamont	Janelle Lamont	Katie Lamont
Caleb Landry	David LaPorte	Bryan LaPrad	Shanna Lapriore
Jeff LaRoche	Darcy Larson	Glenn Larson	Linda LaRue
Dr. Laura Nunno	Brianna Lavoie	Jillian Lawrence	Myles Lawrence
Kelsey Ledden	Terri Lee	Courtney Legein	Olivia Legein
Eglantina Lekaj	Guillaume LeRoy	Joseph Letizia	Ford Letrice
Aksel Lieber, Homeschool Student	Jacob Lieber, Homeschool Student	Jacob Lieber, Homeschooling Parent	Naomi Lieber, Homeschooling Parent
Jessica Lima	Robert Lindeyer	Melissa Lindsey	Mark Lloret
Mark Lockwood	Dennis LoDolce	Crystal Bailey- Loffredo	Michael Loffredo
Julie Loin	Maura Lombardi	James Loomer	Elena Lopez
Erik Lopez	David Lounsbury	Melanie Lourenco	Marissa Lozada
Pam Lucashu, TEACH CT Legislative Liaison	Ashli Lucente	Stephen A. Lucente	Kristin Luiz
Emma Lukoski	Jeffrey Lukoski	Brianna Lundburg	Elizabeth Lundy
Mark Lundy	JoAnne Lussier	Jennifer Lydixsen	David Lyon
Rebekah Lyon	Amanda M.	Amy M.	Betty M.
Candy M.	Carissa M.	Chris M.	Kris M., Social Worker
Kristin M.	Michael M., Homeschooling Father	Theresa M.	James M.
Marlena M.	Edward Maccio	Bradley MacDonald	Erin MacDonald
Kathleen Makowski	Alicia Makowski, Secretary of the Naugatuck Board of Education	Jonathan Malwitz	Megan Manemeit
Robert Manere	Anne Manusky, National Director of	Morgan Mara	Cassie Marcantonio

	the CT Republican Assembly		
Matt Marcella	Andrew Marcellus	Art Marden	Kim Mariani
Lori Marie	Margaret Marie	Mark Maritato	James Martin
Nina Martin	Robbin Martin	Terence Martin	Justus Martinez
Kim Martini, RN	Chris Marzullo	Wendy Mason	Daniel Massameno
Elianna Mathieu	Melissa Matis	Merle Matney	Scott Matney
Trieste Matte	Rebecca Matter	Thomas Mattera	Lori Mattioli
Dawn Mattos	Erica Maver	Matthew Maver	Michele R. May, LMFT
Emily Maycock	Jack Maycock	Jef Maycock	Murielle Mazun
Betsy McCaughey, PhD, Republican Candidate for Governor of CT	James Stanton	Kerrie Stanton	Donna Steck
Randall Stelma	Steven Pietruszka	Alyson Stewart	Erin E. Stewart, Former New Britain Mayor
Joe Stewart	Paula Stewart	Rev. Danny Steyne	Angela Stock
Robert Stock, PhD	Jay Stoddard	Julie Stoken	Jillian Stone
Emily Stonis	Gregory Stott	Tammy Stott	Cora Stover
Lisa Stowe	Anonymous	Benjamin Struski	Patti Struski
Anonymous Homeschooler	Anonymous Homeschooler	Mary Succow	Annmarie Sullivan
Christopher Sullivan	Daniel Sullivan	Kevin Sullivan	Stacy Sullivan
Kathryn Suzio	Rachel Swank	Michele Swanson	Jennifer Sylvia
Rev. Michael A. Sypek	Roger Szendy	Carol Szymanski	Peter Szymonik
Amanda T.	Anna T.	Elizabeth T.	Ellen T.
Mark T.	Marta T.	Michelle T.	S.T., Homeschool Student
Sheila T.	Zbigniew T.	Dr. Jessica Tagliarini	Anthony Takacs
Gina Tampo	Dylan Tanger	Deborah Tanguay	Eden Ayala-Tannis
Martha Ayala-Tannis	Patricia Tavalozzi	Carolyn Taylor	Alicia Teitelbaum
Jessica Teixeira	Stacie Tessman	Heather Bunnell-Thibeault	Lawrence Thibeault
Sarah Thompson	Jeffrey Thurston	Melissa Thurston	Carroll Toal
Hannah Todorov	Kristin Todzia	Monika Tomaszewski	Stephanie Tomaszewsky
Jennifer Tow	Leonardo Tow, Homeschool Graduate	Annette Townsley	David Townsley
Kristopher Tramont	Anonymous	Jeanne Tremblay	Mark Trotochaud

Aletheia Trudeau, Homeschool Student	Gregory Trudeau	Tabitha Trudeau	Garret W.
---	------------------------	------------------------	------------------

Tanya Stanley, Public School Teacher: Ms. Stanley taught for 15 years in CT public schools, and opposes this bill for two reasons. To begin, she explains that differentiation is utilized to make learning more accessible, which can be achieved by using different modes of instruction that are visual or auditory or by using an IEP or 504 plan. With this in mind, she states that when parents withdraw their children from public school, they are engaging in equivalent instruction because they have decided that they are going to teach their child in the method that works for them. She argues that because parents are better able to tailor their child’s education and meet their needs, this results in more homeschooling students pursuing higher education than public school students. Due to the gaps that public schools have in meeting student needs, she worries that using the standard of public school for education would be irresponsible. The second point of contention is school climate, which she contends is crucial for students’ academic success and safety. She testifies regarding the violence, bullying, substance abuse, and peer pressure that she observed in her time as a teacher. Therefore, she believes that this bill does not ensure child safety because this compromised public school climate is a prominent issue, and asking parents to report to a system that could have hurt their child is a poor decision. She emphasizes that because parents know their children best, they know what mode of instruction and school climate they need to succeed.

Attorney Deborah Stevenson, National Home Education Legal Defense, LLC (NHELD): Attorney Stevenson opposes this bill and raises several points of contention. First, she states that the legislature cannot spend money implementing this bill because the School Fund does not allow it. Additionally, she cites the UConn statisticians’ analysis of the 2025 OCA report which found that there was no indication based on the report that there is an impact of homeschooling on DCF referrals, and therefore Attorney Stevenson argues that there should be no regulations with this report as its reasoning. Next, she believes that this bill, through the DCF provision, removes the presumption of innocence by accusing every parent to be suspect of abuse or neglect, thereby making the bill unconstitutional. Furthermore, she references Article Eight of the state Constitution, which delegates the legislature with specific power regarding the regulation of education. Specifically, the sections within it specify that the School Fund cannot be used to fund anything other than public education, and she believes that this bill will use the Fund for non-public education purposes, such as reporting parents to DCF when they withdraw their children and searching the educational records of homeschooling parents, making it in violation of the state Constitution. Moreover, she notes that because the bill could violate FERPA, which would result in the state losing millions of dollars in federal funding. She says that because of the inclusion of the transfer of educational documents to different agencies without the parents’ consent when that child is not the subject of a DCF investigation, the provision does not qualify for the FERPA exception and thus would harm public schools due to loss of federal funds. Regarding the prohibition of a child from being withdrawn from public school if they are the subject of an active DCF investigation, she argues that this would create government-compelled public education with no legal recourse, and thus be a violation of Supreme Court precedent. She also states that this would instill fear and hesitation in parents who are thinking of withdrawing their children from public school. Lastly, she argues that this bill infringes on the rights of parents to determine the upbringing and education of their child through the assessments of

homeschooling curriculum and using DCF to intimidate parents. For these reasons, she stresses that this bill is governmental overreach, unconstitutional, and an abuse of legislative power.

Clara Tummescheit

This individual stated that government should not be using any kind of surveillance on families and believes that in every case of tragedies cited as support for HB-5468, DCF had an open case about the child long before the tragedy. Perhaps more surveillance on the DCF to find out what is going wrong is needed. They shared that the French political philosopher Alexis de Tocqueville, author of Democracy in America, said that we need all sorts of entities that are separate from the government for democracy to thrive. Families, clubs, religious institutions, neighborhood organizations, charities, and civic groups serve as buffers between individuals and the government. A paternalistic government that manages all of society is not needed - "We the People" can do that for ourselves. Educational freedom supports civic life, democracy, and the diversity that is so foundational in life.

Heidi Tummescheit, Educator, PhD Princeton University

This individual taught German language and literature at the university level, including teaching at Trinity College in Hartford. They homeschool because they think it is the best educational option for their children. They point out that some homeschoolers are religious, some are not; some are liberal, some conservative. Homeschoolers know their neighbors, they are in community organizations, and they take their children to museums, nature reserves, the State Capitol, concerts etc. Homeschoolers may even be more connected to the people around them than publicly schooled children.

This individual believes that The Coalition for Responsible Home Education (CRHE) is trying to drum up a witch hunt against homeschoolers. They do not find CRHE public testimony credible, given homeschoolers are presented as extremists who have a "theological conviction that parents hold an absolute divine right to control their children in service of religious ends." They believe that CRHE submitting on public record that homeschoolers are all part of a religious cult determined to control children in service of religious ends is libel and displays reckless disregard for truth. In addition, CRHE makes the same error as DCF in using 'child abuse' and 'homeschooling' interchangeably throughout their public testimony. This individual asks for defense of CT citizens who, as parents, have the responsibility to educate their children, and to not cast suspicion or create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles.

Hubertus Tummescheit

This individual is both a German and an American citizen. They have a PhD in engineering and is an entrepreneur who came to CT 13 years ago, creating employment for highly skilled engineering jobs in CT. A main reason for bringing their family to CT was the educational freedom for homeschooling. They lived in Sweden before, exactly at a time when homeschooling was made all but impossible there. In 1930's Germany, homeschooling was made illegal by the Nazis who saw parents as obstacles. Removing their influence meant Nazis could more easily indoctrinate children with their ideology. Unfortunately, after WWII, Germany had other priorities than reversing these laws, so homeschooling has never been common in Germany, and by now that history is mostly forgotten. This individuals' children have had immense benefits from homeschooling: they are fully bilingual German – English, which is difficult to achieve in schools. They enjoy learning tremendously, which is rare for students in

public schools. All of them play 2-3 musical instruments and play Mozart string quartets together.

Jacob Tummescheit

This individual believes the bill is scapegoating homeschooling families and casting suspicion on them. In other states, the trend is to get rid of unnecessary regulations on homeschoolers. The statistics show that homeschooling produces competent, balanced children who tend to be engaged citizens. This individual suspects that something else is going on here besides what's on the surface. The tragedies that people link to homeschooling aren't homeschooling. It's child abuse. Starting to create lists of parents who choose to homeschool would be a terrible intrusion on family privacy. We must assume that families are innocent, and we cannot build trust in our society if we start with suspicion and surveillance. Parents are the ones most responsible for their children, and they have the right, secured by the Connecticut Constitution, to decide what method of education is in the child's best interest. They think that most parents in Connecticut are to be trusted, and that those parents have their children's best interest at heart.

Olivia Tummescheit, homeschooled resident of West Hartford, student at CT State Capital

HB 5468 strikes at Connecticut's historic educational freedoms, targeting homeschoolers in particular with unconstitutional government surveillance. Studies about homeschooling and child abuse, such as the one by Ray and Shakeel, show that demographics such as family instability are predictive of child abuse and neglect. Educational choice is not. HB 5468 ignores data-based evidence, singling out homeschooling parents as inherently suspect rather than presumably innocent. The requirement for DCF to review files of parents withdrawing children from school is ridiculous. If there is an open case on the family, DCF already has their information, which has been the case with previous abuse cases, such as with Mimi Torres-Garcia. If the family has no open case with DCF, reviewing their files is an unwarranted intrusion on the family's educational decisions.

HB5468 target homeschoolers in particular and parental rights in general. Parents are forced to appear in person, provide an "intent to educate," and prove equivalent instruction annually; and they cannot even withdraw their own child from school without approval from the Board of Education and review by DCF. These are unjust and unconstitutional burdens on parents who should be trusted to make decisions about their child's education. The Connecticut State Constitution grants the primary responsibility for education of children to the parents, allowing them to undertake that responsibility personally or to delegate it to a school. The roots of this law go back to the 1600s! Now HB 5468 seeks to overturn the heritage of educational freedom by essentially granting the state primary authority over every child's education.

What they love most about CT is the way legislators strive to protect and care for all citizens while not infringing on the liberties fought for since the time of the Charter Oak. They request that compassion be applied to more effective use of DCF's open cases on children who are at risk. HB 5468 does nothing but distract from the problem by targeting innocent homeschooling parents with unconstitutional requirements. They want to work and live in CT and hope to homeschool their children here and teach them to love Connecticut's heritage and community. They'll bring them to the Capitol and teach them that democracy means they have a voice in their own government and want to tell them that when they speak up for freedom, their voices will be heard.

Philip Tummescheit, homeschooled resident of West Hartford

This is a seventeen-year-old musician, who plays the violin, piano, and pipe organ. Because of homeschooling, they've been able to study pipe organ during the week with Christopher Houlihan at Trinity College in Hartford and compete successfully in multiple national pipe organ competitions. They've been able to dedicate extra time to mathematics and learn math at a level not offered at their local public high school. Do you want to hinder families who decide that there is something that would work better for their children than sending them to school? Why, don't you trust parents? Of course there are some evil parents, but there are also evil school teachers, and evil government workers. That's not a problem you're going to get rid of with regulation. They hope that nobody at the State Capitol would vote for a bill that proposes to single out certain citizens for special surveillance. They ask legislators if it would be insignificant if their own family were put on a list that was given to the DCF? It would be very unjust, but it would also be pointless, to collect names of homeschooling families and submit them to DCF, or to require that parents get permission to decide how to educate their own children. Statistics show that children are safer as homeschoolers. Statistics also show that homeschooled children have academic and social outcomes that match or exceed those of publicly schooled children.

Emily Tuozzo

It is already a law in Connecticut that parents must provide their children with an education. Placing restrictions and regulations on Homeschoolers or reporting anyone to DCF who chooses to withdraw their child from public school, whether to enroll in private school, homeschool, I or move, does absolutely nothing to address the failure of the entire DCF.

Kayla Turker, Connecticut resident and homeschooling parent

Parents have a fundamental right to direct the upbringing and education of their children. The United States Supreme Court affirmed this principle in Meyer v. Nebraska (1923) and Pierce v. Society of Sisters (1925), recognizing that the state may not unreasonably interfere with a parent's liberty to direct their child's education. Connecticut law already places the responsibility for education squarely on parents. Under Connecticut General Statute §10-184, parents must ensure that their children receive instruction in essential subjects including reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, and United States history. Homeschool families in Connecticut fulfill this obligation under the long-standing framework of "equivalent instruction." They believe that when the Department of Children and Families already has an open case involving a child, ensuring that caseworkers are aware of the child's circumstances - including their educational setting - is entirely appropriate. If a child is under investigation or supervision, DCF should absolutely have the ability to monitor that child's welfare and maintain direct contact.

Their concern with HB5468 is that it risks expanding government involvement and may result in ordinary families who simply choose to withdraw their children for equivalent instruction being unnecessarily routed into the child welfare system. Child protection systems exist to investigate abuse and neglect. Policies that automatically involve those systems when families make lawful educational decisions risk placing innocent families under suspicion while diverting resources away from children who genuinely need protection. During discussions surrounding related proposals, officials from the Connecticut State Department of Education noted that automatically sharing student withdrawal information with outside agencies raises potential concerns under the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), which protects the privacy of student education records. The tragic cases that have prompted these proposals

represent failures in existing child protection systems - not failures of Connecticut's homeschool community. Strengthening DCF's ability to follow up on active cases would be a more targeted and effective response than creating policies that broadly affect law-abiding families.

Kristen Turkosz, public school teacher

This individual sees firsthand every workday how much time is wasted on classroom management rather than educating students. They believe that students who are homeschooled are often years ahead of their public school peers academically, with much more real-world experience. This bill is an infringement of parental rights.

Bryon Turner, life-long resident of CT and retired Air Force officer

This individual has more than 20 years of military service. Having served in places like Afghanistan, where the people live under oppression by the Taliban who systematically instill their twisted ideology in the minds of young children through education, propaganda, and social control, they find it heartbreaking to see freedoms at home under assault by those who the people elected. Public school should be a service provided to parents, not a compulsory activity, pressed upon parents and children by the combined might of an oppressive state government. In a recent article published in the CT Insider, public school enrollment numbers were in the spotlight, with enrollments at the lowest level in at least 20 years. More and more parents know they can do a better job either at home or at private schools. How does the state respond to critique of what they are providing? By pushing legislation that would have families reported to DCF for choosing better educational options for their kids, and by forcing parents to report to the public school system on their own efforts to educate their children.

When their kids were still in public schools, they were educated in a one size fits all manner of teaching. There were times when they were held back by the lowest-common denominator in their classes, and other times when they could have been better served with more individual instruction. Their past public education was peppered with unnecessary identity politics, social and political ideology, and even unwanted Eastern religious practices that conflicted with my family's deeply held religious convictions. HB5468 requires families who are doing a better job of teaching their own children to justify their educational efforts and results to these same public school educators who failed their kids. And making the State Education Resource Center (SERC) the arbitrator who decides if kids are being taught properly is unacceptable. They believe that SERC is a deeply biased organization driven by far-left ideology, which does not belong in any classroom, public or private. This individual's town superintendent expressed opposition to this bill as most school systems already have their hands full even with declining numbers. Home schooling families, and private school families continue to pay ridiculously high taxes, and take nothing from the system in return, freeing up resources for schools. If needed, this individual will pack their bags, sell their home and move to a freer state.

David Turner

This individual believes that we can find a more direct and data-driven way to protect children without usurping the rights of others. CT has been an example of educational freedom making the state a destination for talent, innovation and financial strength. This bill will significantly damage the future of the state and the communities which call this home.

Jill Turner

HB5468 risks expanding government oversight into family-directed education and may undermine parents' long-standing right to provide equivalent instruction to their children.

Kelli Turner

This individual opposes removal of parental freedom and state overreach.

Mary Ann Tuska Stratford, CT parent, grandparent, taxpayer and small business owner

HB 5468 destroys the fundamental right for parents to instruct their own children. CT Statute 10-184 states that it's the responsibility of the parents to educate their children. This bill grants unprecedented state control over our children. "Our" children does not mean the State's children. The Supreme Court made a landmark decision in *Mirabelli v. Bonta*, confirming that Parents, not the State, have the primary right to guide their child's lives and education. This bill is unconstitutional and assumes parents are guilty for taking control of their children's education from a failing public school system. This bill creates a government reporting and data-sharing system for families who withdraw from public school, even when there is no allegation of abuse, neglect or educational failure. This is an appalling abuse of power that many citizens of this state will not forget on election day. They believe that this bill was created in response to the child abuse cases in Waterbury and New Britain and that the State of CT should be investigating the DCF and the Education departments for their failures.

