

# VI .A.

## CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION Hartford

TO BE PROPOSED:  
January 6, 2016

RESOLVED, That the State Board of Education adopts the 2016 Legislative Proposals and directs the Commissioner to take the necessary action.

Approved by a vote of \_\_\_\_ this sixth day of January, Two Thousand Sixteen.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Dianna R. Wentzell, Secretary  
State Board of Education



## 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: <b>None</b> Agency Contact (name, title, phone): Date Contacted:  Approve of Proposal    ___ YES    ___ NO    ___ Talks Ongoing
<b>Summary of Affected Agency's Comments</b>   
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)

<b>Municipal</b> (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation) <i>There would be a fiscal impact for municipalities who are granted relief from the MBR.</i>
<b>State</b>
<b>Federal</b>
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) .