



Agency Legislative Proposal - 2016 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc): **Leave this blank**

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: Connecticut State Department of Education

Liaison: Laura J. Stefon
Phone: (860) 713 – 6493
E-mail: laura.stefon@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: **CTHSS**

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: **Tinty, Chasse, Torres**

Title of Proposal **An Act Concerning Bond Funds**

Statutory Reference **PA 14-98, section 82**

Proposal Summary

To provide the CTHSS with the authority to select additional locations and partners for training based on regional workforce needs.

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

- **Reason for Proposal**

Please consider the following, if applicable:

- (1) *Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary? **Yes or no; If yes, please explain***
- (2) *Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)? **Yes or no***
- (3) *Have certain constituencies called for this action? **Outside groups, task forces, other state agencies, etc.***
- (4) *What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session? **Explain what happens if this does not pass***

To provide the CTHSS with the authority to select location and partners for training



- **Origin of Proposal** **New Proposal** **Resubmission**

If this is a resubmission, please share: *These should be answered only if it is a resubmission*

- (1) What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?
- (2) Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?
- (3) Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?
- (4) What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?

PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency) *Please only complete this section if you have already been working with another agency. If not, I will reach out to the appropriate agency's legislative liaison upon approval from the Commissioner.*

Agency Name:
 Agency Contact (name, title, phone):
 Date Contacted:

Approve of Proposal YES NO Talks Ongoing

Summary of Affected Agency's Comments

Will there need to be further negotiation? YES NO

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation) *Impact on LEAs or municipalities – cost or savings.*

State *In addition to costs to the State/Department, please include additional staffing needs to implement, if any.*

none

Federal *Please note if any federal funds are received, used, etc. as a result of this proposal.*

none

Additional notes on fiscal impact

There is currently a 3.5 million allocation to be used for the purpose of academic enrichment and training in trades for secondary and adult students, which would be distributed among existing and future sites for the biennium, resulting in no additional fiscal cost.



- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

By section, what is the impact of this proposal?

Insert fully drafted bill here

[PA 14-98 Sec. 82. (Effective July 1, 2014)] TBD

(a) For the purposes described in subsection (b) of this section, the State Bond Commission shall have the power from time to time to authorize the issuance of bonds of the state in one or more series and in principal amounts not exceeding in the aggregate three million five hundred thousand dollars.

(b) The proceeds of the sale of said bonds, to the extent of the amount stated in subsection (a) of this section, shall be used by the Department of Education for the technical high school system, to establish a pilot program to provide expanded educational opportunities by extending hours at technical high schools in Hamden, Hartford, New Britain and Waterbury and other sites to be selected by the Connecticut Technical High School System, and approved by the Connecticut Technical High School System Board, based on regional workforce needs for purposes of academic enrichment and training in trades for secondary and adult students.



Agency Legislative Proposal - 2016 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc):

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: Connecticut State Department of Education

Liaison: Laura J. Stefon
Phone: (860) 713 – 6493
E-mail: laura.stefon@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Commissioner's Office

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: Laura J. Stefon

Title of Proposal: An Act Concerning Connecticut's Seal of Biliteracy

Statutory Reference New Language

Proposal Summary

This bill would allow a superintendent to place a Seal of Biliteracy on the diploma and transcript of any student who is able to demonstrate that they are highly proficient in English and another language and will provide employers and colleges with another means of easily identifying those individuals who are proficient in multiple languages.

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

- **Reason for Proposal**

Please consider the following, if applicable:

- (1) Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary? **No***
- (2) Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)? **Yes; several states in recent years have adopted similar legislation: California, New York, Illinois, Washington, etc...***
- (3) Have certain constituencies called for this action? **No***
- (4) What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session? **Students achieving a high level of proficiency in multiple languages would not have an opportunity to be officially recognized on their diploma or high school transcript for having achieved that distinction.***



Origin of Proposal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Proposal	<input type="checkbox"/> Resubmission <i>If this is a resubmission, please share: N/A</i>
<p>(1) <i>What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?</i></p> <p>(2) <i>Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?</i></p> <p>(3) <i>Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?</i></p> <p>(4) <i>What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?</i></p>		

PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency) **N/A**

Agency Name: Agency Contact (name, title, phone): Date Contacted: Approve of Proposal <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> Talks Ongoing
--

Summary of Affected Agency's Comments
--

Will there need to be further negotiation? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation) Impact on LEAs or municipalities – cost or savings.

State In addition to costs to the State/Department, please include additional staffing needs to implement, if any. We do not anticipate any costs associated with this proposal.
--

Federal N/A

Additional notes on fiscal impact



Policy and Programmatic Impacts (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact) **By section, what is the impact of this proposal?**

Insert fully drafted bill here

Section 1 (NEW) (Effective July 1, 2016) **Connecticut State Seal of Biliteracy.** (a) The Connecticut State Seal of Biliteracy program is hereby established to recognize public high school students who have achieved a high level of proficiency in one or more languages in addition to English. Superintendents will have the option to place this seal on the diploma of an eligible graduate, as determined by criteria established by the State Board of Education, beginning with the 2017-2018 school year to certify a high level of proficiency in multiple languages.

(b) For the purposes of this section, “foreign language” means any language other than English, including all modern languages, American Sign Language and Native American Languages.

