

Comparison of Current Education Statute & Education Reform Final Legislation

Principle: Enhance families’ access to high-quality early childhood education opportunities.	
<i>Current Statute</i>	<i>Final Legislation</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No current state obligation to create a specific number of early childhood opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates 1000 new early education slots in low-income communities Launches a facilities study for the continued expansion of early education Calls for the development a Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates pilot program to enhance literacy for students in kindergarten through third grade

Principle: Authorize the intensive interventions and enables the supports necessary to turn around Connecticut’s lowest-performing schools and districts.	
<i>Current Statute</i>	<i>Final Legislation</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No coherent program for state intervention in the state’s struggling schools; responsibility to turn around low-performing schools largely rests with local districts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates the Commissioner’s Network, enabling the State to provide intensive supports and interventions in 25 of the lowest-performing schools over the next three years Each turnaround school will convene a Turnaround Committee made up of teachers, parents, and administrators, which will have the opportunity to submit a consensus plan for consideration by the Commissioner of Education Turnaround plans can also be developed and implemented by the Commissioner Enables high-performing non-profit school operators to operate a subset of the turnaround schools (6 of the 25) Under specified circumstances, allows financial impact bargaining, on an expedited timeframe, regarding elements of the plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient specificity for identification of struggling readers and interventions on their behalf 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates an ambitious pilot program to enhance literacy for students in kindergarten through third grade with specific interventions

Comparison of Current Education Statute & Education Reform Final Legislation

Principle: Expand the availability of high-quality school models, including traditional schools, magnets, charters, and others.	
<i>Current Statute</i>	<i>Final Legislation</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State charter schools receive \$9,400 per pupil • State law does not give special consideration to charters with special missions to serve individual student populations • No incentive to create local charter schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increases charter per pupil funding to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ \$10,500 for 2012-2013 ○ \$11,000 for 2013-2014 ○ \$11,500 for 2014-2015 • Requires state charters to submit a recruitment and retention plan detailing efforts to serve priority student populations. The State Board will hold schools accountable for adherence to these plans. • Requires the State Department of Education to endeavor to launch two charter schools focused on English Language Learners/dual language programs in the coming years. • Offer incentives to local Boards of Education that reach agreement with their bargaining unit regarding staffing flexibility, to launch local charter schools – such districts are eligible for \$500,000 startup grants and \$3000 per pupil operating grants beginning in the 2013-2014 school year.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agricultural Science High Schools receive \$1,355 per pupil in state funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide additional funding for Agricultural Science High Schools, magnet schools, and vocational-technical schools.

Principle: Ensure that our schools are home to the very best teachers and principals – working within a fair system that values skill and effectiveness over seniority and tenure	
<i>Current Statute</i>	<i>Final Legislation</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluations are ongoing but no time period is specified and implementation varies by district • Teachers are required to have a specific number of Continuing Education Units (CEUs) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires annual performance evaluations of principals, administrators, and teachers, based upon the framework developed by the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council. • Strengthens professional development for educators, requiring job-embedded coaching as the predominant form of training. • Requires an evaluation system to be piloted in a diverse group of 8-10 school districts.

Comparison of Current Education Statute & Education Reform Final Legislation

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tenure is attained based on number of years of service: a teacher offered a fifth year of employment is automatically granted tenure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awards tenure on the basis of effective practice. • Allows for ineffective teachers to be terminated. • Focuses termination hearings on whether the evaluation ratings were reasonable and in accordance with the new evaluation program. • Limits, for the first time, the number of hours of evidence and testimony.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No designation exists for excellent teaching performance to enable career advancement within teaching 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognizes excellent educators with a “distinguished educator” designation; creating a career ladder within the teaching profession
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of financial incentives to attract the highest quality teacher candidates to lowest performing schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creates a program to enable the 10 lowest-performing districts to offer employment to top teacher preparation students programs early in the hiring season.

Principle: Deliver more resources, targeted to districts with the greatest need – provided that they embrace key reforms that position our students for success	
<i>Current Statute</i>	<i>Final Legislation</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increases ECS funding by \$50 million, with \$39.5 million targeted to the Alliance Districts – the state’s 30 lowest-performing districts. • Introduces new accountability for funding for low-performing districts. • Provides for a “Common Chart of Accounts” as a budgetary template, enhancing transparency for education spending at the local level.