Tim Tynan

This individual is a father of 2 children that they intend to homeschool. The homeschooling families they've met are loving, involved, dedicated and compassionate who want the best possible future based on their view and experience. As a boy in the public school system, they were always intellectually advanced, but the structure was not conducive to their learning style. They could not sit in class for extended periods and the social dynamics sent them down a path of self distraction. They believe that homeschooling allows the full expression of children to find their learning style and passion. Further, they don't want to expose their children to the use of phones or tablets until an age they feel is appropriate to their brain development, which unfortunately in the school system, is being pushed forward. Also, their wife worked as a social worker for years and saw the burden that is already placed on DCF workers. With DCF's current caseloads, it's already impossible to give their full attention to the children in need of care. They hope we can keep a dialogue going to make sure those who are in favor of this bill can feel their needs are met while not using the government to get in the way of that discussion.

Carol Tyrer, resident of New Milford, CT

Parents have long held a fundamental right to direct the education and upbringing of their children. This principle has been recognized repeatedly by the United States Supreme Court and is deeply rooted in constitutional traditions. While the state has an interest in ensuring that children receive an education, that interest must be balanced carefully against the liberty of parents to determine the best educational environment for their children. Raised Bill 5468 shifts that balance too far toward government oversight and away from parental autonomy. The bill introduces new administrative requirements that significantly expand state involvement in homeschooling families. Mandatory intent forms, annual continuation filings, demonstrations of instruction and data collection represent a substantial increase in oversight of families who are already lawfully providing education to their children. Many homeschooling parents choose this path precisely because they believe they can best meet the educational needs of their children through individualized instruction. Excessive regulatory requirements risk undermining that freedom and the flexibility that makes homeschooling effective. They are also concerned about

the provision requiring a review by the Department of Children and Families before a child may be withdrawn from public school for the purpose of receiving equivalent instruction. This requirement appears to operate on the premise that parents must first be cleared by a child welfare authority before exercising their right to educate their children outside the public school system. Such a provision raises troubling concerns about the presumption of innocence and suggests that families may be treated as potential subjects of investigation simply for choosing to homeschool. Public policy should not imply that parents are guilty until proven innocent. Homeschooling families should not be subject to heightened scrutiny by child welfare authorities absent specific evidence of abuse or neglect. Connecticut has long allowed homeschooling families to educate their children successfully without the level of regulation proposed in this bill. Before expanding state oversight, the legislature should carefully consider whether such measures are truly necessary or whether they may unintentionally burden responsible families who are already meeting their children's educational needs.

Bryan Tyson, Quaker Hill

This individual does not believe there is any reason or credible issue to solve with this bill. Every homeschool child they know excels in their education and are more emotionally balanced and mature than their peers.

Courtney Tyson

Every family this individual knows that has chosen to home educate or private school their children has done so because the system as it stands does not work for the children. This bill would penalize those who have made alternative choices and vilify them. Why should a parent teaching their own child face more government oversight than a private school educating hundreds of students? Why does this bill give the Department of Education authority to define and regulate homeschooling later through agency guidance instead of setting clear limits in statute? This bill expands government oversight of homeschooling while also creating a new administrative burden for school districts and a new workload for DCF, without providing evidence that the current system is failing. How will the state fund this unfunded new law? What about the current caseloads DCF has that it already cannot adequately care for? Why should a lawful educational decision trigger a child welfare review when no other educational choice in Connecticut does?

Lydia van Achterberg

HB5468 restricts the freedom Connecticut residents have long enjoyed as parents who simply want to educate their children. Please don't remove that freedom from us.

Jennifer Van Gorder, parent & local BOE member

Once again, legislation is being promoted and heard that has unintended consequences that representatives don't foresee. Not only will this bill violate FERPA laws, but it will also put an undue burden and unfunded mandate to towns, school districts and DCF. This individual requests investigation and updating of DCF policies and procedures and adding more staff to alleviate employee burnout. They believe this bill is bad governance and join CSDE, superintendents, CAPPs, parents, teachers and alike to implore legislators to vote no.

Jennifer Vanacore

The proper role of government is to protect individual rights, yet this bill undermines those rights rather than protecting them.

Natacha Vanegas

This individual supports the current state stature which lawfully allows parents to select the right educational setting for their child without state reporting.

Alberto Vargas Jr.

This individual believes the proposed bill goes far beyond reasonable administrative oversight and instead creates a burdensome and intrusive framework for families who educate their children outside the public school system. Their children have benefited greatly from the flexibility, individualized attention, and values-based learning environment that homeschooling provides. HB 5468 imposes a new requirement that families demonstrate equivalent instruction each year through a portfolio, standardized testing, or other state-recognized documentation. Although presented as accountability, this shifts substantial discretion and oversight to local boards of education over families who have lawfully chosen another educational path. For many families, this will feel less like support and more like a presumption that they must continually prove themselves to the state. Particularly concerning is the provision requiring a board of education to request that the Commissioner of Children and Families review whether a parent or guardian is subject to protective supervision or receiving protective services before a child may be withdrawn from public school for equivalent instruction. If DCF reports that such an order or services exist, the withdrawal is not effective and the child may not be withdrawn. This is a serious escalation that risks treating the choice to pursue equivalent instruction as a matter warranting child welfare screening, even where no educational neglect has been established. The bill also creates new administrative obligations for local and regional boards of education, including repeated outreach attempts, reporting to the Department of Education, acceptance and review of filings, and new data tracking obligations. At a time when school districts are already managing significant operational and financial demands, this proposal adds another layer of process without clearly demonstrating that it will improve educational outcomes. This bill imposes new compliance burdens on families, expands the role of school districts and DCF into matters that have traditionally been handled with greater restraint, and creates a precedent for unnecessary state intrusion into lawful educational choices.

Ana Vargas, homeschooling mother in Connecticut

This individual's family has homeschooled their children from the beginning of their education, and this freedom has allowed them to flourish academically, socially, and personally. Homeschooling allows them to tailor their children's education to their individual needs, interests, and pace of learning rather than forcing them into a one-size-fits-all system. Their children participate in both in-person and online learning opportunities and are actively involved in community activities and friendships. Before moving to Connecticut, this individual's family lived in New York, where she worked as a high school counselor in the public school system prior to homeschooling her own children. In that role, she personally encountered cases of bullying, abuse, and serious struggles affecting students' well-being. Those experiences taught her an important truth: simply being in a school building does not guarantee a child's safety or well-being. Many difficult situations occurred even under the supervision of systems designed to protect students. Because of this experience, she deeply values the freedom parents have to discern what educational environment is best for their children—not only academically, but emotionally and socially as well. Limiting that freedom takes away a parent's ability to act in the best interest of their child. For many years, Connecticut has recognized the right of families to provide "equivalent instruction" outside the public school system. This approach has worked well for thousands of families who are faithfully educating their children. HB 5468 risks shifting that long-standing balance by introducing additional oversight into the homes of responsible

families. Parents—not the state—carry the primary responsibility for raising and educating their children. Please protect the freedom of families who are faithfully educating their children and allow parents to continue doing what they know and love to do best—raise and educate their children.

Angel Calderon-Vazquez, resident of Bristol, CT

This parent has serious concern regarding the proposal that would require homeschool families to send their children to public school on a part-time basis. They respectfully urge policymakers to reconsider this approach and instead pursue alternatives that respect parental rights while still ensuring educational accountability. The right of parents to direct the upbringing and education of their children is firmly supported by the United States Constitution and long-standing Supreme Court precedent. In *Pierce v. Society of Sisters* (1925), the Supreme Court declared that “the child is not the mere creature of the state” and affirmed that parents have the liberty to direct the education of their children. Similarly, in *Wisconsin v. Yoder* (1972), the Court reaffirmed that parental rights in education are protected under the First and Fourteenth Amendments. These rulings make clear that the state must respect the role of parents as the primary decision-makers in their children’s education. For many families, homeschooling is not a rejection of education but a commitment to providing a more effective and personalized learning environment. Parents often choose this path after careful observation of the limitations they have experienced within traditional school systems. Laws such as the federal No Child Left Behind Act and its successors have introduced structures that, in practice, can limit individualized instruction and fail to meet the needs of every student.

This individual's seven-year-old homeschooled daughter is already reading and learning far beyond her grade level, loves mathematics and science, and dreams of becoming a doctor. They have invested significant time, effort, and personal resources to ensure she receives the best education possible. Homeschooling families often receive little to no financial support from school districts, even though they continue to pay taxes that fund those systems. They purchase their own curriculum, learning materials, and meals, and they often pay additional costs if they enroll their children in online academies or specialized educational programs. Furthermore, public policy should not penalize responsible homeschooling families because of isolated cases of negligence or abuse by others. It is neither just nor appropriate to impose sweeping restrictions on thousands of families who faithfully educate and care for their children because of the misconduct of a few. Accountability should target irresponsible behavior directly rather than restricting the freedoms of law-abiding parents. Connecticut has long been considered a homeschool-friendly state, and many families have relied on that freedom to provide children with strong academic, moral, and spiritual foundations.

Donna M. Veach, State Representative, 30th Assembly District

Representative Veach writes in strong opposition to HB 5468 and believes it represents a significant government overreach into decisions that have traditionally and appropriately been made by parents regarding the education of their children. This legislation appears to be a reaction to a specific and troubling incident, but responding with sweeping policy changes that affect homeschool families and private and parochial schools across the state is not the appropriate solution. In situations where a child’s welfare is at risk, the responsibility to intervene rests with the state’s child protection system, including the Connecticut Department of Children and Families. Expanding broad regulatory authority over families who are responsibly educating their children is not the answer. Connecticut has a long history of successful alternative educational pathways. Many students who are homeschooled or who

attend private or parochial schools receive an excellent education and go on to make meaningful contributions to their communities. Policies that create unnecessary barriers or additional oversight for these families risk undermining educational freedom and parental choice. This bill ultimately raises a fundamental question: who should have primary authority over a child's education—parents or the state? While the state certainly has an obligation to protect vulnerable children, we must do so in a way that respects the rights of parents and avoids imposing unnecessary burdens on families who are acting in the best interest of their children. Connecticut can and should address legitimate child welfare concerns, but it must do so thoughtfully and without broadly restricting parental authority over education.

Ozzie Vazquez

Selly Vazquez

To involve DCF simply because of educational choice is a gross violation of the recent Supreme Court ruling that parents are the legal responsible party for educating their child.

Lauren Vernaglia

This individual believes that this is yet another power grab thrown into a bill full of different things trying to take away parents rights.

Joseph Veselak

Protecting children is a goal we all share. However, this legislation feels less like protection and more like an expansion of government oversight into the decisions families make about their children's education. Many families choose homeschooling because they believe it provides a healthier environment for their children, particularly at a time when anxiety and depression among youth appear to be increasingly common within traditional school systems. For these families, homeschooling offers the flexibility to create a learning environment that supports their children's well-being. This legislation risks placing unnecessary burdens on families who are already working hard to provide safe, supportive, and enriching environments for their children.

Donna Vidam, resident of Windsor, CT

This individual requests that the state leave the homeschooler families alone and focus on fixing DCF systemic mistakes.

Jessica Viera

Alternative forms of education outside the public school do not need oversight by the public school. Public school was originally a service for those who could not school alternatively. The current narrative that alternative schooling is dangerous and needs this much oversight, is not only erroneous but based on little education or data and would challenge those voting to examine more closely which I believe is the least that should be expected of those who are voted in to serve all the people of this state.

Lisa Vincent

This individual is strongly opposed to nearly everything contained in this bill. Freedom, personal choice, and family integrity all matter. The government does not have a superior interest nor a superior motive in this instance, where the only thing shielded by this law is the government itself. Stay in your lane and let families exercise their rights to the full degree our constitution theoretically permits. People who abuse and murder their own children will not be stopped by passage of this law, but every family who chooses to homeschool will be harmed.

Kim Violette

This individual thinks it's unconstitutional that the government thinks that they know what's best for parents who want to homeschool their children. Their grandchildren are homeschooled and are the most amazing, smart, and loving children. How could you say that putting a child in a classroom with 30 other children could be more educational or better for that child than being in a classroom with one or two other children and parents who see them interact every day and know what they need?

Courtney Vitale, resident of Vernon, CT

As a Vernon parent who homeschools, they believe parents have the primary responsibility and right to direct the education of their children. Homeschooling allows families to meet the unique needs of their children in ways that work best for them. HB5468 introduces unnecessary oversight and troubling language that could trigger involvement from the DCF simply because a parent withdraws their child from school to homeschool. Families making a legal educational choice should not be treated with suspicion. Connecticut has long respected parental rights in education, and this bill moves away from that tradition by placing new burdens on responsible families.

Anonymous, Vote No on HB 5468

This individual states that homeschool regulations will not save children from abuse. They will not benefit homeschoolers. They will not benefit public schoolers. No one in this state will benefit from regulating homeschoolers. This bill only serves to try and control homeschooling families. Public schools are a failure. Instead of bothering homeschoolers, fix schools.

Anonymous, Democratic Voter

This individual has been a democrat from the day they were eligible to vote. They are shaken by the attack on personal rights in our state over the last few years. Specifically, the local elected representatives who aren't interested in the citizens views. They've had numerous conversations with their own elected representatives which has gotten them nowhere - either been completely ignored, or sent a copy paste responses. They don't think they can support the Democratic Party in CT further. Public written testimony shows how widely opposed this proposed bill is, yet multiple legislators expressed that it doesn't matter to them. That should outrage every single citizen no matter your party affiliation. This individual opposes this legislation and any other attempt of government overreach. This bill will not support families or children. It will simply make educating children harder.

Stefanie Vozzella

Current statute is more than sufficient and additional oversight is a violation of parental rights.

Ashley W

This individual is a Connecticut mother who homeschools their children and is a former public school teacher with over ten years of classroom experience. Homeschooling their children is not a casual choice; it's a daily commitment that requires time, energy, and financial sacrifice. Their family has chosen this path because they believe, as both law and common sense recognize, that parents are primarily responsible for the education and well-being of their children. We know our kids best, and we make decisions with their needs, strengths, and learning styles in mind. Connecticut has historically struck a thoughtful balance: parents are trusted to educate their children, and the state steps in only if there is real evidence of neglect. Raised Bill 5468 disrupts that balance by requiring families like theirs, who are fulfilling their

responsibilities, to submit multiple forms, annual filings, and proof of “equivalent instruction” every year. It turns a system built on trust into one that treats all homeschooling families as if they might be failing their children. From their experience as a public school teacher, they know that effective education is not one-size-fits-all. Standardized oversight cannot capture the creativity, individualized attention, and depth of learning that happen in homes every day. Many homeschool graduates go on to thrive in college, careers, the military, and in their communities. Yet this bill treats all families the same, despite no evidence of widespread educational failure. Another concern is the involvement of the Department of Children and Families. Requiring a review when a parent withdraws a child from public school effectively mixes child welfare investigations with a lawful educational choice. Families who are doing nothing wrong should not face additional scrutiny simply for choosing to educate their own children. There are also equity considerations. Homeschooling often requires a parent to reduce or leave their income to dedicate time to teaching. Adding paperwork, documentation, and annual reporting imposes a heavy burden on families already sacrificing to provide a quality education, while also adding significant administrative work for school districts.

Judy W

This individual states that homeschooling should be left alone and that more reporting requirements will cause unnecessary burdens. They already have a wonderful working homeschool community doing an excellent job for their children.

Kayla W.

This individual has lived in CT for their entire life, but several months ago, they made the decision to leave CT. In May 2025 they stood alongside ~4000 others in solidarity that they would not be scapegoated for State Agency failures. It was at that time that she and her husband began considering CT would not be the place to continue raising their children. Several months later, they sold their home and left all they ever knew because they value freedom over tyranny. Freedom to educate their children in the way they see fit. Freedom to educate their children outside of failing public school influences and oversight. This individual states that it makes little sense to believe that the very agencies that habitually fail children, both academically and otherwise (namely, the Boards of Education, State Department of Education, and the Department of Children and Families) would effectively manage oversight of families seeking alternative education. The public schools are a dismal reminder at just how much these agencies are failing and are a stark reminder of exactly why so many families are choosing to leave them. This individual believes that HB5468 risks setting a precedent that could limit educational freedoms. Families should be empowered to choose the best learning environment for their children without intrusive regulation. The slow stripping away of freedoms – through bills like this with its unwarranted surveillance and data collection – continues to drive families to leave CT for states that value their parental rights, which reduces community diversity and undermines the state’s ability to retain engaged families.

Rebecca W

This individual previously home schooled their daughter and values the rights parents have to pursue the best education for their children. They understand the motivation of this bill is to protect children, but as currently written it does not do that and will instead create an added burden for already overwhelmed school districts and DCF.

Elise Waggner

This individual is a mother of three who plans to homeschool their children. Despite government overreach in other areas, one of the reasons their family has decided to remain in CT is because it is among the most free states in regard to homeschooling. Parents, not the state, are responsible for raising and educating children and should be given the freedom to do so without the threat of increased oversight from the government.

Sylvia Walfridson, Stamford CT

This individual is a homeschooling parent and a professional with a graduate degree. They recently moved to CT and chose to homeschool their son because it allows her to provide an education tailored to his learning style and developmental needs. CT has long respected the role of parents in directing the education of their children, and this tradition of educational freedom is one of the reasons she felt confident choosing this path. As a medical professional, she cares deeply about the welfare of children. Systems designed to protect children from abuse or neglect serve an important role in communities. Her opposition to HB 5468 is not about avoiding accountability, but about preserving appropriate boundaries between family-directed education and public school administration. Her primary concern is the potential expansion of curriculum oversight, reporting requirements, and supervision by local school districts. Many families choose homeschooling precisely because the traditional school model does not meet their child's needs. This individual is concerned to see language that could place homeschooling families under the curricular authority or supervision of the very institutions they have chosen not to participate in.

Daniel Wang

This individual does not think this bill is practical because the DCF and school districts do not have the resources to thoroughly process every request to withdraw for equivalent education. If proper attention is not given to each request, incidents like the Waterbury Imprisonment Case will not be prevented. This act infringes on the rights of parents to homeschool their kids which was recently upheld by Supreme Court decision *Mirabelli v. Bonta*. This bill states that parents will not be able to withdraw their kids until they are approved by the DCF. Additionally, the bill also says that the DOE will establish required "curriculum" for homeschooling parents. This violates the parents Freedom of Expression when the DOE attempts to require them to teach something against their principles.

