



UPDATE on TASK FORCES and WORKING GROUPS November 2018

SPECIAL EDUCATION COST MODEL TASK FORCE AND FEASIBILITY STUDY

PA 17-2, June special session, Section 70

- conduct a feasibility study on alternative methods of funding special education and addressing the factors impacting the increasing cost and predictability of special education services
- examine a state special education predictable cost cooperative model or other alternative model and other models used in other states
- report to the Education and Appropriations committees Jan. 1, 2019

Cooperative Definition

- Defines “special education predictable cost cooperative” as a funding model that:
- consists of several specified components designed to aggregate special education costs at the state level to compensate for local level volatility by a number of means, including providing predictability in special education costs to local and regional boards of education and maintaining current state special education funding, among others
- it is funded by a formula that consists of (1) a community contribution from each school district and (2) the state contribution funded by a reallocation of the excess cost grant and the special education portion of the education cost sharing grant, designed to (a) ensure that a school district's community contribution will be lower than its actual per pupil special education cost, (b) provide all school districts with some state support for special education services, and (c) reimburse school districts for 100% of their actual special education costs for each fiscal year

Study Requirements

- Requires the study to, at a minimum, address a number of specific areas including:
- state and municipal funding for the possible models, including how towns contribute to the cooperative and how they are compensated for special education costs by the cooperative
- an actuarial analysis of the cooperative model and other models
- the legal status of the cooperative model and other models (i.e., state agency, quasi-public agency, not-for-profit organization, or private entity)
- governance structure including a process for nominating members for the board of directors, and the accountability of the board to the participating towns and boards of education

- staffing and funding sources for the cost of staff
- funding sources analysis for necessary capital costs, including the impact on state special education funding if \$50 million in state special education funding is used
- implementation timeline including prerequisites such as the number of voluntarily participating towns necessary for the cooperative model and other models to function or whether participation should be mandatory
- legal analysis of the state and federal laws (including IDEA) that could affect the model's creation and administration
- accountability to the General Assembly

Task Force Membership

- the OPM secretary, Education Commissioner, CAFE, CASBO, CAPSS, CAS, CCM, RESC Alliance,
- Connecticut Council of Administrators of Special Education, Connecticut Captive Insurance Association, Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center, a UConn Actuarial Science Program faculty member

Task Force Administration

- Must not cause any state agency to incur costs of more than \$1,000, exclusive of costs associated with reimbursing any agency staff person for mileage expenses
- May receive funds from any not-for-profit organization or accept pro bono services from any public or private entity to conduct the feasibility study with help from the Office of Legislative Management

-Focus groups-starting 11/8 feedback

CLASSROOM SAFETY WORKING GROUP

Patrice McCarthy

PA 18-89 **AN ACT CONCERNING ENHANCING CLASSROOM SAFETY AND SCHOOL CLIMATE** was VETOED and a group has been meeting over the last few months to redraft the bill.

The vetoed version- requires BOE to address daily classroom safety in their safe school climate plans:

to annually report to SDE instances of daily classroom safety violations;

allows teachers to refer out of their classroom students who commit daily classroom safety violations and sets standards for the students' return;

requires SDE to provide school districts with training;

expands the duties of school staff in safe school climate leadership positions to include daily classroom safety issues;

and expands the definition of a “prevention and intervention strategy” to include daily classroom safety violations.

FINGERPRINTING TASK FORCE

Patrice McCarthy

SA 18-25 AN ACT ESTABLISHING A TASK FORCE TO STUDY THE PROCESSING AND RETENTION OF FINGERPRINT RECORDS AND CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORDS FOR EDUCATORS.

(1) examine the state's system for fingerprinting and processing of state and national criminal history records checks, conducted in accordance with the provisions of section 29-17a of the general statutes, for employees, applicants for employment, substitute teachers and volunteers of local and regional boards of education, interdistrict magnet school operators and regional educational service centers, and (2) make recommendations for the improvement of such system.

