

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

PA 14-230

HB5566

House	6944-6947	4
Senate	3480-3481	2
Education	1154-1156, 1193-1197, 1248-1252, 1414, 1416, <u>1426-1427</u>	17

23

H – 1201

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2014**

**VOL.57
PART 21
6912 – 7260**

Those absent and not voting 7

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The bill, as amended, is passed.

Mr. Clerk, 266.

THE CLERK:

On page 7, House Calendar 266, favorable report
of the Joint Standing Committee on Education,
Substitute House Bill 5566, AN ACT CONCERNING MINOR
REVISIONS TO THE EDUCATION STATUTES.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's
favorable report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you
remark, sir?

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This bill, as indicated, is minor revisions to
the education statutes. It would change the title
special master to district improvement specialist. It
would change the schedule for visual, hearing and

postural screenings. It would indemnify teacher mentors against lawsuits and other minor changes.

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO 5606. I ask the Clerk please call and I be given permission to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The Clerk is in possession of LCO Number 5606, which will be designated as House Amendment Schedule "A."

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

House Amendment "A," LCO 5606, introduced by Representative Fleischmann, et al.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann, what's your pleasure?

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The amendment before us would change district improvement specialist to district improvement officer, would ensure that students who wish to serve internships on farms and agricultural centers would be able to do so more easily and other minor changes.

I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Question is on adoption.

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And the good Chair did specify specifically there are multiple minor changes and I do ask the Chamber to support the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you -- thank you, sir.

The question is on adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A."

Let me try your minds. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Opposed, nay.

The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted.

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members take your seats. The machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll.

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Will members please return to the Chamber immediately.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Have all the members voted? If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked.

The Clerk will take a tally and the Clerk will announce the tally.

Mr. Clerk, please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

H.B. 5566, as amended by House "A."

Total Number Voting 144

Necessary for Passage 73

Those voting Yea 144

Those voting Nay 0

Those absent and not voting 7

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The bill, as amended, is passed.

Mr. Clerk, Calendar 180.

THE CLERK:

House Calendar 180 on page 5, favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Environment,
Substitute House Bill 5417, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A
SEASON FOR THE TAKING OF GLASS EELS.

**S - 679
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2014**

**VETO
SESSION**

**VOL. 57
PART 11
3246 – 3508**

pat/gbr
SENATE

295
May 7, 2014

SENATOR LOONEY:

If we might pause for just a moment to verify a couple of additional items.

Madam President, to verify an additional item, I believe it was placed on the Consent Calendar and Calendar Page 30, on Calendar Page 30, Calendar 592, Substitute for House Bill 5476.

THE CHAIR:

It is, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

It is on? Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Madam President. If the Clerk would now, finally, Agenda Number 4, Madam President, Agenda Number 4 one additional item ask for suspension to place up on Agenda Number 4 and that is, ask for suspension to place on the Consent Calendar an item from Agenda Number 4.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President, and that item is Substitute House Bill Number 5566 from Senate Agenda Number 4.

Thank you, Madam President. If the Clerk would now, if we might call for a vote on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk. Will you please call for a Roll Call Vote on the Consent Calendar. The machine will be opened.

THE CLERK:

An immediate Roll Call has been ordered in the Senate.

pat/gbr
SENATE

296
May 7, 2014

An immediate Roll Call on Consent Calendar Number 2 has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

If all members have voted, all members have voted, the machine will be closed. Mr. Clerk will you please call the tally.

THE CLERK:

Consent Calendar Number 2.

Total number voting	36
Necessary for adoption	19
Those voting Yea	36
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

The Consent Calendar passes. Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President. Two additional items to take up before the, our final vote on the implementer. If we might stand for just, for just a moment.

The first item to mark Go is, Calendar, to remove from the Consent Calendar, Calendar Page 22, Calendar 536, House Bill 5546. If that item might be marked Go.

And one additional item, Madam President, and that was from Calendar, or rather from Agenda Number 4, ask for suspension to take it up for purposes of marking it Go, that is House Bill, Substitute for House Bill 5417. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**EDUCATION
PART 3
1035 – 1449**

2014

Thank you very much.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Thank you, sir.

Next is Bruce Douglas. Mr. Douglas here? No. Michael Corjulo to be followed by Mary Ellen Donnelly.

Welcome.

MICHAEL CORJULO: Greetings Senator Stillman, Representative Fleischmann, and the members of the Education Committee. My name is Mike Corjulo. I would like my colleague, Donna Kosiorowski to join me. She's scheduled to speak in a little bit, and we thought we would conserve a little time together, if that's okay.

