Act Number	Session	Bill Number	Total Number of Committee Pages	Total Number of House Pages	Total Number of Senate Pages
PA 71-667		**6448**	**27**	**3**	**1**
Committee Pages: • *Education 372-398*				House Pages: • *5587-5589*	Senate Pages: • *3406*

H-120

CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL. 14
PART 13
5555-6226

MR. SPEAKER:

Please proceed. Would you direct the Clerk's attention to the next calendar item for consideration. Could I ask that the aisles be cleared. Part of the difficulty in reaching these bills is the inability on thepart of the Majority Leader to see who is, or is not, in his seat. Does the gentleman from the 118th care to direct our attention to the next calendar item?

CARL AJELLO, 118th District:

Yes, the Clerk has in his possession, a list of items to be taken up and I believe that Calendar No. 1242 is the next one.

THE CLERK:

From Appropriations, Calendar No. 1242, Substitute for House Bill No. 6448, An Act Concerning Procedure for Review of Programs for Exceptional Children, file 1377.

BERNARD AVCOLLIE, 94th District:

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark on acceptance and passage?

BERNARD AVCOLLIE, 94th District:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this bill, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, is one of the, if not the most important special act bills, proposed since the inception of the Special Educa-

tion Statutes. It provides a specific review procedure to settle disputes by parents and school boards over special education services. The bill cures a defect in the original legislation and provides the unfortunate parent with children with learning difficulties, a particular type of review. In Section I, the parent of the child is provided with the opportunity to request a hearing by the board of education to review the diagnosis of his or her child and provide for the written decision to be given the parent. Section 2 covers the procedure for appeal by the parent or the board of education to the state board of education requiring a review of the local board's decision. Section 3 of the bill covers the procedures that the state board must take in reviewing the local board's decision, which shall include the employment of a hearing board of at least three persons, knowledgeable in the field, some or all of whom may be members of the State Department of Education. Section 4 and 5 sets up a procedure for the hearing board and for enforcing their decisions on review. It also sets up an appeal by either party to the Court of Common Pleas. This may seem to be a complex procedure, Mr. Speaker and members of this House, but it is a necessary one for both parents and the school boards. Heretofore, parents seeking a proper evaluation of their children, under existing statutes, had no where to go. No one to review or evaluate when they are refused a program for

their child or when they disagreed with the evaluation or program set forth. Yes, this program is innovative, Mr. Speaker, but more important urgently needed. I hope it will receive support from both sides of the aisle.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are there further remarks on the bill? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye, opposed? The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Page 8, the next calendar item, Calendar No. 1254, Substitute for House Bill No. 6974, An Act Concerning Amending the Connecticut Primary Law.

CARL AJELLO, 118th District:

Mr. Speaker, we are awaiting the arrival of the Chairman of the Committee. I would ask, sir, that it be passed temporarily.

MR. SPEAKER:

So ordered.

THE CLERK:

Page 10, Calendar No. 1338, from Appropriations, Substitute for House Bill No. 7767, An Act Establishing a Commission on Fire Fighting Personnel Standards and Education.

WILLIAM O'NEILL, 52nd District:

Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

S-82
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL. 14
PART 7
2874-3413

File numbers and I'll move for suspension for immediate consideration. They should be in the Clerk s possession and we ll file this list too, if he wishes.

THE CHAIR:

That s what we're talking about, Senator. We want to compare the bills themselves, against the list we have.

Would you come up, Senator Ives and we'll expediate this very quickly?

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, I move for suspension of the rules for immediate consideration of the following bills:

THE CHAIR:

If there is no objection it is so ordered.

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, House Bill 5109, File 1268; House Bill 5298, File 1699; House Bill 5433, File 1310; House Bill 5730, File 940; House Bill 5781, File 1196; House Bill 5782, File 1211; House Bill 6277, File 289; House Bill 6411 File 1117; House Bill 6448, File 1377; House Bill 6685, File 1461; House Bill 6716, File 1684; House Bill 6927, File 934; House Bill 7170, File 769; House Bill 7811, File 1104; House Bill 8410, File 1106; House Bill 8225, File 1197; House Bill 8796, File 927; House Bill 8835, File 1305; House Bill 9189 File 1453; House Bill 6928, File 1080; House Bill 8485, File 1642.

Mr. President, I move for the adoption of the bills listed.

THE CHAIR:

Is there any objection to the adoption or passage of the bills? Hearing none; said bills declared passed.

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

EDUCATION

PART 2
331-675

1971

Dr. Hoffmeyer: We feel that the deaf, if they were put in regional day schools, self standing type day schools, for the deaf, that you could get more of the supportive services that the deaf need. It is a highly technical procedure to teach the deaf and many of the procedures are unlike those for other handicapped. So we feel by having a free standing type facility for the deaf, the deaf can be better served rather than have them mixed with, no reflection on other handicapped, but we feel that the deaf can be better served in a free standing type facility, for the deaf.

Rep. Klebanoff: Thank you. Gordon Clark, he will be followed by Dr. Maurice Ross and Representative John Fabrizio.

Mr. Clark: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I am Gordon Clark of West Hartford. For 36 years I have been teaching hearing impaired children. I am appearing before this Committee in my capacity as president of the Connecticut Council of Organizations Serving the Deaf. This Council is presently made up of two representatives, each of the 24 organizations of and for the deaf in Connecticut. These organizations are located in Bridgeport, New Haven, New London, Hartford, Waterbury and many other cities in the State. I want to comment on bills 6449. HB6449 (Rep. Webber) AN ACT CONCERNING AN ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SPECIAL EDUCATION. Section 2 of this bill states that the Secretary of the State Board of Education shall appoint at least one representative designated by each of the following organizations, and it goes on to name the various associations concerned with special education, none of which include an association of the deaf or the American School for the deaf. In fairness to hearing impaired children, I feel that services of a representative from the Council of Organizations Serving the Deaf and the American School should be included on the Advisory Council and should be spelled out in the bill. Thank you.

Rep. Klebanoff: Dr. Ross.

