

# VII.A.

## Connecticut State Board of Education Hartford

**To Be Proposed:**  
December 7, 2022

**Resolved**, That the State Board of Education adopts these 2023 Legislative Proposals and directs the Commissioner to take the necessary action.

Approved by a vote of \_\_\_\_\_ this seventh day of December, Two Thousand Twenty Two.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Charlene M. Russell-Tucker, Secretary  
State Board of Education



**Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session**

**Document Name:**

<b>Document Name</b>	<b>Changes to the Alliance District Statutes</b>
----------------------	--

**Naming Format:** AGENCY ACRONYM PROPOSAL NUMBER - TOPIC

*Please insert a copy of the fully drafted bill at the end of this document (required for review)*

<b>Legislative Liaison</b>	<b>Laura Stefon</b>
<b>Division Requesting This Proposal</b>	<b>Division of Finance and Internal Operations</b>
<b>Drafter</b>	<b>Kathy Demsey</b>

<b>Title of Proposal</b>	
<b>Statutory Reference, if any</b>	<b>10-262h, CGS 10-262u, CGS</b>
<b>Brief Summary and Statement of Purpose</b>	<b>This proposal fixes several changes made to the Alliance District statute during the most recent legislative session that have unintended consequences for the department and the grantees.</b>

**SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY**

*Summarize sections in groups where appropriate*

<p><b>Section 1 of our proposal allows the Alliance District program to be automatically renewed every 5 years and caps the number of districts identified at 33. These 33 will receive from the department the extra intensive supports necessary to improve student outcomes. It also allows any district that has ever been identified as an Alliance District to keep that designation for the purposes of calculating their ECS grant and receiving Alliance District funds. They will also receive support from the department but at a less intensive level.</b></p>
---



**Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session**

**Document Name:**

Prior to this the program had to be reauthorized by the legislature every 5 years leading to budget uncertainty and an inability to plan for the current Alliance Districts, the districts that were being newly identified, and those that should have “graduated” from the program. The end result was each of the last 2 times the program was reauthorized no district was allowed to “graduate” from the program and instead an increasing number of school districts are now being identified as Alliance Districts. Graduating from the program should be celebrated as it means the additional, targeted resources have worked to improve student outcomes. Fear over losing resources if you “graduate” undermines the goals of program. This change will eliminate that concern.

Second, our proposal makes the look back period for calculating a district’s Alliance District grant the same for the 3 newly identified districts as the previously identified districts. All Alliance Districts will now use FY 2012 as the base year for calculating their Alliance District grant. By imposing a base year of FY 2021 for the new Alliance Districts it reduced the amount of funding the new districts would receive to implement the educational improvement strategies required by the program.

Section 2 of our proposal specifically includes districts that are no longer Alliance Districts but were previously identified as Alliance Districts to still be considered Alliance Districts for the purpose of calculating their Education Cost Sharing (ECS) grant. As the ECS formula phases in to “full funding” it would be possible for an Alliance District that lost that designation to see a decline in their ECS grant if they are currently considered “over-funded”. Our proposal would hold them harmless to the funding level they received as an Alliance District. The goal being continued funding for the initiatives that have helped improve their student outcomes.

**BACKGROUND**

Origin of Proposal             New Proposal                             Resubmission

If this is a resubmission, please share the prior bill number, the reason the bill did not move forward, and any changes made or conversations had since it was last proposed:

*Please consider the following, if applicable:*

Have there been changes in federal/state laws or regulations that make this	Yes, this proposal addresses changes made in the most recent session that modified the program
---	--



**Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session**

**Document Name:**

<b>legislation necessary?</b>	
<b>Has this proposal or a similar proposal been implemented in other states? If yes, to what result?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Have certain constituencies called for this proposal?</b>	

**INTERAGENCY IMPACT**

*List each affected agency. Copy the table as needed.*

**[ X ] Check here if this proposal does NOT impact other agencies**

<b>1. Agency Name</b>	
<b>Agency Contact (name, title)</b>	
<b>Date Contacted</b>	
<b>Status</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Approved</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Talks Ongoing</b>
<b>Open Issues, if any</b>	

**FISCAL IMPACT**

*Include the section number(s) responsible for the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact*



**Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session**

**Document Name:**

Check here if this proposal does NOT have a fiscal impact

<b>State</b>	The potential impact to state funding is a future one and would occur only if a district that was no longer an Alliance District was also a district that was considered “over-funded” under current ECS statute. Our proposal would hold them harmless to their current level of funding.
<b>Municipal (Include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation)</b>	For Enfield and Stratford their communities will have to increase their contribution to the school district to continue to meet the Minimum Budget Requirement (MBR). Alliance District funds are a carve out from the town’s ECS grant. These funds now go to the district directly instead of to the town which would have appropriated them to the district as part of their budget. Under the MBR, towns cannot reduce their budgeted appropriation to the school district. Therefore, they will need to increase their local share of the school district budget to replace the ECS funds that are now going directly to the district.
<b>Federal</b>	N/A
<b>Additional notes</b>	

**MONITORING & EVALUATION PLAN**

*If applicable, please describe the anticipated measurable outcomes and the data that will be used to track those outcomes. Include the section number(s) responsible for those outcomes*

Check here if this proposal does NOT lead to any measurable outcomes

**ANYTHING ELSE WE SHOULD KNOW?**



[Empty rectangular box for document name]

INSERT FULLY DRAFTED BILL HERE

Alliance Districts

Sec. 1 - Subsections (a) to (c), inclusive, of section 10-262u of the 2022 supplement to the general statutes, as amended by section 266 of Public Act 22-118, are repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof: **(1) (A) For fiscal years ending June 20, 2012 to July 1, 2027, "Alliance District" means a school district for a town that (i) is among the towns with the thirty-three lowest accountability index scores, as calculated by the Department of Education, or (ii) was previously designated under this section as an alliance district by the Commissioner of Education; (B) For fiscal years ending June 30, 2028 and each fiscal year thereafter, "Alliance District" means a school district for a town that is among the towns with the thirty-three lowest accountability index scores, as calculated by the Department of Education.** [(a) As used in this section and section 10-262i: (1) "Alliance district" means a school district for a town that (A) is among the towns with the [thirty] thirty-three lowest accountability index scores, as calculated by the Department of Education, or (B) was previously designated as an alliance district by the Commissioner of Education [for the fiscal years ending June 30, 2013, to June 30, 2022, inclusive]. (2) "Accountability index" has the same meaning as provided in section 10-223e. (3) "Mastery test data of record" has the same meaning as provided in section 10-262f. (4) "Educational reform district" means an alliance district that is among the ten lowest accountability index scores when all towns are ranked highest to lowest in accountability index scores.

(b) (1) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013, the Commissioner of Education shall designate thirty school districts as alliance districts. Any school district designated as an alliance district shall be so designated for a period of five years. On or before June 30, 2016, the Department of Education shall determine if there are any additional alliance districts. (2) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2018, the commissioner shall designate thirty-three school districts as alliance districts. Any school district designated as an alliance district shall be so designated for a period of five years. (3) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2023, the commissioner shall designate thirty-six school districts as alliance districts. Any school district designated as an alliance district shall be so designated for a period of five years. **(4) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2028, and every five-year period after that, the commissioner shall designate thirty-three school districts as alliance districts. Any school district previously identified as an Alliance District but no longer among the towns with the thirty-three lowest accountability index**



## Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session

Document Name:

**scores, as calculated by the Department of Education shall retain the designation for the purpose of subsection (c)(1) of this section and section 10-262h. Any school district designated as an alliance district shall be so designated for a period of five years.**

(c) (1) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2023, [and each fiscal year thereafter,] the Comptroller shall withhold from any town that (A) was designated as an alliance district pursuant to subdivision (2) of subsection (b) of this section any increase in funds received over the amount the town received for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012, pursuant to subsection (a) of section 10-262i, and (B) was designated as an alliance district for the first time pursuant to subdivision (3) of subsection (b) of this section, any increase in funds received over the amount the town received for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2022, pursuant to subsection (a) of section 10-262i. **For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2024, and each fiscal year thereafter, the Comptroller shall withhold from any town that was designated an alliance district pursuant to subdivisions (2) and (3) of subsection (b) of this section any increase in funds received over the amount the town received for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012, pursuant to subsection (a) of section 10-262i.** The Comptroller shall transfer such funds to the Commissioner of Education.