(c) The State Seal of Biliteracy is intended to: (1) encourage public school students to study multiple languages, (2), certify the attainment of a high level of biliteracy on a student’s high school diploma and transcript, (3) provide employers and universities with another method of identifying individuals who have attained a high level of proficiency in multiple languages and (4) recognize the value of foreign and native language instruction in public schools.

(d) By no later than September 1, 2017, the State Board of Education shall adopt guidelines to establish the criteria that a student must achieve to attain the Connecticut State Seal of Biliteracy and the method by which a Superintendent shall award this Seal.

(e) School Districts will have the option of participating in this program, beginning in the 2017-2018 school year. A school district participating shall (1) maintain appropriate records in order to allow for the identification of a student who has achieved biliteracy in two or more languages and (2) make the appropriate designation on both the diploma and the transcript of a student who earns the State Seal of Biliteracy.



Agency Legislative Proposal - 2016 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc):

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: Connecticut State Department of Education

Liaison: Laura Stefon
Phone: (860) 713 – 6493
E-mail: Laura.Stefon@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: **Bureau of Educator Standards and Certification, Talent Office**

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: **Nancy L. Pugliese, J.D., Bureau Chief; Wendy Harwin, Education Consultant**

Title of Proposal “An Act Concerning Minor Revisions to Bilingual Education Certification”

Statutory Reference **Sec. 10-145h. Requirements for certification as a bilingual education teacher.**

Proposal Summary

This Act proposes to:

- 1) **Revise testing requirements for bilingual educator certification to eliminate the need to demonstrate oral proficiency in the educator’s first language, and ensure proficiency in all languages of instruction.**
- 2) **Clarify the grade levels authorized under bilingual elementary certification.**

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

- **Reason for Proposal**
 - 1) **Recent legislation eliminated the requirement for educators to demonstrate their oral proficiency in English. Since bilingual certification authorizes educators to teach academic content in two languages, educators should be fully proficient in both languages of instruction. This proposal recommends restoring the requirements for candidates to demonstrate oral proficiency in English. However, oral proficiency testing should not be required in the educator’s first language.**
 - 2) **Authorizing elementary bilingual teachers to serve students in Grades K through 8 will potentially provide districts with the flexibility to create multi-age bilingual education groups that serve the needs of students who require instruction in both languages. Language clarifying these grade levels for the elementary bilingual endorsement was contained in a section of the statute that was inadvertently eliminated in legislation passed in July 2015. This proposal recommends adding that language back into the bilingual statute.**

- **Origin of Proposal** **New Proposal** **Resubmission**



PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency)

Agency Name: Agency Contact (name, title, phone): Date Contacted: Approve of Proposal ___ YES ___ NO ___ Talks Ongoing
Summary of Affected Agency's Comments
Will there need to be further negotiation? ___ YES ___ NO

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation)
None
State
None
Federal
None
Additional notes on fiscal impact

- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

By section, what is the impact of this proposal?
Sec 10-145h:
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Ensure oral proficiency in all languages of instruction, without unnecessary testing.2. Clarify that bilingual elementary certification, a significant teacher shortage area at this time, will authorize educators to serve in bilingual classrooms in Grades K-8.



Insert fully drafted bill here

- New language should be underlined
- Language to be removed should be in **[bold brackets]**

Sec. 10-145h. Requirements for certification as a bilingual education teacher.

(a) On and after July 1, 2015, the State Board of Education shall require an applicant for certification as a bilingual education teacher to demonstrate written and oral competency in English and written and oral competency in the other language of instruction as a condition of certification, except that demonstration of oral proficiency in the educator's native language shall not be required. Written competency in English shall be demonstrated by successful passage of the essential skills test approved by the State Board of Education. Written competency in the other language shall be demonstrated on an examination, if available, of comparable difficulty as specified by the Department of Education. If such an examination is not available, competency shall be demonstrated by an appropriate alternative method as specified by the department. Oral competency **[in the other language]** shall be demonstrated by an appropriate method specified by the Department of Education.

(b) On and after July 1, 2015, the State Board of Education shall require persons seeking to become (1) elementary level bilingual education teachers to meet coursework requirements in elementary education and bilingual education, and (2) secondary level bilingual education teachers to meet coursework requirements in both the subject area they will teach and in bilingual education. The State Board of Education may issue an endorsement in bilingual education to an applicant who has (A) completed coursework requirements in (i) elementary education and bilingual education, or (ii) the subject area they will teach and bilingual education, and (B) successful passage of examination requirements for bilingual education, as approved by the State Board of Education.

(c) On and after July 1, 2000, the State Board of Education shall require bilingual education teachers holding provisional educator certificates to meet the requirements of this subsection in order to qualify for a professional educator certificate to teach bilingual education. (1) Such bilingual education teachers who teach on the elementary level shall take fifteen credit hours in bilingual education and fifteen credit hours in language arts, reading and mathematics. (2) Such bilingual education teachers who teach on the middle or secondary level shall take fifteen credit hours in bilingual education and fifteen credit hours in the subject matter that they teach. Such professional educator certificate shall be valid for bilingual education and the grade level and content area of preparation.

(d) Certification in elementary bilingual education shall be valid for grades kindergarten to eight, inclusive.