Dr. Ross: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I am Maurice Ross, Associate Commissioner State Department of Education. I urge the Committee to report favorably on HB 6456 or HB5747 (Rep. Stolberg) AN ACT CONCERNING GRANTS FOR THE EDUCATION OF EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED CHILDREN. A major need of this State is to improve

Dr. Ross: the educational programs designed to help disadvantaged children in our urban areas. During the past five years considerable help has been given to disadvantaged children through the resources provided by the General Assembly for this purpose. Our experiences over the past five years have proven that urban education can be greatly improved by the initiation and expansion of programs in our urban schools such as programs for pre-school children, Follow-through for early elementary grades, bi-lingual education, programs for urban-suburban cooperation, programs of quality integrated education. This revision of An Act Concerning State Aid for Disadvantaged Children will give us the added resources over and above those already provided to deliver programs of help to our inner-city children. And if I may, Mr. Chairman, also like to urge the Committee to report favorably on HB5962 (Rep. McNellis) AN ACT CONCERNING CHILDREN REQUIRING SPECIAL EDUCATION. Since the passage of Public Act 627 in 1967, Connecticut has sought to provide eduational opportunities for all exceptional children who need and can profit from special education programs and services. The proposed revisions of Section 10-76 found in this bill are primarily to make the responsibilities of the local boards of education more explicit, to prohibit state agencies from charging tuition to local boards of education for children who must be placed in a State facility and to increase State aid from 66 2/3 to 75% of the net cost of special education. This bill authorizes the State board to pay the current tuition costs incurred by local boards for children who must be placed in private facilities, thus eliminating the hardships imposed on the local boards when they must place two or three children in expensive facilities, which they could not have anticipated when they prepared their budgets. Local boards of education are identifying more and more exceptional children and at an earlier age than ever before. Local boards of education need increased State aid to assist them in teaching the retarded child, the physically handicapped, the deaf, the emotionally disturbed, and children with a wide range of learning disabilities. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before this Committee to urge a favorable report on HB5962, and I shall be back this afternoon for the school lunch program.

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY FEBRUARY 17, 1971

Rep. Klebanoff: Dr. Ross, I would just like to ask one request of the State Department. We do recognize that you're one of the spokesman for the Department, however we would appreciate it if we could get a list from the Department of the various people, especially those who are heading up some of these programs and also a list of the consultants in the Department so we could call them before the various subcommittees. That would apply to of course, not just to this morning's hearing, but to some of the other hearings. I think some of them may be very helpful when we have our subcommittee hearings.

Dr. Ross: We'll be glad to provide those and if any members of the Committee will get in touch with me, I will be happy to see that the consultants will be there in your office, Mr. Chairman. There is a full list of the Department personnel, I'll be glad to provide if any of the members so desire.

Rep. Klebanoff: Thank you. Dr. Ross, I believe there's a question.

Sen. Hammer: Senator Hammer of the 12th District, Dr. Ross I would like to speak to you about bill 6456, which you spoke on and which was very much talked about here this morning. I understand the point of this bill is to provide flexibility in educational programs, particularly for the inner-cities and for disadvantaged children, deprived children, I'm all for this, I just want to refresh my mind, as a matter of fact I look hopefully for more flexibility in most areas of our educational establishment and which I don't always find, but I like that idea so I'm not speaking against any of these programs, but I just want to know what you mean when you talk about these programs would be approved if said board, meaning the State Board of Education, find that such programs meet the criteria established to demonsatrate that such are designed to meet special educational problems of urban communities, what criteria would those be and who would set them up?

Dr. Ross: Under bill 6456, Senator, which incidentially is not our bill, although we support it in concept, our bill is 5747, both bills would provide the flexibility you speak of and in 5747, it would provide a little more. But the criteria for these programs have been and are cooperative with the

Dr. Ross: participants in the program, that is the local school people and ourselves before they are administered and then we would apply the instruments of evaluation to determine how well these things are being done so that we could then make further recommendations.

Sen. Hammer: Well you know flexibility is one thing, but it's not carte blanche, don't you feel that some of these crieteria and other matters should be set up by a formula and regulations?

Dr. Ross: This could very easily be done and if their done through regulations they will of course be developed cooperatively with the people in the fields so that I think that we would be talking about the same thing. The process would be the same.

Sen. Hammer: But they would be approved by the General Assembly. As it is now you're talking, asking for what I call carte blanche to set up these programs on your own. Now let me say something more on that before you answer. The five categories which are listed here, how would we know, and don't think I'm against programs that are being mentioned, I'm not, but how would we know that $5,000,000 for these programs how would we know that $3,000,000 was not going to Project Concern, to the slighting of the other programs?

Dr. Ross: To answer your question directly, if the legislature is going to control the amounts, you would then allocate the amounts into the categories. If however you are providing a flexibility, which all of us seem to favor, it would seem to me that it might well happen that some of the amounts would be larger in one program than another as the various cities determine what their priorities were. It would be this amount which the State Department of Education would be passing so that in effect, Hartford found that the most effective way to spend its money was for Project Concern, that is a large portion of it, but this is what would be considered and it might well happen that this is true. Another city might find for example, New Haven with its largest portion of Puerto Rican children of any city in the State, that it wants to divert a larger amount or per centage to the bi-lingual program, this would appear to be allright too.

Sen. Hammer: Well I like this method of arriving at these things but, I also think that New Haven for instance or the rest of the taxpayers of the State might not like $3,000,000 to go to Project Concern in Hartford. I think you should have some guidelines set up in departmental regulations so that we can take a look at it over here and see just what is going on.

Dr. Ross: We'll note your request.

Sen. Hammer: Oh, and something else I want to ask you, Dr. Ross. I notice you didn't mention support for 6455. Do you feel it's unreasonable for the legislature to ask for an evaluation of these programs?

Dr. Ross: No. We have evaluations in as a matter of fact, you will within a few days be receiving copies of the evaluations or accountability of Title 1 and SADC. We carry this as a matter of course. We have no objection to evaluations or accountability. It's one of the projects in which we're working very diligently.

Sen. Hammer: Well I think it's one of the things lacking in general in all sorts of programs, not only education.

Rep. Klebanoff: Thank you, Dr. Ross. Representative Fabizio (absent from hearing at this time) Mrs. Libby Harris, followed by Mr. Donald Mitchell.

Mrs. Harris: I'm the speech and hearing coordinator for Watertown and in the morning I teach hearing impaired children. They came to us as rubela babies. May I ask a question before I make my comments? Is the bill 6806 formally being considered today or has that been left out?

Rep. Klebanoff: The hearing is basically by subject matter and although a specific bill may not be listed, it's only because it's not printed in time for this morning's hearing.