Members: Commissioner of Emergency Services and Public Protection, or designee; Commissioner of Education, or designee; and The Alliance of Regional Educational Service Centers, CAPSS, CABE, CAS, CEA and AFT.

They shall submit a report on its findings and recommendations to the Education and the Public Safety and Security committees by 1/1/19. The task force terminates 1/1/19.

SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL LEARNING TASK FORCE

Bob Rader

Issues relating to best practices for the promotion of social-emotional learning in schools. The working group shall (1) identify successful models of social-emotional learning that are being implemented by school districts in Connecticut or other states, (2) analyze the suspension and expulsion rates, prior to and after a successful model has been implemented in a school district, and (3) make recommendations for how such successful models can be expanded and implemented in other school districts throughout the state.

SCHOOL SAFETY WORKING GROUP

Reps. Carol Hall, Sredzinski and Ohler held press conference 3/20/18 formed group.

issues- Summarize current school safety legislation; Measure school districts’ knowledge of current legislation;

Use and availability of existing state and federal funds; Review of whether regulations and associated programs have been implemented;

Availability of school-based mental health professionals; Parents’ knowledge and understanding of their district’s security measures;

Local educators’ view of the effectiveness of legislation and related programs; Determine viability of school security measures installed years ago;

Identify new trends and techniques in school security; Collect recent concerns of educators, students and law enforcement;

Determine what other states are doing

SEARCH AND SEIZURE OF STUDENTS' PERSONAL ELECTRONIC DEVICES WORKING GROUP (SA 18-28) Lon Seidman

January 1, 2019, submit findings and recommendations to the Education Committee.

(b) No **school employee** may (1) **take custody** of a student's mobile electronic device for purposes of accessing any data or other content stored upon or accessible from such device, or (2) **compel a student to** produce, display, share or provide access to any data or other content stored upon or accessible from such device, except a school employee **may take custody** of a student's mobile electronic device **if** (A) such device is located on school property or being used during a school-sponsored activity, **and** (B) the school employee has a reasonable suspicion that a student (i) **has violated** or is violating an educational policy and that such device contains evidence of the suspected violation, or (ii) **poses a risk** of imminent personal injury to such student or others. Upon taking custody of a student's mobile electronic device, the school employee shall immediately turn over such device to an administrator.

(c) An **administrator** may conduct a search of a student's mobile electronic device taken pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. Any such search shall (1) be strictly limited to finding evidence of the suspected policy violation or to prevent imminent personal injury to such student or others, and (2) immediately cease upon (A) finding sufficient evidence or no evidence of the suspected violation, or (B) preventing such imminent personal injury to such student or others.

(d) A school employee who has taken custody of and turned over a mobile electronic device pursuant to subsection (b) of this section shall immediately submit a written report to the principal that explains the reasonable suspicion that gave rise to such school employee taking custody of such device and to whom such device was turned over to after taking custody of such device.

(e) Not later than 24 hours after the completion of the search pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, the principal shall notify the student and the parent or guardian of the student of the suspected violation and what data, if any, was accessed from such device during the search of such device, and provide a copy of the report explaining the reasonable suspicion that gave rise to the search.

-BOE shall include the requirements in the publication of the rules, procedures and standards of conduct for the school district and in all student handbooks.

Agricultural Science and Technology Education Center

The Thomaston BOE petitioned the state BOE in a matter that involved the Region 6 BOE regarding sending students to the Region 6 agricultural science and technology education center (ASTEC). C.G.S. 10-65(b) establishes a three- year average number of students enrolled criteria as well as separate criteria for 9th graders. **However**, C.G.S. 10-64(d) has this language: “any person may attend.”

The state BOE voted to “suggest that the Legislature may find it appropriate to re-examine these issues and provide clarification.”

The state board voted on five other issue within the ruling.

Day on the Hill March 20