Agency Legislative Proposal - 2016 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc):

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: Connecticut State Department of Education

Liaison: Laura J. Stefon
Phone: (860) 713-6493
E-mail: laura.stefon@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: **Bureau of Grants Management**

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: **Sarah Bourne (OFA Analyst); Lynn Nauss Cipriano (SDE Drafter); Kathy Demsey (SDE Manager)**

Title of Proposal **AAC Various Revisions and Additions to the Education Statutes**

Statutory Reference **PA 15-1 JSS Sec. 13(i)(1)/Sec. 19 and Sec. 32(k)(1)/Sec. 38**

Proposal Summary **Technical corrections are needed to clarify that the start-up capital funds awarded to Sheff partners are, by intent, temporary. These proposed changes offer relief from the penalties associated with redirection of facilities within 10 years.**

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

- Reason for Proposal

Please consider the following, if applicable:

- (1) Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary? *Yes or no; If yes, please explain*
- (2) Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)? *Yes or no*
- (3) Have certain constituencies called for this action? *Outside groups, task forces, other state agencies, etc.*
- (4) What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session? *Explain what happens if this does not pass*

Without this correction, the Sheff partners would be subject to repayment of funds intended as grants-in-aid, funds utilized to ready space quickly to accommodate Hartford and suburban students in accordance with the assorted Sheff remedies.

- Origin of Proposal **New Proposal** **Resubmission**

If this is a resubmission, please share: *These should be answered only if it is a resubmission*

- (1) What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?
- (2) Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?
- (3) Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?
- (4) What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?



PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency)

Agency Name: Agency Contact (name, title, phone): Date Contacted: Approve of Proposal ___ YES ___ NO ___ Talks Ongoing	N/A
Summary of Affected Agency's Comments	
Will there need to be further negotiation? ___ YES ___ NO	

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation)	NONE
State	NONE
Federal	NONE
Additional notes on fiscal impact	

- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

--



NEW (Effective Upon Passage) NOTWITHSTANDING THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 19 OF PUBLIC ACT 15-1 OF THE JUNE SPECIAL SESSION, GRANTS-IN-AID FOR CAPITAL START-UP COSTS PAID TO THE CAPITOL REGION EDUCATION COUNCIL, IN ACCORDANCE WITH SUBDIVISION (1) OF SUBSECTION (i) OF SECTION 13 OF PUBLIC ACT 15-1 OF THE JUNE SPECIAL SESSION, AND USED PURSUANT TO SAID SUBSECTION SHALL NOT BE SUBJECT TO LIEN OR REPAYMENT.

NOTWITHSTANDING THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 38 OF PUBLIC ACT 15-1 OF THE JUNE SPECIAL SESSION, GRANTS-IN-AID FOR CAPITAL START-UP COSTS PAID TO THE CAPITOL REGION EDUCATION COUNCIL, IN ACCORDANCE WITH SUBDIVISION (1) OF SUBSECTION (k) OF SECTION 32 OF PUBLIC ACT 15-1 OF THE JUNE SPECIAL SESSION, AND USED PURSUANT TO SAID SUBSECTION SHALL NOT BE SUBJECT TO LIEN OR REPAYMENT.





Agency Legislative Proposal - 2016 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc):

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: Connecticut State Department of Education

Liaison: Laura J. Stefon
Phone: (860) 713-6493
E-mail: laura.stefon@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: **Bureau of Grants Management**

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: **Sarah Bourne (OFA Analyst); Lynn Nauss Cipriano (SDE Drafter); Kathy Demsey (SDE Manager)**

Title of Proposal **AAC Various Revisions and Additions to the Education Statutes**

Statutory Reference **CGS 10-264(d)(2)**

Proposal Summary: Under current law, there is a timing problem with the effective date of the data for Goodwin's September magnet operating grant. The data and the payment are both assigned a September 1 date. SDE requires processing time for the payment, so it will be necessary to establish a different date for the student counts.

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

- **Reason for Proposal**

Please consider the following, if applicable:

- (1) Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary? **Yes or no; If yes, please explain**
- (2) Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)? **Yes or no**
- (3) Have certain constituencies called for this action? **Outside groups, task forces, other state agencies, etc.**
- (4) What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session? **Explain what happens if this does not pass**

Without this correction, SDE will not be able to meet the statutory deadline for processing the initial Goodwin magnet operating grant by Sept. 1.

- **Origin of Proposal** **New Proposal** **Resubmission**

If this is a resubmission, please share: **These should be answered only if it is a resubmission**

- (1) What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?
- (2) Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?
- (3) Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?
- (4) What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?



PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency)

Agency Name: Agency Contact (name, title, phone): Date Contacted:	N/A
Approve of Proposal <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> Talks Ongoing	
Summary of Affected Agency's Comments	
Will there need to be further negotiation? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation)	NONE
State	NONE
Federal	NONE
Additional notes on fiscal impact	

- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

--



10-2641(d)(2) For the fiscal year ending June 30, [2015] **2017** and each fiscal year thereafter, grants made pursuant to subparagraph (E) of subdivision (3) of subsection (c) of this section shall be paid as follows: Fifty per cent of the amount not later than September first based on estimated student enrollment for the first semester on [September first] **AUGUST FIRST**, and another fifty per cent not later than May first of each fiscal year based on actual student enrollment for the second semester on February first. The May first payment shall be adjusted to reflect actual interdistrict magnet school program enrollment for those students who have been enrolled at such school for at least two semesters of the school year, using the data of record, and actual student enrollment for those students who have been enrolled at such school for only one semester, using data of record. The May first payment shall be further adjusted for the difference between the total grant received by the magnet school operator in the prior fiscal year and the revised total grant amount calculated for the prior fiscal year where the financial audit submitted by the interdistrict magnet school operator pursuant to subdivision (1) of subsection (n) of this section indicates an overpayment by the department.