Mrs. Harris: I see. Being uncertain about this I'm going to address my remarks to HB6466 because in reading over the bills after I came here, I believe that it can include other things which are dearest to my heart. I"m speaking for John, Michael, Peter, Allen, Sharon and Rita. They can't come today

Mrs. Harris: because they haven't been in school and they haven't learned to talk. We have compulsory education in Connecticut, yet we have hearing impaired children under the age of 12 who are not receiving an education. We have other hearing impaired children who are receiving only a token education. Two of them, and you will note that I'm speaking of small numbers of children, where my precedentors have spoken up into the thousands, but this is also an acute problem, two of these children in a town near Watertown are 7 years old, but of them are waiting for openings. A girl of 11, is also waiting. Our town has several older profoundly deaf children who have found no places in schools for the deaf. By denying and education to these children, and there are many of them throughout the State, what will become of them? Society will be committed to take care of a whole generation of these children for their lifetime. By adding regional centers throughout the State, these children will be educated and on their way to being self supporting. Approximately 1000 other students with moderate to severe hearing loss could also significantly upgrade their educational skills if they had access to additional training in speach and hearing in a regional center. I understand bill 6466 need not be set-up to include all handicapped children in one regional center. I am thinking of regional centers for hearing impaired children and perhaps one regional center for multi-handicapped children who are also deaf or who have impaired hearing. Thank you.

Rep. Klebanoff: Thank you. Mr. Donald Mitchell, followed by Anita Pusek.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I'm Donald E. Mitchell, I'm the principal of an elementary school in Watertown, I am fortunate to have the services of the previous speaker as the speech and hearing therapist within my school. I have presently five children in the hearing impaired class and receiving instruction within my school, so I'm very interested in the problems they face in achieving the education that every child is bound to throughout the State. So I would support HB6466 but if I had my choice and I knew the other bill was here, the HB6806, would be preferred. I feel that the regional center for the hearing impaired child would enable us as the public school to provide the services for these children much more so than we

Mr. Mitchell: are at this particular time. Administratively, we have tried to adapt a public school program to a child who has limited speech, who has trouble communicating to begin with and with teachers who are not fully prepared to teach this type of child. We need and we need this urgently, the services and support of a classroom teacher in providing the education for that type of child. We also have a child who is in our school who is waiting for other services that would provide her with the on going education above the level which she's achieving now. We feel if we reach some success, some of them are working as well as some of our first graders, but again with supportive services by a regional agency where they could go daily or where the agency could provide us with additional information, they would receive a better and more qualified education. Thank you.

Rep. Klebanoff: Thank you. Anita Pusek.

Miss Pusek: Mr. Chairman, I've been deaf since birth. I came from an oral school for the deaf. Lots of people think deaf people can't talk, but it is not true. I'm supporting oralism. I want to tell you a little about my life at Mystic Oral School for the Deaf. Before I went to Mystic, I couldn't talk and I could not read lips. I went to Mystic Oral School at the age of 2½ years old. They taught me how to talk and to read the lips. At the 5th grade, Mrs. Durant, the principal of Mystic Oral School, decided it's time for me to go to public school. I went to public school in 5th grade. I went right along through the grades. If it were not for Mystic Oral School for the Deaf, I would not be able to talk and I would not be able to be in public school. Now I'm planning to be a teacher for the deaf. I think oralism is very important because this is the hearing world. I hope that you will support HB6466 so that hearing impaired children will receive a quality oral education. Thank you.

Rep. Klebanoff: Mrs. Gerald Dandrow, followed by Mr. Robert Melender.

Mrs. Dandrow: Mister Chairman and Committee members, as northeast regional director of Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, and a parent of a hearing impaired child I have come today to ask your support for HB6466, which provides State operated regional

Mrs. Dandrow: programs for seriously handicapped children, HB6449 which provides an advisory council on special ed, HB6448 which provides for adequate review of appeal procedure for special ed, HB6448 (Rep. Webber) AN ACT CONCERNING PROCEDURE FOR REVIEW OF PROGRAMS FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN. Yesterday in the Governor's message I somehow picked out this one quote for us today, all of these bills would enable us to do the right thing in the right way and to do it now without increasing our cost. Our State now pays per pupil under existing programs under Section 1076, approximately $5000. Under the proposed regional programs cost would be approximately $3250 per pupil. Transportation cost under current existing programs per child is approximately $3000 and under proposed regional programs, transportation costs would be half that figure. Hearing impaired children should never be isolated from their hearing peers and opportunities for intergration into regular school programs can best be met by HB6466. I have stood before you in 1967 where we begged to have day classes for the German measles babies of 1964. I saw the passage of 627 and last session we added our own consultant for the hearing impaired, Mr. Stephen Meecham who is supervisor in coordinating our programs. Some local boards have not assumed their responsibility in the past. Without this additional legislation local boards will not have to develop long term quality programs. Comprises have been made at the expense of some children. HB6466 guarantees the on going consistency of programs at less cost with better quality. HB6449 and 6448 further develop and coordinates the efforts of parent, professional and school personnel to meet the educational and individual needs of the hearing impaired child. I thank you and the members of the Committee, and urge you to support these bills as they provide quality with economy. Thank you.

Rep. Klebanoff: We'll call Mr. Robert Melander. I would just like to announce that we will try to call another five or six speakers before breaking for lunch at approximately 12:30 or 12:55, we will then reconvene in room 408, upstairs on the fourth floor, the Education Committee main hearing room. Mr. Robert Melander.

Mr. Melander: Mr. Chairman, members of the Education Committee, I'm Robert Melander, vice-president for the

Mr. Melander: Connecticut Association for Mental Health. I have a prepared statement which I will leave, however I do sense from Dr. Hoffmeyer and others from his group, some misconception about the intent of HB6466. I believe the content of this bill, if they will analyze it will do essentially what they indicated they were in favor of for their children. However, it does encompass those other children, the other handicapps which are not now covered by public school programs. The seriously handicapped child is currently either ignored by his local school system, provided taken services or placed in an expensive residential facility, usually private because a more appropriate placement is not available. After nearly four years of special education under our present mandatory law, seriously handicapped children are still for the most part, second class citizens. The number of children being placed in residential programs has increased substantially each year since the 1967-8 school year. The numbers will continue to increase unless effective local services are available as an alternative to private residential school placement. In the 1967-8 school year the first year the special education law was in effect, about 100 children were placed in residential facilities. The next school year this number had increased to about 240 children. This past year 1969-70 the number was up to about 530 children. Since many seriously handicapped children still lack adequate services it is logical to expect another substantial increase in the number of children this year. Based on a $5500 a year cost per child, we spend about $2,915,000 during the 1969-70 school year to support children in residential facilities. This year, the cost could easily reach a total of $4,510,000. The development of regional programs could significantly reverse this trend. Properly organized such programs could provide improved services for the seriously handicapped child, make it possible for many of these children to remain in their home communities and reduce the overall cost per child, of the programs. Based on the amount of money currently being spent, we recommend that a sum of $1,500,000 be appropriated for the fiscal year starting July 1, 1971 for the planning and development of the initial regional programs. One of the dangers of regional programs is the possibility that they may be used as dumping grounds for the children in the local school system. If this should happen, it would certainly defeat the purpose behind the regional programs. We feel that HB6466 contains