Gina Wangrycht, a resident of New Britain, CT, homeschooling parent

This individual is strongly committed to parental rights and educational freedom and believes that this bill imposes unnecessary government overreach on homeschooling families by mandating formal registration, annual continuation filings, in-person submissions, and demonstrations of "equivalent instruction" through portfolios, state testing, or other means. Connecticut's current law under CGS § 10-184 already requires parents to provide equivalent instruction without heavy bureaucratic burdens. HB5468 creates new layers of oversight, tracking by school districts, potential DCF involvement during withdrawals, and record-keeping requirements that infringe on parental authority and privacy. Homeschooling families in Connecticut educate successfully with high academic outcomes and no widespread evidence of educational neglect justifying this expansion. This bill places unnecessary burden on thousands of families, increases administrative costs for districts (potentially raising property taxes), and erodes the fundamental right of parents to direct their children's education—rights affirmed by U.S. Supreme Court precedents like *Pierce v. Society of Sisters* and *Meyer v. Nebraska*. No crisis exists to warrant this gross overreach. Protect parental rights, preserve

educational choice, and reject unnecessary government intrusion into personal family decisions.

Hilda Ward

This individual feels that this bill should be illegal and should not be considered. She questions why the state wants to discourage parents to homeschool or place their children in private schools due to all the failures of public schools and believes involving DCF is absurd.

Daniel Warriner, Rev Dr.

This individual and family value the freedom to train their son outside of the public school system. They find it a sacred responsibility to plan curriculum and participate in his education.

Heather Warriner

This individual is a homeschooling mom who highly values the freedom and sacred responsibility to educate her son.

Rebecca Watrous

This individual believes this is an unconstitutional heinous attack on families and parental rights across the state. Legislators are elected to uphold the constitution, not undermine it.

Deanna Way

This individual states that homeschool families are not the issue when it comes to education in this state. The rampant bullying, overworked teachers, lack of standards leading to an increasing percentage of illiterate high school diploma holders, and disregard for religious beliefs in forced curriculum are the issues. The public school system and DCF needs reform.

Stephanie Webberley

This individual and family live in CT but are considering moving because they don't want to live in a state that wants to take away the rights of homeschooling parents rather than correct a failing child protection agency.

Amy Webster

This individual is a homeschooling mother of three sons. In the fall of 2021, their middle son (now 13) asked if he could be homeschooled since school had become a source of significant anxiety for him. He struggled with reading and speech, but during remote learning they discovered he was able to learn better in a calmer environment. In March of 2022, after only five months of kindergarten, they withdrew their youngest son as well. He was struggling with speech and early reading. Shortly after, they also withdrew their oldest son after he experienced ongoing bullying. Over time, each of our boys was diagnosed Autism and ADHD which helped them understand why the traditional classroom environment was not meeting their needs. The United States Supreme Court affirmed in *Pierce v. Society of Sisters* that the child is not the mere creature of the state and that parents have the fundamental right to direct the upbringing and education of their children. This individual is also concerned that HB 5468 could place unnecessary burdens on local BoE administrators and the DCF. Expanding oversight of homeschooling families risks diverting time and resources away from children who are truly in need of protection and support. For their family, homeschooling was not an escape from education, it was the path that finally allowed their children to learn.

Luca Webster

This individual is a 13-year-old homeschool student that lives in Middletown, CT. He requested to be homeschooled because he struggled with anxiety in the classroom. He studies subjects like math, language arts, history, and science, and participates in activities such as being taught piano, going to Trail life, and social homeschool activities. He understands that protecting children is important and hopes that any laws passed will protect children while also respecting families who are responsibly educating their children at home.

Nico Webster

This individual believes this bill would put unnecessary burden on BOE and DCF agency that will divert necessary resources for children who truly need it.

Timothy Wee, Homeschooling Dad, North Branford, CT

This individual stated that the tragic cases cited by legislators are heartbreaking, and every reasonable person shares the desire to prevent abuse and protect vulnerable children. The question, however, is whether this bill actually addresses the problem it seeks to solve. HB5468 would transmit identifying information about families who withdraw their children from school to the DCF, even when there is no allegation of abuse or neglect. In practice, this places law-abiding families into the orbit of the child-welfare system simply for exercising their right to direct their children's education. In most circumstances, DCF involvement begins when there is probable cause or a credible report of harm. HB 5468 would be different. It creates a pathway for information about innocent families to be shared with DCF without suspicion of wrongdoing. Many parents understandably view any association with DCF as serious and stigmatizing. It is difficult not to feel that this shifts the presumption away from parental innocence. It is also worth noting that the tragic cases cited by supporters of the bill appear to have involved families already known to child-welfare authorities. If that is the case, the failure was not a lack of information, but a failure of follow-through within the existing system. Expanding surveillance of unrelated families does not seem likely to address that problem. Connecticut has long maintained a trust-based approach to education. Our laws already allow the state to intervene when there is genuine cause for concern through mandatory reporting laws, neglect statutes, and welfare checks. Those mechanisms focus attention where it belongs: on situations where there is evidence of risk. Most homeschooling families in Connecticut are deeply invested in their children's education and wellbeing. They should not feel that exercising a lawful educational choice places them under suspicion or within the child-welfare system's awareness.

Eileen Weinstein

This individual believes that a homeschool curriculum should be the choice of a parent and that there is too much in public school that they don't want their grandchildren to be subject too. Their religion and hometown values need to be theirs to control.

Jeffrey Weiss

This individual states that Parochial schools and home schoolers alleviate a local financial educational shortfall and attendance burden for public schools so things should be made easier for them, not harder. Parochial schools and home schoolers produce students that are well rounded, educated and ready to be civically engaged. This individual believes that until there is equality oversight in public schools this is prejudicial. They suggest that maybe now is the time to add live stream to all public school classrooms - add cameras with sound in real time. DCF has proven they (individually and collectively) are not qualified to be judging anyone's

environment, learning or otherwise. This individual is an active voter and will not support either with his votes or finances anyone that votes for this un-American bill.

Elizabeth Wells

This individual is a mom of four children (ages 7, 5, 2, and 2) and is currently home schooling her 7 and 5-year-old. She values the right to decide how to educate her children and to prepare them to be responsible citizens. This proposed bill places an undue burden on herself and other Home Educators.

Lindsey Wells, Trumbull, CT

Families who choose homeschooling are deeply committed to their children's education and development. Parents who pursue homeschooling or any alternative educational path do so after thoughtful consideration of what will best meet the unique needs of their children. These decisions are rarely made lightly and reflect a deep sense of responsibility for their child's academic, social, and personal growth. Through both their professional practice and personal experience, they've seen firsthand how carefully families evaluate educational options. Education is not a one-size-fits-all system. Each child learns differently, and families often make individualized decisions to ensure the best possible environment for each of their children. In many cases, a family may homeschool one child while another attends a traditional school because their needs are different. These decisions are guided by the goal of meeting the needs of the child, not by ideology or convenience. Families who take on the responsibility of directing their children's education should not face additional burdens from the state for doing so. Instead, their commitment and engagement should be respected.

Julia Werth

This individual is a homeschooling mom of soon to be four children in New Haven. She opposes proposed legislation to require homeschoolers to submit proof of equivalent education as it is unnecessary and will not improve education for either homeschooled children or children in public schools. It is an infringement on her right to educate her child how she deems best. As the state constitution states it is the parent's job to educate their child or find a school to do so. Her children learn many of the same things as children in public schools, but they learn many things never covered or taught within public schools. Also homeschooled children learn at a totally different, unique pace that is not comparable to public school years and curriculum grade standards. In addition, this individuals' local public schools - as an alliance district - are failing many of the students that attend. A huge percentage of New Haven children are below grade level, so why take more resources from the teachers and administrators to review homeschooled children's work.

Brittany West

This individual's family chose homeschooling because they believe parents know their children best. Every child learns differently, and for many families—including those raising children with medical challenges, learning differences, or complex health needs—the traditional public school model simply does not work. Homeschooling allows parents to create an educational environment that meets their child exactly where they are, academically, emotionally, and physically. For some children, especially those with chronic illnesses, immune challenges, or disabilities, homeschooling is not just a preference—it is a lifeline. These children may miss school frequently due to medical appointments, fatigue, or flare-ups of illness. A rigid classroom structure with large class sizes often cannot accommodate those realities. Homeschooling

allows families to tailor instruction around medical needs, adjust pacing when a child is struggling, and create a calm learning environment that supports healing as well as education.

The timing of this legislation is particularly notable in light of the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Mirabelli v. Bonta*, which reaffirmed a long-standing legal principle: parents—not the State—have primary authority over the upbringing and education of their children. This principle has been repeatedly recognized by the Court in cases such as *Pierce v. Society of Sisters* and *Meyer v. Nebraska*. These decisions make clear that parents have the fundamental right to guide their children’s education and development. This individual cites several provisions of HB5468 that raise serious concerns including State control over the ability to homeschool Section 1 and State control over homeschool curriculum Sections 2 and 3. Further, it is widely understood that recent tragic cases in Connecticut have prompted calls for reform. Every parent shares the desire to protect children and prevent abuse. However, policies designed to address rare tragedies should not punish or restrict the freedoms of thousands of responsible families who are homeschooling in good faith. The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently recognized that parents—not government agencies—are the primary protectors of their children’s best interests. Homeschooling families in Connecticut are not asking for special treatment. They are simply asking to retain the freedom to educate their children in the way that best meets their needs.

John Westlake, Coventry, CT

This individual feels that the State needs to stay out of homeschooling. Public education has been receiving a failing grade for decades, pushing through students who struggle with grade level work - low reading and math levels. Home schooling provides an alternative, where a parent can customize a legitimate program of instruction for their child/children.

Rebecca Whatley, East Haddam, CT

This individual is friends with homeschooling families and has observed the manner in which they handle their educational approach with their children. Their children are bright, thriving and intelligent individuals. They believe that this bill creates an incredible amount of administrative burden on the state, towns, and families and is completely unnecessary.

LaTanya White

This individual states that punishing parents who parent differently is unconstitutional. This bill is effectively backing parents into a corner and tying their hands, by first making it difficult for unvaccinated children to get into school and day cares - basically banning them - and then punishing their parents by investigating why they pull them from schools.

Jean Whitehead

Parents lawfully choosing a different educational path than the public school system should not immediately be placed under suspicion of wrongdoing. Disproportionate burdens are being placed on homeschooling families. This individual is concerned about how "equivalent instruction" would be determined. Homeschooling families are to demonstrate "equivalent instruction" to the State Education Resource Center (SERC). SERC is not a neutral academic review body. The values of many faith-based homeschool families may be in conflict with SERC's values. This could cause unnecessary conflict and angst. The level of surveillance being proposed is unwarranted and intrusive. The collecting and sharing of the students' data could violate FERPA. Knowingly breaking federal law is unacceptable. Parents are the rightful controllers of decisions in raising their children, and they should be free to do so.

Jamie Wilkinson

This individual shared reasons and concerns they have for opposing HB5468: 1.) Complete government oversight and control surrounding education. 2.) Safety and privacy concerns related to sharing personal information of a minor without parental consent. 3.) Excessive administration burdens of both time and money. 4.) Creating laws around isolated incidents rather than looking at the whole picture and targeting parents for choosing what may be best for their family/child(ren). The public education system that is currently in place has failed at least two generations within their family. Homeschool has kept their children safe from harassment and bullying and be able to actually learn at a pace that is geared towards them. Between coops, tutors both in person and online, accredited vs non accredited curriculums, sports/music/extracurricular practices, and more, homeschooled children with responsible parents are able to learn and grow at their specific individual rate without all the extra “noise” public education creates. They ask that legislators reevaluate the public education system before coming for homeschooled children.

Rachel Williams, Wolcott, CT

Savannah Williams, Wolcott, CT

Expanding universal notification requirements to include every school withdrawal or expanding requirements for current homeschoolers does not address the systemic failures of DCF in the tragic Waterbury and New Britain cases. The proposed requirements will not accomplish the stated goal of making children safer, and increasing the logistical burden with more requirements is unfair to parents who already go above and beyond. Furthermore, these bills raise serious privacy concerns that implicate both the U.S. Constitution and the Connecticut state constitution. Specifically, the proposed expansion and rebranding of the State’s integrated data system as “Data Link Connecticut,” including cross-agency data matching and integration, raises important questions about data retention, secondary use, access controls, and longterm profiling. Any expansion of cross-agency data sharing should include clear statutory limits, transparency safeguards, and meaningful correction procedures to protect families’ privacy and due process rights. The proposed legislation would increase the volume of low-risk reports sent to DCF without resolving staffing shortages, investigative thresholds, or accountability concerns. Overloading an already strained agency risks diverting attention from children who are genuinely at risk. This could place all children in Connecticut at greater risk. Effective child protection policy should be targeted, risk-based, and focused on known indicators of harm—not lawful educational choices. Protecting children and respecting parental rights are not competing goals. Reform should strengthen agency performance, improve accountability, and focus on high-risk cases—without placing every lawful family under suspicion or burdening them with additional logistical requirements.

Barbara Gene Wilson, Teacher

This individual understands the desire behind this bill is to ensure that all children are protected. However, placing new regulations and government oversight on homeschooling families is not the solution. Connecticut homeschoolers have a long history of raising well-educated, well-cared-for children while working cooperatively with their local districts under the current framework. When tragic cases occur, they often involve breakdowns in the systems already designed to protect children. Rather than creating new oversight for law-abiding homeschool families, the state should focus on strengthening and properly enforcing the child protection policies and agencies that already exist.

Clorasteen Wilson, CT Teacher and AOG Associate

This individual worked as an educator at a private school in CT and is a homeschooling parent who believes the public school system and DCF should be focused on supporting those in need of support, not their family that simply wishes to educate their own children. This individual pays high town taxes, one of the highest mill rates in the state, and doesn't use the school system. They are happy to support the town, but will be forced to leave if this bill passes.

David Wilson

Among other things, the bill would remove the ability of parents / guardians to make educational decisions for their children based merely on an unsupported report to DCF. This individual feels this is bureaucratic overreach and against the freedoms of Americans.

Tracy Winski, RN

This individual is a full-time working mother that recently became a homeschooling parent of a 14 year old son and an 8 year old daughter due to ongoing issues and failures within the Norwich public school system. Their daughter has had ongoing health issues which have required hospitalizations for acute respiratory failure and ongoing immunology consults. In first grade, at 6 years old, her daughter was repeatedly verbally and physically bullied by a classmate leading up to threats of death and bodily harm. Despite repeated contacted and reassurance from school administrators that the situation would be dealt with, it was not. Their son, who was in 7th grade at the time he transitioned to home-based learning, lacked basic foundational math, reading and writing skills to the point that he could not write a cohesive paragraph at 13 years old. Their schools do not assign homework. When concerns about areas of deficit were raised during parent teacher conferences she was simply told "That's where they are all at." He was sadly part of a generation of children whom were expected to attempt virtual school during COVID for the better part of 2 years, which were developmentally crucial years. These children were never caught up, more so just pushed ahead with no real or meaningful plan to address these foundational deficits. This individual's final breaking point to make the decision to transition to homeschooling came after a DCF referral was made for truancy after both of their children had surgery, the flu, covid and repeated bouts of strep throat despite ongoing medical documentation being provided. This referral was made without any attempt to contact her or her husband.

This individual has worked for DCF as a psychiatric nurse in an adolescent inpatient setting for the last 13 years. They fully support efforts to keep children safe as a community, but do not feel this bill will accomplish its intended goal of decreasing instances of abuse and/or neglect. Statistically speaking, children 5 and younger are most likely to suffer abuse/neglect. If this legislation were truly about prevention and early identification of abuse or neglect a better approach would be to find ways to support new parents and implement social constructs and screening processes for those who are most vulnerable instead of depending on a school system to hopefully identify issues upon school enrollment after what could be years of abuse/neglect.

Christine Wojdyla

This individual is a former homeschool mom with one child currently in public school and one child in Catholic school. Numerous studies have shown that homeschooled and private school children are often better educated than public school children, and yet it is these families that must jump through hoops. Problems with abuse are the result of terrible parents, neglectful families who turn a blind eye to family members being abused, and terrible oversight by DCF.

Jared Wolff, Clinton, CT — Connecticut Resident & Employer

This individual is an avid supporter of homeschooling and as an employer has hired homeschooled young adults who consistently proven to be among his most capable, self-motivated, and well-prepared workers. His firsthand experience gives him great confidence in what homeschooling families are able to achieve — and great concern about legislation that would treat those same families as suspects in need of government oversight. While he understands the legislature’s concern for child welfare — particularly in the wake of high-profile tragedies — he believes that HB5468 is an overbroad response that would subject thousands of law-abiding homeschooling families to government surveillance and bureaucratic gatekeeping without cause. It raises serious constitutional concerns, conflicts with federal privacy law, and would burden responsible families while doing little to protect children who are actually at risk. If the legislature wishes to address gaps in child welfare oversight, the appropriate vehicle is targeted reform of DCF’s existing case management and follow-up procedures — not a surveillance framework applied to every family that chooses an alternative to public school. They are parents making a lawful, constitutionally protected choice. Legislation that treats them otherwise — and that may cost the state federal funding in the process — is not sound policy.

Leslie Wolfgang, Director of Public Policy, Family Institute of Connecticut

This individual testifies on behalf of many of their members that are distressed by HB5468. Many homeschool, to avoid certain teachings in public schools that conflict with their deeply held religious beliefs, particularly around sexual ethics and gender identity. The website of the State Education Resource Center, referenced in line 241 of this bill, has training and materials that emphasize topics such as gender identity policies, preferred pronouns, boys in girls’ sports and bathrooms, and trauma-informed practices designed to create LGBTQIA-affirming school environments. As such, homeschool parents are alarmed to see that SERC could be designated as an organization to review a family’s “demonstration of equivalent instruction”. Even if SERC is not currently evaluating sexual or health education, families worry about where those standards might go in the future. SERC is not neutral on gender issues and is basically a mandated reporter to DCF. DCF has removed or threatened to remove children from homes where there was no finding of abuse, but where parents refused to affirm a child’s gender identity. When parents put those pieces together—teachers trained on these topics, families leaving public schools because of them, homeschooling at great personal sacrifice, and then potentially being reviewed by the same organization with mandated reporting authority—it creates very real fear. This individual asks for further review of the section preventing parents from withdrawing their child to homeschool if they have a DCF order or are receiving protective services. Sometimes homeschooling is the balm needed to help a family stabilize and heal. They request adding flexibility so that it is possible for these families to withdraw their child under proper monitored conditions to homeschool.

Jennifer Wood

Alternative forms of education outside the public school do not need oversight by the public school.

Kristi Wood Lisbon, CT

As written, HB 5468 would significantly expand government oversight of families who provide their children with “equivalent instruction,” commonly known as homeschooling. Connecticut has long recognized that parents hold the primary responsibility for their children’s education,

and the current law already requires that children receive instruction in core academic subjects. HB 5468 would move Connecticut away from that long-standing approach by creating new systems of registration, reporting, and potential monitoring of homeschool families. Their major concerns with this proposal are as follows 1. It undermines parental rights. 2. It creates unnecessary bureaucracy. 3. It treats responsible families as though they require monitoring. 4. It risks discouraging educational flexibility and innovation. Connecticut's current framework already ensures that children receive instruction while preserving family autonomy and educational freedom. Rather than expanding regulation, policymakers should focus on enforcing existing child welfare laws and supporting families in providing high-quality education.