Agency Legislative Proposal - 2016 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc):

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: Connecticut State Department of Education

Liaison: Laura J. Stefon
Phone: (860) 713 – 6493
E-mail: laura.stefon@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: CSDE Talent Office

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: Nancy Pugliese, Chief, Bureau of Educator Standards and Certification

Title of Proposal “An Act Concerning Minor Revisions to Teacher Certification Requirements for Interstate Agreements for Teacher Certification Reciprocity”

Statutory Reference

Proposal Summary Revise the language that was passed in July 2015 to allow teachers who have successfully completed an out-of-state educator preparation program from a regionally accredited college or university, but who have not taught under an appropriate certificate issued by another state, territory or possession of the United States or the District of Columbia or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, to gain certification through the interstate agreement(s). Additionally, the language has been revised to allow CSDE to issue the appropriate level of an educator certificate based upon the previous successful service completed in the other state and for CSDE to enter recognition agreements when a state or territory does not wish to enter an interstate agreement, but CT wishes to accept candidates from that state or territory.

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

- **Reason for Proposal**

Please consider the following, if applicable:

- (1) Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary? NO
- (2) Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)? NO
- (3) Have certain constituencies called for this action? NO
- (4) What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session? The number of teachers who will qualify to obtain for a Connecticut educator certificate will be significantly reduced because the current statutory language requires individuals who have completed an educator preparation program at an out-of-state, regionally accredited institution, to also have (1) obtained certification in the other state; and (2) taught in another state. Those who have not gained certification and worked under that certificate in the other state will not be eligible for Connecticut certification under the current or newly developed interstate agreements.



- **Origin of Proposal** **New Proposal** **Resubmission**

If this is a resubmission, please share:

- (1) What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?
- (2) Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?
- (3) Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?
- (4) What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?

PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency) .

Agency Name:

Agency Contact (name, title, phone):

Date Contacted:

Approve of Proposal YES NO Talks Ongoing

Summary of Affected Agency's Comments

Will there need to be further negotiation? YES NO

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation) No direct fiscal impact

State None

Federal None

Additional notes on fiscal impact



- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

The current language passed in PA 15-108 limits the entry of individuals from other states who recently completed an approved educator preparation program for certification in another state, territory or possession of the United States or the District of Columbia or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and meet all conditions as mandated by such interstate agreement, but did not seek certification in the other state and have not worked under a certificate in the other state. This will decrease the number of out-of-state individuals who will be eligible to be certified in the State of Connecticut. This contradicts the intent of the original statutory revision.

Additionally, the current language only allows the issuance of an initial certificate for individuals who enter Connecticut from another state and does not allow the CSDE to consider the number of years of previous successful service for a higher level certificate. Currently, if an individual has successfully served in another state for 30 months or more in the past 10 years, they are eligible to receive a provisional certificate.

In cases where another state or territory does not wish to enter an agreement, the commissioner may choose to develop a recognition agreement that will allow CSDE to accept individuals who complete an educator preparation program and meet all other conditions as mandated by such recognition agreement.

Sec. 2. Section 10-146c of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective July 1, 2016*):

The Commissioner of Education, or the commissioner's designee, as agent for the state shall establish or join interstate agreements or recognition agreements to facilitate the certification of qualified educators from other states, territories or possessions of the United States, or the District of Columbia or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, provided candidates for certification, at a minimum, (a) hold a bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited college or university in another state, territory or possession of the United States or the District of Columbia or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, (b) meet all conditions mandated by such interstate agreement, including completion of an approved educator preparation program, which shall be a required component of any interstate agreement to which the State of Connecticut is a party, and (c) have fulfilled assessment requirements as approved by the commissioner. [in another state, territory or possession of the United States or the District of Columbia or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and meet all conditions as mandated by such interstate agreement have fulfilled post preparation assessments as approved by the commissioner, have taught under an appropriate certificate issued by].

Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 10-145b, as amended by this act, and 10-145f, the State Board of Education shall issue an [initial] appropriate level of an educator certificate based upon documented appropriate teaching experience to any person who satisfies the requirements of this section and the appropriate interstate agreement and/or recognition agreement.



Agency Legislative Proposal - 2016 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc):

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: Connecticut State Department of Education

Liaison: Laura J. Stefon
Phone: (860) 713-6493
E-mail: laura.stefon@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: **Bureau of Grants Management**

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: **Sarah Bourne (OFA Analyst); Lynn Nauss Cipriano (SDE Drafter); Kathy Demsey (SDE Manager)**

Title of Proposal **AAC Various Revisions and Additions to the Education Statutes**

Statutory Reference **CGS 10-264i(a)(4)**

Proposal Summary **Allows for payment of supplemental magnet transportation to CREC, to cover the additional costs of transporting students in the Hartford area in support of the Sheff initiative. Legislation caps the per-student amount at \$2,000 in the Sheff region. Transportation grants are not sufficient to cover the costs associated with the significant numbers of students being transported, bus runs for extra-curricular activities, reasonable ride times, and geographic challenges associated with transporting students over such an extensive region.**

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

- **Reason for Proposal**

Please consider the following, if applicable:

- (1) *Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary? **Yes or no; If yes, please explain***
- (2) *Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)? **Yes or no***
- (3) *Have certain constituencies called for this action? **Outside groups, task forces, other state agencies, etc.***
- (4) *What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session? **Explain what happens if this does not pass***

Without this correction, CREC will experience a significant transportation deficit.