Mr. Melander: adequate safeguards to prevent this. Protection is built into the legislation by leaving the basic responsibility of the child with the local school system, where we strongly feel it should be, by requiring the parent or guardian to approve the placement of the child in a regional program, by giving the State Department of Education the authority to determine what children will be accepted into any particular regional program. All of these safeguards are very important. Now I would also like to support HB5962, which makes significant modifications to the special education statutes. We support these modifications. The prime one of which is the elimination of the various categorical descriptions of handicapped children. This represents another step toward the goal of individualized education programming based on the special needs of every handicapped child. We do not, however agree with the philosophy stated in Section 3 of the bill, that services provided by the various state agencies should be free to local school systems. Such an approach tends to reduce the responsibility of the local school system. Services now provided by state agencies with few exceptions are not free to the individual citizen. To create free services in one area only, only creates another inequity. There is one other item I would like to bring up at this time that has not been mentioned before at this hearing. That is SB416 (Sen. Ives) AN ACT ALLOWING THE PROBATE COURT TO REQUEST OR CONSENT TO SPECIAL EDUCATION FOR AN EXCEPTIONAL CHILD which allow the local school system to go to probate court when a parent or guardian would not agree to proposed placement of a child outside of the public school system. We feel that this circumvents the safeguards that were built into the existing law and the possible abuses of such an arrangement are obvious. This provides the funds for the local school system to bring pressure or even blackmail a parent or guardian into doing what the school system wants. To protect his rights the parent must to go the expense of retaining legal counsel. The child and his parents are automatically on the defensive and may be forced into expenditures they may not be able to afford. The abuses possible under SB416 could do extensive harm to the present development of special education. We recognize that there are disinterested and uncooperative parents just as there are disinterested and uncooperative school systems, no one is perfect

Mr. Melander: we all have our shortcomings. Differences of opinion are bound to occur and there is an obvious need of an equitable way to settle disputes when they do occur. What is needed is a fair, objective procedure which has the welfare of the child as the prime consideration and which is available to both the parent and the local school system without cost. SB416 does not fulfill these requirements. We believe however, that the procedures established by HB6448 are designed to protect the child,the school system and the parents and to do it based primarily on the basis of the needs of the child with resort to the courts as a last resort. Thank you.

Rep. Klebanoff: I'd like to say something on behalf of the Committee and on behalf of myself, having a hearing impaired child. There seems to be an unfortunate division among various groups here that really should be working together and the Education Committee will appoint an special subcommittee to meet with representatives of the various groups here in a smaller type hearing to try to go over these problems What we would like to do is ask the representatives of the various groups to contact the Education Committee office at extension 5406 in order that we may go into this matter in more detail at a smaller type hearing. I'll list the remaining four speakers that we'll call before adjourning for lunch. Reverend Husey, followed by Reverend Genecki Councilman Lee and Mr. Herb Barall

Rev. Husey: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, ladies and gentlemen, I'm Dennis R. Husey, Catholic pastor in Sacred Heart Church in Waterbury and I am speaking in behalf of HB6456, but more specifically in regard to the amendment of the non-public schools working with public schools and speaking specifically about a program which is in operation for the last two years at the Berkley Heights Primary Grade School within the project itself. It is unique in the sense that it's the only experimental education program that is in the State of Connecticut with non-public auspices working with the public school system and I am asking that consideration be done to the work that has been done in the last two years in helping children in a project. I say it's unique because it's in the Black project, but there are white children being bussed into the project and it has been kindergarten and first grade and we are hoping to go up to second grade

Rev. Husey: next year. It is staffed by two Sisters of Mercy who are being loaned through our system where we by necessity have to be affiliated with the Sacred Heart Catholic School. We are not an extension, it is not a parochial school system. We are merely trying to alleviate a problem which has arisen in Waterbury which we were asked and invited two years ago to enter into, the Follow-through program because of an intergration problem. And this year we ask for public assistance, but were turned down and had to resort to public or private funding which the Arch-bishop approves of, also the fact that manufacturers have been asked to help but they failed to see the need, and so we are asking a special consideration of this amendment to 6456 so that we will be helped . We are facing the possibility of being phased out this June unless immediate help comes to us. Thank you.

Rep. Klebanoff: Thank you. Reverend Genecki.

Rev. Genecki: Thank you Mr. Chairman and I'm grateful to the members of the Education Committee for the opportunity to speak very briefly to you today. Even though I stand here in the clothing of a priest I am of the feeling that I represent many concerned people of Waterbury. I am stationed in an inner-city area in Waterbury, dealing with people I feel have a conscience and are concerned to the needs of deprived children. I have seen the improvement educationally of children and their families who have been deprived for so long of adequate opportunities to grow and use their God-given talent educationally. Our school because of the State aid, we have been able to receive, has made a significant contribution to the improvement of children and their families who are disadvantaged. An important point I think that should be emphasized today is this fact, I have seen people not educationally deprived, nor financially deprived and not overly concerned at all about those who are. I have seen these people gradually become enthusiastically concerned and involved because opportunities were provided for their involvement by the money we receive in our school through State aid. This is most important and most healthy not only to our community, our State but to the entire Country. I am proud of our school and our people. It is one of the best intergrated schools in the City of Waterbury and without this aid from

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY FEBRUARY 17, 1971

Rev. Genecki: HB6456, our programs are lost. There is more to education than just reading, writing and arithmetic there is also a great importance for social education which I believe must be money from this bill will provide and I strongly urge your support in passing of the amendment to HB 6456. Thank you.