I'm the health coordinator for the ACES School System and the president of the Association of School Nurses of Connecticut, ASNC. I'm also a practicing primary care provider and an acting member of the PCMH Care Management Committee, Co-Chaired by Representative Cook. And I would like to express support for raised Bill 5566, an act concerning minor revisions to the education statute, Section 4, from the perspective of both my roles, and I'd like to thank the committee for addressing this issue in this bill.

I think the historic rationale for some of the health screenings in school has been in response to the lack of healthcare access by too many students, potentially having an impact on their academic achievement, particularly underinsured students or those who are Medicaid recipients.

So as a primary care provider and a PCMH

committee member, I'm quite pleased to say that this is no longer the case. I've seen firsthand how our Medicaid system has transformed the innovative PCMH model, investing millions of dollars to restructure our healthcare system, integrating two key concepts that supports this legislation. A commitment that all 600,000 Medicaid recipients have a primary care provider, using a medical home framework, and a goal that these children/adolescents receive comprehensive Well Child Care, according to the American Academy of Pediatrics and EPSDD's guidelines, which for children after the age of two is annually. These Well Child Care visits would include all the health screenings that have been delegated to schools and that this legislation is addressing.

From my school nurse perspective, I support this legislation based on the rationale that the screening grades aligns with current American Academy of Pediatric guidelines, which accomplishes two goals. This decreases the time students spend out of class not learning, receiving screening that is either not medically indicated or is duplicated from a Well Child Care visit. It also allows the school nurse more time to address the acute and chronic health issues that are impacting students' ability to be in class ready to learn, including, for example, food allergy prevention, asthma control, and injury prevention.

I do respectfully request that additional wording be added to clarify that schools do not need to duplicate screenings if done in some reasonable timeframe -- for example, six to nine months -- of that grade by an appropriate healthcare provider. So the rationale for the time frame is that students who are required,

for example, to have a seventh grade physical, often get that physical the summer or the spring beforehand in sixth grade, and that all the information on that physical is then -- we're able to use it, including immunizations, sports participation, and any of the other health requirements.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Thank you very much. Thank you. Questions for either of them.

I'm sorry. I didn't -- if you would introduce yourself, please.

MICHAEL CORJULO: Sure. Michael Corjulo.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Corjulo. Yep.

MICHAEL CORJULO: And Donna Kosiorowski.

DONNA KOSIOROWSKI: I'm with the Association of School Nurses of Connecticut and the Connecticut Nurses Association.

I think the evidence speaks for itself, and the reason I'm here with Mike is because my testimony is going to be the same as his.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Okay. Thank you. Short and sweet. We like that. Okay. Questions? Okay. Thank you. Thank you for waiting.

MICHAEL CORJULO: Thank you very much.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Mr. Douglas here; did he come back? He's probably gone.

Mary Ellen Donnelly to be followed by Dr. Louisa Spear-Swerling.

Welcome.

testimony. So, thank you.

Questions anyone? Thank you again.

Melodie Peters, please. And while she's coming up, we have a young man in the first row. Was he here to testify, or is he keeping you company? Okay. Because if there are children waiting to speak, we like to take them. Okay. He's happy. We're happy.

MELODIE PETERS: I'm still a child.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Thank you. Welcome. Good to see you.

MELODIE PETERS: Thank you very much, Madam Chairwoman and Chair Fleischmann, for this opportunity to speak to the members of the Education Committee. I feel like we're old friends by now.

I do represent AFT Connecticut as president with 29,000 members, 15 of those in the education system.

I'm here to quickly testify on a number of bills.

We are in strong support of Senate Bill 476. The early childhood education is vital to a child's lifelong academic success. We believe that the good work that Governor Malloy and his committee has done and continues to do to improve access to quality preschool programs. It makes sense also to carry that commitment to early childhood learning through a full day of kindergarten. So we are suggesting that you take a look at that.

My members, Josue and Rose, and in listening to Representative Candelaria, and their

HB5561
HB5566

testimonies were really all encompassing; and we wholeheartedly endorse their positions.

- On House Bill 5561, we've included suggested language for you to consider we believe that Connecticut supports local charter schools, and we do believe that they should be able to play by the same rules.

They have different funding mechanisms and accountability structures than state charter schools. We believe it would appropriate to have at least one local charter school audited each year just as has been the practice for state charter schools. It's simply a leveling of the playing field, and there's suggestive language there for you to consider.