Jessica Woodward

During this individual's time at the UCONN pursuing a B.A. in English Literature, they read 1984 by George Orwell which centers around themes of government surveillance, control, suppression, manipulation, and destruction of the individual. They feel that HB 5468 is eerily similar to Orwell's 1984. If enacted, the bill would require government oversight of curriculum (dictatorially decreeing acceptability while annihilating individualized child-centered learning), data tracking (surveillance), registration (more surveillance), DCF screening without just cause (suppression and fear that discourages a parent's right to decide what's best for their child), and state authority encroaching on private family decisions.

Robert Woodward, 12 years old homeschooler

This individual likes homeschooling because they are able to work at their level. They are currently working a grade ahead in Science and History. They oppose this bill because they feel it is very controlling and doesn't fit into a country that is a democracy.

Shangjie Sharon Yao, Homeschool Mother

This individual's husband and her have been homeschooling their children for eleven years, and believe parents love their children the most and commit to give their children the best education. If passed, this bill will infringe upon parental rights and jeopardize the freedoms that allow homeschooling children to thrive under their parents's guidance and teaching.

Collin York

This individual believes that while the stated goal of ensuring "equivalent instruction" is noble, the bill creates unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles that infringe upon parental rights and the educational freedom that has allowed Connecticut's homeschooling families to thrive for decades. Their key points of concern include: 1.) Presumption of Guilt - The requirement for the Department of Education to notify DCF upon a student's withdrawal from public school essentially treats every homeschooling parent as a potential suspect, rather than a primary educator. It risks overwhelming an already strained DCF system with "false flags" while doing nothing to target actual cases of neglect. 2.) Privacy and FERPA Violations - State Education Commissioner Charlene Russell-Tucker has raised concerns that such data sharing may violate the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). Passing a law that jeopardizes millions in federal education funding is fiscally and legally irresponsible. 3.) Erosion of Educational Diversity - The "portfolio and progress" mandates move Connecticut away from its successful "no-notice" history toward a rigid, one-size-fits-all model. Standardized oversight threatens the very innovation that makes home education successful. 4.) Administrative Burden - Forcing parents to appear in person at school district offices to sign forms and submit annual "continuation" paperwork creates a logistical barrier for working families and those in rural areas, with no proven benefit to the student's academic outcome.

Mel Young

This individual believes that government should not interfere with parental rights and the citizens of CT and the American people are not blind to what has been going on.

Frances Yurek

This individual believes this bill is an absolute overreach by the government. They question if anything was learned from the Covid travesty and reminds legislators that they are in their position because of the people and they should represent the will of the people.

Aleksander Z

This individual believes this bill creates an unwarranted and expensive government system that violates civil liberties and privacy rights of Connecticut residents. This sets a dangerous precedent for government overreach into the private homes of its citizens, regardless of whether they have children. Taxpayer resources should be allocated towards improving current public schools rather than be diverted to fund unnecessary oversight and a registry of law abiding citizens. They believe the state should focus on its own agency accountability rather than expand its authority to monitor private citizens who have committed no crimes.

Elzbieta Z

This individual feels this bill disregards educational freedom and puts in place an unwarranted surveillance system that treats parents like suspects. Parental rights should be preserved and protected.

Susan Zabohonski Plantsville, CT

This individual believes this bill places an unnecessary and intrusive burden on families who choose "equivalent instruction" (homeschooling) for their children. By requiring in-person registration and the submission of private educational portfolios to state-funded entities, this legislation infringes upon parental rights and creates a redundant layer of bureaucracy. This bill allows local boards to share private student records with the State Education Resource Center (SERC) for subjective evaluation. Requiring parents to appear in person at district offices for "Intent to Educate" forms is an outdated requirement that inconveniences working families and is just another example of government overreach. Current Connecticut law already ensures children receive a "sufficient" education; these new mandates for standardized testing and portfolio reviews are a solution in search of a problem.

Steven Zarrella

This individual feels this bill attempts to solve a problem that does not exist and scapegoats everyone involved in homeschooling. They believe that the two cases used to necessitate the proposed legislation are red herrings and, that in each case, child services were already involved and failed both children.

Robert Zdanowski

This grandparent of homeschooled children finds this legislation overreaching and unnecessary, a burden to families seeking the best educational choices for their children.

Carl Zemke, Student, Killingworth, CT

This individual requests CT families be left to homeschool freely without government oversight and that focus be redirected to agencies in place to protect children from neglect.

Erica Zoccano, concerned mother

This individual believes that homeschooling should not create a notification to a CT Child Welfare agency when any child is removed from public school to be homeschooled. It is a complete overreach of government and unacceptable. They believe that private school and homeschooling is safer than public schools and should not be treated as dangerous options.

Lauren Zuvich

This individual is a Democrat who values child welfare, equity in education, and civil liberties. While they support stronger safeguards against child abuse and ensuring every child receives a genuine education, this bill risks overreach by expanding vague state authority over "equivalent instruction." It will disproportionately burden low-income families, working parents, and those using homeschooling for legitimate reasons—like accommodating disabilities, cultural needs, or escaping underfunded public schools; without meaningfully targeting actual abuse. Current failures lie in under-resourced agencies like DCF and schools, not in parental choice. Punitive monitoring of homeschoolers presumes suspicion, echoing discriminatory surveillance that has historically harmed marginalized communities. True child protection means fully funding social services, mental health, and public education—not bureaucratic hoops that remove educational freedom.

Daniel Saunders

Connecticut has long been one of the least restrictive states when it comes to homeschooling and parental education choices. That approach has worked well for decades. Families have been able to choose homeschooling, private school, or move districts without unnecessary government involvement. This bill changes that dramatically by involving DCF when a family withdraws a child from public school. DCF plays an important role when children are actually at risk but involving them simply because a parent chooses a different educational path sends the message that families should be treated with suspicion for making a lawful decision. It would also place additional administrative burden and legal risk on school districts that are already stretched thin. More broadly, policies like this contribute to a growing frustration many Connecticut families already feel. When government continues to expand into family decisions, people eventually start voting with their feet and moving to states where they feel those freedoms are respected.

Michelle Scanlon

This individual believes that this bill takes away parents' rights to educate their children the way they see fit. They feel that if parents have the means to educate their children efficiently, they should not be bullied by ridiculous laws of the government.

Eliza Shantley

This individual believes that the current statute is more than sufficient and additional oversight is a violation of parental rights. If passed, this bill would require the BOE to fulfill additional oversight that would lead to an increase in public funds by way of education budgets, which come directly from taxpayers. To involve DCF simply because of educational choice is a gross violation of the recent Supreme Court ruling that parents are the legal responsible party for educating their child. Rather than expanding regulation, CT should continue to respect and support the rights of parents to direct their children's education.

Eden Ayala-Tannis

This individual is a 15 year old young man that's been a classical conversations student since the age of 3. They oppose this bill because it is a violation of constitutional rights. His education has been a blessing from God and has made him a better person. He believes that parents are parents for a reason and they are here to protect their children. When his mom and him think about the trajectory that will follow such a bill as this, they are deeply saddened. He questions what America is, if the constitution is not adhered to.

Jennifer Tow, Glastonbury, CT

This individual is a lifelong CT citizen, a liberal, and registered Democrat who homeschooled their children to expand their opportunities, not to limit them. They wanted to raise intelligent people who are also good, kind and thoughtful human beings and good citizens, with well-developed critical thinking skills and the capacity to realize their dreams. Unschooling free of testing and curricula was their path to those goals. They urge legislators to consider requiring public schools to prove equivalency to homeschoolers, as they may find their outcomes much improved. The very idea that parents must "present themselves" to a school authority they have intentionally opted out of is outrageous.

One of the primary reasons their family never left CT was the freedom to raise their children as they saw fit. For the past decade, they have seen that freedom eroded with every legislative session, marked by micromanagement and overreach at every level of their personal lives. They shared that the implicit message that "if someone has nothing to hide, they should not be concerned" about this Constitutional assault suggests that we have completely lost our way. No citizen is obligated to prove they have nothing to hide to be treated with respect, dignity and the presumption of innocence. That message is a direct violation of both the letter and the spirit of the United States Constitution and should never be weaponized by our own governments a means of coercion. They call upon the legislature to recognize the language in this bill as reckless overreach in the face of a desire to address the horrific consequences of DCF's pervasive failure to protect the children entrusted to them. No amount of politicizing or propagandizing these failures can ever justify trampling the Constitutional rights of CT parents in choosing how to raise or educate their children.

Annette Townsley

This individual doesn't want their tax dollars being used to supervise something (i.e. homeschooling) that is already doing a better job than public schools. What a waste!

Gregory Trudeau

While they are not opposed to some system that protects children from abusive parents who claim to be homeschooling, homeschool families should not be forced to teach values that oppose their religious beliefs.

Kristopher Tramont

This individual believes this bill infringes on the rights of parents to decide what is best for their children. Parents—not the government—should have the primary authority over how their children are raised. While government officials are elected to represent the people, they should not overstep that role by dictating decisions that rightfully belong to families.

Stephanie Tomaszewsky

This individual states that there is no good reason to force more rubbernecking into the DCF pipeline that is already overloaded. If a child has a DCF record, they shouldn't need the referral,

they are already in DCF's system. This is a redundant process and violates parents' duties under the constitution. They don't believe the bill does anything for child safety.

Stef Tok

This individual immigrated legally from a communist country to U.S.A., supposedly a free country, and believe that as an adult they should be making their own decisions regarding themselves and their family, not a bunch of politicians.

Jeffrey Thurston

They oppose governmental overreach of power and infringement on parental rights.

HB-05468 Anonymous, Anonymous-Opposes

This individual is a father from Norwalk, Connecticut whose wife left her career so she could homeschool their child. That was not an easy decision, but it was a necessary one because the schools in their area are struggling deeply. In Norwalk, even the school with the highest reading and math proficiency rates is still below 50%. That means the majority of students are not meeting basic academic standards. As parents, they stepped in and took responsibility to make sure their child receives the education they deserve. HB05468 would add unnecessary oversight and burdens on families like theirs who are already sacrificing time, income, and stability to educate their children. Homeschool families refuse to let their children fall through the cracks. This bill risks discouraging families who are doing everything they can to give their children a better future.

HB-05468 Anonymous, Anonymous-Opposes

This individual believes that rather than presuming that parents are the primary and responsible educators of their children, the bill shifts that presumption to the state, inviting more bureaucracy, more reporting, and more opportunities for conflict between families and school districts over deeply personal educational choices. This approach threatens educational freedom, privacy, and the diversity of learning models that have served Connecticut children well for generations. Extra layers of registration, review, and possible scrutiny will not improve outcomes. They will, however, put unnecessary pressure on families, especially those with children who have unique learning styles, to abandon customized education that works for them in favor of a one-size-fits-all model. They urge legislators to support policies that respect parents as the primary decision-makers in their children's education, protect home and alternative education options, and focus state energy on strengthening the public schools already under your direct responsibility.

HB-05468 Anonymous, Anonymous-Opposes

Every child learns differently, and at a different pace. Sometimes parents are better equipped to handle their children's education than the overwhelmed school system. Annual testing will NEVER accurately reflect a child's progress because progress looks different for every child. The school environment can be TOXIC to some children. Being in school can lead to rebellious or violent tendencies that lead to problems at home and eventually in society. Having the opportunity to homeschool freely allows children to escape the toxic environment and function better in society.

Iris White, Superintendent of Schools for Bristol Public Schools: Ms. White opposes this bill due to the financial and administrative hurdles that it creates for local school districts. She says that the provisions of this bill require staff, training, data systems, and oversight that is not

being passed with the funding to fulfill those obligations. While posing significant challenges due to limited municipal resources, she also highlights that the misinterpretation or improper implementation of the bill could expose school districts to legal liability via violations of FERPA, thereby costing districts federal funding. She testifies that this bill, along with SB6, have been flagged by SDE as potential sources of conflict with federal privacy law, and thus she stresses the need for careful consideration prior to the establishment of new reporting requirements involving student records. Furthermore, she argues that withdrawal timelines and approval procedures within the bill could cause avoidable disruptions in students' educational transitions; and she expresses worry that the inclusion of homeschooling students in public school extracurriculars would create additional resourcing, liability, and administrative concerns for districts who are facing issues regarding capacity restraints. Lastly, she notes that if the requirements within this bill cause families to suddenly return to public school, this influx in enrollment could reduce access to transportation, staffing, classroom space, and other services for public school students and their families.

Peter Wolfgang, President of the Family Institute of CT Action: Mr. Wolfgang opposes this bill as it raises concerns regarding privacy, effectiveness, and the allocation of limited state resources. He highlights how this bill raises constitutional concern, conflicts with federal student privacy laws, and questions how this impacts child welfare or education outcomes. Firstly, he points to research suggesting that homeschooled students are academically at or above national averages, stating that Connecticut's current approach to homeschooling is not unusual or failing. Secondly, there is a Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) concern where reports to the Department of Children and Families (DCF) go beyond FERPA's protection rules where parental consent is needed to release confidential student educational records. As a result, he argues that there is a risk of educational records being used as a screening tool when they are intended to be confidential until released. In addition to sharing information with DCF, the private educational records are being shared with the State Education Resource Center (SERC), a quasi-public organization with inclusive viewpoints, and he says that parents are unaware of how this organization is utilizing the records. Additionally, Mr. Wolfgang draws attention to the existing limitations of state resources, citing the large caseloads for DCF workers, prior to the addition of the provisions of this bill that require funding. Finally, Mr. Wolfgang emphasizes that the protection of children and the guarantee of educational opportunity should be the focal point for policymakers and families, but points to how this bill creates risks and burdens on families' privacy and limits attention to higher-priority public needs.

Isabelle Zaffetti: Mrs. Zaffetti opposes this bill as it undermines parents' authority, is a financial burden to taxpayers and current school employees, and does not improve children's safety. She elaborates on how parents are the primary educators to children and have the rights and responsibilities to choose how their children live their lives. Once children begin education, she feels that the responsibility remains on the parents to make the decisions for their children. Additionally, she highlights an issue with student safety, where there is an outsourcing to educational review teams, resulting in children's information being shared without parental consent. Furthermore, she discusses how portfolio reviews do not improve safety, but instead take a personal look into their home life to judge if learning is happening. She argues that a review team that makes judgements about the amount of learning can be stressful and could impact the educational process. Lastly, she believes this bill is intended to aid the interest of constituents, but is written in a way that does not accomplish that goal.

The following 97 individuals voiced opposition to this bill:

Michael Turner	Danielle Turrell	Terri Uccello	Daniel Ugliono
Jessica Ugliono	Robert V.	Valerie V.	Chris Valley
Daniel Vazquez	Mariana Velez	Anar Verdiyev	Ekaterina Verd zadze
Bayleigh W	D W	Don W	Heather W
Joanna W	Krystal W	Sarah Waita	Sara Walka
Julie Walther	EJ Watrous	Robin Watrous	Tim Watrous
Christine Watson	Gary Watson	Audrey Wayman Pham	Susan Wayman
Kerry Webb	Robin Wilber	Sue Wilcox	James Williams
Lisa Williams	Margaret Williams	Robert Williams	Scott Williams
Sterling Williams	Susan Williams	Todd Williams	Thomas Winiarski
Yitzchak Winograd	Super Woman	Don Woodin	K Woodin
Brandon Woods	Cassandra Woods	Donna Woods	Glen Woods
Matthew Woods	Charles Wright	Samantha Wright	n y
Maryann Adams	Helen Albert	Anonymous 1180	Anonymous 1259
Anonymous 1272	Anonymous 1350	Anonymous 1413	Anonymous 1471
Anonymous 1566	Anonymous 1602	Anonymous 1665	Anonymous 281
Anonymous 699	Anonymous 889	Anonymous 934	Anonymous 936
Lily Ayres	Danielle Boies	Matthew Boies	Erica Boria
Violeta Breaz	Brian D	caden durbois	Amarilis Sanchez
Christopher Sangalli	Cassie Schoenknecht	Lindsey Semyanko	Teresa Skoniecki
Student	Angela Tuccero	Guy Tuccero	Jenifer Wood
Robert Zdanowski	Jeanne Tremblay	Diana Tovar	Laura Tortora
Stephanie Tornatore	Joseph Tonski	Sheila Toal	O Toal
Lyndom Thorn	Lyndon Thorn	Hope Thorn	Amber Thomas
Theresa Teixeira			

An additional **419** People submitted similar testimony in opposition anonymously for fear of retaliation. Many stated that the state should not control when parents withdraw children from public schools. A decision to withdrawal is not an act of abuse requiring DCF reporting, and they do not need oversight from public schools. Many parents state they did not understand why the legislature was focusing on homeschooling oversight rather than addressing the failures within the systems already present. DCF is already short staffed and does not have the funding to comply with the bill and they explain that the CT Commissioner of Education said the bill would likely violate FERPA resulting in funding lose. They fear it would infringe on their constitutional rights if implemented and be state surveillance. The cases of *Pierce v. Society of Sisters* (1925), *Wisconsin v. Yoder* (1972) and *Troxel v. Granville* (2000) were cited by many people, and they often stated their children were bullied in school as a reason for choosing to homeschool. Several parents mention NAEP scoring CT's educations proficiencies being low and that homeschooling allowed their children to better thrive. Many homeschool students stated they get more attention and help from home than they did at school, with their grades significantly improving. They explain they had less anxiety, did not have to fear for their safety and still got to go on educational trips for hands on learning. Multiple people stated they would leave the state if this passed and that it went against multiple sections of the constitution. Others mentioned private schools and being satisfied with them among other reasons not related to the content of the bill. Several people expressed condolences over Mimi Torres-

Garcia's death, among others but stated it should not be used as a reason to punish home schoolers.