Rep. Klebanoff: Thank you. Councilman Levine

Councilman Levine: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, my name is George Levine, I'm a member of the Hartford City Council and the chairman of that Council's legislative policy matters committee. I'm here to speak in regard to HB6456, particularly interested in the Project Concern. Existing educational query maintains that there are two possible methods of approaching education of low income children. Compensatory education or intergrated education. I call your attention to a study which was referred to earlier this morning by our Mayor, it's titled Achievement and Related School Factors in the Largest Cities of Connecticut, it was published in April, 1970 by the Educational Resources and Development Center of the University of Connecticut and the Office of Program Development of the State Department of Education. This is a review of existing programs in the largest cities in Connecticut, basically compensatory education programs. I quote from page 28 of that report; In attempting to improve the educational patterns for children in large cities, it is recommended that concern be directed towards such factors as high concentrations of poor children and minority group children and attendance rates. The greatest attention must be devoted to these areas rather than rely on lowering teacher-pupil ratio, increasing per pupil expenditure or increasing the number of personnel. In short Mr. Chairman, this study concluded that the compensatory education programs are not arresting the problems in our school system, much less solving them. The conclusion from other studies of Project Concern clearly indicate that this program is working and is effective. It seems clear that the only way that we can provide equal educational opportunities to low income children is to create programs like Project Concern or expand Project Concern so that all children may go to school in classes that are intergrated. I call your attention to the fact that the 1970 Democratic State Platform contained

Councilman Levine: an acknowledgement of the fact that every child in this State has a right to equal educational opportunities and beyond that it is the responsibility of the State to provide that equal educational opportunity. We prefer that this educational opportunity be provided in regional schools, however the objection has been made that regional schools would be, would eliminate the voluntary nature of this type of program and this objection is apparently is very serious in the minds of some of the suburbanites so that we ask you if you cannot create the regional school systems at least allow us to expand our voluntary programs such as Project Concern. Thank you.

Rep. Klebanoff: Thank you, Councilman Levine. Mr. Barall, and then we will try to squeeze in two other speakers. Mrs. Joan Kimler and Mrs. Matthews.

Mr. Barall: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I come here today as a parent. My name is Herbert Barall, and I live in East Hartford. This legislature has an opportunity to with the current legislation proposed, HB6466 and HB6448 to enable my child, my youngest child and children like him to avoid institutions for the rest of their lives. I'd like to give you just a capsule version of my past history and my familie's history because the statistics you can get from your own experts. First of all, I should note that I'm a lawyer, I'm corporation council for the town of East Hartford I'm married, have two children. I say this not to illustrate that my child's problem is not unique to any particular class, it crosses all segments of the community, every socially and economic group, every color, every creed, and the answer to my child problem is the answer to many other children's problems. Some time ago, my child was born with what we thought was then just a heart defect, and as is so often the problem of many of these children they have multiple defects. It became obvious after a period of time that my child could not gain a public school education and could not cope with the public school system. So the question became, what do you do then? And although I suppose that some people would consider myself as sophisticated at least education wise that I could find a solution. My family went from pillar to post trying to find

Mr. Barall: just diagnostic techniques for my child. We've been to an Einstien Clinic in New York, we've been to Children's Hospital in Boston and we've been to every institution in this northeast region. And then you get the answers, well it takes six months to get in, or three months, or five months or a year, and what do you do with your child in the mean time? Well fortunately we came across an eminent authority who gave us at least a partial solution. He said the answer to your child's problem is education because my child had to have a label is classified as autistic and there are many, many labels for all these children and they all run into the same things. They have learning disabilities and when we said, okay where do we go where do we go for an educational institution, and we contacted, since I was a former member of the board of education, and I came up with a big fat zero. And for months we vacilated back and forth trying to find a place for my child and then we came really fortuitously, a application I had sent in some six months previously to Hartly Samon Clinic here in Hartford gave us for the first time at least, a partial solution to my child's problem. They were starting a school, a school for 12 children. And somehow through the grace of God my child was able to be sneaked into that program. That program now has been expanded to 24 children. But how about all the children around us that did not have that opportunity? And this opportunity of mine is a limited one because when my child reaches the age of 12 years old, I will have to start the additional trek of trying to look and find a place for him. And what is the solution? To send him out of State to a private insitituion, so that the State and town government can pay from anywhere from $10,000 to $16,000 a year for his education. We have a beautiful school at Hartly Samon with a great deal of dedicated people, grossly unequipped who could solve my child's problem and in so doing solve many, many other children's problems, both from a financial stand point it is illogical to spend the type of money that has to be spent in a private institution outside of this State when we too can have appropriate facilities for our children and so I ask you, gentlemen and ladies that you consider the plight of many, many children of all economic groupings, of all economic status, of all races, colors, creeds who are confronted with this problem that we cannot cope with ourselves. We the parent of these

Mr. Barall: children are willing to do our part. I don't want to abandon my child to an institution. I'll assume the responsibility and so will all these other parents of their care, but give us the facilities which we need to properly educate our children. Thank you.

Rep. Klebanoff: Thank you Mr. Barall. Mrs. Kimler.

Mrs. Kimler: Thank you Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I am Mrs. Leonard Kimler, chairman of the public affairs committee of the Greater Hartford Community Council and I will briefly summarize my remarks. I would like to go record for the Community Council endorsing HB6456. We believe that compensatory and intergrated education are top priority programs for scarce State education dollars. And it would be short-sighted for the State not to expand and strengthen these areas. We're also supporting HB6455 for periodic review and evaluation an absolute necessity in a time when fiscal stringency demands top return for every State dollar spent. Thank you very much.

Rep. Klebanoff: Thank you, Mrs. Kimler. Our last speaker before we adjourn for lunch, Mrs. Matthews.

Mrs. Matthews: Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee. My name is Sylvia Matthews. I'm a teacher of hearing impaired children and I represent the Capitol Region Education Council. I would like to speak in favor of HB6466. There is no question in my mind that regional programs are the only way to provide educationally-adequate day programs for hearing impaired children. With no other exceptionality is it more vital to have sufficient numbers of children to group homogeneously than with the hearing impaired. The 1967 federally sponsored National Research Conference on Day Programs for the Hearing Impaired bears this out. Small local programs and isolated day classes were found over and over again to be inherently inadequate. As the coordinating teacher of locally sponsored hearing impaired programs for four years I experienced the frustrations of local responsibility. Each year it was difficult to find towns willing to sponsor even one class because of budgetary problems. No town was willing to assume responsibility on more than a one year basis, so no semblance of long range planning

Mrs. Matthews: was possible. Finally last year, the Capitol Region Education Council took over the sponsorship and financial responsibility for a coordinated program of several classes at different levels. While this was a big step in the direction of regional programs, towns in the CREC area may or may not cooperate at will. This leads to uncertainty from year to year on the part of parents as to whether or not their children will be able to continue in the program. I therefore urge your positive consideration of HB6466 which will provide for the establishment of quality programs on a regional basis for hearing impaired as well as other handicapped children. Thank you.