(2) Upon receipt of an application pursuant to subsection (d) of this section or section 10-156gg, the Commissioner of Education may pay such funds to the town designated as an alliance district and such town shall pay all such funds to the local or regional board of education for such town on the condition that such funds shall be expended in accordance with (A) the plan described in subsection (d) of this section, (B) the minority candidate certification, retention or residency year program pursuant to section 10-156gg, (C) the provisions of subsection (c) of section 10-262i, and (D) any guidelines developed by the State Board of Education for such funds. Such funds shall be used to improve student achievement and recruit and retain minority teachers in such alliance district and to offset any other local education costs approved by the commissioner.

Section 2 - Section 10-262h of the 2022 supplement to the general statutes, **as amended by section 267, of Public Act 22-118,** is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof: (a) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2018, each town maintaining public schools according to law shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant as follows: (1) Any town designated as an alliance district, as defined in section 10-262u, shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to its base grant amount; and (2) any town not designated as an alliance district shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to ninety-five per cent of its base grant amount. (b) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2019, each town maintaining public schools according to law shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant as follows: (1) Any town whose fully funded grant is greater than its base grant amount shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to its base grant amount plus four and one-tenth per cent of its grant adjustment; and (2) any town whose fully funded grant is less than its base grant amount shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to its base grant amount minus twenty-five per cent of its grant adjustment, except any such town designated as an alliance district shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to its base grant amount. (c) For the fiscal years ending June 30, 2020, and June 30, 2021, each town maintaining public schools according to law shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant as follows: (1) Any town whose fully funded grant is greater than its



## Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session

Document Name:

base grant amount shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year plus ten and sixty-six-onehundredths per cent of its grant adjustment; and (2) any town whose fully funded grant is less than its base grant amount shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year minus eight and thirty-threeone-hundredths per cent of its grant adjustment, except any such town designated as an alliance district shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to its base grant amount. (d) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2022, each town maintaining public schools according to law shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant as follows: (1) Any town whose fully funded grant is greater than its base grant amount shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year plus ten and sixty-six-onehundredths per cent of its grant adjustment; and (2) any town whose fully funded grant is less than its base grant amount shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to the amount the town was entitled to for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2021. (e) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2023, each town maintaining public schools according to law shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant as follows: (1) Any town whose fully funded grant is greater than its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year plus sixteen and sixty-seven-one-hundredths per cent of its grant adjustment; and (2) any town whose fully funded grant is less than its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to the amount the town was entitled to for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2022. (f) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2024, each town maintaining public schools according to law shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant as follows: (1) Any town whose fully funded grant is greater than its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year plus twenty per cent of its grant adjustment; (2) any town whose fully funded grant is less than its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year minus fourteen and twenty-nine-one-hundredths per cent of its grant adjustment; and (3) any town designated as an alliance district shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount that is the greater of (A) the amount described in either subdivision (1) of this subsection or subdivision (2) of this subsection, as applicable, (B) its base grant amount, or (C) its equalization aid grant entitlement for the previous fiscal year. (g) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2025, each town maintaining public schools according to law shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant as follows: (1) Any town whose fully funded grant is greater than its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year plus twentyfive per cent of its grant adjustment; (2) any town whose fully funded grant is less than its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year minus sixteen and sixty-seven-one-hundredths per cent of its grant adjustment; and (3) any town designated as an alliance district shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount that is the greater of (A) the amount described in either subdivision (1) of this subsection or subdivision (2) of this subsection, as applicable, (B) its base grant





## Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session

Document Name:

amount, or (C) its equalization aid grant entitlement for the previous fiscal year. (h) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2026, each town maintaining public schools according to law shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant as follows: (1) Any town whose fully funded grant is greater than its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year plus thirty-three and thirty-three-one-hundredths per cent of its grant adjustment; (2) any town whose fully funded grant is less than its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year minus twenty per cent of its grant adjustment; and (3) any town designated as an alliance district shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount that is the greater of (A) the amount described in either subdivision (1) of this subsection or subdivision (2) of this subsection, as applicable, (B) its base grant amount, or (C) its equalization aid grant entitlement for the previous fiscal year. (i) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2027, each town maintaining public schools according to law shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant as follows: (1) Any town whose fully funded grant is greater than its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year plus fifty per cent of its grant adjustment; (2) any town whose fully funded grant is less than its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year minus twenty-five per cent of its grant adjustment; and (3) any town designated as an alliance district shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount that is the greater of (A) the amount described in either subdivision (1) of this subsection or subdivision (2) of this subsection, as applicable, (B) its base grant amount, or (C) its equalization aid grant entitlement for the previous fiscal year. (j) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2028, each town maintaining public schools according to law shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant as follows: (1) Any town whose fully funded grant is greater than its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to its fully funded grant; (2) any town whose fully funded grant is less than its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year minus thirtythree and thirty-three-one-hundredths per cent of its grant adjustment; and (3) any town designated as an alliance district **and any town that was previously designated under section 12-262u as an alliance district** shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount that is the greater of (A) the amount described in either subdivision (1) of this subsection or subdivision (2) of this subsection, as applicable, (B) its base grant amount, or (C) its equalization aid grant entitlement for the previous fiscal year. (k) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2029, each town maintaining public schools according to law shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant as follows: (1) Any town whose fully funded grant is greater than its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to its fully funded grant; (2) any town whose fully funded grant is less than its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to its equalization aid grant amount for the previous fiscal year minus fifty per cent of its grant adjustment; and (3) any town designated as an alliance district **and any town that was previously designated under section 12-262u as an alliance**



## Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session

Document Name:

**district** shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount that is the greater of (A) the amount described in either subdivision (1) of this subsection or subdivision (2) of this subsection, as applicable, (B) its base grant amount, or (C) its equalization aid grant entitlement for the previous fiscal year. (I) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2030, and each fiscal year thereafter, each town maintaining public schools according to law shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount equal to its fully funded grant, except any town designated as an alliance district **and any town that was previously designated under section 12-262u as an alliance district** shall be entitled to an equalization aid grant in an amount that is the greater of (1) its fully funded grant, (2) its base grant amount, or (3) its equalization aid grant entitlement for the previous fiscal year.



## Agency Legislative Proposal - 2023 Session

**Document Name:** Technical Revisions to Educator Evaluation and Support  
**Educator Evaluation Revisions**

(If submitting electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092621\_SDE\_TechRevisions)

State Agency: CT Department of Education (CSDE)

**Liaison:** Laura 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: Dr. Shuana Tucker, Chief Talent Officer

**Title of Proposal:** Educator Evaluation and Support

**Statutory Reference:** 10-151(b)

**Proposal Summary:**

Revise current legislation 10-151b(c) to provide legal authority to the Commissioner of Education to recommend changes to the CT Guidelines for Educator Evaluation and Support (Guidelines) to the State Board of Education (SBE), and for the SBE to have the legal authority to adopt recommended changes. The Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC) shall recommend proposed changes to the Guidelines for the Commissioner of Education to consider. Currently, the Guidelines must align with 10-151b(c), and changes to some components of the Guidelines are not possible without changing legislation.

Revise current legislation to provide the Commissioner of Education legal authority to waive the provisions of 10-151b(2)(d) for any local or regional board of education that has expressed an intent.

### 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?
- (2) Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)? Are other states considering something similar this year?
- (3) Have certain constituencies called for this action?
- (4) What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session?

The 2012 Statute outlined new requirements for educator evaluation and support. As districts have implemented their educator evaluation and support plans (EESPs), beginning in 2013, aligned to the requirements in the CT Guidelines for Educator Evaluation and Support, new and innovative strategies to support the continuous improvement of educator practice are



emerging. Some of these strategies reflect best practices in the field of education, but do not align with what is currently in Statute.  
 The current Statute does not provide the Commissioner of Education the legal authority to waive provisions 10-151b(2)(d) for any local or regional board of education that has expressed an intent after July 1, 2013.

