

**Connecticut State Board of Education**  
**Hartford**

**The Legislation and Policy Development Committee**

Wednesday, December 3, 2025 -- 12:00 p.m.  
State Office Building, 450 Columbus Blvd., Hartford, Connecticut

**Minutes**

**(Approved February 11, 2026)**

Pursuant to notice filed with the Secretary of the State, the State Board of Education Legislation and Policy Development Committee ["LPDC"] met in person on December 3, 2025.

**I. Call to Order**

Committee Chair Bonnie E. Burr called the meeting to order at 12:04. In addition to Ms. Burr, also present at the meeting were Committee Members Kristen A. Record, Seth D. Zimmerman, Paula S. Gilberto, and Gladys Labas, well as State Board Vice Chair Erin Benham. Joining the Board members from the CSDE were: Sinthia Sone-Moyano, Deputy Commissioner; Laura Stefon, Chief of State and Legislative Liaison; Keith Norton, Chief Strategic Planning Officer; Robin Cecere, Director of School Choice Office; Matthew Venhorst, Attorney; Julianne Frost, Education Consultant/Compliance Coordinator; Karen Colebut, Education Staff Assistant/CEPCB Administrator; and Michael McKeon, Director of Legal and Governmental Affairs (who attended virtually).

**II. Approval of Minutes**

Ms. Record moved, and Ms. Gilberto seconded approval of the November 5, 2025, minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

**III. Presentation – CSDE Legislative Proposals**

Ms. Stefon begins to present the legislative proposals, including the biliteracy measure, which was in the legislative bill during the 2025 session but which did not get passed as the legislative session ended before it could be voted on by both houses. The second proposal is a modification of the kindergarten entry bill, which also was not voted on during the 2025 legislative session due to the expiration of time. The current legislation has caused a number of issues among districts as to how best to handle the determination of which students get in early and which do not, in part due to the current legislation not specifying what the required early-entry assessments consist of. The CSDE's proposal eliminates the assessment and sets a firm date by which a child would have had to have been born in order to have reached the kindergarten-entry age.

Ms. Stefon then spoke on interdistrict magnet and school choice proposals, one of which standardizes the enrollment process so as to, in turn, standardize the magnet school enrollment numbers. The next proposal addresses the issue of special education funding for students who are enrolled in Open Choice programs, specifically aligning the financing and the planning responsibilities. Ms. Cecere added that this was proposed last year but was not adopted. The next proposal is a technical adjustment clarifying the timing of the transportation payments to the regional education service centers ["RESCS"] to effectuate the Sheff settlement. This provides, in part, for the payment of actual costs to the RESCS for transportation in two separate payments.

The next proposal addresses the over seventy reports that the CSDE is required to provide to the legislature each year. This eliminates outdated reports or those that merely replicate the information that is available on our EdSight webpage. Ms. Burr notes the importance of ensuring that the information can be found easily on the EdSight webpage.

The next proposal addresses the Increasing Educator Diversity plan, establishing a biennial submission rather than an annual submission as of 2026. It requires districts to monitor and report on their efforts and would empower Commissioner to approve plans or return with demanded modifications. Ms. Record asked how this would interact with federal laws. In response, Attorney McKeon discussed the purpose of the IED plans, noting that they are not quotas nor are they intended to favor any candidate due to their race or ethnicity; rather, they are simply a report on steps districts, in the fact of teacher shortages, are taking to expand their recruitment efforts, including expanding their marketing to ensure they are reaching all qualified potential candidates. Dr. Labas noted that in the past, districts would say they were unable to attract diverse staff and she asks how these plans would be monitored. Ms. Sone-Moyano discussed how they would be overseen, including ongoing conversations with districts.

Ms. Stefon then discussed the next proposal which was motivated by the recent formation of Regional School District No. 20, which is comprised of what was formerly Regional School District No. 6 and the Litchfield Public Schools. Region 6 left a number of outstanding debts that Region 20 did not anticipate but nonetheless inherited. Consequently, there was a meeting with legislators, who asked the CSDE to draft proposed legislation that would address and seek to avoid situations such as this in the future. Consequently, this proposed language requires a new budget plan for the proposed new district, which could be submitted to a third party for its review and would include transition costs. Ms. Record asked why the proposed submission to a third party would not be a requirement? Ms. Stefon explained that this could pose a significant expense to the new district, adding that the CSDE was seeking to avoid imposing unfunded mandates.

