



## CBCF EXECUTIVE ORDER TRACKER

# Ending Radical Indoctrination in K-12 Schooling

## Executive Order #14190

### POLICY UPDATE

#### Background

- On January 29, 2025, President Trump signed an [executive order](#) to prevent the use of federal funds to support “discriminatory educational practices” and mandate that public schools exclude systemic racism, privilege, gender ideology, and implicit bias from their curricula. The order also prohibits federally funded teacher training programs from including diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) frameworks and limits comprehensive Black history education, reducing students' exposure to foundational historical and contemporary issues affecting Black communities.

#### Current Landscape

- On June 27, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled on [Mahmoud v. Taylor](#), a case centered around a group of Maryland parents who sought a religious exemption to prevent their children from reading books with LGBTQ+ content at school. The lower courts denied the parents' petition, rejecting their claim that the school's curriculum violated their freedom to exercise their religion. In a [6-3 decision](#) that split down ideological lines, the Supreme Court ruled in favor of the plaintiffs and sent the ruling back to the lower court for a final ruling. While the circuit court deliberates, the Supreme Court ordered the Maryland school board to notify parents when books with LGBTQ+ themes are assigned and to allow parents to exclude their children from related lessons without penalty. Justice Sonia Sotomayer read the dissent [aloud from the bench](#), an uncommon practice typically reserved for times when justices wish to voice extreme opposition to the decision. In the [dissent](#), Justice Sotomayer said that if “exposing students to the ‘message’ that LGBTQ people exist, and that their loved ones may celebrate their marriages and life events [...] is enough to trigger the most demanding form of judicial scrutiny, then little is not.”

## POLICY UPDATE

- While this case focused on LGBTQ+ representation and religious freedom, the ruling will have significant implications for public schools at large. In the past, individual parents had to seek permission to exclude their children from lessons about topics like evolution on the basis of religion. However, the recent ruling establishes the precedent that schools should pre-emptively notify parents about curriculum that discusses gender and sexuality. This decision could lead to situations where parents exempt their children from discussions of other important topics, like the women's suffrage movement, the history of Jim Crow, or the transatlantic slave trade. In the meantime, due to the Trump Administration's recent cuts to the Department of Education, school districts will have less funding in the fall. Teachers, already stretched thin, may decide to remove books or lessons about diverse people from their curriculum to avoid having to notify parents. In Justice Sotomayer's dissent, she expressed grave concern about this occurrence: "Many school districts, and particularly the most resource strapped, cannot afford to engage in costly litigation over opt-out rights or to divert resources to tracking and managing student absences. Schools may instead censor their curricula, stripping material that risks generating religious objections."
- While some legal scholars have declared that this ruling is an extension of parental rights, others say it is instead indicative of the Supreme Court's shift to the right. In early June, the Supreme Court ruled in [\*United States v. Skrametti\*](#) that Tennessee's ban on gender-affirming care for transgender minors was constitutional. While the *Skrametti* case was seen as a victory for conservatives, some argue that it represents a rollback of parental rights, as it prohibits parents in Tennessee from making decisions about their child's healthcare. While *Mahmoud v. Taylor* gives parents more autonomy over their children's pedagogy, it also bestows power to parents who have the time to converse with school officials about the curriculum. This ruling could dissuade teachers from discussing racial issues or other topics that would warrant pushback from a small but vocal group of parents, even in public schools with predominantly Black student bodies. On the heels of a recent wave of [book banning](#) by conservative groups, and this executive order, which seeks to end discussions of systemic racism in public education, *Mahmoud v. Taylor* is a watershed decision that may shape public education for years to come.