On House Bill 5566, you're going to hear from one of my members later this evening about the special master and how that got rolled out in Windham. You heard some comments earlier today, and we believe that the bill is really well intentioned. We like the idea that you're changing the name, but we also think we need to put more teeth into what the special master is supposed to do in a community. And make it inclusive so that you are bringing in, you know, our parents and teachers to talk about -- and local politicians or boards, to talk about what you're going to do.

This was intended to be an interim step to a state takeover, and we believe that that should be preserved.

Our proposal, which is included in my written testimony, attempts to build some of the good intentions, and you will see in my testimony what we're proposing that you would take a look at as you're putting more teeth into this special master legislation. And we really do

231
rc/jt/cd

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

March 17, 2014
11:00 A.M.

appreciate that the committee is taking another look at this.

And that's it.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Thank you very much. We do have -- I have a copy in my office of some correspondence that you had shared with -- with the Co-Chairs early on before session even started in relationship to the special master. So we'll look at that again.

I agree with you. It's hard to come up with a new name, but I think we have some ideas floating around. I know that in New London the title special master was brought to my attention was, quite frankly, offensive, and that we need to change it. And so we will do so.

This is one suggestion that's in this bill today, but we'll look at some other things as well so that a person doesn't -- my concern is that the title diminish the role in that we want this to be someone who is viewed with some authority. Maybe not all the authority, but some authority.

So we will be looking at that again as well as some other items in your correspondence.

MELODIE PETERS: I appreciate that, Senator.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Thank you.

MELODIE PETERS: I have to say too that the title actually offended me as well because I felt like we're living on a plantation somewhere. And I just think -- I don't know who pulled this name out, but it's not an appropriate use for what it is that we're trying to achieve.

And it truly is -- you know, you try to avoid a state takeover at any cost, and this is an opportunity for communities to be able to work with someone to avoid that. And so I am strongly in favor of the concept. Thank you.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Thank you very much. Any questions? Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Very briefly. Thank you for your testimony.

I was going through my packet. I didn't see it in written form. Was it submitted to us? Okay. I will get it.

And, certainly, the least we can do is improve the title that you've talked about, and I don't think there was any intention to offend. I think at the time that that bill was proposed to the legislature by the State Department of Education, the leader of the Education Department was African-American. So I don't think there was an intention to offend, but, nonetheless, there is the result.

And the concern of any community that gets appointed someone with that title. So we'll be working with you to try to make sure we address both the titular questions and the substantive ones. We appreciate you bringing it to our attention.

MELODIE PETERS: Thank you. And I would agree that there was no intention. It's just the way -- you know, some things rub you the wrong way. It was just one of those things.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Well, and as we know, that issue was addressed very late in the session, and it was one of these -- that's a reflection of doing things too quickly probably. I won't

233
rc/jt/cd

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

March 17, 2014
11:00 A.M.

belabor it, but we will be looking at your testimony.

MELODIE PETERS: I appreciate it.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Thank you. Any other questions?
Yes. Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON: Thank you, Madam Chair.

And thank you today for all your work on this issue. It's much appreciated in bringing it to the attention of the Education Committee. I just want to thank you for working with us on making some of these recommendations.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

MELODIE PETERS: Thank you, Representative Johnson.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Thank you. Good to see you again. Thank you very much.

Mary Maloney. Is Mary here? Tracy Lay. Oh, we go through this. We're going to get through quite a few names this way. Okay. Certainly if they come back, hopefully they will let us know that they have returned.

Karima Robinson. There she is. Patricia Charles. Is Patricia Charles -- good. You will be next and Michelle Ducette-Cunningham to follow.

Karima Robinson, welcome.

KARIMA ROBINSON: Good afternoon, Representative Fleischmann, Senator Stillman, and members of the Education Committee.

HB5562

My name is Karima Robinson. I am a tutor for Literacy Volunteers of Greater New Haven. I am

is heard regarding this.

KELLY HOWARD: Thank you.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Any other questions? If not, thank you, again, and you can thank your daughters as well.

KELLY HOWARD: Okay.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Now it's Tom Drewry's turn.

TOM DREWRY: Good evening, Representative Fleischmann and members of the Education Committee. My name is Tom Drewry, and I am Vice President of the Windham Federation of Teachers, AFT Local 1577. WFT represents over 350 teachers throughout the Windham School District. It is on their behalf that I testify before you today on HB 5566, and why we need to make changes to the special master statute.