- **Origin of Proposal** **X** **New Proposal** **Resubmission**

If this is a resubmission, please share: **These should be answered only if it is a resubmission**

- (1) *What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?*
- (2) *Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?*
- (3) *Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?*
- (4) *What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?*



PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency)

Agency Name: Agency Contact (name, title, phone): Date Contacted: Approve of Proposal ___ YES ___ NO ___ Talks Ongoing	N/A
Summary of Affected Agency's Comments	
Will there need to be further negotiation? ___ YES ___ NO	

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation)	NONE
State The supplemental magnet transportation grant is typically paid over two years, half in the year the deficit is incurred, and half in the subsequent year, post audit. In this instance, timing is such that the full amount will be paid to CREC near the end of FY2016. We estimate the amount to be between \$15M and \$20M.	
Federal	NONE
Additional notes on fiscal impact	

- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

--



4. In addition to the grants otherwise provided pursuant to this section, the Commissioner of Education may provide supplemental transportation grants to regional educational service centers for the purposes of transportation to interdistrict magnet schools. Any such grant shall be provided within available appropriations and after the commissioner has reviewed and approved the total interdistrict magnet school transportation budget for a regional educational service center, including all revenue and expenditure estimates. ~~[For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010, in addition to the grants otherwise provided pursuant to this section, the Commissioner of Education, with the approval of the Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management, may provide supplemental transportation grants to the Hartford school district and the Capitol Region Education Council for the purposes of transportation of students who are not residents of Hartford to interdistrict magnet schools operated by the Capitol Region Education Council or the Hartford school district. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012, in addition to the grants otherwise provided pursuant to this section, the Commissioner of Education may provide supplemental transportation grants to regional educational service centers for the purposes of transportation to interdistrict magnet schools that assist the state in meeting the goals of the 2008 stipulation and order for Milo Sheff, et al. v. William A. O'Neill, et al. Any such grant shall be provided within available appropriations and upon a comprehensive financial review of all transportation activities as prescribed by the commissioner. The commissioner may require the regional educational service center to provide an independent financial review, by an auditor selected by the Commissioner of Education, the costs of which may be paid from funds that are part of the supplemental transportation grant. Any such grant shall be paid as follows: Up to fifty per cent of the grant on or before June 30, 2012, and the balance on or before September 1, 2012, upon completion of the comprehensive financial review.]~~ For the fiscal years ending June 30, 2013, to June 30, 2015, inclusive, in addition to the grants otherwise provided pursuant to this section, the Commissioner of Education may provide supplemental transportation to interdistrict magnet schools that assist the state in meeting the goals of the 2008 stipulation and order for Milo Sheff, et al. v. William O'Neill, et al., as extended, or the goals of the 2013 stipulation and order for Milo Sheff, et al. v. William A. O'Neill, et al., **AS EXTENDED**, and for transportation provided by EASTCONN to interdistrict magnet schools. Any such grant shall be provided within available appropriations and upon a comprehensive financial review, by an auditor selected by the Commissioner of Education, the costs of such review may be paid from funds that are part of the supplemental transportation grant. Any such grant shall be paid as follows: For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013, up to fifty per cent of the grant on or before June 30, 2013, and the balance on or before September 1, 2013, upon completion of the comprehensive financial review; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2014, up to fifty per cent of the grant on or before June 30, 2014, and the balance on or before September 1, 2014, upon completion of the comprehensive financial review; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015, up to fifty per cent of the grant on or before June 30, 2015, and the balance on or before September 1, 2015, upon completion of the comprehensive financial review. **FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2016, IN ADDITION TO THE GRANTS OTHERWISE PROVIDED PURSUANT TO THIS SECTION, THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION MAY PROVIDE SUPPLEMENTAL TRANSPORTATION GRANTS TO REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICE CENTERS FOR THE PURPOSES OF TRANSPORTATION TO INTERDISTRICT MAGNET SCHOOLS THAT ASSIST THE STATE IN MEETING THE GOALS OF THE 2008 STIPULATION AND ORDER FOR MILO SHEFF, ET AL. V. WILLIAM O'NEILL, ET AL., AS EXTENDED, OR THE GOALS OF THE 2013 STIPULATION AND ORDER FOR MILO SHEFF, ET AL. V. WILLIAM A. O'NEILL, ET AL., AS EXTENDED. ANY SUCH GRANT SHALL BE PROVIDED WITHIN AVAILABLE APPROPRIATIONS AND UPON A COMPREHENSIVE FINANCIAL REVIEW, BY AN AUDITOR SELECTED BY THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION; THE COSTS OF SUCH REVIEW MAY BE PAID FROM FUNDS THAT ARE PART OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL TRANSPORTATION GRANT. ANY SUCH GRANT SHALL BE PAID IN THE SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEAR, UPON COMPLETION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE FINANCIAL REVIEW.**



Agency Legislative Proposal - 2016 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc):

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: Connecticut State Department of Education

Liaison: Laura J. Stefon
Phone: (860) 713-6493
E-mail: laura.stefon@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: **Bureau of Grants Management**

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: **Sarah Bourne (OFA Analyst); Lynn Nauss Cipriano (SDE Drafter); Kathy Demsey (SDE Manager)**

Title of Proposal **AAC Various Revisions and Additions to the Education Statutes**