Rep. Klebanoff: Thank you, Mrs. Matthews. At this time, I'm sorry we will adjourn briefly for lunch. We will resume the hearing at approximately 1:00 o'clock in room 408. We do ask that you vacate the Hall of the House now because it has to be made ready for the legislative session which will begin at 1:30 . Thank you.

Rep.DellaVecchia: May I have your attention for a moment please. We'll continue our customary format, come forward to the microphone, please give your name and what organization you are representing and would you please keep your remarks brief as possible. If you have a prepared statement would you please leave it. First speaker I'm going to call upon is Dr. David Dawson.

Dr. Dawson: I'm Dr. David Dawson of Glastonbury. I'm chairman of the special education committee of the Education Department of Central Connecticut State College and I'm chairman of the Children's Committee of the Connecticut Association for Mental Health. On behalf of the Connecticut Association for Mental Health I'd like to express support for HB6448 concerning a formal review and appeal for children in special education programs. When the special education act was originally drafted, our Association felt that such a review procedure was a vital part of the total bill. This procedure, however, was not then included in the final bill. During the 1969 session of the General Assembly our Association again supported adoption of such a measure, but at that time, the bill was defeated. Experience in the past four years, and the early returns from the Association sponsored State wide

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY FEBRUARY 17, 1971

Dr. Dawson: survey, indicate that there is a need for a review and appeal procedure and that it should be visible as part of our State statutes, we feel that it is now not visible. We need this procedure to protect the school system from unreasonable demands and to protect the child and his family from inadequate services. HB6448 would establish provision for hearing and review of 1. the special education programs prescribed and provided for the child. 2. The diagnosis given the child. and 3. any exclusion or exemption from school privileges of a child. This bill provides for an independent professional review and evaluation of the programs under question, which in our opinion is vital to the protection of the welfare of the child and the school system. We believe that this procedure is necessary to settle, short of court action, disputes occurring between parents and local boards of education over special education services for handicapped children. We urge your approval of this important measure. I might also at this time mention that the results of the State wide survey of what is being done for emotionally disturbed children in the schools of Connecticut will be made available to this Committee as soon as it's completed, hopefully within the next month. Frankly we are quite discouraged by the bleak picture reflecting inadequate classes, instruction and services for disturbed youngsters and all handicapped children, in many many school systems. Thank you.

Rep.DellaVecchia: Thank you, Dr. Dawson. The next speaker is Mr. John Allison, (absent from hearing at this time) Mrs. Jody Rosebaum, Mrs. David Rubbins(both absent from hearing at this time) Mrs. Allene Kelly

Mrs. Kelly: Before I begin, may I suggest that if the Education Committee has $150 it can invest it in an overhead projector then all speakers can be flashed in full daylight back behind the speaker and they would be no need for an interpreter and the written word would be interpreted by all deaf people.

Rep.DellaVecchia: Thank you. We'll take your remarks into consideration.

Mrs. Kelly: I am Mrs. Allene Kelly. I represent the Connecticut Assoication for Hearing Impaired Children. I am a teacher of hearing impaired children in the town of North Haven. My remarks today I think are of importance because of the fact that I teach and the fact that I've had a background in many towns and have had the flavor of teaching and its

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY FEBRUARY 17, 1971

Mrs. Kelly: problems in towns that have been from population of 2,000 to 25,000. Public Act 627 was a landmark law extending education to all exceptional children as their right. The intent of the law was clear. The implementation of the law has been negligible. An unanticipated effect of the law has been to expose many problems that exist locally. These are the problems that are often unrecognized and hidden in a smoke screen of semantics. They are insufficient meaningful communication among educators, administrators, parents and boards of education, budgeting priorities and prejudice. We have the knowledge, personnel, and technology available right now to train the educably retarded child to become a responsible, independent self-supporting adult, to intergrate the deaf and the blind into society's mainstream. With sheltered workshops the trainable retarded can become partially self supporting. A few towns in this State which have committed themselves to the philosophy of total education have produced outstanding programs. These only serve to illuminate the fact that the majority of the 169 municipalities in Connecticut neglect the education of exceptional children. I think HB6466 is a rational, intelligent attempt to solve the problems of special education without infringing upon the rights of individuals local options to communities, and legislated perogatives of boards of education.

Sen. Mondani: Dick Unger, Mrs. Blanchard, Mr. Spear (all absent from hearing at this time). Reverend Desmarais.

Reverend Desmarais: Mr. Chairman, members of the Education Committee, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Camille Desmarais the Espiscopel Church's missionary to the deaf, of Connecticut. I am a graduate of the American School for the Deaf. Nearly all my wakening hours are spent struggling with the problems of the deaf. I do not claim to be an expert in the education of the deaf, but I do know quite a few things about the adult deaf. Since most of the problems deaf people have to live with are rooted in their childhood, I have a deep interest in the special education bills before this legislature which will affect the lives of my people. The very content of bills 6466 and 6449 show that the people responsible for them are far from knowledgeable about the problems of deafness in their many forms and degrees. Our State is faced with financial difficulties and yet

Reverend Desmarais: we have proposals before us which would be expensive and in my opinion, do more harm than good. To be more specific, any advisory council on education of the deaf should include at least one deaf adult. The principal of self-determination is a sound one and it should certainly apply to the minority with which I live and work. Who is more knowledgeable about deafness than professional deaf persons. Certainly not so called educators of the deaf or consultants who cannot even communicate with the people they claim to serve. HB6449 should spell out that the advisory committee shall include a representative from the Connecticut Council of Organizations Serving the Deaf which is composed of 24 member organizations and also a representative from the American School for the Deaf. Without these provisions I fear the proposed bill will make the lives of deaf children even more difficult than they are presently. Thank you.