- Anonymous 1326, Mom
- Anonymous 1327
- Anonymous 1328
- Anonymous 1331
- Anonymous 1335
- Anonymous 1336
- Anonymous 1337
- Anonymous 1342
- Anonymous 1344
- Anonymous 1346
- Anonymous 1347
- Anonymous 1348
- Anonymous 1350
- Anonymous 1356
- Anonymous 1357
- Anonymous 1358
- Anonymous 1360
- Anonymous 1362
- Anonymous 1363
- Anonymous 1364
- Anonymous 1365, 4th Grader
- Anonymous 1366
- Anonymous 1367
- Anonymous 1368
- Anonymous 1369
- Anonymous 1370
- Anonymous 1371
- Anonymous 1372
- Anonymous 1373
- Anonymous 1374
- Anonymous 1375
- Anonymous 1376
- Anonymous 1377
- Anonymous 1378, Mom of 3
- Anonymous 1379
- Anonymous 1380
- Anonymous 1381
- Anonymous 1384
- Anonymous 1389
- Anonymous 1391
- Anonymous 1396
- Anonymous 1402
- Anonymous 1403
- Anonymous 1404, A father
- Anonymous 1407
- Anonymous 1408
- Anonymous 1410
- Anonymous 1411
- Anonymous 1412
- Anonymous 1413
- Anonymous 1415
- Anonymous 1417
- Anonymous 1418
- Anonymous 1419
- Anonymous 1420
- Anonymous 1422
- Anonymous 1424
- Anonymous 1425
- Anonymous 1426, MS CCC SLP
- Anonymous 1427
- Anonymous 1428
- Anonymous 1429
- Anonymous 1430
- Anonymous 1431
- Anonymous 1432
- Anonymous 1433
- Anonymous 1434, 7 year old
- Anonymous 1435, AP assistant
- Anonymous 1436
- Anonymous 1437
- Anonymous 1438
- Anonymous 1440
- Anonymous 1445
- Anonymous 1446
- Anonymous 1447
- Anonymous 1448
- Anonymous 1450, Homeschool Student
- Anonymous 1451
- Anonymous 1452
- Anonymous 1453
- Anonymous 1454
- Anonymous 1455
- Anonymous 1456
- Anonymous 1457
- Anonymous 1459
- Anonymous 1461, Parent
- Anonymous 1462, Teacher
- Anonymous 1464, parent
- Anonymous 1465
- Anonymous 1466
- Anonymous 1467
- Anonymous 1468
- Anonymous 1469
- Anonymous 1470
- Anonymous 1471
- Anonymous 1473
- Anonymous 1474
- Anonymous 1475
- Anonymous 1477, Homeschool mother
- Anonymous 1478
- Anonymous 1479
- Anonymous 1480
- Anonymous 1481
- Anonymous 1482
- Anonymous 1481
- Anonymous 1482
- Anonymous 1484
- Anonymous 1485
- Anonymous 1486
- Anonymous 1487
- Anonymous 1488
- Anonymous 1489
- Anonymous 1490
- Anonymous 1496
- Anonymous 1497
- Anonymous 1498
- Anonymous 1499
- Anonymous 1501
- Anonymous 1504
- Anonymous 1505
- Anonymous 1507
- Anonymous 1509, Law enforcement
- Anonymous 1509
- Anonymous 1511
- Anonymous 1513
- Anonymous 1517
- Anonymous 1518
- Anonymous 1520
- Anonymous 1521
- Anonymous 1522
- Anonymous 1523
- Anonymous 1525
- Anonymous 1526, Home Educated Student
- Anonymous 1529
- Anonymous 1530
- Anonymous 1531, Homeschool Parent
- Anonymous 1532
- Anonymous 1533
- Anonymous 1534
- Anonymous 1535
- Anonymous 1536
- Anonymous 1537
- Anonymous 1538
- Anonymous 1540
- Anonymous 1542
- Anonymous 1543, School Secretary
- Anonymous 1546
- Anonymous 1547
- Anonymous 1548
- Anonymous 1549
- Anonymous 1552, Homeschooling Parent and Teacher
- Anonymous 1556
- Anonymous 1557, Board Certified Behavior Analyst
- Anonymous 1558
- Anonymous 1559, A concerned homeschool student
- Anonymous 1560
- Anonymous 1561
- Anonymous 1563
- Anonymous 1564
- Anonymous 1565, Professor-CT State University System
- Anonymous 1566
- Anonymous 1568
- Anonymous 1569
- Anonymous 1570
- Anonymous 1572
- Anonymous 1573
- Anonymous 1574
- Anonymous 1575
- Anonymous 1576
- Anonymous 1578, Student
- Anonymous 1579
- Anonymous 1581
- Anonymous 1582
- Anonymous 1583
- Anonymous 1585
- Anonymous 1586, 13 Year

Old Student •Anonymous 1589, College Students Testimony •Anonymous 1592
•Anonymous 1593 •Anonymous 1594 •Anonymous 1595 •Anonymous 1597, Parent
•Anonymous 1598 •Anonymous 1601 •Anonymous 1602 •Anonymous 1603
•Anonymous 1604 •Anonymous 1605 •Anonymous 1606 •Anonymous 1609
•Anonymous 1610 •Anonymous 1614 •Anonymous 1616 •Anonymous 1617
•Anonymous 1619 •Anonymous 1620 •Anonymous 1624 •Anonymous 1625
•Anonymous 1626, Homeschool Mom •Anonymous 1631 •Anonymous 1632
•Anonymous 1633 •Anonymous 1634 •Anonymous 1635 •Anonymous 1636
•Anonymous 1638 •Anonymous 1639 •Anonymous 1640 •Anonymous 1643
•Anonymous 1644 •Anonymous 1645 •Anonymous 1646 •Anonymous 1648
•Anonymous 1650 •Anonymous 1652, Concerned Parent •Anonymous 1653
•Anonymous 1654 •Anonymous 1657 •Anonymous 1658 •Anonymous 1659
•Anonymous 1660 •Anonymous 1661 •Anonymous 1662 •Anonymous 1663
•Anonymous 1663 •Anonymous 1665 •Anonymous 1668 •Anonymous 1669
•Anonymous 1672 •Anonymous 1673 •Anonymous 1674 •Anonymous 1676
•Anonymous 1679 •Anonymous 1680 •Anonymous 1681 •Anonymous 1682
•Anonymous 1683 •Anonymous 1685 •Anonymous 1687 •Anonymous 1689
•Anonymous 1692 •Anonymous 1693 •Anonymous 1694 •Anonymous 1695
•Anonymous 1696 •Anonymous 1697 •Anonymous 1698 •Anonymous 1699
•Anonymous 1701 •Anonymous 1702 •Anonymous 1705, Mother •Anonymous 1706,
Mother •Anonymous 1707 •Anonymous 1708 •Anonymous 1709, Homeschool Student
•Anonymous 1710 •Anonymous 1711 •Anonymous 1712 •Anonymous 1713
•Anonymous 1715 •Anonymous 1716 •Anonymous 1718 •Anonymous 1720, Registered
Voter •Anonymous 1723 •Anonymous 183 •Anonymous 185 •Anonymous 185
•Anonymous 188 •Anonymous 188 •Anonymous 190 •Anonymous 191 •Anonymous
192 •Anonymous 193 •Anonymous 194 •Anonymous 195 •Anonymous 196
•Anonymous 197 •Anonymous 199 •Anonymous 201 •Anonymous 202 •Anonymous
204 •Anonymous 205 •Anonymous 206 •Anonymous 207 •Anonymous 208
•Anonymous 209 •Anonymous 211 •Anonymous 213 •Anonymous 214 •Anonymous
215 •Anonymous 216 •Anonymous 217 •Anonymous 218 •Anonymous 218
•Anonymous 220 •Anonymous 223 •Anonymous 224 •Anonymous 225 •Anonymous
226 •Anonymous 227 •Anonymous 228 •Anonymous 352 •Anonymous 353
•Anonymous 354 •Anonymous 355 •Anonymous 357 •Anonymous 365 •Anonymous
366 •Anonymous 367 •Anonymous 370 •Anonymous 375 •Anonymous 377
•Anonymous 379 •Anonymous 381 •Anonymous 389 •Anonymous 399, Parent
•Anonymous 404 •Anonymous 405, Retired teacher •Anonymous 412 •Anonymous 417
•Anonymous 421 •Anonymous 423 •Anonymous 425 •Anonymous 426 •Anonymous
427 •Anonymous 428 •Anonymous 429 •Anonymous 432 •Anonymous 435
•Anonymous 440 •Anonymous 447 •Anonymous 463 •Anonymous 464 •Anonymous
468 •Anonymous 471 •Anonymous 473 •Anonymous 476 •Anonymous 477
•Anonymous 480 •Anonymous 481 •Anonymous 488 •Anonymous 489 •Anonymous
490 •Anonymous 491 •Anonymous 494 •Anonymous 495 •Anonymous 496
•Anonymous 499 •Anonymous 502 •Anonymous 505 •Anonymous 508 •Anonymous
510 •Anonymous 512 •Anonymous 513 •Anonymous 515 •Anonymous 516
•Anonymous 517 •Anonymous 518 •Anonymous 521 •Anonymous 526 •Anonymous
527 •Anonymous 537 •Anonymous 537 •Anonymous 541 •Anonymous 542
•Anonymous 543 •Anonymous 547 •Anonymous 556 •Anonymous 564 •Anonymous
565, Former paraprofessional •Anonymous 577 •Anonymous 579 •Anonymous 583
•Anonymous 585 •Anonymous 595 •Anonymous 597 •Anonymous 598 •Anonymous

**600 •Anonymous 604 •Anonymous 607 •Anonymous 609 •Anonymous 611
 •Anonymous 615 •Anonymous 618 •Anonymous 623 •Anonymous 632 •Anonymous
 634 •Anonymous 637 •Anonymous 638 •Anonymous 639 •Anonymous 642
 •Anonymous 648 •Anonymous 650 •Anonymous 655 •Anonymous 665 •Anonymous
 669 •Anonymous 671 •Anonymous 672 •Anonymous 673 •Anonymous 676
 •Anonymous 682 •Anonymous 685 •Anonymous 686 •Anonymous 689 •Anonymous
 698 •Anonymous 699 •Anonymous 708 •Anonymous 714 •Anonymous 715
 •Anonymous 717 •Anonymous 721 •Anonymous 723 •Anonymous 724 •Anonymous
 725 •Anonymous 732 •Anonymous 735 •**

The following anonymous people submitted testimony opposing this bill. They believe that this bill is government overreach. They believe that parents have a right to choose the way in which their children are educated.

Anonymous 243	Anonymous 247	Anonymous 248	Anonymous 260
Anonymous 262	Anonymous 288	Anonymous 308	Anonymous 309
Anonymous 315	Anonymous 316	Anonymous 319	Anonymous 320
Anonymous 330	Anonymous 334	Anonymous 345	

The following anonymous people submitted testimony opposing this bill, saying it goes against the Constitution and/or their constitutional rights.

Anonymous 253	Anonymous 263	Anonymous 264	Anonymous 289
Anonymous 301	Anonymous 307	Anonymous 311	Anonymous 318
Anonymous 338	Anonymous 340	Anonymous 346	

The following anonymous people submitted testimony opposing this bill, saying it's a FERPA violation.

Anonymous 287	Anonymous 302	Anonymous 344	
---------------	---------------	---------------	--

The following people testified anonymously in opposition to this bill. They testified that this bill creates burdens on families and also raises questions about fairness. Increased bureaucratic requirements often fall hardest on minority and low-income families who may lack the resources and flexibility to navigate increased documentation requirements.

Anonymous 317	Anonymous 326		
---------------	---------------	--	--

The following people testified anonymous opposing this bill. They point to other areas that lawmakers should focus on instead of homeschooling, such as the public schools and DCF. They also say that this new bureaucracy strains resources.

Anonymous 296	Anonymous 328	Anonymous 332	Anonymous 341
Anonymous 343	Anonymous 284/286		

Anonymous 230 opposes this bill. They are a grandparent whose grandchildren are receiving well-rounded education at home. They believe the parents should focus their time and energy on teaching, rather than addressing administrative requirements. These requirements place a disproportionate burden on families with limited financial resources and create carriers for

parents who are trying to do their best. They believe families who have no reason to be distrusted should not be subject to this increasing government intrusion.

Anonymous 233 opposes this bill. They oppose the involvement of DCF when parents withdraw their child from public school to educate them at home. They believe that children deserve opportunities to engage in various subjects rather than focus on standardized tests. They believe that homeschooling families are not the problem and that this bill creates unnecessary scrutiny and fear for homeschooling families.

Anonymous 237 opposes this bill. They have a degree in education and is a homeschooling parent. They believe they should have the freedom to homeschool their children without the government overreaching into their family.

Anonymous 245 opposes this bill. They state that homeschooling is already regulated in the state under CT General Statute § 10-184. They believe that further regulation of homeschooling will not address the core issue of child abuse and instead infringes on the rights of parents to educate their own children. They also state that the extra requirements outlined in the bill places extra, unconstitutional burdens on parents who are already working hard to educate their children. They do not like the data-sharing system that this bill creates and believes this bill would strip away people's freedoms.

Anonymous 258 opposes this bill for five reasons. First, they believe that this bill poses new administrative responsibilities on school districts, which will create financial burdens, among other pressures. Second, this bill could create an unfunded mandate. Third, it is unclear what data or other documented evidence supports the needs for the level of oversight this bill requires. Fourth, it is unclear how these new reporting measures would improve educational outcomes. Fifth, this bill's requirements pose possible legal and privacy consequences.

Anonymous 267 opposes this bill. They believe the bill undermines parent's rights. They also believe that homeschoolers do not want equivalent instruction. They point to data from other states that show homeschoolers perform better compared to public school students. They are concerned that this bill will lead to a big expense and burden on school districts, which will pass to the taxpayers. Further, they believe that this bill wouldn't actually protect the children who are being abused and neglected.

Anonymous 299 opposes this bill because their child is homeschooled as a result of the public system's failure. Their child needed an IEP and was "too smart." At public school, their child did not receive the right amount or kind of attention, with teachers focusing on disciplining other students at the expense of their child's education. They oppose this bill because they believe it is their God-given right to ensure their child's safety, well-being, and education.

Anonymous 300 opposes this bill. As a homeschooling mother, she believes this legislation increases unnecessary government oversight of homeschooling families. Homeschooling provides a lot of benefits to families and requirements that increase reporting and government tracking create a presumption that homeschooling parents are doing something wrong. Rather than imposing broad regulations on numerous law-abiding homeschooling families, she believes that lawmakers should instead focus on improving responses to actual reports of abuse and neglect. It is those systems that have failed rather than homeschooling.

Anonymous 306 opposes this bill, saying it's unnecessary and overreaching. They believe it will create great stress on public schools that are already failing. They also note that Connecticut has had effective homeschooling legislation for hundreds of years and asks why a change is necessary now. Finally, they believe that this bill creates excessive red tape and that the data the government collects in compliance with this bill will be mismanaged. Rather than look to homeschooling regulations to improve children's safety, they believe lawmakers should look at other systems and institutions like public schools, private schools, and DCF.

Anonymous 313 opposes this bill. They say it creates an unnecessary burden on parents and will do nothing to improve child safety.

The following people submitted testimony opposing this bill. They believe that this bill is government overreach.

Alton Blodgett	Daniel Bolduc	Marcia Bono	Steven Boswell
Aaron Bowman	John Boyle	Thomas Bracco	Mark Brault
Katherine Breakell	Eliabeth Brodeur	Russell Brodin	Kayla Bubniak
Marrit Budny	Diana Bump	Karl Burgess	Thomas Buzzi
Maria Caffrey	Bruce Calef	Sarah Calkins	Asher Campbell
Carol Cangiano	Russell Caram	Kathryn Carlson	Brittany Casey

The following people submitted testimony oppose this bill. They believe that parents have a fundamental/constitutional right to choose the way in which their children are educated without government intrusion.

Jillian Berry	Lisa Bethke	Deborah Beveridge	Karin Blaschik
Caitlin Blessey	Anne Bora	Andrew Boyden	Jillian Boyden
Joel Boyle	Julie Brennan	Hannah Breton	Robert Brown
Tucker Bruch	Jessica Buchanan	Joan Burke	Julie Butter
Barbara C	Cody Calaci	Art Calef	Cristina Calef
Cassidy Camille	Andrew Campbell	Brianna Campbell	Madilyn Campbell
Jill Capalbo	Rubens Caproni	Alanie Cardona	Emanuel Cardona
Emanuel E. Cardona	Breault Carol	Lucius Carrasquillo	Kristen Carreras
James Cartabiano	Rebecca Cartabiano	Spencer Cartabiano	Raymond Carter
Robert Cassotto	Antoinette Catalina	Thomas Catalina	Carl Cecil, President of C&K Cecil Enterprises, LLC
Barbara Cervero	Raymond Chagnon	Jonathan Chechile	Marguerite Christie

The following people submitted testimony opposing this bill, saying that homeschooling provides better or unique opportunities for children that the public school system does not.

Melissa Bertrand	Isabelle Betterley		
------------------	--------------------	--	--

The following people submitted testimony opposing this bill, saying it's a FERPA violation.

Bianca Brittol	Thais Caproni		
----------------	---------------	--	--

The following people testified in opposition to this bill. They testified that this bill creates burdens on families and/or school systems.

Curran Bishop	Irene Bosco	Veronica Boulden	Jesse Buchanan
Jennifer Byars, Superintendent of Schools, Amity Regional School District No. 5	Eric Byrne, Superintendent of Darien Public Schools	Michael Byrne	Rebekah Calef
Craig Cameron			

The following people provided testimony opposing this bill, believing that the bill unfairly targets responsible homeschooling families and creates a presumption that homeschooling families are at fault.

Jennifer Bouchard	Marissa Bouchard	Olivia Braaten	Alesha Bracco
Marcy Brennan	Emelia Brito	JR Bryant	Bryan Bushong
Ella Casey			

The following people provided testimony opposing this bill because of the terms “equivalent instruction” and “equivalent education.” This bill hinges on the term “equivalent instruction” but does not define what that term means. If the benchmark is the current quality of Connecticut’s public schools, this bill does not attempt to raise the bar for children and instead attempts to lower it.

John Biskupski	Stephanie C	Lydia Calef	Nicole Carrasquillo
----------------	-------------	-------------	---------------------

Thomas Berrill from the Institute of Connecticut History opposes this bill. He believes that the notion of children belonging to the state and the destruction of the nuclear family is a Marxist principle, which will lead to a negative outcome.

Amanda Berry opposes this bill. She believes that homeschooling has long been a lawful and successful education option and that this bill adds layers of regulation that place unnecessary stress on homeschooling families. She also has concerns about DCF involvement in this homeschool oversight given her personal involvement with DCF.

Lee Ann Berry opposes this bill. She believes that this bill is government interference and may conflict with FERPA protections. She also believes this bill could raise constitutional concerns, including violations of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Rachael Bertels opposes this bill. She believes this bill will kill the fundamental right of a parent to educate their child due to the bill’s requirement for DCF involvement. She believes this bill constitutes governmental overreach. She believes that fixing DCF and the public school system are the ways to make kids safer.

Roselyn Bertels opposes this bill. She questions DCF’s involvement when parents want to pull their children from public school in order to homeschool them.

Liz Bickford opposes this bill. She is a mother, social worker, and former public-school teacher. She has seen firsthand how systems with the intent to help children often prevent children from receiving the help they need. She believes the freedom to tailor learning to children’s specific needs, which homeschooling allows, is critical for some children. She believes this bill will lead to expanding oversight. A new system would require staff, funding, and other resources that state agencies and school systems lack.

Suzanne Binelli opposes this bill. She points to several court cases where courts have held that parents have a right to educate their children outside of the public and private school systems (e.g., *Pierce v. Society of Sisters* and *Meyer v. Nebraska*). She also believes this bill is an overreach of power and does not trust DCF's involvement in the process this bill would install.