Statutory Reference **CGS 10-266p(f) and 10-266p(g); 10-266p(i)**

Proposal Summary **Technical corrections are needed for the Priority School Districts (PSD) grants to: (1) extend the PSD grant beyond fiscal year 2015; (2) allow districts to continue to carry forward unexpended funds; and (3) correct an error in the grant amount for Norwalk to the intended grant amount (from \$2,200,070 to \$2,270,000).**

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

- Reason for Proposal**

Please consider the following, if applicable:

- (1) Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary? **Yes or no; If yes, please explain**
- (2) Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)? **Yes or no**
- (3) Have certain constituencies called for this action? **Outside groups, task forces, other state agencies, etc.**
- (4) What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session? **Explain what happens if this does not pass**

Without correction, SDE will be unable to properly calculate and pay portions of the PSD grant.

- Origin of Proposal** **X** **New Proposal** **Resubmission**

If this is a resubmission, please share: **These should be answered only if it is a resubmission**

- (1) What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?
- (2) Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?
- (3) Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?
- (4) What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?



PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency)

Agency Name: Agency Contact (name, title, phone): Date Contacted: Approve of Proposal ___ YES ___ NO ___ Talks Ongoing	N/A
Summary of Affected Agency's Comments	
Will there need to be further negotiation? ___ YES ___ NO	

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation) Norwalk would be shorted nearly \$70,000 associated with the error in the legislation.
State Approximately \$2.9 million would go undistributed for the main portion of the PSD grant, which is not in line with legislative intent.
Federal NONE
Additional notes on fiscal impact

- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

--



Subsections (f) and (g) and (i) of section 10-266p of the general statutes are repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (Effective Upon Passage:

(f) In addition to the amounts allocated in subsection (a), and subsections (c) to (e), inclusive, of this section, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2006, the State Board of Education shall allocate two million thirty-nine thousand six hundred eighty-six dollars to the towns that rank one to three, inclusive, in population pursuant to subdivision (1) of said subsection (a), and for the fiscal year[s] ending June 30, 2007, [~~to June 30, 2015~~] **AND EACH FISCAL YEAR THEREAFTER**, the State Board of Education shall allocate two million six hundred ten thousand seven hundred ninety-eight dollars to the towns that rank one to three, inclusive, in population pursuant to subdivision (1) of said subsection (a).

(g) In addition to the amounts allocated in subsection (a) and subsections (c) to (f), inclusive, of this section, for [~~the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012, the State Board of Education shall allocate three million two hundred sixteen thousand nine hundred eight dollars as follows: Each priority school district shall receive an allocation based on the ratio of the amount it is eligible to receive pursuant to subsection (a) and subsections (c) to (f), inclusive, of this section to the total amount all priority school districts are eligible to receive pursuant to said subsection (a) and said subsections (c) to (f), inclusive. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2014, the State Board of Education shall allocate two million nine hundred twenty five thousand four hundred eighty one dollars as follows: Each priority school district shall receive an allocation based on the ratio of the amount it is eligible to receive pursuant to subsection (a) of this section and subsections (c) to (f), inclusive, of this section to the total amount all priority school districts are eligible to receive pursuant to subsection (a) of this section and subsections (c) to (f), inclusive, of this section. For]~~ the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015, **AND EACH FISCAL YEAR THEREAFTER**, the State Board of Education shall allocate two million eight hundred eighty-two thousand three hundred sixty-eight dollars as follows: Each priority school district shall receive an allocation based on the ratio of the amount it is eligible to receive pursuant to subsection (a) of this section and subsections (c) to (f), inclusive, of this section to the total amount all priority school districts are eligible to receive pursuant to subsection (a) of this section and subsections (c) to (f), inclusive, of this section. For the fiscal year ending June 30, [~~2014~~] **2016**, a priority school district may carry forward any unexpended funds allocated after May 1, [~~2014~~] **2016**, pursuant to this subsection, into the fiscal year ending June 30, [~~2015~~] **2017**.

(i) In addition to the amounts allocated in subsection (a) and subsections (c) to (h), inclusive, of this section, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2008, and each fiscal year thereafter, the State Board of Education shall allocate two million twenty thousand dollars to the town ranked sixth when all towns are ranked from highest to lowest in population, based on the most recent federal decennial census, except that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015, the State Board of Education shall allocate two million two hundred **SEVENTY** thousand [~~seventy~~] dollars to said town.



Agency Legislative Proposal - 2016 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc):

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: Connecticut State Department of Education

Liaison: Laura J. Stefon
Phone: (860) 713-6493
E-mail: laura.stefon@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: **Bureau of Grants Management**

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: **Sarah Bourne (OFA Analyst); Lynn Nauss Cipriano (SDE Drafter); Kathy Demsey (SDE Manager)**

Title of Proposal **AAC Various Revisions and Additions to the Education Statutes**

Statutory Reference **CGS 10-19q**

Proposal Summary **Notwithstanding language drafted to allow three earmarks funded through the Youth Service Bureau Enhancement account to be paid. These programs are identified in the OFA Budget Notes, but in the absence of supporting legislation, the payments cannot be released from an entitlement grant account.**

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

- **Reason for Proposal**

Please consider the following, if applicable:

- (1) Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary? **NO**
- (2) Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)? **N/A**
- (3) Have certain constituencies called for this action? **Refer to OFA Budget Notes, page 11 of the 7/16/2015 version**
- (4) What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session? **Without passage, SDE will be unable to release payment to the three special entities.**

- **Origin of Proposal** **X** **New Proposal** **Resubmission**

If this is a resubmission, please share: **These should be answered only if it is a resubmission**

- (1) What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?
- (2) Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?
- (3) Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?
- (4) What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?



PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency)

Agency Name: Agency Contact (name, title, phone): Date Contacted:	N/A
Approve of Proposal <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> Talks Ongoing	
Summary of Affected Agency's Comments	
Will there need to be further negotiation? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation)	NONE
State	In the absence of this legislation, the state would realize a surplus of \$90,250.
Federal	NONE
Additional notes on fiscal impact	

- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

--



NOTWITHSTANDING THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 10-19q OF THE GENERAL STATUTES, THE FOLLOWING SHALL BE ELIGIBLE FOR GRANTS: THE BRIDGE FAMILY CENTER, EAST HARTFORD ADVENTURE PLUS, AND VIRTUOSI ORCHESTRA IN NEW BRITAIN.



Agency Legislative Proposal - 2015 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc): Parent University Pilot Program modification - final

(If submitting electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: **Connecticut State Department of Education**

Liaison: **Laura J. Stefon**

Phone: **860-713-6493**

E-mail: **laura.stefon@ct.gov**

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: **Office of Student Supports and Organizational Effectiveness**

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: **John Frassinelli, Bureau Chief; Judy Carson, Program Manager**

Title of Proposal

AAC Modifications to the Parent University Pilot Program

Statutory Reference June 12 Special Session, Public Act No. 12-1

An Act Implementing Provisions of the State Budget for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2012.

Proposal Summary

Remove existing language which limits the number of parent university grants that the commissioner may award. This allows the commissioner discretion in awarding parent university pilot grant funds to more than two Education Reform districts. Clarify that the program is ongoing. In addition remove the word pilot from the legislative language as this program has passed the pilot stage and is ready to replicate in other districts.

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

• Reason for Proposal

Please consider the following, if applicable:

- (1) *Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary? **No***
- (2) *Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)? **no***
- (3) *Have certain constituencies called for this action? **No***
- (4) *What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session? **Restriction on the number of grants awarded***

• Origin of Proposal

New Proposal

Resubmission



If this is a resubmission, please share:

- (1) What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?
It was not taken up by the Education Committee
- (2) Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?
- (3) Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?
- (4) What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?

PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency) **None**

Agency Name:

Agency Contact (name, title, phone):

Date Contacted:

Approve of Proposal ___ YES ___ NO ___ Talks Ongoing

Summary of Affected Agency's Comments

Will there need to be further negotiation? ___ YES ___ NO

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact) **None**

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation) **None**

State: In addition to costs to the State/Department, please include additional staffing needs to implement, if any. **None**

Federal: Please note if any federal funds are received, used, etc. as a result of this proposal. **None**

Additional notes on fiscal impact



- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

By section, what is the impact of this proposal?

By removing the cap on the number of grants that may be awarded, the CSDE can extend the number of parent universities available to families in Educational Reform Districts.

- New language should be underlined
- Language to be removed should be in **[bold brackets]**

Sec. 233. (Effective July 1, 2012) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the Department of Education shall establish a parent university **[pilot]** program to provide grants to **[two]** educational reform districts, as defined in section 34 of public act 12-116, as selected by the Commissioner of Education, for the establishment of a parent university **[in such selected educational reform districts]**. Each parent university established under this section shall provide district-wide educational opportunities for parents and educational opportunities for parents of students enrolled in certain schools and who reside in certain neighborhoods. The local or regional board of education for an educational reform district or a nonprofit organization partnering with such board of education may apply to the commissioner for a grant under this section at such time and in such manner as the commissioner prescribes. The department may accept private donations for purposes of the parent university **[pilot]** program, provided such donations shall in no way limit the scope of parent university **[pilot]** program grants pursuant to this section.



Agency Legislative Proposal - 2016 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc): **Leave this blank**

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: Connecticut State Department of Education

Liaison: Laura J. Stefon
Phone: (860) 713 – 6493
E-mail: laura.stefon@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: **Division of Finance and Internal Operations**

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: **Kathy Demsey**

Title of Proposal **AAC Revisions to the Minimum Budget Requirement**

Statutory Reference **§10-262j(e)**

Proposal Summary This proposal makes three changes to legislation that passed last session:

- 1) It removes an incorrect statutory reference, and bases the calculations for districts falling within the top 10 percent on the accountability index, a more holistic measure of district performance.
- 2) It requires SDE to utilize school classification criteria for category one schools, as outlined in Connecticut's school accountability system, and apply them on a district level when considering which districts will receive MBR relief. This ensures that districts that may be high performers but have achievement or graduation gaps or low participation in state assessments will not be eligible for MBR relief.
- 3) Requires both the elementary or elementary-middle school district and the regional middle-high or high school district to meet the criteria outlined in numbers 1 and 2 in order to be considered for MBR relief, if a district is a member of a middle-high school or high school region.

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

- **Reason for Proposal**

Please consider the following, if applicable:

- (1) Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary? **Yes**
- (2) Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)? **N/A**
- (3) Have certain constituencies called for this action? **N/A**
- (4) What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session? **Districts that are failing our most vulnerable students (i.e. those with large achievement or graduation rate gaps) may be identified for MBR relief, when they should be targeting additional resources and supports to ensure the success of those very students.**



- **Origin of Proposal** **New Proposal** **Resubmission**

If this is a resubmission, please share: *These should be answered only if it is a resubmission*

- (1) What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?
- (2) Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?
- (3) Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?
- (4) What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?

PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency) *Please only complete this section if you have already been working with another agency. If not, I will reach out to the appropriate agency's legislative liaison upon approval from the Commissioner.*

Agency Name: **None**

Agency Contact (name, title, phone):

Date Contacted:

Approve of Proposal YES NO Talks Ongoing

Summary of Affected Agency's Comments

Will there need to be further negotiation? YES NO

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation) *There would be a fiscal impact for municipalities who are granted relief from the MBR.*

State

Federal

Additional notes on fiscal impact



- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

By section, what is the impact of this proposal?

This proposal will 1) provide a more holistic framework to identify districts eligible for MBR relief and 2) will institute safeguards to ensure that this fiscal relief is not at the expense of our most vulnerable students.

Insert fully drafted bill here

(e) For the fiscal years ending June 30, 2016, and June 30, 2017, the provisions of this section shall not apply to any district that [is] (1) is in the top ten per cent of school districts based on the accountability index, as defined in subdivision (1) of subsection (a) of section 10-223e, as amended by section 326 of Public Act 15-5 of the June Special Session [district performance index, as defined in section 10-262u.]; and (2) would be classified as category one if the school classification criteria in the state-wide performance management and support plan prepared pursuant to subdivision (3) of subsection (b) of section 10-223e were applied to the district. For the purposes of this subsection, if a district is a member of a middle-high school or high school region, both the elementary or elementary-middle school district and the regional middle-high or high school district must meet the criteria in subdivisions (1) and (2) .



Agency Legislative Proposal - 2016 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc): **Leave this blank**

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: Connecticut State Department of Education

Liaison: Laura J. Stefon
Phone: (860) 713 – 6493
E-mail: laura.stefon@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Division of Finance and Internal Operations

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: Kathy Demsey

Title of Proposal : An Act Concerning the Alliance District Grant

Statutory Reference : Section 10-262u, as amended by PA 15-5, June Special Session

Proposal Summary

This proposal would provide legislative authority for the department to limit carryforward of Alliance District funds to 3% of the amount received in the prior fiscal year and to expend them in accordance with their approved Alliance District plan.

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

- Reason for Proposal

Please consider the following, if applicable:

- (1) *Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary? **Yes or no; If yes, please explain***
- (2) *Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)? **Yes or no***
- (3) *Have certain constituencies called for this action? **Outside groups, task forces, other state agencies, etc.***
- (4) *What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session? **Explain what happens if this does not pass***

Fiscal Year 2017 will be the fifth year of the department's implementation of the Alliance District program created as part of Governor Malloy's Education Reform legislation in 2012. Funding dedicated to the Alliance District program will reach \$ 148.7 million. This proposal would implement a process improvement based on what the department has learned administering the program over the last four years.

Current legislation allows districts to carryforward all unexpended Alliance District grant funds into the following year in an unrestricted fashion. Our proposal would limit the carryforward amount to 3% of the grant received in any one year and require approval of its use in accordance with the statutory



requirements related to approving activities to be included in Alliance District plans. The unrestricted carryforward language was necessary when the department was developing the program as approval of districts' plans came too late in the fiscal year for them to responsibly expend all of the grant funds in the current year. However four years later, we are still finding that districts are carrying forward as much as 50% of their current funding into the following year and in certain cases using it to support anticipated funding shortfalls. The most critical impact of this is that important parts of their approved plans to improve local educational opportunities are either not being carried out or greatly delayed. Since it is not unreasonable to believe that districts may have small amounts of funds left if they've modified strategies during the course of the year or been delayed in implementing certain activities, the department is requesting a cap on the amount of carryover and approval by the Commissioner of the use of those funds.

- **Origin of Proposal** **New Proposal** **Resubmission**

*If this is a resubmission, please share: **These should be answered only if it is a resubmission***

- (1) *What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?*
- (2) *Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?*
- (3) *Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?*
- (4) *What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?*

PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency) **Please only complete this section if you have already been working with another agency. If not, I will reach out to the appropriate agency's legislative liaison upon approval from the Commissioner.**

Agency Name: N/A Agency Contact (name, title, phone): Date Contacted: Approve of Proposal <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> Talks Ongoing
Summary of Affected Agency's Comments
Will there need to be further negotiation? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO



- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation) **Impact on LEAs or municipalities – cost or savings.**

N/A

State **In addition to costs to the State/Department, please include additional staffing needs to implement, if any.**

N/A

Federal **Please note if any federal funds are received, used, etc. as a result of this proposal.**

N/A

Additional notes on fiscal impact

- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

By section, what is the impact of this proposal?

The impact of this proposal is to provide greater assurance that the state's significant investment in education in our neediest districts is being directed to the efforts most likely to achieve a positive impact on students' educational outcomes.

Insert fully drafted bill here

Subsection (h) of section 10-262u, of the Connecticut General Statutes shall be amended as follows:

Up to three percent of the funds paid to a [Any balance remaining for each] local or regional board of education pursuant to this section may, at the end of any fiscal year **[shall]**, be carried forward for such local or regional board of education for use in accordance with a plan approved pursuant to subsection (d) of this section and the provisions of subsection (c) of section 10-262i in the next fiscal year.