PA 1161 is a piece of legislation fraught with a deep ambiguity reflected in the title of the position it created. The crafters of this language obviously hope to evoke us on some virtuosity or expertise. Connotations of the word master on through its ancient affinity with words like maestro and the Latin word for teacher, magister.

In PA 1161, this sense of the word is taken up in the mandate that the special master share his expertise in making collaborative decisions with local experts, the superintendent and the Board of Education in particular.

But master is a much more disquieting sense, one indicating extensive arbitrary and often cruelly imposed authority. This sense is reflected in terms such as task master and plantation master and stand in opposition to a

philosophy of collaboration.

Because PA 1161 did not adequately define the limits of the special master's authority, nor did it impose independent means of holding the special master accountable for fulfilling the role within the scope of the law, it set the potential for the special master's arbitrary execution of bureaucratic power, backed by a State Department of Education with newly politicized authority of its own, in Windham. Therefore, it has been the latter negative sense of master that has attached itself to a position created by PA 1161.

And I intend on sharing examples of the rigid management practices that have generated this association before doing so, unnecessary word on the mode of those practices. The particular management methodology of the appointed special master further evokes detention between the senses of master embodied in the legislation. Drung upon the principles of the Bro Foundation's Leadership Program is addressed policy decisions in Windham in a rigorously predictable way. As district managers define the scope and nature of the perceived problems, excluding any related factors with which he did not wish to contend.

Next he has established a narrowly defined goal that becomes the sole focus of subsequent decision-making.

And finally, he identified a limited number of from which the implemented policy would be drawn. Collaboration under this special master has extended to this, allowing district administrators and teachers to review, discuss, and select from a narrow set of policies predetermined by him. If the navigation of decision-making towards his desired end has

become threatened, he has resorted to unadorned directives.

This method can be illustrated through some details of the process of redesigning our high school. The special master's first order that the high school be divided into two distinct academies. When the redesign team entertained the prospect of horizontal division of the school into upper and lower academies, he ordered a vertical division with one academy adopting a standard theme.

While the committee was then allowed to pick the theme of the second academy, what was important to him was that the district adopted a portfolio model with as little critical dialect as possible. He managed (inaudible) maneuver through executive order. Then he hand-picked out of district experts to steer the high school redesign team in the right direction and eliminated from them anyone who offered input in variance with his desired outcomes for the plans.

Following this prescription, a firm directive, coupled with highly restrictive collaboration, the following policy decisions have been made in Windham despite limited or tenuous support from local experts.

Board of Ed. meetings were restructured to limit public input into this decision-making and insulate district leaders from critical commentary.

Teacher America was employed at some expense to the district and in spite of no genuine difficulties, hiring new personnel. Windham has had major difficulty maintaining staff, which the utilization of TFA will exacerbate.

A redundant study of the district's bilingual program was commissioned in order to redefine the district's instructional language needs. An overhaul of services to emergent bilinguals was mandated that rendered dozens of students who had been introduced to the English language fewer than 10 months previous into wholly English language classes without support.

The high school's alternative program was terminated, as the special master supported a state alternative education charter school for the district.

Agreements were reached between Windham and other local districts requiring the contracted districts to pay tuition for students wishing to attend school in other contracting districts.

As anticipated by many in Windham, we have seen an exodus of skilled students and funding. The special master then turned to private deals with parents of students not selected by lottery to attend out of district, promising to refund tuition paid by them out of pocket. The new Board of Education has since rescinded one of these contracts.

The budget process was overhauled. Per --

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Mr. Drewry, so the buzzer did go off a while ago, and we do have your written testimony.

TOM DREWRY: Okay.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: If you want to just wrap up and tell us the essence of the point you're trying to make.

TOM DREWRY: The essence is this. The revisions to

PA 1161 proposed by HB 5566 would do little more than change the title of special master to district turnaround specialist. Unless more substantial alterations, such as those attached to my testimony, are made to ensure that the authority invested in the position is precisely defined and subject to objective external review, then the title special master would remain as the more appropriate one.

Thank you for this opportunity. I would be happy to answer any questions.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Thank you for that testimony and the good summary, which I think captured what you were driving towards. I appreciate that.

Are there questions or comments from members of the committee? If not, thank you for your time, your testimony, your advocacy, your patience.

TOM DREWRY: Thank you.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Is Jessica Theisen still with us?

JESSICA THEISEN: Yes.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Your time is now.

JESSICA THEISEN: Hi. Thank you for taking the time to hear me.