The Bjorbekks (a family) oppose this bill because they have seen how the school system has ailed some children. They have also fostered and adopted children through DCF and believe DCF is already over-strained.

Lauren Blackburn opposes this bill because she believes this bill constitutes government overreach with regard to infringing on parental rights. She also believes this bill is misguided in trying to protect children from abuse and neglect. DCF is already an overburdened system and, rather than target homeschooling, DCF itself needs to be fixed in order to protect children.

Ivon Bolanos opposes this bill. She believes parents have the right to make decisions regarding their children's education and upbringing. She also notes how many minority families already face barriers in accessing resources and support. She believes this bill may unintentionally create additional challenges for minority families.

Katerina Bouzakis opposes this bill. While she is not opposed to accountability in homeschooling, she believes this particular bill goes too far. She does not support DCF involvement with this new, proposed process and believes this bill conflicts with FERPA. She also notes that homeschooled children tend reach higher levels of academic achievement compared to public school students. Finally, she does not believe that this bill will actually protect children from abuse and neglect.

Errol Boyle opposes this bill. He and his wife homeschooled their children and has seen firsthand the benefits of homeschooling. He does not believe this bill targeting homeschooling will prevent the tragic cases that occurred in Waterbury and New Britain since those were DCF failures. He also notes that the United Supreme Court has long recognized the fundamental rights of parents regarding the upbringing and education of their children. Finally, these bills raise privacy concerns given that this bill requires a certain amount of data collection from parents who want to homeschool their children.

David Bruno opposes this bill. He believes this is a major and unnecessary expansion of government authority over homeschooling families, which includes a new reporting and monitoring system and involving DCF in this new process. He also believes this bill would impose significant administrative burdens on local school districts.

David Buck opposes this bill. He believes that it's a parent's constitutional right to educate their children as they see fit. The recent cases in Waterbury and New Britain are not related to homeschooling but to DCF, which is an understaffed agency. He also believes that this bill will force already strained school districts to spend more on time and staffing to approve all curriculums when they should be focusing on public school students.

Carmen Burgos opposes this bill because of concerns that it the bill is not balancing parental rights with the responsibility to ensure every child has access to education and protection.

Carmen does believe it is important to have safeguards when children are withdrawn from school for homeschooling, but also believes in a parent's right to homeschool their children.

Sondra Byrne opposes this bill. She worries that the new demands imposed by this bill will not actually provide support to people who choose to homeschool.

Eileen C opposes this bill. She testifies that the bill attempts to place vague and undefined educational standards on homeschooling families. She believes that this new oversight that the bill proposes will require more taxpayer money and divert resources from public schools. She also believes that homeschooling and private school are not equivalent to public school and attempting to make them equivalent removes the fundamental right of parents to direct their children's education. Finally, she believes that involving DCF to the process this bill proposes creates a presumption of guilt, which targets and burdens homeschooling families.

Christine "Chris" Cantone opposes this bill. She believes the bill would devastate homeschooling families, in part because it would require DCF reporting. She also believes this bill creates a blanket suspicion of homeschooling families.

Mirelle Capozza opposes this bill. She believes this bill is an overreach of government authority and misallocates state resources, which will result in tax increases. She believes that parents have a right to educate their children as they see fit. She also believes that the cases in Waterbury and New Britain are due to DCF's failures and not a result of lax homeschooling regulations.

Katherine Capozzi opposes this bill. She is against DCF involvement, collection of data, curriculum and portfolio review, and the monitoring of efficacy in homeschooling.

Jahaida Cardona opposes this bill as a homeschooling parent who has seen firsthand the benefits of homeschooling. They homeschool, in part, because they do not want their children to have so much access to social media.

Tandi Carignan opposes this bill. They do not believe that allowing the commissioner or other authority to determine a parent's withdrawal of their child from public school to be effective. They believe this determination give a third party the ability to override a parent's decision when parents are the individuals most familiar with the children's needs. As a former public school teacher, they also believe that the demonstration of equivalent of instruction as outlined in this bill assumes that homeschooling needs to be equivalent to public schools and that public schools are not always the best at evaluating educational outcomes. Finally, they note how overwhelmed child welfare and educational systems can be. Expanding oversight and responsibilities, as they believe this bill does, will increase the administrative burden of these systems without improving children's educational outcomes.

Sheila Carlson opposes this bill because she believes abuse can happen in schools of all kinds, including public schools.

Rebecca Carpenter opposes this bill, expressing concerns about needing approval from public school administrators and clearance from DCF. She disapproves of the bill's presumptions that a public school education is superior to a homeschooling one, that a public school education is

safer, that a random bureaucrat is better qualified to determine what is best over the parent, and that DCF will be able to handle the increased caseload this bill would impose.

Jessica Carr opposes this bill. She believes automatically flagging families to DCF creates a presumption that law-abiding, homeschooling parents are abusing their children. She urges that the solution is not with the parents but with DCF, which needs reforms. She also believes that children and not the government are responsible for directing their children's education. Finally, she believes that requiring school districts to monitor homeschooled children would divert resources away from public school students.

Timothy Carr opposes this bill. His family did not originally intend to homeschool, but began to out of necessity due to their son's medical challenges. Their children thrived as a result of their homeschooling. Because he has seen the benefits of homeschooling, he raises several concerns about the bill. First, the bill introduces new administrative requirements that creates a system of oversight and tracking of families who are lawfully educating their children. Second, the bill introduces a process requiring DCF notification, which creates a presumption of suspicion towards any families who wish to homeschool their children. This bill's move for increased oversight risks undermining the flexibility that makes homeschooling so effective.

Monika Chapar opposes this bill. She has concerns over the automatic DCF involvement and the portfolio/testing requirements, believes that both aspects of this bill remain unclear. She also believes this bill would impose extra costs to families.

Shannon Chatfield opposes this bill. She understands the desire of the state to ensure all children receive an education, but believes this bill overreaches in terms of oversight and respect for parental authority. She notes that this bill requires DCF involvement and that DCF is already operating under staffing shortages and a heavy caseload. She also has concerns that this bill could unintentionally push families towards expensive accredited online programs to demonstrate compliance, which would change the nature of homeschooling from parent-led instruction to a more institutional model. She notes that many families cannot afford this option.

Lingxiao Cheng opposes this bill. Their family participates in a homeschool co-op where families meet and learn together. They have seen the benefits this community provides to the children in it. They also note how their home country does not often give people the freedom to homeschool and that this freedom is one of the reasons they are grateful to live in the United States.

Eric Ciardiello opposes this bill. He believes that this bill does not refine existing law but completely changes it by placing the burden on parents, rather than the government, to affirmatively prove that parents ensure their children receive equivalent instruction. He also believes this bill is punitive as it requires surveillance of homeschooling families, discriminates against families who can least afford to bear the new burdens this bill imposes, and requires DCF involvement. He also believes this bill's provisions violates FERPA and jeopardizes federal funding.

Connecticut Association of Boards of Education, Administrative Associate, Gail Heath:

Opposes HB 5468 for the creation of "unreasonable and unworkable new mandates on local and regional boards of education." CABE finds that implementing Section 4 would be "impossible," asking what would constitute two classes in an elementary school? Secondly,

CABE believes that allowing part-time students will affect the capacity of districts and that verifying CIAC academic eligibility for homeschooled students would be difficult. They foresee the bill producing an administrative burden, especially when ensuring homeschoolers' compliance with the proposed policies, codes, and rules.

Carolyn Ambrose:	Anonymous:	Anonymous:	Anonymous 1159:
Anonymous 1162:	Anonymous 1210:	Anonymous 1221:	Anonymous 1222:
Anonymous 1246:	Anonymous 1295:	Anonymous 1321:	Noah:
Anonymous 803:	Anonymous 812:	Anonymous 953:	Owen B:
Julia Banda:	Noah Banda:	Amelia Barrette:	Sullivan Barrette:
Sarah Baughman:	Jonathan Bennett:	Hailey Farrington:	Luke Gaetano:
Elisabeth Grissom:	Laura H:	M H:	Nolan Harvey:
Eliza Heft:	Ezra Heft:	Joyanna Heft:	Noah Heft:
Ellie Hope:	Angela Howard:	Jesse Hupal:	Andrew McLaurin:
Eli McLaurin:	Andrew McMahan:	Eliza Miller:	Gavin Miller:
Kelly Miller:	Jack Morgan:	Elias Mosher:	Ephraim Mosher:
Isabella Murphy:	Charles Nystrom:	Hunter Ouellette:	Sawyer Ouellette:
Cody Owens:	Anna Petrie:	Sarah:	Andrea Putetti:
Elizabeth Putetti:	Elisa R:	Kaelyn R:	Theo R:
Robert Ragsdale:	William Ragsdale:	Di-Aneliz Rivera:	Lia Rodriguez:
Annabelle S:	Ayden S:	Kyla S:	Gianluca S:
Taylor S:	A Sab:	Nazareth Sanders:	Bethany Saunders:
Francis-David Scalzo:	Ryan Schantz:	Myalene Schulze:	Anna Smith:
Maeve Snyder:	Falynn Spisak:	Kylan Spisak:	

As current and former homeschooled students, they feel that proving their equivalent instruction takes time away from the things they care to learn about. They wish not to follow in the footsteps of public school children, believing it takes away from their freedoms, personalized education, love of learning at home, self-paced learning, and quality of life.

Psychiatric Nurse Practitioner, Andrea Adimando:	Roberta Ahuja:	Erica Bencivenga:	William Michael:
--	----------------	-------------------	------------------

As professionals in their respective fields, they comment on their being mandated reporters and make known their familiarity with cases of abuse and neglect. They hold that the Connecticut homeschooling community is a model for other states, adding just how well classes behave and conduct themselves.

James Ambrose:	Megen Angelino:	Anonymous 1011:	Anonymous 1195:
Anonymous 1240:	Anonymous 752:	Anonymous 761:	Anonymous 799:
Anonymous 820:	Justin Bair:	Paul Palmer:	David Platt:

Opposes the bill as they value the terms and outcomes that come with homeschooling. They take offense to measures that suspect parents of being incapable educators and note that existing "equivalent instruction" standards are already complied with, which, as they note, hold

homeschooling families to a higher standard. It is said that further regulations on law-abiding homeschool families are unnecessary and contribute to vagueness.

Anonymous 1020:	Anonymous 1028:	Anonymous 1249:	Anonymous 1265:
-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Believes the bill inaccurately casts homeschoolers as burdens or abusers of their children. This group holds that the bill presumes a family is “guilty until proven innocent.” Families have come out declaring families are deeply invested in their childrens’ successes, finding any sort of requirement/mandate as unnecessary and troublesome.

Anonymous:	Rachel A:	Ruth Albert:	Linda Alexander:
Thea Alfes:	Nicole Allen:	Nicole Amory:	Anonymous 1062:
Anonymous 1071:	Anonymous 1107:	Anonymous 1136:	Anonymous 1158:
Anonymous 1168:	Anonymous 1172:	Anonymous 1174:	Anonymous 1197:
Anonymous 1198:	Anonymous 1200:	Anonymous 1207:	Anonymous 1230:
Anonymous 1231:	Anonymous 1239:	Anonymous 1244:	Anonymous 1245:
Anonymous 1274:	Anonymous 1278:	Anonymous 1289:	Anonymous 1290:
Anonymous 1299:	Anonymous 1325:	Anonymous 767:	Anonymous 768:
Anonymous 785:	Anonymous 808:	Anonymous 813:	Anonymous 829:
Anonymous 854:	Anonymous 863:	Anonymous 927:	Anonymous 991:
Anonymous:	Anonymous:	Anonymous:	Kaitlin Aregentina:
Kimberly Audet:	Ashley Audino: Dave B:	Kelly B:	Emily B:
Dacia Banda:	Listen Barter:	Emma Belske:	Christopher Benamati:
Wendy Benedict:	Jennifer Benham:	Chloe Benjamin:	Justin Bennett:
Christina Bernhardt:	Anonymous:	Jane F:	Kristen F:
Melanie F:	Aaron Farmer:	Ken Farrington:	Molly Farrington:
Rebekah Farrington:	L Q Fell:	Warren Fentress:	Kari Fliss:
Tanya Fonte:	Heather Fowler:	Cesare Franceze:	Franco Franzese:
Felicia G:	Johan G:	Sera Gadbois:	Michelle Gagliardi:
Cynthia Gale:	Luis Garate:	Jeannie Garrett:	Mary Gauthier:
Kasey Giancaspro:	Gezim Gjonbalaj:	Jeremy Glidden:	Kevin Gonzalez Sr:
Michele Goode:	Elizabeth Grayson:	Solomon Greenbacker:	Bryce Grissom:
Amanda Guilford:	Christian H:	Jenny Haddad Mosher:	Amber Haifley:
Kyle Haifley:	Ryan Halpin:	Nusie Halpine:	Abram Hammer:
Erin Heath:	Staci Hebler:	Connecticut Homeschool Network, Vice President, Crystal Heft:	Todd Heft:
Leo Heinl:	Melissa Heise:	Suzanne Hodgdon:	Pamela Hoffman:
Sherri Hopkins:	Victoria Hopkins:	Amelia Horbal:	Jacqueline Horbal:
Iris Hotakov:	Patricia Hough:	Antoinette Howard:	Nathan Howard:
Laurie Hoyt:	Heather Hudson:	Tanya Hughes:	Susan Hull:
Caroline Hunter:	Talita Hupal:	Olivia Ipucha:	E J:

Megan J:	Lynn Jaycox:	Anonymous:	Heather McKeon:
Kate McLaurin:	Matthew McMahon:	Sara McMahon:	Kalee Mead:
Amanda Medling:	Kathryn Mercado:	Sondra Millea:	Bethany Miller:
Sara Miller:	Brandy Minter:	Marsha Miranda Rivera:	Jackson Miranda:
Frances Morlino:	Aaron Mumford:	Grace Murphy:	Celine N:
Jenny N:	Gregory Nappo:	David Nelson:	Rachel Nelson:
Carleton Newell:	Sharleen Newell:	Michael Nintean:	Katrina Norton:
Amy Obolewicz:	Michael O'Connell:	Timothy O'Rourke Jr.:	Lisa P:
Alysia Palmisciano:	Alisa Paskiewicz:	Linda Paternostro:	Thomas Pauloz:
Donna Pennoyer:	Dilcia Perez:	Peter Person:	N Peters:
Jamie Piechota:	Stephen Piechota:	Noah Pierce:	Katrina Pitt:
Mia Pomerence:	Amy Pontillo:	Steve Preli:	Anonymous:
Alise Pugliese:	Kristine Putetti:	Sarah R:	Maike Rankin:
Jeri Reid:	Mark Ritter:	Jacqueline Roatch:	Cynthia Robertson:
Kathleen Robinson:	Laura Rodas:	Melanie Rodriguez:	Jacquelyn Ross:
Diana Rourke:	Tina Ruddy:	Judith Ruhm:	Erin S:
Jennifer S:	Valentina S:	Rachel Sackett:	CJ Salamatian:
Hannah Salcedo:	James Santangelo:	Amy Saucier:	Brookfield Board of Education, Member, Erin Scalera:
Michael Schadone:	Stephanie Schaedler:	Elizabeth Schantz:	Christina Schulze:
Liana Schurig:	Alisha Schutrick:	Charity Scott:	Victoria Sealey:
Rachael Seaman:	Wendy Sears:	Julio Segarra:	Liza Seipold:
Anna Sellari:	Paolo Sellari:	Robin Sharp:	Shannon Sherwood:
Valentina Shevlin:	Denis Shubin:	Thomas Silva:	Joseph Silverio:
Jill Small:	E Smith:	Kristin Smith:	Megan Spisak:
Sharon St. Jean:	Carolyn Stands:		

Predominantly, family members and homeschoolers (past, current, and prospective), along with some advocates, recognize well-intentioned households educating their children through non-public schooling. They claim that after being faced with reality, families weren't left with a viable alternative and cite curriculum, spectrum/anxiety/defiance disorders, illnesses, unique learning styles, child safety, bullying, and undermined personal/religious values as factors in their decision-making. This group supports figuring out the best paths, meeting children's needs, and reforming public education, claiming schools are underfunded/overworked and viewing homeschooling as an act of responsibility and legitimate choice, not neglect. Many testimonies suggest that homeschooling is the reason their children are thriving, contributing members of society, demonstrating strong educational outcomes, and outperforming their public school peers in reading/writing levels. Parents, family members, and teachers note having a deep investment in children's education and well-being, supporting claims with research that signal low risk rates, improved child safety outcomes, higher standardized test scores, and no link between state regulation and academic success. Many clarify that education is not a one-size-fits-all approach.

Anonymous 52:
Anonymous 772:

Is concerned with Section 2 on equivalent instruction. They find that standardized testing isn't an accurate measurement of success for children.

