

**Oral opponent testimony on**  
**SB 47**  
**In**  
**Senate Education Committee**  
**By**  
**Leah Fliter, Assistant Executive Director of Advocacy**  
**Kansas Association of School Boards**  
[Lfliter@kasb.org](mailto:Lfliter@kasb.org)

Feb. 11, 2025

Madam Chair and members of the committee,

KASB appears today in strong opposition to SB 47. It violates local school boards' constitutional rights to oversee their districts, could subject districts to cyberattacks, and requires school boards to adopt policies the legislature would not require of itself.

On page 2, beginning on Line 8, the language requiring all board members' emails to be disclosed and publicized overrides our members' efforts to protect their districts from cybersecurity attacks. One of the simplest ways to hack into a school district's tech system is to send a spoofing or phishing email to board members or employees. If one person takes the bait, the entire district is at risk for a cybersecurity attack. This is why many districts have a fillable form on their website for those who want to email a person with a district account.

The legislature has been vocal, and rightfully so, about how school districts are addressing their vulnerability to cyberattacks. We urge the committee to reject all attempts to contravene legislative intent.

This bill conflicts with local board policies for development of the board agenda by the board president and superintendent. Most districts also have policies on adding items to a board agenda by request. If a board member wishes to add an agenda item during the meeting, that member need only secure a second and the votes of three additional members to have that item placed on the meeting agenda. This process allows the board president to keep order and follow parliamentary procedure, keep the meeting moving, and ensure that initiatives the majority of the board do not wish to spend time on do not dominate the time they have together.

This bill overrides a board president's ability to keep order in a meeting, like a legislative committee chair's authority to preside over a committee meeting. Nothing in current law prohibits a board president from conducting a meeting as the bill prescribes; however, allowing board members to question or debate with a member of the public can lead to grandstanding by either side; lengthen the meeting; and intrude on the rights of other citizens who also wish to provide public comment.

These policies are designed to facilitate orderly board meetings and are like similar policies in place in legislative committees. We urge the committee to consider the optics of requiring school boards to comply with directives the legislature would not adopt for itself.

The bill would make public comment a requirement at every board of education meeting. This is not presently a legal requirement, although we believe our boards allow time for public comment in most of

their regular board meetings. We ask that our boards be allowed to determine, based on the length and nature of their agenda, whether to allow time for public comment at each meeting, especially special meetings that are generally called for a narrow purpose with a shortened agenda. Our boards go to great lengths to ensure board meetings are accessible to the public, as the law requires, and to seek input of individuals in attendance in most meetings. Similarly, there are several instances where the law requires them to have public hearings, which they dutifully hold. However, we ask that the board retain some ability to control their agenda, to ensure the necessary work of the board is accomplished at every meeting.

In closing, SB 47 represents an intrusion into the rights of locally elected school boards to conduct district business in a professional, efficient, and responsible manner. It puts districts at risk of cybersecurity attacks. And it represents another chapter in the attacks on public education that are causing good people to resign from or not run for volunteer school board seats, driving teachers out of the profession, and putting Kansas children at educational risk.

For these reasons, KASB strongly opposes SB 47.