Sen. Mondani: Gary Curtis.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Chairman, members of the Education Committee, my name is Gary Curtis. At 8:15 a.m. this morning we learned from a mother of a deaf child that HB6806 might be disregarded and consideration would be given 6466. HB6806 had dealt specifically with the deaf and has been discussed with parents, educators audiologists, the deaf community and other interested in the welfare of the hard of hearing and deaf. Revisions to make the concept workable had been suggested to those concerned in our open discussion. Only this past Monday for exapmle, I had a letter from State officials connected with education of the deaf giving me additional background on 6806, and we had grown to the point of agreeing in concept and workability with that bill. Several years ago many of us lived through the legislation that lumped deaf children into an omibus bill for educational programming. There was opposition, however late to that being done, but considerable emotion and bias, and the good that would be done for other handicapped persons saw it through. Now we are except in seversl instances, picking up those deaf children who could not mold themselves to the programs. It was educationally unsound. And now the same thing may be done. We had better oppose and oppose strongly bill 6466 as it pertains to the hard of hearing and deaf because I'm certain that there is a great misunderstanding, ambiguity, insufficient information and a shortage of statistics surrounding

Mr. Curtis: the bill. We must not move forward on legislation so based. I would like you to remember that the complexities of school situations for the deaf are unique. The deaf child needs special considerations and legislation bearing on his problems, needs, very special consideration by experienced people. I along with the great bulk of parents, the deaf community and persons from the areas of education of the deaf, audiology and others who care very deeply about getting better programs are not familiar with 6466. We have no idea how it will effect education of the deaf in Connecticut. We must know because lives and time can be wasted although the general intent of those concerned may be quite legitimate. I wonder for example, if 6466 is for only the multi-handicapped, and there are many multi-handicapped deaf children being unserved. If so we should not even consider involving deaf children, per sa, but should incorpate the multi-handicapped deaf. In addition I oppose bill 6449 because the proposed representation to the advisory body who would counsel toward comprehensive educational services for the deaf is inadequate and a misrepresentation of the great majority of persons interested in the total spectrum of services for the hard of hearing and deaf. There's a great deal of emotion behind any legislation connected with these very special children. I would suggest to all groups as Representative Klebanoff did so beautifully this morning, that we consider as a place where emotion and bias behind proposed legislation end and just plain people begin. Thank you very much. I happen to be the assistant executive director, headmaster of the American School for the Deaf, but more importantly I think, pertaining to this particular legislation have had the opportunity to interview at least a thousand parents of the deaf children over the past year. Thank you.

Sen. Mondani: I might explain that the bill that some of you are referring to 6806, was not referred to the Education Committee, it was referred to the Public Health and Safety Committee and this accounts for our not having it in our own book today. We will attempt to see the chairman of that committee to see if the bill could be referred to the Education Committee since we're handling the whole topic and we'll ask him today, and I don't anticipate any real problems. But that accounts for our not having it in front of us.

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY FEBRUARY 17, 1971

Sen. Mondani: Mrs. Rosenbaum.

Mrs. Rosenbaum: I"m Judy Rosenbaum and I'm the president of The League for Autistic and Mentally Handicapped Children. We of the League for Autistic and Mentally Handicapped Children, the name tells it as a composite of the many labels given our children, would like to state our support in regard to bill 6466 and 6448 introduced by Representative Albert Webber. Our main concern is the lack of special programs for our children. Current programs are inadequate for their educational needs. Our children are so scattered throughout the State that often local boards cannot afford the cost of adequate programs. The educational needs of our children are above and beyond the capabilities of our local boards. Therefore we support HB6466. Establishing a regional center for our children would save both the State and local boards money. By centralizing services fewer professionals will be needed. Our children will have a facility within our State that can provide the right wide range of services that they desire. Therefore our support of bill 6448. Thank you.

Sen. Mondani: Mr. Robbins.

Mr. Robbins: Gentlemen. I don't represent any group. I'm a parent of an 8 year old girl who can't be here today because she's already in an institution, very far away and she can't speak for herself because she can't speak. Now the funny thing is, inview of the interest of the people in the audience today is, that my daughter can hear perfectly. Nothing wrong with her hearing at all. She has been diagnosed since birth as autistic. Now I can't tell you anything more than most experts can just what autism is, but I can describe to you sort of,the terms of my daughter. Suffices to say it's a profound emotional disturbance, characterized by in my daughter's case of a very intact intellect, which is not necessarily from many forms of mental retardation, my daughter Amy isn't retarded in the strictest sense of the word, she has an average intellect and by all measurable means has a superior intellect. Now the funny thing is I'm not here to tell you that she belongs in a regional day program because I'm not really sure that she does. She's been in a very good day school program, the very one Mr. Barall's youngster is in today. Nobody is really

Mr. Robbins: certain of that, we only know that she belongs in a residential program at this stage in her long road towards fuller development. But I do feel this, and I can tell you this, she's 200 miles away at the age of 8 and I ask you to consider, all of you here, what would it have been like to be separated from your mother, your father and your brother at age 8. This is a child who is barely aware of the whole world around her any way. Imagine trying to deal with this kind of separation. She's away at a cost of over $11,000 a year. Now I happen to be a very staunch believer in a regional approach to municipal services. And I'm a layman but I'll make a prediction that in the 21st century this State and almost every State that's a part of the 21st century will have some form of government that recognizes this concept. It's a dirty word these days, regionalization. Nobody wants to talk about it, but we'll see it because it has to come. The biggest problem facing our State today and almost every other State is money. We don't have enough money to serve the needs of our people. It stands to reason that if we share our resources and share our concern that we're going to save some money and we'll have some money to deal with the problems of our society. So what I'm saying is that although it is not a panacea for all profoundly handicapped youngsters, regional centers are definitely a step in the a direction that needs to be taken. And all I really want to do is just ask you people to go on record now, by taking the first step. Thank you very much.

Sen. Mondani: Mr. Unger.

Mr. Unger: Members of the Committee, my name is Richard Unger, I'm from Stamford and I am the parent of a hearing impaired child. I've been listening with interest all morning to various points of view. I'd like to express mine now. I would like to say that I'm talking particularly in favor of HB6466 but I would also like as a personal basis to go on record as being opposed to SB416. Because I think that tends to take away certain parental prerogatives which presently exist. And I might say gentlemen that I have recently been involved in a situation regarding my own son where if bill 416 were passed I would have probably been required to spend considerable funds in order to achieve an education for my son which I consider to be a viable one.