Eden Ayala-Tannis:	Jackie A:	Kristen A:	Anonymous:
Jim Adams:	Corbin Adzigirey:	Erika Ahern:	Sharon Ambrose:
Brad Andrews:	Karen Andrews:	Erin Andrin:	Vince Angelino:
John Aniolowski:	Kathleen Aniolowski:	Anonymous 1007:	Anonymous 1034:
Anonymous 1039:	Anonymous 1041:	Anonymous 1045:	Anonymous 1048:
Anonymous 1056:	Anonymous 1057:	Anonymous 1065:	Anonymous 1083:
Anonymous 1085:	Anonymous 1091:	Anonymous 1113:	Anonymous 1126:
Anonymous 1128:	Anonymous 1134:	Anonymous 1137:	Anonymous 1160:
Anonymous 1167:	Anonymous 1173:	Anonymous 1177:	Anonymous 1184:
Anonymous 1188:	Anonymous 1189:	Anonymous 1196: Anonymous 1223:	Anonymous 1227:
Anonymous 1228:	Anonymous 1234:	Anonymous 1237:	Anonymous 1247:
Anonymous 1250:	Anonymous 1252:	Anonymous 1253:	Anonymous 1257:
Anonymous 1287:	Anonymous 1296:	Anonymous 1297:	Anonymous 1298:
Anonymous 1299:	Anonymous 1318:	Anonymous 748: Anonymous 773:	Anonymous 793:
Anonymous 794:	Anonymous 805: Anonymous 809: Anonymous 814:	Anonymous 818:	Anonymous 837:
Anonymous 839:	Anonymous 844:	Anonymous 851:	Anonymous 852:
Anonymous 865:	Anonymous 878:	Anonymous 880:	Anonymous 900:
Anonymous 955:	Anonymous 992:	Anonymous 995:	Anonymous:
Eden Ayala-Tannis:	Lily Ayres:	Amy B:	Michelle B:
Y B:	Danielle Bagshaw:	Karen Barber:	Victoria Beckett:
Marissa Behuniak:	Hannah Belval:	Juliann Bencivenga:	Marco Bencivenga:
Carolyn Bennett:	G F:	Christine Fadden:	Nicole Farmer:
Bryce Farrington:	Laura Farrington:	Ryan Farrington:	Laurie Field:
Colleen Flaherty:	John Fontaine:	Maria Forcucci:	Michael Franzese:
Manju Gerber:	David Geres:	Lena Gjonaj:	Kristie Googin:
Anthony Greco:	Patricia Greenbacker:	Laura Greenbank:	Alison Grissom:
Joshua Grover:	Angela Gyamfi:	Ann H:	Debbie H:
Karen H:	Russ H:	Diane Haggas:	Hannah Hammer:
Jesenia Hernandez:	Marnie Hinze:	Michelle Hogan:	Serenity House Elkanah Ministries, Reverend, Ernestine Holloway:
Emily Holt:	Charlotte Hurst:	Lindsey Hurst:	Jeanne Jaquith:
Anonymous:	Anonymous:	Isaac McLaurin:	Joanne Mekawi:
Jody Mello:	Joe Mello:	Mona Menard:	Karen Miller:
Jeremy Minter:	Levi Minter:	Christopher Moll:	Leonardo Montero:
John Morgan:	Megan Morgan:	W D Morgan:	Allegra Morosani:
Anna Moschella:	Aylah Murcia:	Elijah Murcia:	Lilliana Navarra:
Meagan Nicholson:	Jacek Niemczycki:	Laura Niemczycki:	Thomas Niemczycki:

Urszula Niemczycki:	Samantha Niro:	Samantha Norman:	Kim Novak:
Esai Ortiz:	Deb Ouellette:	Nick P:	Samantha Pacileo:
Dawn Paradise:	James Paradise:	Liz Patterson:	Rachael Paz:
Paula Penna:	Michael Pepin:	Sampson Phillips:	Jon Piechota:
Jennifer Plano:	Sharon Plumberg:	Danny Post:	Connecticut Residents Against Medical Mandates, President & Founder, Kate Prokop:
Kelly Purple:	Andrea Ragsdale:	Abdur Raheem:	Kym Read:
Christine Rebstock:	Jared Renzoni:	Deborah Reynolds:	Nick Rezendes:
Heather Ritz:	Koriann Roberts:	Eric Rodrigues:	Lourdes Rodrigues:
Home School Legal Defense Association, Attorney, Ralph Rodriguez:	Contra Rogationis:	Karley Root:	Carmen Rosa:
David Roseland:	Chris Ross:	Hannah S:	Heather S:
Alex Sabetta:	Jennifer Saunders:	Chris Savoie:	Jane Scanlon:
Hillary Schneider:	Todd Schneider:	Phillip Semyanko:	Elizabeth Shaker:
Bridget Sielicki:	Christine Sinopoli:	Andrew Skinner:	Hannah Skinner:
Amy Spallino:	Melissa Spitz:	Josh Stanley:	

Requests not to advance HB 5469, considering parents' rights God-given, inalienable, and a violation/infringement of the Constitution (Amendments 1 & 14), in addition to a Supreme Court upholding. Parents' lines of reasoning align with Constitutional beliefs, affirming that parents have the right to choose, bear primary responsibility, and should homeschool without government intrusion. This cohort is discouraged by increased surveillance and data collection, urging to protect parental authority, commonly referred to as a "longstanding approach."

Anonymous:	Amelia A.:	Isaac Alamo:	Jackie Alamo:
Mary Alford:	Katrina Allegra:	Lisa Amatruda:	Anonymous 1019:
Anonymous 1023:	Anonymous 1053:	Anonymous 1055:	Anonymous 1064:
Anonymous 1073:	Anonymous 1089:	Anonymous 1097:	Anonymous 1118:
Anonymous 1127:	Anonymous 1147:	Anonymous 1149:	Anonymous 1156:
Anonymous 1178:	Anonymous 1202:	Anonymous 1206:	Anonymous 1211:
Anonymous 1199:			
Anonymous 1216:	Anonymous 1217:	Anonymous 1272:	Anonymous 1278:
Anonymous 1291:	Anonymous 1306:	Anonymous 759:	Anonymous 762:
Anonymous 765:	Anonymous 770:	Anonymous 775:	Anonymous 779:
Anonymous 769:			
Anonymous 795:	Anonymous 796:	Anonymous 798:	Anonymous 810:
Anonymous 817:	Anonymous 827:	Anonymous 828:	Anonymous 830:
Anonymous 823:			
Anonymous 824:			
Anonymous 835:	Anonymous 847:	Anonymous 849:	Anonymous 853:
Anonymous 855:	Anonymous 868:	Anonymous 868:	Anonymous 870:

Anonymous 874:	Anonymous 891: Anonymous 892:	Anonymous 893:	Anonymous 896:
Anonymous 897:	Anonymous 901:	Anonymous 918:	Anonymous 919:
Anonymous 920:	Anonymous 939:	Anonymous 983:	Manal Anz:
Kendra Arnold:	Amy Arroyo:	Christina B:	Jack B:
L B:	Lori B:	Dean B:	Jannalyn Bailey:
Alecia Bair:	Belmarys Barreto:	Justin Barros:	Teresa Barry:
Judith Bassem:	Steven Bassett:	Lisa Bauerle:	Christina Beckett:
Paul Beckett:	Kasandra Beckwith:	Stori Beckwith:	Aaron Benham:
Lauren Bennett:	DeQwon Bentley:	Kristen BerggrenL	Anonymous:
Jamie Falvo:	Kelly Finnnucan:	Jill Fitzgerald:	Koby Fowler:
Michelle Fowler:	Suzanne Freniere:	Alison G:	Jessica G:
Jacqueline Gaetano:	Jennifer Gailey:	Justin Gailey:	Mark Gale:
Meagan Gallo:	Arely Garcia:	Jenny Gauthier:	Patricia Gauthier:
Stasha Giannini:	Amy Gillespie:	Kristina Gillespie: Mark Glines:	The New England National Project, Adam Goetz:
Senate Republican Office, State Senator, Jeff Gordon:	Julianne Graff:	Danielle Graves:	Matthew Greenbacker:
Robert Guarino:	Jacquelyne Guerra:	Annie Guidone:	Asher Guidone:
Evolet Guidone:	Lirit Guidone:	Phoenix Guidone:	Raymond Guidone:
Christopher Guzzi:	Jackie H:	Sarah H:	Brenda Hamilton:
Katie Hamilton:	Michaela Hanson:	Radiant Health and Wellness, Owner, Beata Harasim:	Andrea Harrington:
Jacob Harvey:	Sumaiya Hasan:	Valbona Hassenfeldt:	Charlie Hatchett:
Tiffany Hawley:	Lindsay Hayes:	Peter Herndon:	Robert Hill:
Cheri Hitchcock:	Aaron Hoffman:	Matthew Hogan:	Lydia Howard:
William Howard:	Josh Hummel:	Trista Hummel:	Michelle J:
Sabrina Janco:	Marie Janket:	Jenny Jasunas:	Jason Jenkins:
Liz Jensen:	Ericca Johnson:	Aaron McCool:	Christopher McDougal:
Crystal McKeever:	Wellspring Church, Reverend, Richard McKinnis:	Amanda McLaughlin:	Erin McLaughlin:
Joshua McMahon:	Raymond McMahon:	Timothy McMahon:	Kelly Mead:
Laura Medeiros:	Alane Meehan:	Jessica Megargle:	Scott Menko:
Michael Mercado:	Jacqueline Mewha:	Jonathan Mewha:	Brandon Michaud:
Russ Mika:	Danielle Miller:	Jennifer Miranda:	William Miranda:
Deanna Morales:	Travis Moran:	Elisabeth Muchiri:	Michael Murphy:
Joelle N:	Julie N:	Christian Nelson:	David Nevin:
Home Educators Resource Directory, Owner, Elisa Nevitt:	Josh Nicol:	Rose Nicol:	Suzanne Ninteau:

Jessica French-Norris:	Robert Nyilas:	Michael O:	Michael O'Connell:
Eli Ojeda:	Sarah Olchanowski:	Pat Orlowski:	Patricia Deborah Orris:
Paul Ortiz:	Stephen Ouellette:	Jeffrey Owens:	Mary Owens:
Katrina P:	Nicole P:	Sarah P:	Nishtha Padhy:
Paul Palmer Jr.:	Annie Palumbo:	Ancuta Pan:	Genna Panaroni:
Janet Parrish:	Pamela Pasha:	Zachariah Patterson:	Christopher Paulin:
Jeffrey Paz:	Boomer Perrault:	Mark Peters:	Leela Peterson:
Monica Petrie:	Rodger Phillips:	Benjamin Piacenza:	Viola Pickering:
Krystal Pietruszka:	William Polowy:	Nick Postovoit:	Jorge Pozo:
Kathleen Prescott:	Eva Primerano:	James Prunty:	Caroline Quick:
John-Ryan Quick:	B R:	Calvin R:	Karin R:
Bruce Ramsey:	Michael Rapetski:	Marta Rarey:	House Republican Office:
Alexa Reynolds:	Quiet Corner Academy, Director, Tiffany Ribeiro:	Selina Rifkin:	Lou Rinaldi:
Kim Riordan:	Genevieve Ritch:	Jose Rivera:	Jeff Rodas:
Clifford Rodgerson:	Jena Rogers:	Matthew Rogers:	Nicole Rogers:
Melody Romeo:	Deborah Rose:	Jason Ross:	Mariah Roy:
Anne S:	Bri S:	Eddie S:	Mysti S:
Peter S:	Raul S:	Stefanie S:	Hannah S:
Jessica S:	Morah Sabetta:	Kristina Sabo:	Crystal Sacchinelli:
David Saccuso:	Nikki Sambitsky:	Charmaine Samoska:	Senate Republican Office, State Senator, Rob Sampson:
120 Church, Minister of Education, Dyami Sanders:	Scott Sans:	Katherine Sarris:	Ivette Saunders:
Gregory Scalzo:	Haley Scanlon:	Michelle Scanlon:	Stephen Scarlato:
Charles Schutrick:	Rebekah Segarra:	Amanda Seitlinger:	Gabrielle Sellari:
Roberto Sellari:	Cara September:	Rebecca Shain:	Lisa Shamansky:
Gayle Shanley:	Eliza Shantley:	Meghan Sickles:	Brittany Sidler:
Lee Sirotnak:	Shannon Skypeak:	Tom Skypek:	Abigail Smith:
Benjamin Smith:	Kim Smith:	Maria Smith:	Nicholas Smith:
Doug Snyder:	Erin Snyder:	Gina Souza:	Richard Souza:
Jesse Spada:	Kathleen Sposato:	Jaimie-Lynne St. Onge:	Katherine Stanley:

Oppose HB 5468 as it places the responsibility of approving the education of children on the State and schools, rather than parents. Stakeholders claim that proposals like HB 5468 represent expansions of government authority and intent to co-parent. Testimony is provided in support of parents who raise, nurture, and decide what's best for their children, choosing educational settings and options. Many hold that parents ought to parent, and not the state, claiming Connecticut and its departments have no entitlement or stake in the matter. Some educators join families in asserting that it's wrong to subject private educational choice to

greater government oversight, authority, monitoring, reporting, “surveillance,” and “overreach.”

Anonymous 1058:	Anonymous 1079: Anonymous 1080:	Anonymous 1095:	Anonymous 1101:
Anonymous 1111:	Anonymous 1117:	Anonymous 1165:	Anonymous 1170:
Anonymous 1208:	Anonymous 1293:	Anonymous 1310:	Anonymous 751:
Anonymous 763:	Anonymous 774:	Anonymous 777:	Anonymous 781:
Anonymous 800: Anonymous 806:	Anonymous 819:	Anonymous 826:	Anonymous 836:
Anonymous 841:	Anonymous 864:	Anonymous 932:	Anonymous 933:
Anonymous 940:	Anonymous 944:	Anonymous 954:	Anonymous 969:
Anonymous 970:	Anonymous 971:	Judith Applegate:	Brendan Arbuckle:
Abby B:	Phil B:	Lisa B:	Jessica Balogh:
Wendell Barry:	Patricia Bence:	Barbara Fairbanks:	Bobbie Ferro:
Marilyn Figueroa:	Andrea Foligno:	Sarah Fontaine:	Christina G:
Rebekah Gemza:	Patricia George:	Lindsay Graham:	Lauren Green:
Robert Haigh:	Rebecca Hamman:	Cathy Hartley: Rebecca Harvey:	Lorraine Healy:
Greg Hendrickson:	Lisa Herring:	Madeline Homar:	Wesley Howard:
Katie Huey:	Jacob Johnson:	Larissa Johnson:	Anonymous:
Shawn McKeon:	Tim McLaurin:	Richard Miller:	Gloria Miranda:
Elizabeth Morin:	Jeremy Mulder:	Joy Mumley:	Jennifer Murphy:
Natasha N:	Joy Nanni:	Stephanie Neil:	Sean Nolan:
Stephanie Obrien:	Cheryl Oravec:	Jim Owens:	J P:
Roger Parent:	Melanie Parsons:	Diane Paz:	Elaine Pelizzari:
Donna Person:	Cori Powers:	Cecilia Primerano:	Constance Quinn:
Bonnie R:	Stuart Rankin:	Julie Rau:	Jennifer Rindflesh:
Michael Rizzo:	Nicole Rizzo:	Lindsay Rodgers:	Angela Rodriguez:
Jenna Rodriguez:	Luna Rosado:	Wellspring Church, Assistant Pastor, John Rosario:	Karolyn Ryan Papacoda:
Bridget Sackett:	Faedra Salafia:	Matthew Samuelson:	Laney Sanchez:
Brittany Santacroce:	Jennifer Scott:	Anthony Simonetti:	Sink:

Opposes the vague terms associated with “equivalency” and shifts attention to DCF, which, in their view, would be stretched thin and under-resourced by HB 5468 with an increasingly burdensome scope of work. People point out current gaps in the Department’s care, noting their major “mishandlings,” said to be evident in two notorious Connecticut cases. Comments suggest holding DCF accountable, reforming, and alleviating their caseload, other than preventing agency involvement. More passionate pieces of testimony refer to DCF as a broken, “failed system.”

Anonymous 1059:	Anonymous 1068:	Anonymous 1132:	Anonymous:
Elena Asberry:	Jamie Bailey:		

Opposes the bill as currently written, signaling policy aftermaths. Their concerns start with the information-sharing framework, which raises questions on compliance with federal student

privacy law. Secondly, they aren't confident that proposals in HB 5468 would target the percentage of children most in need. They see an administrative burden being created by a bureaucratic, statewide oversight system, concluding that the legislation's additional regulatory layers create ambiguous standards and raise questions about compliance with FERPA.

Brookfield Public Schools, Superintendent, Stephen Foresi:

Somers Public Schools, Superintendent, Sam Galloway:

Enfield Public Schools, Superintendent, Steven Moccio:

Westport Public Schools, Superintendent, Thomas Scarice:

North Branford Public Schools, Superintendent, Scott Schoonmaker:

Wilton Public Schools, Superintendent, Kevin Smith:

Cheshire Public Schools, Superintendent, Jeffrey Solan:

New Hartford Public Schools, Superintendent, Jeffrey Sousa:

Believe the state has an interest in the well-being of all children, but prefaces that local school districts primarily exist to educate the students enrolled in them. They predict an administrative adjustment would result from districts assuming more home-based responsibilities. In addition to being unfunded, they consider the bill's special education proposals impractical and have concerns about opening roster spots/participation in athletics, classes, and extracurriculars to students who are not fully enrolled.

Find that HB 5468 raises significant administrative and oversight concerns, representing a "fundamental shift away from the core mission of public school districts, which is to educate the student enrolled in our schools." Both don't believe in the collecting and tracking intent-to-educate forms and respects the rights of parents who choose equivalent instruction for their children. In addition, they oppose permitting non-enrolled students' participation in extracurriculars and athletics. One final conclusion by one suggests establishing a dedicated state-level office for handling responsibilities like preserving local school district missions, evaluating equivalent instruction, promoting consistent statewide practice, and avoiding the formation of unfunded mandates.

Connecticut Association of Public School Attendants, Executive Director, Fran Rabinowitz:

Find that HB 5468's responsibilities would reshape the mission, workload, and operational capacity of school districts. CAPSS believes public schools would lose their structure in the process of oversight agency transitions and incur costs for additional staff hirings. In addition, she sees challenges with permitting homeschooled students' participation in clubs, extracurriculars, intramurals, and interscholastic activities, citing problems with equity. She asks for the Committee to reject the shift of oversight duties and add a state-level office with capabilities to manage equivalent instruction oversight statewide.

Anonymous 910:

Opposes HB 5468, referencing investigative reports of 58 school-employee misconduct cases in the state. Having occurred between 2005 and 2016, the content "shows the scale of the issue over a longer period."

Connecticut Association of Athletic Directors, Executive Director, Fred Balsamo:

CAAD expresses strong opposition to Section 4, as it seeks to grant homeschooled students access to public school extracurricular activities and athletics. The group considers this an

undermining of “our educational and athletic systems” for (1) allowing withdrawal as a means to bypass accountability, (2) impacting logistics/culture, and (3) threatening the protection of vulnerable student populations.