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)*

<b>Agency Name:</b> CT Department of Education <b>Agency Contact (name, title, phone):</b> Charlene Russell-Tucker, Commissioner of Education, 860.713.6500 <b>Date Contacted:</b>
Approve of Proposal <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> Talks Ongoing
<b>Summary of Affected Agency’s Comments</b>
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)*

<b>Municipal</b> <i>(please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation)</i> None
<b>State</b> None



**Federal**

None

**Additional notes on fiscal impact**

◇ **POLICY and PROGRAMMATIC IMPACTS** *(Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)*

◇ **EVIDENCE BASE**

*What data will be used to track the impact of this proposal over time, and what measurable outcome do you anticipate? Is that data currently available or must it be developed? Please provide information on the measurement and evaluation plan. Where possible, those plans should include process and outcome components. Pew MacArthur Results First [evidence definitions](#) can help you to establish the evidence-base for your program and their [Clearinghouse](#) allows for easy access to information about the evidence base for a variety of programs.*

The CSDE Talent Office monitors the implementation of district implementation of educator evaluation and support plans (EESP). Districts must annually confirm their continued use of their most recent CSDE-approved EESP or submit a proposal for an amendment to their current EESP. The Talent Office will highlight emerging ‘best practices’ for consideration in other districts.

**Insert fully drafted bill here**

**§ 10-151b. Teacher evaluations. Teacher evaluation and support program; development; adoption; implementation; guidelines**

(a) The superintendent of each local or regional board of education shall annually evaluate or cause to be evaluated each teacher, and for the school year commencing July 1, [2013] **2023**, and each school year thereafter, such annual evaluations shall be the teacher evaluation and support program adopted pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. The superintendent may conduct additional formative evaluations toward producing an annual summative evaluation. An evaluation pursuant to this subsection shall include, but need not be limited to, strengths, areas needing improvement, strategies for improvement and multiple indicators of student academic growth. Claims of failure to follow the established procedures of such teacher evaluation and support program shall be subject to the grievance procedure in collective bargaining agreements negotiated subsequent to July 1, 2004. In the event that a teacher does not receive a summative evaluation during the school year, such teacher shall receive a “not rated” designation for such school year. The superintendent shall report



(1) the status of teacher evaluations to the local or regional board of education on or before June first of each year, and (2) the status of the implementation of the teacher evaluation and support program, including the frequency of evaluations, aggregate evaluation ratings, the number of teachers who have not been evaluated and other requirements as determined by the Department of Education, to the Commissioner of Education on or before September fifteenth of each year. For purposes of this section, the term “teacher” shall include each professional employee of a board of education, below the rank of superintendent, who holds a certificate or permit issued by the State Board of Education.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, not later than **[September 1, 2013,], October 1 of each year**, each local and regional board of education shall adopt and implement a teacher evaluation and support program that is consistent with the guidelines for a model teacher evaluation and support program adopted by the State Board of Education, pursuant to subsection (c) of this section. Such teacher evaluation and support program shall be developed through mutual agreement between the local or regional board of education and the professional development and evaluation committee for the school district, established pursuant to subsection (b) of [section 10-220a](#). If a local or regional board of education is unable to develop a teacher evaluation and support program through mutual agreement with such professional development and evaluation committee, then such board of education and such professional development and evaluation committee shall consider the model teacher evaluation and support program adopted by the State Board of Education, pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, and such board of education may adopt, through mutual agreement with such professional development and evaluation committee, such model teacher evaluation and support program. If a local or regional board of education and the professional development and evaluation committee are unable to mutually agree on the adoption of such model teacher evaluation and support program, then such board of education shall adopt and implement a teacher evaluation and support program developed by such board of education, provided such teacher evaluation and support program is consistent with the guidelines adopted by the State Board of Education, pursuant to subsection (c) of this section. Each local and regional board of education may commence implementation of the teacher evaluation and support program adopted pursuant to this subsection in accordance with a teacher evaluation and support program implementation plan adopted pursuant to subsection (d) of this section.

(c) (1) On or before July 1, 2012, the State Board of Education shall adopt, in consultation with the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council established pursuant to [section 10-151d](#), guidelines for a model teacher evaluation and support program. Such guidelines shall include, but not be limited to, (A) the use of **[four]** performance evaluations designators **[Exemplary, proficient, developing and below standard]**; (B) the use of multiple indicators of student academic growth and development in teacher evaluations; (C) methods for assessing student **academic** growth and development; (D) a consideration of control factors tracked by the state-wide public school information system, pursuant to subsection (c) of [section 10-10a](#), that may influence teacher performance ratings, including, but not limited to, student characteristics, student attendance and student mobility; (E) minimum requirements for teacher evaluation instruments and procedures, including scoring systems to determine **[exemplary, proficient, developing and below standard]** **summative** ratings; (F) the



development and implementation of periodic training programs regarding the teacher evaluation and support program to be offered by the local or regional board of education or regional educational service center for the school district to teachers who are employed by such local or regional board of education and whose performance is being evaluated and to administrators who are employed by such local or regional board of education and who are conducting performance evaluations; (G) the provision of professional development services based on the individual or group of individuals' needs that are identified through the evaluation process; (H) the creation of individual teacher improvement and remediation plans for teachers whose **summative rating performance demonstrates a need for additional support to meet criteria established for educator practice and performance and/or student academic growth and development** [is developing or below standard], designed in consultation with such teacher and his or her exclusive bargaining representative for certified teachers chosen pursuant to **section 10-153b**, and that (i) identify resources, support and other strategies to be provided by the local or regional board of education to address documented deficiencies, (ii) indicate a timeline for implementing such resources, support, and other strategies, in the course of the same school year as the plan is issued, and (iii) include indicators of success including a summative rating of proficient or better immediately at the conclusion of the improvement and remediation plan; (I) opportunities for career development and professional growth; and (J) a validation procedure to audit evaluation **summative** ratings [of exemplary or below standard] by the department or a third-party entity approved by the department.

(2) **Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (c)(1) of this section, [T]the** State Board of Education [shall, following the completion of the teacher evaluation and support pilot program, pursuant to **section 10-151f**, and the submission of the study of such pilot program, pursuant to **section 10-151g**, review and] may revise, as necessary, the guidelines for a model teacher evaluation and support program and the model teacher evaluation and support program adopted under this subsection.

(d) A local or regional board of education may phase in full implementation of the teacher evaluation and support program adopted pursuant to subsection (b) of this section during the school years commencing [July 1, 2013] **July 1, 2023**, and [July 1, 2014] **July 1, 2024**, pursuant to a teacher evaluation and support program implementation plan adopted by the State Board of Education, in consultation with the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council, not later than July 1, 2013. The Commissioner of Education may waive the provisions of subsection (b) of this section and the implementation plan provisions of this subsection for any local or regional board of education that has expressed an intent **and rationale** [, not later than July 1, 2013,] to adopt a teacher evaluation program for which such board requests a waiver in accordance with this subsection **and subsection (b) of 10-151b.**



**Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session**

**Document Name:**

<b>Document Name</b>	<b>Citation Correction: C.G.S. Section 10-15f</b>
----------------------	---

**Naming Format:** AGENCY ACRONYM PROPOSAL NUMBER - TOPIC

*Please insert a copy of the fully drafted bill at the end of this document (required for review)*

<b>Legislative Liaison</b>	<b>Laura Stefon</b>
<b>Division Requesting This Proposal</b>	<b>Division of Legal and Governmental Affairs</b>
<b>Drafter</b>	<b>Laura Anastasio</b>

<b>Title of Proposal</b>	<b>Citation Correction in the Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children</b>
<b>Statutory Reference, if any</b>	<b>C.G.S. Section 10-15f, Article II(A) and Article III(A)(1)</b>
<b>Brief Summary and Statement of Purpose</b>	<b>To correct a citation error from 10 U.S.C. Section 1209 and 1211 to 10 U.S.C. Chapters 1209 and 1211.</b>

**SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY**

*Summarize sections in groups where appropriate*

**The model language of the Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children contained a citation error in Article II(A) and Article III(A)(1), both of which refer to “members of the National Guard and Reserve on active duty orders pursuant to 10 U.S.C. Section 1209 and 1211.” The provisions should both instead cite to 10 U.S.C. Chapters 1209 and 1211. This is a scrivener’s error in a section of the Compact which controls the scope of coverage. Since sections 1209 and 1211 do not relate to the National Guard and Reserves active duty status, the provision renders the group of students who were intended to be eligible for coverage effectively not covered by the Compact.**





**Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session**

**Document Name:**

**BACKGROUND**

**Origin of Proposal**

**New Proposal**

**Resubmission**

**If this is a resubmission, please share the prior bill number, the reason the bill did not move forward, and any changes made or conversations had since it was last proposed:**

*Please consider the following, if applicable:*

<b>Have there been changes in federal/state laws or regulations that make this legislation necessary?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Has this proposal or a similar proposal been implemented in other states? If yes, to what result?</b>	<b>Two states, Iowa and Vermont have correct citations in their Compact statutes. The remaining states will be making technical changes to correct this error within the next several legislative sessions.</b>
<b>Have certain constituencies called for this proposal?</b>	

**INTERAGENCY IMPACT**

*List each affected agency. Copy the table as needed.*

**Check here if this proposal does NOT impact other agencies**



**Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session**

**Document Name:**

<b>1. Agency Name</b>	<b>State Department of Education</b>
<b>Agency Contact (name, title)</b>	<b>Laura Stefon</b>
<b>Date Contacted</b>	<b>9/2/2022</b>
<b>Status</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Approved</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Talks Ongoing</b>
<b>Open Issues, if any</b>	

**FISCAL IMPACT**

*Include the section number(s) responsible for the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact*

**Check here if this proposal does NOT have a fiscal impact**

<b>State</b>	
<b>Municipal (Include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation)</b>	
<b>Federal</b>	
<b>Additional notes</b>	

**MONITORING & EVALUATION PLAN**

*If applicable, please describe the anticipated measurable outcomes and the data that will be used to track those outcomes. Include the section number(s) responsible for those outcomes*

**Check here if this proposal does NOT lead to any measurable outcomes**



**ANYTHING ELSE WE SHOULD KNOW?**

---

**INSERT FULLY DRAFTED BILL HERE**

**Sec. 10-15f. Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children.**

Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children.

ARTICLE I

PURPOSE

It is the purpose of this compact to remove barriers to educational success imposed on children of military families because of frequent moves and deployment of their parents by:

A. Facilitating the timely enrollment of children of military families and ensuring that they are not placed at a disadvantage due to difficulty in the transfer of education records from the previous school districts or variations in entrance or age requirements.

B. Facilitating the student placement process through which children of military families are not disadvantaged by variations in attendance requirements, scheduling, sequencing, grading, course content or assessment.

C. Facilitating the qualification and eligibility for enrollment, educational programs, and participation in extracurricular academic, athletic, and social activities.



- D. Facilitating the on-time graduation of children of military families.
- E. Providing for the promulgation and enforcement of administrative rules implementing the provisions of this compact.
- F. Providing for the uniform collection and sharing of information between and among member states, schools and military families under this compact.
- G. Promoting coordination between this compact and other compacts affecting military children.
- H. Promoting flexibility and cooperation between the educational system, parents and the student in order to achieve educational success for the student.

## ARTICLE II

### DEFINITIONS

As used in this compact, unless the context clearly requires a different construction:

- A. “Active duty” means full-time duty status in the active uniformed service of the United States, including members of the National Guard and Reserve on active duty orders pursuant to 10 USC [Section] Chapters 1209 and 1211.
- B. “Children of military families” means school-aged children, enrolled in kindergarten through twelfth grade, in the household of an active duty member.
- C. “Compact commissioner” means the voting representative of each compacting state appointed pursuant to Article VIII of this compact.
- D. “Deployment” means the period one month prior to the service members' departure from their home station on military orders to six months after return to their home station.
- E. “Educational records” means the official records, files, and data directly related to a student and maintained by the school or local education agency, including, but not limited, to records encompassing all the material kept in the student's cumulative folder such as general identifying data, records of attendance and of academic work



**Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session**

**Document Name:**

completed, records of achievement and results of evaluative tests, health data, disciplinary status, test protocols and individualized education programs.

F. “Extracurricular activities” means a voluntary activity sponsored by the school or local education agency or an organization sanctioned by the local education agency. Extracurricular activities include, but are not limited to, preparation for and involvement in public performances, contests, athletic competitions, demonstrations, displays and club activities.

G. “Interstate Commission on Educational Opportunity for Military Children” means the commission that is created under Article IX of this compact, which is generally referred to as the Interstate Commission.

H. “Local education agency” means a public authority legally constituted by the state as an administrative agency to provide control of and direction for kindergarten through twelfth grade public educational institutions.

I. “Member state” means a state that has enacted this compact.

J. “Military installation” means a base, camp, post, station, yard, center, homeport facility for any ship, or other activity under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, including any leased facility, which is located within any of the several states, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Marianas Islands and any other U.S. Territory. Such term does not include any facility used primarily for civil works, rivers and harbors projects, or flood control projects.

K. “Nonmember state” means a state that has not enacted this compact.

L. “Receiving state” means the state to which a child of a military family is sent, brought or caused to be sent or brought.

M. “Rule” means a written statement by the Interstate Commission promulgated pursuant to Article XII of this compact that is of general applicability, implements, interprets or prescribes a policy or provision of the compact, or an organizational, procedural or practice requirement of the Interstate Commission, and has the force and effect of statutory law in a member state, and includes the amendment, repeal or suspension of an existing rule.



**Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session**

**Document Name:**

N. “Sending state” means the state from which a child of a military family is sent, brought or caused to be sent or brought.

O. “State” means a state of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Marianas Islands and any other U.S. territory.

P. “Student” means the child of a military family for whom the local education agency receives public funding and who is formally enrolled in kindergarten through twelfth grade.

Q. “Transition” means (1) the formal and physical process of transferring from school to school, or (2) the period of time in which a student moves from one school in the sending state to another school in the receiving state.

R. “Uniformed services” means the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard as well as the Commissioned Corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and Public Health Services.

S. “Veteran” means a person who served in the uniformed services and who was discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable.

**ARTICLE III**

**APPLICABILITY**

A. Except as otherwise provided in Section B, this compact shall apply to the children of:

1. Active duty members of the uniformed services as defined in this compact, including members of the National Guard and Reserve on active duty orders pursuant to 10 USC [Section] Chapters 1209 and 1211;

2. Members or veterans of the uniformed services who are severely injured and medically discharged or retired for a period of one year after medical discharge or retirement; and

3. Members of the uniformed services who die on active duty or as a result of injuries sustained on active duty for a period of one year after death.



**Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session**

**Document Name:**

B. The provisions of this interstate compact shall only apply to local education agencies as defined in this compact.

C. The provisions of this compact shall not apply to the children of:

1. Inactive members of the National Guard and military reserves;
2. Members of the uniformed services now retired, except as provided in Section A;
3. Veterans of the uniformed services, except as provided in Section A of this Article;  
and
4. Other U.S. Dept. of Defense personnel and other federal agency civilian and contract employees not defined as active duty members of the uniformed services.



**Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session**

**Document Name:** SDE090222MagnetEnrollmentStandardsExtended

<b>Document Name</b>	SDE090222MagnetEnrollmentStandardsExtended
----------------------	--

**Naming Format:** AGENCY ACRONYM PROPOSAL NUMBER - TOPIC

*Please insert a copy of the fully drafted bill at the end of this document (required for review)*

<b>Legislative Liaison</b>	Laura Stefon Phone: (860) 713 – 6493 E-mail: <a href="mailto:laura.stefon@ct.gov">laura.stefon@ct.gov</a>
<b>Division Requesting This Proposal</b>	<b>Office of Strategic Planning and Partnership</b>
<b>Drafter</b>	Robin Colombo Cecere Phone: 860-713-6518 Email: <a href="mailto:robin.cecere@ct.gov">robin.cecere@ct.gov</a>

<b>Title of Proposal</b>	<b>An Act Extending the Dates for Magnet Enrollment Standards</b>
<b>Statutory Reference, if any</b>	C.G.S. §10-264/(a), (b)
<b>Brief Summary and Statement of Purpose</b>	This proposal extends the dates for application of statutory provisions relating to enrollment standards for interdistrict magnet schools pursuant to C.G.S. §§10-264/(a), (b).





**SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY**

*Summarize sections in groups where appropriate*

This proposal continues the period that the reduced-isolation and residency enrollment requirements for interdistrict magnet schools will apply to such schools from June 30, 2023 to each fiscal year thereafter to remain consistent with the settlement agreement in the *Sheff v. O’Neill* case and the policy for enrollment requirements outside of the Sheff region.

For C.G.S. §10-264/(a), the proposal extends the period interdistrict magnet schools must meet residency and reduced-isolation standards set by the Commissioner of Education beyond the existing end period of July 1, 2023, to every school year thereafter.

For C.G.S. §10-264/(b), the proposal extends the period that interdistrict magnet schools must meet residency and reduced-isolation standards set by the Commissioner of Education to qualify for the magnet operating grant beyond the existing end date of June 30, 2023, to every fiscal year thereafter.

**BACKGROUND**

Origin of Proposal       New Proposal       Resubmission

**If this is a resubmission, please share the prior bill number, the reason the bill did not move forward, and any changes made or conversations had since it was last proposed:**

*Please consider the following, if applicable:*

<b>Have there been changes in federal/state laws or regulations that make this legislation necessary?</b>	The parties to the <i>Sheff v. O’Neill</i> litigation entered a new stipulated agreement on January 26, 2022, which was approved by the General Assembly by operation of law on March 17, 2022, and approved by the Superior Court as a Court Order on March 21, 2022. The stipulated agreement sets enrollment goals for reducing isolation of Hartford-resident minority students through integrated educational options as articulated in the Comprehensive School Choice Plan (CCP).
<b>Has this proposal or a similar proposal been</b>	N/A



**Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session**

**Document Name: SDE090222MagnetEnrollmentStandardsExtended**

<b>implemented in other states? If yes, to what result?</b>	
<b>Have certain constituencies called for this proposal?</b>	N/A

**INTERAGENCY IMPACT**

*List each affected agency. Copy the table as needed.*

**[ X ] Check here if this proposal does NOT impact other agencies**

<b>1. Agency Name</b>	
<b>Agency Contact (name, title)</b>	
<b>Date Contacted</b>	
<b>Status</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Talks Ongoing
<b>Open Issues, if any</b>	

**FISCAL IMPACT**

*Include the section number(s) responsible for the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact*

**[X] Check here if this proposal does NOT have a fiscal impact**

<b>State</b>	
<b>Municipal (Include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation)</b>	



**Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session**

**Document Name: SDE090222MagnetEnrollmentStandardsExtended**

<b>Federal</b>	
<b>Additional notes</b>	

**MONITORING & EVALUATION PLAN**

*If applicable, please describe the anticipated measurable outcomes and the data that will be used to track those outcomes. Include the section number(s) responsible for those outcomes*

**[X] Check here if this proposal does NOT lead to any measurable outcomes**

**ANYTHING ELSE WE SHOULD KNOW?**

---

**INSERT FULLY DRAFTED BILL HERE**

Subsections (a) and (b), inclusive, of section 10-264I of the 2022 supplement to the general statutes are repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective July 1, 2023*):

(a) The Department of Education shall, within available appropriations, establish a grant program (1) to assist (A) local and regional boards of education, (B) regional educational service centers, (C) the Board of Trustees of the Community-Technical Colleges on behalf of Quinebaug Valley Community College and Three Rivers Community College, and (D) cooperative arrangements pursuant to section 10-158a, and (2) in assisting the state in meeting its



## Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session

Document Name: SDE090222MagnetEnrollmentStandardsExtended

obligations pursuant to the decision in *Sheff v. O'Neill*, 238 Conn. 1 (1996), or any related stipulation or order in effect, as determined by the commissioner, to assist (A) the Board of Trustees of the Community-Technical Colleges on behalf of a regional community-technical college, (B) the Board of Trustees of the Connecticut State University System on behalf of a state university, (C) the Board of Trustees of The University of Connecticut on behalf of the university, (D) the board of governors for an independent institution of higher education, as defined in subsection (a) of section 10a-173, or the equivalent of such a board, on behalf of the independent institution of higher education, and (E) any other third-party not-for-profit corporation approved by the commissioner with the operation of interdistrict magnet school programs. All interdistrict magnet schools shall be operated in conformance with the same laws and regulations applicable to public schools. For the purposes of this section “an interdistrict magnet school program” means a program which (i) supports racial, ethnic and economic diversity, (ii) offers a special and high quality curriculum, and (iii) requires students who are enrolled to attend at least half-time. An interdistrict magnet school program does not include a regional agricultural science and technology school, a technical education and career school or a regional special education center. For the school year[s] commencing July 1, 2017, and each school year thereafter**[to July 1, 2023, inclusive]**, the governing authority for each interdistrict magnet school program shall (I) restrict the number of students that may enroll in the school from a participating district to seventy-five per cent of the total school enrollment, and (II) maintain a total school enrollment that is in accordance with the reduced-isolation setting standards for interdistrict magnet school programs, developed by the Commissioner of Education pursuant to section 10-264r.

(b) (1) Applications for interdistrict magnet school program operating grants awarded pursuant to this section shall be submitted annually to the Commissioner of Education at such time and in such manner as the commissioner prescribes, except that on and after July 1, 2009, applications for such operating grants for new interdistrict magnet schools, other than those that the commissioner determines will assist the state in meeting its obligations pursuant to the decision in *Sheff v. O'Neill*, 238 Conn. 1 (1996), or any related stipulation or order in effect, as determined by the commissioner, shall not be accepted until the commissioner develops a comprehensive state-wide interdistrict magnet school plan. The commissioner shall submit such comprehensive state-wide interdistrict magnet school plan on or before October 1, 2016, to the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to education and appropriations.

(2) In determining whether an application shall be approved and funds awarded pursuant to this section, the commissioner shall consider, but such consideration shall not be limited to: (A) Whether the program offered by the school is likely to increase student achievement; (B) whether the program is likely to reduce racial, ethnic and economic isolation; (C) the percentage of the student enrollment in the program from each participating district; and (D) the proposed operating budget and the sources of funding for the interdistrict magnet school. For a magnet school not operated by a local or regional board of education, the commissioner shall only approve a proposed operating budget that, on a per pupil basis, does not exceed the maximum



## Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session

Document Name: SDE090222MagnetEnrollmentStandardsExtended

allowable threshold established in accordance with this subdivision. The maximum allowable threshold shall be an amount equal to one hundred twenty per cent of the state average of the quotient obtained by dividing net current expenditures, as defined in section 10-261, by average daily membership, as defined in said section, for the fiscal year two years prior to the fiscal year for which the operating grant is requested. The Department of Education shall establish the maximum allowable threshold no later than December fifteenth of the fiscal year prior to the fiscal year for which the operating grant is requested. If requested by an applicant that is not a local or regional board of education, the commissioner may approve a proposed operating budget that exceeds the maximum allowable threshold if the commissioner determines that there are extraordinary programmatic needs. For the fiscal years ending June 30, 2017, June 30, 2018, June 30, 2020, and June 30, 2021, in the case of an interdistrict magnet school that will assist the state in meeting its obligations pursuant to the decision in *Sheff v. O'Neill*, 238 Conn. 1 (1996), or any related stipulation or order in effect, as determined by the commissioner, the commissioner shall also consider whether the school is meeting the reduced-isolation setting standards for interdistrict magnet school programs, developed by the commissioner pursuant to section 10-264r. If such school has not met such reduced-isolation setting standards, it shall not be entitled to receive a grant pursuant to this section unless the commissioner finds that it is appropriate to award a grant for an additional year or years and approves a plan to bring such school into compliance with such reduced-isolation setting standards. If requested by the commissioner, the applicant shall meet with the commissioner or the commissioner's designee to discuss the budget and sources of funding.