Mr. Unger: But as I say I'm speaking particularly in favor of HB6466 providing regional programs for handicapped children and particularly hearing impaired children. The session in 1967, legislative session, and this Committee which I had the opportunity to speak to at that time also, passed an act numbered 627 which resulted in some statutes mainly 10-76 inclusive, which I consider tob be a forward step in the education of not only hearing impaired children but other handicapped children. However, in the ensuing four years I have seen that at least my local school board has taken no action with regard to 10-76. Now this is not because there's not a need. There are some 18 children in Stamford who are in need of such services, and in addition there are several others that are either at the American School for the Deaf or the Mystic Oral School for the Deaf or at some other institution, either within the State of Connecticut or without. All of these children could benefit from special education services. However for various and sundry reasons which I won't go into today, the City of Stamford is unable to provide those services. Regional programs and a regional program in our area particularly in Fairfield County, would provide such services to those children. Many of the children who are not at home presently, that is to say they are in one of the two learning institutions within the State of Connecticut or in private institutions elsewhere, or public institutions elsewhere could benefit, these are hearing impaired children now, could benefit from a regional program, providing appropriate services. In addition the children who now travel from Greenwich, Connecticut to Norwalk, which does have a program, and from other towns around our area who travel long distances by taxi, and bus to programs, local day programs in other communities, namely Norwalk, Westport and perhaps one other, would benefit from a regional center. And because of that I feel that a law which provides the ability for the State Board of Education to the Department of Education to create where needed, such regional programs is a must. It adds one more capability to the State of Connecticut for educating handicapped children. Thank you.

Sen. Mondani: There was a meeting of the State and Urban Development Committee scheduled for this room. If there's some people here, that Committee is scheduled to meet in 418. State and Urban Development will be

Sen. Mondani: meeting in 418. The second thing is we had also scheduled hearing on lunch programs and for those people who are here in that area, we'll proceed with this hearing and then go right into the school lunch program. If we can get together the school lunch subcommittee in a separate room, we'll move that group into that room. That's what we're trying to do now for your convenience. Miss LaMonte.

Miss LaMonte: My name is Michele LaMonte. I'm the parent of a 7 year old deaf child who is a student at the American School for the Deaf. I came here today to support HB6806 with vision. I since have discovered that bill 6466 is being discussed today. I read it for the first time this morning and I'm not in favor of this bill. I don't feel that the State Board of Education should make the final decision for the placement of children. I'm opposed to this bill as it pertains to hearing impaired children, it may have some value for children with some other handicap. I feel that hearing impaired children have a unique learning ability or disability. Some method of learning must be different to compensate, they cannot be treated in the same building in the same way. Therefore, I think the matter should be considered separately. Thank you.

Sen. Mondani: Marvin Sallop.

Mr. Sallop: My name is Marvin Sallop, and I am the son of deaf parents and I'm here today really to discuss my support for 6806, however, we know the story behind it. I won't go into a lengthy discussion because other people have spoken and voiced my ideas in opposition to both 6466 and 6449. I would like sir, to make this one point, and one point only. It's that any bill considering education of the deaf should be researched among the deaf themselves, in their experiences, in their schools, in their educational procedures and in their lives after graduating from those schools. Their thoughts and ideas should be taken into account for any education program taken on.

Sen. Mondani: Mr. Sallop, first of all I'd like to commend you for assisting us in acting as the interpreter, and you have done a magnificent job, and we certainly appreciate it. Giving the people the opportunity to give testimony. Secondly, Representative Klebanoff and I met and this is why the suggestion was offered that we would try to bring all the groups

Sen. Mondani: together. We know that there are problems with each of the bills and we want to make sure that whatever is developed has the full approval of all the groups involved so that we do not hurt any one and we don't want to do anything but help them. Ann Switzer; Madelyn Neumann(both absent from hearing at this time) George Gillespie.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I come in support of bill 5650. making a revolving board. I have been with rehabilitation of the blind for some 20 odd years, starting here in Connecticut in 1953. Since then I've been Nation wide. And accreditation for agencies serving the blind is a very, very important process. There are several things involved. This bill I believe will satisfy most all of the blind in Connecticut. To go further than that, it'll satisfy the National accreditation agency and we will not ever lose any of the matching funds which is an important part of rehabilitation of the blind. If we do not get accreditation in this area I can see the day when the matching funds maybe curtailed. Before we're threatened with that I hope that we bring our State agencies for the blind in line with those good practices which will give us all the support and at the same time give the blind representation which is new blood from time to time and permit the valuable rehabilitation for the blind to go forth. And I thank you.

Sen. Mondani: Mr. Patton.

Mr. Patton: My name is William Patton and I am the directer of the board of education for services for the blind, and I'm speaking today on behalf of the board in favor of SB287 (Sen. Caldwell) AN ACT CONCERNING STATE PAYMENT OF INSTRUCTION COSTS FOR BLIND PERSONS which deals with increased payments for the education of blind, visually impaired and multi-handicapped blind children. Specifically this bill would change the General Statutes, Chapter 174, Section 2, 10-295 to increase educational payments that can be made for blind children from $3400 to $4000 annually and the educational payment that can be made for a blind child who is also deaf or has another severe handicap from $6000 to $7500. Now this increase is necessary to meet the tuition costs that we have had to do periodically over the past two years, to meet the increased tuition costs for blind children and multi-handicap

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY FEBRUARY 17, 1971

Mr. Patton: blind children who require the services of residential schools and specifically in most cases I'm referring to the Oak Hill School in Hartford and the Perkins School in Watertown, Mass. which has a fine program for deaf, blind children who also may have other handicaps. I might just mention that the philosophy is to encourage children whereever it is realistically possible to go to public school and more and more of the children for whom we are responsible and the board if responsible for the education of all blind and visually impaired children in the State. More and more are going to public school, approximately 2/3 at this point. The average cost for the child in public school for whom we provide special education services and materials as necessary is $1200 which is considerably less than the statutory limitations. So I respectfully request your support of this bill. Thank you.

Sen. Mondani: Mrs. Myrum.

Mrs. Myrum: I am Sophie Myrum, mother of an adult Cerebral Palsied son and a teacher of the exceptional children for many, many years. I'm actually here representing the Cerebral Palsy Association of Connecticut. We of United Cerebral Palsy Association of Connecticut wish to express our support and endorsement of HB 6448. This bill concerns a proposed procedure for the review of programs for exceptional children. At present, there is no statutory method under which either parent or guardian may seek review of the actions of local boards of education as to the diagnosis, evaluation or placement of their children. With full recognition of the sincerity of these boards, it is not reasonable to expect their decisions to be errorless at all times. Therefore, in fairness to boards of education, parents and children alike, it is respectfully suggested that HB6448 be adopted. It will close a gap in our laws and provide thereby, better opportunities for the successful education of our handicapped children. We are also supporting and would like to endorse HB6466 which concerns state operated programs for seriously handicapped children. A substantial step was initiated with the enactment of Section 10-76A to 10-76G covering' the special education of handicapped children. This was landmark legislation which provided for the education of those who had been otherwise neglected.