I am here today to testify in support of raised House Bill 5562. My name is Jessica Theisen, and I live in Milford, Connecticut. I am the parent of an eight-year-old daughter, Isabelle, who is severely dyslexic.

We knew something was not quite right early on and placed her in the town preschool, assuming she would get early intervention. It has been



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



Connecticut General Assembly
Education Committee
Testimony of Commissioner Stefan Pryor
March 17, 2014

Sen. Stillman, Rep. Fleischmann, Sen. Boucher, Rep. Ackert, and members of the Education Committee, thank you for offering the opportunity to share some thoughts with you on a number of the bills on your agenda. I regret that I cannot join you today, but am certainly open to further dialogue around any of these issues.

HB 5563: An Act Concerning the Technical High School System and Agricultural Science and Technology Education Centers

Acknowledging that the Technical High School System now has its own governing board, we would appreciate the Committee's support for this legislation, which would permit the new board to oversee the reports submitted by the CTHSS system. We further appreciate the fact that the Committee is considering our proposal allowing the technical high schools to be eligible for all grant opportunities other public schools are open to.

SB 472: An Act Concerning State Funding For Education and the Budgets of Boards of Education

The Department appreciates the Committee's willingness to raise the minor, though important, language in the initial six sections. This will allow payments to proceed to districts for a number of grants as intended.

We would like to discuss the language in section 7 delaying the implementation of the Uniform Chart of Accounts. We believe this language may be unnecessary as we have been working diligently with stakeholders to ensure that in the first year – a transition year – the collection is not burdensome for districts, but will still provide us with necessary information to continue improving the system. In this first year we are asking districts to upload information in the way they always have, and we are making adjustments on our end to align the system accordingly. We join you in a commitment to relieve districts of burdens and mandates, and are open to a further dialogue on this issue.

SB 473: An Act Concerning Magnet Schools

The language in section 1 requiring magnet operators to notify parents of lottery results makes sense. We think this information is important for parents to be able to plan appropriately. We would note that the language in section 2 does not yet fully address our concerns around this issue. We have attached language submitted to the Committee, and ask that you consider substituting that language so that the Sheff Phase 3 settlement can be appropriately implemented.

SB 476: An Act Concerning the Academic Achievement Gap

The Department is supportive of opportunities for extended learning time for students, especially in our Alliance Districts and including full-day kindergarten. Of the 30 Alliance Districts, only 3 do not currently have full-day kindergarten. Several Alliance Districts have already chosen to use their additional funds to implement full-day kindergarten in their districts, so while this language may not be necessary, we are not opposed to it.

HB5561
HB5564
HB5566
HB5567
SR7
HR4

HB 5566: An Act Concerning Minor Revisions to the Education Statutes

The Department would request further conversation regarding the change in language from Special Master to Turnaround Specialist. We are receptive to revising this language to ensure that the title best captures the meaning of this role but would like to discuss the precise terminology. We would also like to note that our State Board of Education and the Windham Board of Education recently reached a resolution concerning the transition out of the special master arrangement in that district. We want to ensure this new language will not conflict with that agreement, and welcome the opportunity to address all aspects of this language change further with the committee.

HB 5567: An Act Concerning Alternative Schools

The Department welcomes the opportunity to further address alternative schools in Connecticut. At the direction of this Committee, the Department engaged in a study of alternative schools over the past year. That study was submitted to this Committee, and we are pleased that several recommendations are incorporated into this legislation. Conceptually, we agree with this legislation and think it helps to ensure that alternative schools are a quality part of the educational system. We think it is critical to have better data and information on these programs, and we highlighted that need in our report. This legislation would lead to more information on students and staff, facilities, and academic progress. We believe this is a positive development.

Our report also highlights the discrepancies between programs. We welcome the opportunity for the state to create guidelines for these programs, and are committed to working with stakeholders to ensure comprehensive, thoughtful guidelines that address student and staff needs.

We also commend the committee for defining alternative school programs. We are, however, concerned with one section of that definition, which requires these programs to adhere to sections 10-15, 10-16, and 10-16b – requiring the same curriculum and hours in a school day as all other schools. While we certainly acknowledge the need for quality educational opportunities for all students, we are concerned that in some cases, students who are attending an alternative school program benefit from a different experience – involving, for example, a different curriculum or differing hours. We would encourage the committee to amend this language so that the guidelines developed for alternative school programs allow for such flexibility rather than requiring conformance with these specific clauses. And, given both the importance and complexity of this subject, we would suggest that we collectively engage in further consultation with local district administrators of alternative school programs regarding their feedback on any more detailed requirements under considerations before we place such requirements in statute.