(3) For the fiscal years ending June 30, 2018, **[to June 30, 2023, inclusive]** and each fiscal year thereafter, the commissioner shall not award a grant to an interdistrict magnet school program that (A) has more than seventy-five per cent of the total school enrollment from one school district, or (B) does not maintain a total school enrollment that is in accordance with the reduced-isolation setting standards for interdistrict magnet school programs, developed by the Commissioner of Education pursuant to section 10-264r, except the commissioner may award a grant to such school for an additional year or years if the commissioner finds it is appropriate to do so and approves a plan to bring such school into compliance with such residency or reduced-isolation setting standards.

(4) For the fiscal years ending June 30, 2018, to June 30, 2021, inclusive, if an interdistrict magnet school program does not maintain a total school enrollment that is in accordance with the reduced-isolation setting standards for interdistrict magnet school programs, developed by the commissioner pursuant to section 10-264r, for two or more consecutive years, the commissioner may impose a financial penalty on the operator of such interdistrict magnet school program, or take any other measure, in consultation with such operator, as may be appropriate to assist such operator in complying with such reduced-isolation setting standards.



**Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session**  
**Document Name: SDE090222MagnetFundingUpdate**

<b>Document Name</b>	SDE090222MagnetFundingUpdate
----------------------	------------------------------

**Naming Format: AGENCY ACRONYM PROPOSAL NUMBER - TOPIC**

***Please insert a copy of the fully drafted bill at the end of this document (required for review)***

<b>Legislative Liaison</b>	Laura Stefon Phone: (860) 713 – 6493 E-mail: <a href="mailto:laura.stefon@ct.gov">laura.stefon@ct.gov</a>
<b>Division Requesting This Proposal</b>	<b>Office of Strategic Planning and Partnership</b>
<b>Drafter</b>	Robin Colombo Cecere Phone: 860-713-6518 Email: <a href="mailto:robin.cecere@ct.gov">robin.cecere@ct.gov</a>

<b>Title of Proposal</b>	<b>An Act Concerning Interdistrict Magnet School Funding to Repeal Inapplicable Funding Structure</b>
<b>Statutory Reference, if any</b>	C.G.S. §§10-264/(c)(3)(C)(i),(ii) and
<b>Brief Summary and Statement of Purpose</b>	This proposal eliminates the funding provisions in C.G.S. §§10-264/(c)(3)(C)(i), (ii) that no longer apply to any existing magnet school and will not apply to any magnet school in the future.



**SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY**

*Summarize sections in groups where appropriate*

This proposal repeals C.G.S. §§10-264/(c)(3)(C)(i), (ii). These provisions provided a unique funding structure for Thomas Edison Magnet School based on enrollments of students from Meriden. The magnet school, operated by ACES, relocated to Waterbury as a new magnet school in 2021 under the name ACES at Chase. The statutory language no longer applies since it requires that the school began operations on July 1, 2001.

**BACKGROUND**

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

**If this is a resubmission, please share the prior bill number, the reason the bill did not move forward, and any changes made or conversations had since it was last proposed:**

*Please consider the following, if applicable:*

<b>Have there been changes in federal/state laws or regulations that make this legislation necessary?</b>	N/A
<b>Has this proposal or a similar proposal been implemented in other states? If yes, to what result?</b>	N/A



<b>Have certain constituencies called for this proposal?</b>	N/A
--	-----

**INTERAGENCY IMPACT**

*List each affected agency. Copy the table as needed.*

**[ X ] Check here if this proposal does NOT impact other agencies**

<b>1. Agency Name</b>	
<b>Agency Contact (name, title)</b>	
<b>Date Contacted</b>	
<b>Status</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Talks Ongoing
<b>Open Issues, if any</b>	

**FISCAL IMPACT**

*Include the section number(s) responsible for the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact*

**[X] Check here if this proposal does NOT have a fiscal impact**

<b>State</b>	
<b>Municipal (Include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation)</b>	
<b>Federal</b>	





<b>Additional notes</b>	

**MONITORING & EVALUATION PLAN**

*If applicable, please describe the anticipated measurable outcomes and the data that will be used to track those outcomes. Include the section number(s) responsible for those outcomes*

**[X] Check here if this proposal does NOT lead to any measurable outcomes**

**ANYTHING ELSE WE SHOULD KNOW?**

**INSERT FULLY DRAFTED BILL HERE**

Subsections (c)(3)(C)(i) to (c)(3)(C)(ii), inclusive, of section 10-264/ of the 2022 supplement to the general statutes are repealed (*Effective on passage*):

[(C) (i) For the fiscal years ending June 30, 2015, to June 30, 2019, inclusive, each interdistrict magnet school operated by a regional educational service center that began operations for the school year commencing July 1, 2001, and that for the school year commencing July 1, 2008, enrolled at least fifty-five per cent, but no more than eighty per cent of the school's students from a single town, shall receive a per pupil grant (I) for each enrolled student who is a resident of the district that enrolls at least fifty-five per cent, but no more than eighty per cent of the school's students, up to an amount equal to the total number of such enrolled students as of October 1, 2013, using the data of record, in the amount of eight thousand one hundred eighty dollars, (II) for each enrolled student who is a resident of the district that enrolls at least fifty-five per cent, but not more than eighty per cent of the school's students, in an amount greater than



**Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session**  
**Document Name: SDE090222MagnetFundingUpdate**

the total number of such enrolled students as of October 1, 2013, using the data of record, in the amount of three thousand dollars, (III) for each enrolled student who is not a resident of the district that enrolls at least fifty-five per cent, but no more than eighty per cent of the school's students, up to an amount equal to the total number of such enrolled students as of October 1, 2013, using the data of record, in the amount of eight thousand one hundred eighty dollars, and (IV) for each enrolled student who is not a resident of the district that enrolls at least fifty-five per cent, but not more than eighty per cent of the school's students, in an amount greater than the total number of such enrolled students as of October 1, 2013, using the data of record, in the amount of seven thousand eighty-five dollars.

(ii) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2020, and each fiscal year thereafter, each interdistrict magnet school operated by a regional educational service center that began operations for the school year commencing July 1, 2001, and that for the school year commencing July 1, 2008, enrolled at least fifty-five per cent, but not more than eighty per cent of the school's students from a single town, shall receive a per pupil grant (I) for each enrolled student who is a resident of the district that enrolls at least fifty-five per cent, but not more than eighty per cent of the school's students, up to an amount equal to the total number of such enrolled students as of October 1, 2013, using the data of record, in the amount of eight thousand three hundred forty-four dollars, (II) for each enrolled student who is a resident of the district that enrolls at least fifty-five per cent, but not more than eighty per cent of the school's students, in an amount greater than the total number of such enrolled students as of October 1, 2013, using the data of record, in the amount of three thousand sixty dollars, (III) for each enrolled student who is not a resident of the district that enrolls at least fifty-five per cent, but no more than eighty per cent of the school's students, up to an amount equal to the total number of such enrolled students as of October 1, 2013, using the data of record, in the amount of eight thousand three hundred forty-four dollars, and (IV) for each enrolled student who is not a resident of the district that enrolls at least fifty-five per cent, but not more than eighty per cent of the school's students, in an amount greater than the total number of such enrolled students as of October 1, 2013, using the data of record, in the amount of seven thousand two hundred twenty-seven dollars.]



**Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session**  
**Document Name: SDE090222MagnetRIStandard10-264r**

<b>Document Name</b>	SDE090222MagnetRIStandard10-264r
----------------------	----------------------------------

**Naming Format: AGENCY ACRONYM PROPOSAL NUMBER - TOPIC**

***Please insert a copy of the fully drafted bill at the end of this document (required for review)***

<b>Legislative Liaison</b>	Laura Stefon Phone: (860) 713 – 6493 E-mail: <a href="mailto:laura.stefon@ct.gov">laura.stefon@ct.gov</a>
<b>Division Requesting This Proposal</b>	<b>Office of Strategic Planning and Partnership</b>
<b>Drafter</b>	Robin Colombo Cecere Phone: 860-713-6518 Email: <a href="mailto:robin.cecere@ct.gov">robin.cecere@ct.gov</a>

<b>Title of Proposal</b>	<b>An Act Concerning Reduced Isolation Setting Standards for Interdistrict Magnet Schools</b>
<b>Statutory Reference, if any</b>	C.G.S. §10-264r
<b>Brief Summary and Statement of Purpose</b>	This proposal seeks to update the language in C.G.S. §10-264r to authorize the Commissioner of Education to update interdistrict enrollment standards as necessary to comply with the applicable stipulated agreements in the <i>Sheff v. O’Neill</i> case and legal considerations in the non-Sheff region.



**SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY**

*Summarize sections in groups where appropriate*

C.G.S. §10-264r authorizes the Commissioner of Education to develop reduced-isolation standards for interdistrict magnet schools for purposes of enrollment requirements pursuant to 10-264/ on or before July 1, 2017, and to develop an alternative reduced-isolation student enrollment percentage for an interdistrict magnet school located in the Sheff region on or before May 1, 2018. This proposal seeks to update the language in C.G.S. §10-264r to authorize the Commissioner of Education to update the reduced-isolation standards as necessary to comply with the applicable stipulated agreements in the *Sheff v. O’Neill* case and legal considerations in the non-Sheff region.

**BACKGROUND**

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

**If this is a resubmission, please share the prior bill number, the reason the bill did not move forward, and any changes made or conversations had since it was last proposed:**  
 A similar proposal was submitted in 2021 in Section 18 of SB 886. Since the 2021 submission, the state has entered into a final settlement agreement with the *Sheff* plaintiffs. This proposal seeks to update existing language in C.G.S. §10-264r to authorize the Commissioner of Education to update the reduced-isolation standards as necessary to comply with the most recent stipulated agreement in the *Sheff v. O’Neill* case and align with recent legal considerations in the non-Sheff region concerning enrollment requirements.

*Please consider the following, if applicable:*

<b>Have there been changes in federal/state laws or regulations that make this legislation necessary?</b>	The parties to the <i>Sheff v. O’Neill</i> litigation entered a new stipulated agreement on January 26, 2022, which was approved by the General Assembly by operation of law on March 17, 2022, and approved by the Superior Court as a Court Order on March 21, 2022. The stipulated agreement contains standards for reduced-isolation, which should be reflected in the Commissioner’s standards.
<b>Has this proposal or a similar proposal been implemented in other states? If yes, to what result?</b>	N/A



<b>Have certain constituencies called for this proposal?</b>	N/A

**INTERAGENCY IMPACT**

*List each affected agency. Copy the table as needed.*

**[ X ] Check here if this proposal does NOT impact other agencies**

<b>1. Agency Name</b>	
<b>Agency Contact (name, title)</b>	
<b>Date Contacted</b>	
<b>Status</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Approved</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Talks Ongoing</b>
<b>Open Issues, if any</b>	

**FISCAL IMPACT**

*Include the section number(s) responsible for the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact*

**[ X ] Check here if this proposal does NOT have a fiscal impact**

<b>State</b>	
<b>Municipal (Include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation)</b>	
<b>Federal</b>	



<b>Additional notes</b>	

**MONITORING & EVALUATION PLAN**

*If applicable, please describe the anticipated measurable outcomes and the data that will be used to track those outcomes. Include the section number(s) responsible for those outcomes*

**[X] Check here if this proposal does NOT lead to any measurable outcomes**

**ANYTHING ELSE WE SHOULD KNOW?**

---

**INSERT FULLY DRAFTED BILL HERE**

Section 10-264r of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective on passage*):

**Reduced-isolation setting standards.** Not later than July 1, ~~{2017}~~, the Commissioner of Education shall develop, and may revise as necessary, reduced-isolation ~~[setting]~~ enrollment standards for interdistrict magnet school programs that shall serve as the enrollment requirements for purposes of section 10-264l. Such standards shall (1) comply with the decision of Sheff v. O’Neill, 238 Conn. 1 (1996), or any related stipulation or order in effect, for an interdistrict magnet school program located in the Sheff region, (2) define the term “reduced-isolation student” for purposes of the standards, ~~[(2)]~~ (3) establish a requirement for the minimum percentage of reduced-isolation students that can be enrolled in an interdistrict magnet school program, provided such minimum percentage is not less than twenty per cent of



## Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session

Document Name: SDE090222MagnetRIStandard10-264r

the total school enrollment, ~~[(3)]~~(4) allow an interdistrict magnet school program to have a total school enrollment of reduced-isolation students that is not more than one per cent below the minimum percentage established by the commissioner, provided the commissioner approves a plan that is designed to bring the number of reduced-isolation students of such interdistrict magnet school program into compliance with the minimum percentage, and ~~[(4)]~~(5) for the school year commencing July 1, 2018, authorize the commissioner to establish on or before May 1, 2018, and as may be revised as necessary, an alternative reduced-isolation student enrollment percentage for an interdistrict magnet school program located in the Sheff region, as defined in subsection (k) of section 10-264l, provided the commissioner (A) determines that such alternative (i) increases opportunities for students who are residents of Hartford to access an educational setting with reduced racial isolation or other categories of diversity, including, but not limited to, geography, socioeconomic status, special education, English language learners and academic achievement, (ii) complies with the decision of Sheff v. O'Neill, 238 Conn. 1 (1996), or any related stipulation or order in effect, and (B) approves a plan for such interdistrict magnet school program that is designed to bring the number of reduced-isolation students of such interdistrict magnet school program into compliance with such alternative or the minimum percentage described in subdivision (2) of this section. Not later than May 1, 2018, the commissioner shall submit a report on each alternative reduced-isolation student enrollment percentage established, pursuant to subdivision (4) of this section, for an interdistrict magnet school program located in the Sheff region to the joint standing committee of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to education, in accordance with the provisions of section 11-4a. The reduced-isolation setting standards for interdistrict magnet school programs shall not be deemed to be regulations, as defined in section 4-166.



**Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session**  
**Document Name: SDE090222MagnetTuitionLimits**

<b>Document Name</b>	SDE090222MagnetTuitionLimits
----------------------	------------------------------

**Naming Format: AGENCY ACRONYM PROPOSAL NUMBER - TOPIC**

***Please insert a copy of the fully drafted bill at the end of this document (required for review)***

<b>Legislative Liaison</b>	Laura Stefon Phone: (860) 713 – 6493 E-mail: <a href="mailto:laura.stefon@ct.gov">laura.stefon@ct.gov</a>
<b>Division Requesting This Proposal</b>	<b>Office of Strategic Planning and Partnership</b>
<b>Drafter</b>	Robin Colombo Cecere Phone: 860-713-6518 Email: <a href="mailto:robin.cecere@ct.gov">robin.cecere@ct.gov</a>

<b>Title of Proposal</b>	<b>An Act Extending Limits on Local Boards of Education in the Sheff Region from Charging Magnet School Tuition</b>
<b>Statutory Reference, if any</b>	C.G.S. §10-264/(o)
<b>Brief Summary and Statement of Purpose</b>	This proposal extends the period prohibiting local boards of education that operate interdistrict magnet schools in the <i>Sheff</i> region from charging tuition for students enrolled in the school programs, with the exception of Hartford Public Schools which may charge tuition for students attending Great Path Academy.





**SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY**

*Summarize sections in groups where appropriate*

This proposal extends the period prohibiting local boards of education that operate interdistrict magnet schools in the *Sheff* region from charging tuition for students enrolled in the school programs, with the exception of Hartford Public Schools which may charge tuition for students attending Great Path Academy. Such local boards may not charge tuition for student enrollment since those districts continue not receive ECS for students enrolled in magnet schools and receive a higher per pupil magnet operating grant than RESC-operated magnet schools to compensate for the inability to charge tuition. Hartford Public Schools (HPS) may charge tuition for Great Path Academy since HPS operates Great Path Academy through a contract on behalf of Manchester Community College and does not receive direct financial benefit from student enrollments.