The final proposal pertains to the Aspiring Educators Scholarship, opening the pool of scholarship-eligible students beyond diverse students and thereby bring it into closer alignment with federal law. Citing the ongoing teacher shortage, Ms. Record noted her support of this proposal.

At the conclusion of Ms. Stefon's presentation, Ms. Gilberto moved, and Dr. Labas seconded the approval of the legislative proposals. The motion passed unanimously.

The Committee members then raised the possible reconsideration of its motion from the November 5, 2025, meeting, which referred to the State Board with a positive recommendation a statutory change proposed by the Connecticut Educator Preparation and Certification Board ["CEPCB"], shifting responsibility for initial certification determinations from the State Board to the CEPCB. Further research and review had determined that this proposal was contrary with the original legislative intent, investing in the State Board this power. Following discussion, Ms. Record moved and Dr. Labas seconded the motion to reconsider. The motion passed unanimously. Ms. Record then moved and Dr. Labas seconded a motion to refer the CEPCB's legislative proposal to the full State Board with a negative recommendation. The motion passed unanimously.

Jen Rodriguez, Chair of the CEPCB, asked whether this would be on the January or February 2026 meetings. Attorney McKeon noted it would be on the January 2026 agenda. Ms. Rodriguez asked about

the sixty-day time frame for either board to review the other’s proposals. Attorney McKeon explained that that timeline pertains to the full Board, not to the Committee.

Ms. Rodriguez began presenting on new CEPCB proposals. There are some regulations that are scheduled to sunset, which the CEPCB is proposing be maintained in the form of statutes rather than regulations. After discussion, Ms. Record moved, and Ms. Gilberto seconded, approval of this proposal. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Rodriguez then discussed a proposed regulation pertaining to the initial educator certification which comports with previously approved legislation as well as proposed technical adjustments to the regulations. Following brief discussion, Ms. Gilberto moved, and Dr. Labas seconded, to approve this CEPCB proposal, which motion passed unanimously.

The CEPCB’s next proposal was to revise the regulations to address Charter Oak and other schools using the 90-day certificate. Other educator preparation programs [“EPP”] may be similarly situated in the future. Ms. Record asked for an example of a shortage area that is not already covered under the statute and noted that special subjects or fields typically pertains to specials such as art or music. Ms. Frost noted that right now, there is no certification for computer science, and this proposal would provide coverage. Dr. Labas asked how these programs would get accreditation if they cannot provide sufficient teaching hours. Ms. Rodriguez explained that the 90-day certificate would provide those teaching hours, analogizing it to a dual credit– the individual would be working for a district but still receiving EPP credit. Ms. Gilberto then moved, and Ms. Record seconded, to approve this proposal. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Rodriguez then discussed the CEPCB’s proposal to expand the Durational Shortage Area certificate use, adding an additional potential year in which it could be used. Ms. Record asked about how this would apply to DSAP teachers’ ability to participate in the TEAMS process and further asked what “board” refers to in the proposed regulation. Attorney Venhorst explained that the regulation definitions indicated that that this is the State Board. Ms. Record further expressed questions and concerns about the purpose of this regulation. Attorney McKeon advised that the Committee could vote to hold it over to the next Committee meeting. Ms. Record responded that she had no objection to moving this CEPCB proposal to the full Board with a favorable recommendation. Ms. Rodriguez asked about a conditional referral, but Ms. Benham explained that the State Board preferred that questions be worked out at the Committee level. Following this discussion, Ms. Record moved, and Dr. Labas seconded, a motion to approve the proposal, which passed unanimously.

The next proposal addressed cross-endorsements and actually came to the CEPCB from the CSDE. It allows someone from out of state to have their course credits approved by Connecticut, thereby eliminating delays in taking any additional courses. Ms. Benham expressed her belief that this is a good suggestion, after which Dr. Labas moved, and Ms. Gilberto seconded, to approve the proposal. The motion passed unanimously.

Finally, Ms. Rodriguez review proposed technical edits to the regulations to ensure that the language matched what is currently in statute. Ms. Gilberto then moved, and Ms. Record seconded, to approve this proposal, which motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Gilberto expressed her appreciation to Ms. Rodriguez for all of the work that goes into this process, who noted that it is a large team process.

**Adjournment**

The business of the Committee having ended, Ms. Gilberto moved, and Ms. Record seconded, a motion to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously, and the meeting adjourned at 1:12.