SR 7 and HR 4: Resolution Approving the Settlement Agreement in Sheff V. O'Neill

We would like to offer brief testimony encouraging your support of both resolutions. Your approval would confirm the Department's ability to move forward with the implementation of the phase 3 agreement as agreed to by the plaintiffs and the State. It is important that this stipulation be implemented in order to allow the Department to carry out the agreed upon work. Among this work is a new feature – the lighthouse school – which aims to help the Hartford Board of Education enhance the performance of and provide for the better positioning of a neighborhood school – and, through that work, help stabilize the surrounding area and strengthen diversity within the community. The Department supports these resolutions and is committed to carrying out the associated work as we move forward.

Michael Corjulo APRN, CPNP, AE-C
President Association of School Nurses of Connecticut
Area Cooperative Education Services (ACES)
350 State Street North Haven, CT 06473
(203) 498-6857
mcorjulo@aces.org

March 17, 2014

Greetings Senator Stillman, Representative Fleischman, Senator Boucher, Representative Ackert and members of the Education Committee.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony in support of:

HB 5566 An Act Concerning Minor Revisions to the Education Statutes, in Particular Section 4

I am Michael Corjulo, President of the Association of School Nurses of CT (ASNC) and a primary care provider who is also an active participant on the PCMH Care Management Committee. I very much appreciate this proposed legislation.

There are a few underlining trends that directly support the rationale for these revisions:

- This reflects the current trend in healthcare that CT has invested into: promoting primary care for every Medicaid recipient with the state's innovative PCMH program. As we commit to ensuring that every child has a primary care provider who can provide comprehensive annual Well Child Care, we are no longer in a position to rely on schools to compensate for that lack of healthcare.
- This will decrease the time students spend out of their class receiving screenings that may be redundant or not clinically indicated, while still maintaining a process to ensure screenings are done at ages that follows American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) guidelines (http://brightfutures.aap.org/tool_and_resource_kit.html).
- This supports our efforts to help districts use their school nursing resources more efficiently, meeting the acute and chronic care needs of students, and optimizing their time in class ready to learn.

I do respectfully request that additional wording be added to clarify that schools do not need to duplicate screenings if done within some reasonable timeframe (i.e. 6-9 months) of that grade by an appropriate healthcare provider. The rationale for the timeframe is that students who are required to have a 7th grade physical will often get that done during the previous spring or summer, which meets all of the other health requirements, including immunizations and sports participation, and should meet the criteria for these screenings as well.

I would also support future consideration for increasing the grades that comprehensive physicals are required, which would foster students connection with their Medical Home, address their physical and mental health care needs more proactively, and support the state's PCMH outcome measures.

Respectfully Submitted,
Michael T Corjulo APRN, CPNP, AE-C

Donna Kosiorowski RN MS NCSN
 Association of School Nurses of Connecticut
 Connecticut Nurses Association
 American Federation of Teachers
 3 Henry Drive
 Shelton, Connecticut 06484
skosiorowski@snet.net

March 17, 2014

HB 5566 An Act Concerning Minor Revisions to the Education Statutes

Thank you to Senator Stillman, Representative Fleischmann, Senator Boucher, Representative Ackert and members of the Education Committee for the opportunity to submit testimony in support of *HB 5566 An Act Concerning Minor Revisions to the Education Statutes, in particular Section 4.*

In researching the laws for screenings in Connecticut schools, the records go back to 1949. With the exception of the law related to postural screenings, which was changed in 1996, those laws have not changed.

Evidence based practices and recommendations from trusted sources such as the American Academy of Pediatrics recommend screenings as seen below.

Recommended change to meet the recommendations of AAP: Table 1

AAP / Bright Futures Hearing and Vision Screening Recommendations	
Age	Grade
5	KG
6	1 st
8	3 rd
9	4 th
10	5 th
7 (2 nd grade) and 11 -21 years are screened based on PCP risk assessment. A single vision screening is recommended once in early adolescence (would be met with 9 th or 10 th grade physical).	

Vision, hearing, and postural screenings are required as part of the mandated physical examination according to Chapter 169 School Health and Sanitation, Section 10-206, Health Assessments (b) (3) and (c) (3).

I respectfully ask you to adopt **HB 5566 An Act Concerning Minor Revisions to the Education Statutes** with the insertion of the following language:

“When screenings are done during a mandated physical examination, screenings need not be repeated in school.”

Thank you.