**BACKGROUND**

Origin of Proposal       New Proposal       Resubmission

**If this is a resubmission, please share the prior bill number, the reason the bill did not move forward, and any changes made or conversations had since it was last proposed:**

*Please consider the following, if applicable:*

<b>Have there been changes in federal/state laws or regulations that make this legislation necessary?</b>	N/A
<b>Has this proposal or a similar proposal been implemented in other states? If</b>	N/A



<b>yes, to what result?</b>	
<b>Have certain constituencies called for this proposal?</b>	N/A

**INTERAGENCY IMPACT**

*List each affected agency. Copy the table as needed.*

**[ X ] Check here if this proposal does NOT impact other agencies**

<b>1. Agency Name</b>	
<b>Agency Contact (name, title)</b>	
<b>Date Contacted</b>	
<b>Status</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Approved</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Talks Ongoing</b>
<b>Open Issues, if any</b>	

**FISCAL IMPACT**

*Include the section number(s) responsible for the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact*

**[ ] Check here if this proposal does NOT have a fiscal impact**

<b>State</b>	
<b>Municipal (Include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation)</b>	Local boards of education which operate interdistrict magnet schools are not permitted to charge sending districts for tuition for students enrolled in their magnet schools but such boards continue to receive ECS for their students enrolled in magnet schools and receive \$13,315 per pupil as their



	operating grant as compared to the \$10,652 per pupil received by RESCs.
<b>Federal</b>	
<b>Additional notes</b>	

**MONITORING & EVALUATION PLAN**

*If applicable, please describe the anticipated measurable outcomes and the data that will be used to track those outcomes. Include the section number(s) responsible for those outcomes*

**[X] Check here if this proposal does NOT lead to any measurable outcomes**

**ANYTHING ELSE WE SHOULD KNOW?**

---

**INSERT FULLY DRAFTED BILL HERE**

Subsection o of section 10-264l of the 2022 supplement to the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective on passage*):

(o) For the school years commencing July 1, 2009, [to July 1, 2018, inclusive] and each school year thereafter, any local or regional board of education operating an interdistrict magnet school pursuant to the decision in Sheff v. O'Neill, 238 Conn. 1 (1996), or any related stipulation or order in effect, shall not charge tuition for any student enrolled in a preschool program or in kindergarten to grade twelve, inclusive, in an interdistrict magnet school operated by such school



**Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session**  
**Document Name: SDE090222MagnetTuitionLimits**

district, except the Hartford school district may charge tuition for any student enrolled in the Great Path Academy.



**Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session**  
**Document Name: SDE090222SheffChoiceGrants**

<b>Document Name</b>	SDE090222SheffChoiceGrants
----------------------	----------------------------

**Naming Format: AGENCY ACRONYM PROPOSAL NUMBER - TOPIC**

***Please insert a copy of the fully drafted bill at the end of this document (required for review)***

<b>Legislative Liaison</b>	Laura Stefon Phone: (860) 713 – 6493 E-mail: <a href="mailto:laura.stefon@ct.gov">laura.stefon@ct.gov</a>
<b>Division Requesting This Proposal</b>	<b>Office of Strategic Planning and Partnership</b>
<b>Drafter</b>	Robin Colombo Cecere Phone: 860-713-6518 Email: <a href="mailto:robin.cecere@ct.gov">robin.cecere@ct.gov</a>

<b>Title of Proposal</b>	<b>An Act Concerning the Funding of Grants for Choice Programs with Funds Appropriated for Sheff Settlement</b>
<b>Statutory Reference, if any</b>	C.G.S. §10-262s
<b>Brief Summary and Statement of Purpose</b>	This proposal seeks to authorize the Commissioner of Education to make grant payments to voluntary interdistrict school choice school programs with funds appropriated for Sheff settlement for academic and social student support for programs that assist the state in meeting its obligation pursuant to the decision in <i>Sheff v. O’Neill</i> , 238 Conn. 1 (1996) or any related stipulation or order in effect. Currently, there is authority to issue academic and social support grants for magnet schools and Open Choice districts but not for other choice options. This language provides that authority for purposes of meeting the requirements of the Comprehensive School Choice Plan (CCP) in <i>Sheff</i> .



**SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY**

*Summarize sections in groups where appropriate*

To assist the state in meeting its obligations pursuant to the decision in *Sheff v. O'Neill*, 238 Conn. 1 (1996), or any related stipulation or order in effect, C.G.S. §10-262s authorizes the Commissioner of Education to transfer funds appropriated for the Sheff settlement to the following: (1) Grants for interdistrict cooperative programs pursuant to section 10-74d, (2) grants for state charter schools pursuant to section 10-66ee, (3) grants for the interdistrict public school attendance program pursuant to section 10-266aa, (4) grants for interdistrict magnet schools pursuant to section 10-264l, and (5) to the Technical Education and Career System for programming. This proposal adds language to C.G.S. §10-262s to authorize the Commissioner of Education to make grant payments to these same voluntary interdistrict school choice school programs with funds appropriated for Sheff settlement for academic and social student support programs that assist the state in meeting its obligation pursuant to the decision in *Sheff v. O'Neill*, 238 Conn. 1 (1996) or any related stipulation or order in effect. The most recent stipulated agreement in the *Sheff* case, the CCP, contains commitments to support various voluntary interdistrict school choice program academic and social support activities to assist the state in meeting its obligations in *Sheff* and this proposal provides a statutory basis for issuing grant payments that implement those activities using funds appropriated for Sheff settlement.

**BACKGROUND**

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

**If this is a resubmission, please share the prior bill number, the reason the bill did not move forward, and any changes made or conversations had since it was last proposed:**

*Please consider the following, if applicable:*

<b>Have there been changes in federal/state laws or regulations that make this</b>	The parties to the <i>Sheff v. O'Neill</i> litigation entered a new stipulated agreement on January 26, 2022, which was approved by the General Assembly by operation of law on March 17, 2022, and approved by the Superior Court as a Court Order on March 21, 2022. The stipulated agreement contains commitments to support various voluntary
--	---



**Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session**  
**Document Name: SDE090222SheffChoiceGrants**

<b>legislation necessary?</b>	interdistrict school choice program academic and social support activities to assist the state in meeting its obligations in <i>Sheff</i> .
<b>Has this proposal or a similar proposal been implemented in other states? If yes, to what result?</b>	N/A
<b>Have certain constituencies called for this proposal?</b>	N/A

**INTERAGENCY IMPACT**

*List each affected agency. Copy the table as needed.*

**[ X ] Check here if this proposal does NOT impact other agencies**

<b>1. Agency Name</b>	
<b>Agency Contact (name, title)</b>	
<b>Date Contacted</b>	
<b>Status</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Talks Ongoing
<b>Open Issues, if any</b>	

**FISCAL IMPACT**

*Include the section number(s) responsible for the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact*

**[X] Check here if this proposal does NOT have a fiscal impact**



<b>State</b>	
<b>Municipal (Include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation)</b>	
<b>Federal</b>	
<b>Additional notes</b>	

**MONITORING & EVALUATION PLAN**

*If applicable, please describe the anticipated measurable outcomes and the data that will be used to track those outcomes. Include the section number(s) responsible for those outcomes*

**[X] Check here if this proposal does NOT lead to any measurable outcomes**

**ANYTHING ELSE WE SHOULD KNOW?**

---

**INSERT FULLY DRAFTED BILL HERE**





**Agency Legislative Proposal – 2023 Session**  
**Document Name: SDE090222SheffChoiceGrants**

Section 10-262s of the 2022 supplement to the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective on passage*):

**Authority of Commissioner of Education to transfer and issue funds appropriated for Sheff settlement to certain grant programs.** **(a)** The Commissioner of Education may, to assist the state in meeting its obligations pursuant to the decision in *Sheff v. O'Neill*, 238 Conn. 1 (1996), or any related stipulation or order in effect, as determined by the Commissioner of Education, transfer funds appropriated for the Sheff settlement to the following: (1) Grants for interdistrict cooperative programs pursuant to section 10-74d, (2) grants for state charter schools pursuant to section 10-66ee, (3) grants for the interdistrict public school attendance program pursuant to section 10-266aa, (4) grants for interdistrict magnet schools pursuant to section 10-264l, and (5) to the Technical Education and Career System for programming.

(b) The Commissioner of Education may, to assist the state in meeting its obligations pursuant to the decision in *Sheff v. O'Neill*, 238 Conn. 1 (1996), or any related stipulation or order in effect, as determined by the Commissioner of Education, make grants with funds appropriated for the Sheff settlement for academic and social student support programs for the following voluntary interdistrict programs: (1) interdistrict cooperative programs pursuant to section 10-74d, (2) the interdistrict public school attendance program pursuant to section 10-266aa, (3) interdistrict magnet schools pursuant to section 10-264l, and (4) the Technical Education and Career System.