The following individuals voiced opposition to this bill:

Anonymous 746:	Anonymous 749:	Anonymous 750:	Anonymous 760:
Anonymous 764:	Anonymous 771:	Anonymous 776:	Anonymous 778:
Anonymous 780:	Anonymous 782:	Anonymous 786:	Anonymous 787:
Anonymous 789:	Anonymous 790:	Anonymous 791:	Anonymous 792:
Anonymous 797:	Anonymous 801:	Anonymous 804:	Anonymous 807:
Anonymous 822:	Anonymous 831:	Anonymous 832:	Anonymous 833:
Anonymous 834:	Anonymous 838:	Anonymous 840:	Anonymous 842:
Anonymous 846:	Anonymous 856:	Anonymous 862:	Anonymous 867:
Anonymous 873:	Anonymous 876:	Anonymous 879:	Anonymous 881:
Anonymous 882:	Anonymous 883:	Anonymous 884:	Anonymous 885:
Anonymous 886:	Anonymous 887:	Anonymous 888:	Anonymous 889:
Anonymous 895:	Anonymous 898:	Anonymous 899:	Anonymous 903:
Anonymous 905:	Anonymous 908: Anonymous 911:	Anonymous 912:	Anonymous 914:
Anonymous 916:	Anonymous 917:	Anonymous 921:	Anonymous 923:
Anonymous 924:	Anonymous 925:	Anonymous 929:	Anonymous 930:
Anonymous 931:	Anonymous 934:	Anonymous 936:	Anonymous 938:
Anonymous 941:	Anonymous 942:	Anonymous 943:	Anonymous 945:
Anonymous 946:	Anonymous 947:	Anonymous 948:	Anonymous 949:
Anonymous 956:	Anonymous 957:	Anonymous 960:	Anonymous 961:
Anonymous 962:	Anonymous 965:	Anonymous 967:	Anonymous 968:
Anonymous 972:	Anonymous 973:	Anonymous 974:	Anonymous 977:
Anonymous 978:	Anonymous 979:	Anonymous 981:	Anonymous 984:
Anonymous 986:	Anonymous 988:	Anonymous 989:	Anonymous 990:
Anonymous 996:	Anonymous 997:	Anonymous 999:	Rebekah Arbuckle:
Elizabeth Arce:	Linda Arment:	Meaghan Arnold:	Scott Audet:
Jaime Axenroth:	Damon B:	Jennifer B:	S B:
Jacob Banda:	Adam Bannon:	Katie Barbieri:	Austin Barnes:
Gina Cewe-Barrett:	Alister Barrette:	Casey Barrette:	Corey Barrette:
Daniel Barriault:	Jacklyn Barriault:	Kari Beattie:	Jake Beckwith:
Stephen Belida:	Elizabeth Belske:	Hailey Belton:	Kevin Benjamin:
Rachel Bernsten:	Dawn A:	Gabe A:	Phoenix A:
Courtney Abeling:	Leonard Adams:	Maryann Adams:	Nicole Adams:
Tracie Adams:	Helen Albert:	Joseph Albert:	Rianna Albert:
Amy Albert:			
Steve Albert:	Robert Alesio:	Alexis Amarante:	Matthew Amatruda:
Caitlin D’Ambrosio:	Lisa Anderson:	Thomas Anderson:	Brreault Andrew:
Anonymous 1000:	Anonymous 1001:	Anonymous 1002:	Anonymous 1003: Anonymous 1004:
Anonymous 1005:	Anonymous 1006:	Anonymous 1009:	Anonymous 1013:
Anonymous 1014:	Anonymous 1015:	Anonymous 1017:	Anonymous 1022:
Anonymous 1024:	Anonymous 1025:	Anonymous 1026:	Anonymous 1027:
Anonymous 1031:	Anonymous 1032:	Anonymous 1033:	Anonymous 1037:

Anonymous 1038:	Anonymous 1040:	Anonymous 1044:	Anonymous 1047:
Anonymous 1049:	Anonymous 1050:	Anonymous 1051:	Anonymous 1063:
Anonymous 1066:	Anonymous 1067: Anonymous 1069:	Anonymous 1074:	Anonymous 1075: Anonymous 1076:
Anonymous 1077: Anonymous 1078:	Anonymous 1082:	Anonymous 1086:	Anonymous 1088:
Anonymous 1090:	Anonymous 1092:	Anonymous 1093:	Anonymous 1094:
Anonymous 1102: Anonymous 1103:	Anonymous 1109:	Anonymous 1110:	Anonymous 1112:
Anonymous 1114:	Anonymous 1115:	Anonymous 1119:	Anonymous 1120:
Anonymous 1121:	Anonymous 1123:	Anonymous 1129:	Anonymous 1130:
Anonymous 1131:	Anonymous 1133:	Anonymous 1135:	Anonymous 1141:
Anonymous 1143:	Anonymous 1146:	Anonymous 1150:	Anonymous 1151: Anonymous 1152:
Anonymous 1153:	Anonymous 1155:	Anonymous 1157:	Anonymous 1161:
Anonymous 1163:	Anonymous 1169:	Anonymous 1171:	Anonymous 1175:
Anonymous 1180:	Anonymous 1182:	Anonymous 1185:	Anonymous 1186:
Anonymous 1187:	Anonymous 1191:	Anonymous 1192:	Anonymous 1193:
Anonymous 1194:	Anonymous 1201:	Anonymous 1204:	Anonymous 1209: Anonymous 1213: Anonymous 1215:
Anonymous 1218:	Anonymous 1219:	Anonymous 1220:	Anonymous 1224:
Anonymous 1225:	Anonymous 1226:	Anonymous 1229:	Anonymous 1233:
Anonymous 1241:	Anonymous 1242:	Anonymous 1243:	Anonymous 1248:
Anonymous 1254:	Anonymous 1259:	Anonymous 1261:	Anonymous 1262:
Anonymous 1266:	Anonymous 1269:	Anonymous 1275:	Anonymous 1280:
Anonymous 1281:	Anonymous 1282:	Anonymous 1284:	Anonymous 1285:
Anonymous 1292:	Anonymous 1294:	Anonymous 1307:	Anonymous 1309:
Anonymous 1311:	Anonymous 1312:	Anonymous 1313:	Anonymous 1319:
Anonymous 1320:	Chris F:	Gabriel F:	Kristyn F:
Julia F:	John Fagerquist:	Marissa Fagerquist:	Ibraheem Farajat:
Clara Farrington:	John Fiorello:	Amber Flodquist:	Daniel Fontaine:
David Ford Jr.:	Lori Forget:	Bill Fow:	Giovanna Fowler:
Andrew Fredette:	Amanda Fredrickson:	Karen French:	Heidi Freudenthal:
Michelle Friedrich:	Abbie G:	Dorothy G:	Jose G:
Alani G:	Heidi Gallen:	John Gallen:	Angela Galluzzo:
Christina Galluzzo:	Christopher Garant:	K Garant:	Socrates Garcia:
Kelly Gardino:	Holly Gaspar:	Deborah Geddes:	Jessica Geddes:
Rory Geddes:	Tabitha Gelinis:	Melissa Gibbons:	Paul Gingras:
Besim Gjonbalaj:	Faith Good:	Lean Good:	Ronald Goodmaster:
Brandon Graber:	Connie Greenwood:	Katie Groome:	Mary Grotjan:
Erin Grover:	Ray Guidone:	Elbert H:	Jill H:
Michael H:	Nicholle El-Hachem:	Deanna Hafidi:	Susan Haig:
Bethany Hamill:	Delores Harris:	Kathy Hartley:	Billy Harvey:
William Haugh:	Samantha Hawes:	Courtney Hawthorne:	Curt Hayes:
Jasper Hayes:	Tristan Hayes:	Eileen Haynes:	Kim Henderson:
Dawn Hengesbach:	Rachel Hill:	Daniel Holt:	Ryan Horbal:

Stacie Houle:	Robert Hoyt Jr.:	Sonia Hunt:	Sara Hunter:
Noel Hurst:	Brett Inlow:	Amy Irish:	Jennifer J:
Naphtali Jackson:	Jessica James:	Lynn James:	Alexa Jamieson:
Madelyn Jellinek:	Kim Jewett:	Angelica Johnson:	Lily Johnson:
Anonymous:	Anonymous	Sonja McClelland:	Tracy McCollom:
Emily McDivitt:	Jacqueline McGovern:	Alyssa McMahan:	Lisa McManus:
Kristin Mendoza:	E Mercado:	S Mercado:	Shelby Merchant:
Nora Merriam:	Melanie Michael:	Megan Mik:	Michelle Mike:
Kathleen Minerly:	Linda Minter:	Michael Minter:	Russell Minter:
Jennifer Mitchell:	Kiara Mitchell:	Dawn Mitera:	Kim Montecalvo:
Erin Morelli:	Joshua Morelli:	Liz Motta:	Sal Motta:
David Muench:	Christina Muggeo:	Laura Mullaly:	Ashley Murcia:
Luis Murcia:	Taylor Murray:	Stephanie Musco:	Mary N:
Stella N:	Jennifer Nadeau:	Mary Nagy:	Gabriela Narvaez:
Joao Narvaez:	Zac Neville:	Carol Nicholls:	Heather Nicholson:
Peter Niro:	Alexandria Novak:	Ian Novak:	Lilliana Novak:
Rachael Novak:	Katherine Nute:	Kelly O:	C O'Connell:
Andrea Olson:	Denise Olson:	Cynthia Hinds-Ortiz:	Omayra Ortiz:
Jennifer Ouellette:	Nathan Ouellette:	Phil Ouellette:	Beverly Outlaw:
Deborah Outlaw:	Gary Outlaw:	Christine Pallman:	Dina Palmer:
Lorenzo Palmer:	Gabriel Pandolfo:	Giavanna Pandolfo:	Grace Pandolfo:
Jalena Diaz-Pandolfo:	James Pandolfo:	Tina Pandolfo:	Maria Paraiso:
Heather Pascucci:	Hunter Pascucci:	Candace Pendred:	Raymond Pennoyer:
Barbara Pereira:	Shakilah Phillip:	Irene Phinney:	Melinda Pickering:
James Pierson:	Kristi Pierson:	Janet Porter:	Grace Prause:
Carl Price:	Julie Quinn:	Aubrey R:	Carrie R:
Christina R:	Heather R:	Kyle R:	Jiana Ramirez:
Gary Rebillard:	Jenna Rebillard:	Matthew Rebillard:	Tracy Rebillard:
Laura Regan:	Michael Regan:	Allison Renaud:	Charles Renzoni:
Mary Renzoni:	Sarah Renzoni:	Miriam Reutter:	Summer Reynolds:
Ashley Rezendes:	Jennifer Rhodes:	Stephen Riccitelli:	Bethany Rios:
Holly Rivera:	Olivia Rivera:	Thomas Robbins:	Fable Rodgers:
Dennis Rodrigues:	Courtney Rogers:	Joseph Rogers:	Whitney Rogers:
Ari Rose:	Amy Russolillo:	Jonah S:	L S:
Matt S:	Gillian Sabella:	Ayden Sabetta:	Nevaeh Sabetta:
Ann Sackett:	Karen Sadowski:	Chrysovalanti Sakoglou:	Christina Samaha:
Sarah Sampias:	Antonio Sandu:	Christopher Sangalli:	Toni Sangalli:
Amy Saunders:	Richard Savage:	Andrea Savoie:	Jane Scatena:
Suzanne Scheurer:	Margaret Schirmer:	Cassie Schoenknecht:	Alyssa Schroen:
Colby Schroen:	Grace Scionti:	Caitlin Scott:	Amanda Seitz:
Carlos Semeghini:	Lindsey Semyanko:	Richard Shanley:	Julian Silkman:
Teresa Skoniecki:	Wojciech Skoniecki:	Samantha Slater:	Cory Smith Jr.:
Cory Smith:	Joseph Smith:	Mary Smith:	Millie Smith:

Anna Soave:	Paul Solevo:	Katie Sorel:	Mia Sorel:
Jennifer Sparks:	Amy Sperrazza:	Caroline Spinnanger:	Jeremy Spitz:
Kevin Spurgas:	Bonnie Spurlock:	Jacob Spurlock:	Heidi St Jacques:
Harry Stanley:			

The following 181 individuals voiced opposition to this bill:

	Anonymous 356	Anonymous 362	Anonymous 363
Anonymous 364	Anonymous 372	Anonymous 378	Anonymous 384
Anonymous 385	Anonymous 386	Anonymous 387	Anonymous 390
Anonymous 391	Anonymous 395	Anonymous 396	Anonymous 397
Anonymous 398	Anonymous 403	Anonymous 406	Anonymous 407
Anonymous 408	Anonymous 410	Anonymous 411	Anonymous 413
Anonymous 414	Anonymous 415	Anonymous 416	Anonymous 418
Anonymous 420	Anonymous 430	Anonymous 433	Anonymous 436
Anonymous 437	Anonymous 438	Anonymous 439	Anonymous 441
Anonymous 442	Anonymous 443	Anonymous 444	Anonymous 445
Anonymous 446	Anonymous 448	Anonymous 449	Anonymous 450
Anonymous 451	Anonymous 452	Anonymous 454	Anonymous 455
Anonymous 456	Anonymous 458	Anonymous 459	Anonymous 460
Anonymous 462	Anonymous 466	Anonymous 467	Anonymous 469
Anonymous 470	Anonymous 472	Anonymous 474	Anonymous 475
Anonymous 478	Anonymous 482	Anonymous 483	Anonymous 484
Anonymous 485	Anonymous 486	Anonymous 487	Anonymous 492
Anonymous 493	Anonymous 497	Anonymous 503	Anonymous 504
Anonymous 506	Anonymous 507	Anonymous 514	Anonymous 519
Anonymous 520	Anonymous 522	Anonymous 523	Anonymous 524
Anonymous 529	Anonymous 532	Anonymous 534	Anonymous 535
Anonymous 539	Anonymous 540	Anonymous 545, Director Health Care	Anonymous 546
Anonymous 548	Anonymous 549	Anonymous 550	Anonymous 552
Anonymous 554	Anonymous 555	Anonymous 557	Anonymous 558
Anonymous 559	Anonymous 559	Anonymous 561	Anonymous 563
Anonymous 566	Anonymous 567	Anonymous 569	Anonymous 572
Anonymous 573	Anonymous 575	Anonymous 578	Anonymous 581
Anonymous 588	Anonymous 589	Anonymous 590	Anonymous 591
Anonymous 592	Anonymous 596	Anonymous 599	Anonymous 601
Anonymous 602	Anonymous 606	Anonymous 608	Anonymous 614
Anonymous 616	Anonymous 617	Anonymous 619	Anonymous 620
Anonymous 621	Anonymous 622	Anonymous 624	Anonymous 625
Anonymous 626	Anonymous 628	Anonymous 631	Anonymous 635
Anonymous 636	Anonymous 643	Anonymous 644	Anonymous 645
Anonymous 646	Anonymous 647	Anonymous 651	Anonymous 656
Anonymous 658	Anonymous 660	Anonymous 661	Anonymous 662
Anonymous 663	Anonymous 667	Anonymous 668	Anonymous 674
Anonymous 675	Anonymous 677	Anonymous 678	Anonymous 687
Anonymous 688	Anonymous 691	Anonymous 692	Anonymous 693
Anonymous 694	Anonymous 695	Anonymous 701	Anonymous 702

Anonymous 704	Anonymous 705	Anonymous 707	Anonymous 709
Anonymous 711	Anonymous 712	Anonymous 716	Anonymous 718
Anonymous 719	Anonymous 722	Anonymous 726	Anonymous 727
Anonymous 729	Anonymous 730	Anonymous 731	Anonymous 736
Anonymous 736	Anonymous 738	Anonymous 740	Anonymous 741
Anonymous 743	Anonymous 744		

The following 91 individuals voiced opposition to this bill:

Christine Ciesielski	Amanda Cinea	Suzanne Claiborne	Nerlie Clark
Michaela Clement	Erike Clendinen	John Clifford	Caroline Clukey
Donna Clukey	Katharine Clukey	Ronald Clukey	Diana Colella
Olivia Coles	James Collins	Lauren Collins	Lori Conte
Jason Conway	Jillian Conway	Brian Cordell	Marie Cordell
Carrie Cos	Gail Costabile	Megan Cournoyer	Heather Couture
Kimberly Cranford	Chelsea Creedon	Dolores Cremonie	Ana Crespo
Carol Cross	Katherine Crouch	Dennis Crowe	Kyle Cyr
Sarah Cyr	Amanda D.	Charles D.	Doreen D.
James D.	Megan D.	Sara D.	Brian D.
Heather Dahlman	Jamie Dalessio	Heather DaMotta	Abigail Daniels
Michelle Daniels	Constance Davenport	Elias Davenport	Johnathan Davis
Kelly Davis	Daniel DeCaprio	Rachel DeCaprio	Gregory DeCarli
Jessica DeCarli	Alexis Denning	Kathy Deptula	Robert Descault
Theresa Descault	Terri DiBiasi	Christina Dillon	Patrick Dillon
Heather Dionne	Allison Dombroski	Breanna Dominguez	Nicole Dorazio
Roy Downey	Peter Downs	Jaysa Drozdenko	Lee Drozdenko
Dylan Ducharme	Mallory Ducharme	Carol Duncan	Heather Duncan
Megan Dunne	Sarah Durao	Alison Durbois	Caden Durbois
Judith Durbois	Robert Dubois	Samantha Dzierlatka	Marjorie E. LaPierre
Autumn E.	Teri E.	Arianna Ege	Malachi Ege
Karen Eisenbeiser	Aaron Ellington	Star Ems	Rania Enan
Jane Erfe	Sarah Espenscheid	Celeste F.	

The following 124 individuals voiced opposition to this bill:

Anonymous 229	Anonymous 231	Anonymous 232	Anonymous 234
Anonymous 240	Anonymous 241	Anonymous 242	Anonymous 246
Anonymous 249	Anonymous 250	Anonymous 251	Anonymous 252
Anonymous 254	Anonymous 256	Anonymous 257	Anonymous 259
Anonymous 261	Anonymous 266	Anonymous 268	Anonymous 269
Anonymous 270	Anonymous 271	Anonymous 272	Anonymous 274
Anonymous 276	Anonymous 278	Anonymous 280	Anonymous 281
Anonymous 283	Anonymous 285	Anonymous 290	Anonymous 291
Anonymous 292	Anonymous 293	Anonymous 294	Anonymous 295
Anonymous 297	Anonymous 298	Anonymous 303	Anonymous 304
Anonymous 310	Anonymous 323	Anonymous 325	Anonymous 327
Anonymous 333	Anonymous 336	Anonymous 337	Anonymous 339
Anonymous 342	Anonymous 348	Anonymous 350	Anonymous 351

Cyndy Bezz	Linda Bieszad	Thomas Bieszad	Roxanne Biron
Jill Bishop	Shamma Bishop	Sophia Bisogno	Amanda Blake
Jessica Bliven	Katie Bogert	Danielle Boies	Matthew Boies
Erica Boria	Michael Boscarino	Carla Boucher	Joan Bowe
Andrew Boyden	Rachael Bragdon	Violeta Breaz	Autumn Brennan
Jesse Brennan	Liv Brennan	Morgan Brightman	Adam Brodeur
Coleen Brodin	Ashley Brown	Marcia Brown	Jessica Brubaker
Jan Brunetti	Samantha Bryce	Stephanie Bryce	Suzanne Budwitz
Sheri Burghart	Stephanie Burghart	John Butkevicius	A.P. Butler
Paul Butler	Peter Butler	Thomas Butler	Gregory Butterworth
Katherine Butterworth	Desiree Byrne	Hadleigh C	Ian C
Jennifer C	Kara C	Makenna C	Myralynn C
Emma Calef	Hannah Calef	Linda Calef	Peter Calef
Amanda Calzaretta	Anthony Calzaretta	Skylynn Campbell	Crystal Capasso
Sandi Carpenter	Evan Cartabiano	Linda Carter	Michela Casey
Cynthia A. Cassotto	Amanda Caswell	Destiny Chamness	Douglas Chamness
Lily Chamness	Tina Chamness	Miranda Chapman	Emma Chappell
Michelle Chappell	Tamika Cheatem	Amanda Chmura	Maureen Ciardiello

**Due to the significant amount of written testimony received, overwhelmingly in opposition, this Joint Favorable report reflects reduced testimony summaries in varying format.*

Reported by:
Mia Giglietti
Zachary Robinson
Lawrence Sanchez
Alexandria Silva
Emily Swiatek
Geva Tinker
Liann Waite

Date: 4/22/2026