

Education Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No.: HB-7076

Title: AN ACT PROVIDING EDUCATION MANDATE RELIEF.

Vote Date: 3/24/2025

Vote Action: Joint Favorable Substitute

PH Date: 3/3/2025

File No.: 621

Disclaimer: *The following JOINT FAVORABLE Report is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose.*

SPONSORS OF BILL:

Education Committee

REASONS FOR BILL:

This bill aims to reduce unnecessary requirements for schools and give districts greater flexibility in how they serve students. By removing outdated mandates and streamlining policies, the bill supports a more efficient, student-centered education system that empowers local decision-making. One of the proposed changes addresses kindergarten admissions. Currently, if a child turns five after September 1, parents can request an early admission evaluation, and schools are required to conduct it. Under this bill, that evaluation would become optional. Schools would only be required to offer early admission assessments if they already have a policy in place. This change allows districts to make decisions based on their unique local needs and helps ease the pressure on school staff and resources.

The bill also modifies when special education services end. Right now, students with disabilities can continue receiving support through the end of the school year in which they turn 22. The new proposal would end services on a student's 22nd birthday, unless they graduate earlier. This adjustment helps schools plan more effectively for service delivery and ensures consistency across the state. Another key provision of the bill pauses enforcement of the state's racial imbalance law until July 1, 2029. While the law was designed to address racial disparities in school enrollment, many districts have found it difficult to comply due to changing population patterns. Temporarily suspending enforcement provides the state with time to re-evaluate the law and explore more effective, modern approaches to promoting diversity in schools. Finally, the bill eliminates an annual reporting requirement to the Commission for Educational Technology. By removing this administrative task, the bill helps reduce the paperwork burden on schools, allowing staff to focus more on student learning and less on bureaucracy.

In summary, this bill will be a step toward making the education system more responsive, efficient, and focused on students. It gives districts the flexibility to address their own challenges while ensuring that policies remain practical and relevant in today's educational landscape.

SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE:

The substitute extends the effective date of the kindergarten waiver provision, moving it from July 1, 2025, to July 1, 2026.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

[Connecticut Department Administrative Services, Commissioner, Michelle Gillman](#): Supports this bill, citing specifically Section 12. The Commissioner states that this section would eliminate a school district's responsibility of reporting to the Commission for Educational Technology, which has been seeing extremely low due to privacy law being a major obstacle to receiving and tabulating such data. Hence, eliminating the requirement to report to the Commission would save valuable funds and limit unnecessary data collection. In essence, increasing the Commission's focus on increasing technology use in education at an efficient cost.

[Connecticut Department of Education, Commissioner, Charlene Tucker](#): The Commissioner opposes this bill for several reasons. First, changes to Section 10-15c would increase confusion for children turning five after the September 1st deadline, creating barriers to special education and limiting school choice. The proposed lottery system would also complicate the process for parents. Additionally, the bill's proposed extra enrollment examinations are unnecessary, as each student's IEP already includes a review. The Commissioner also opposes Section 2-8, which would limit special education enrollment to a student's 22nd birthday, rather than the end of the academic year. A 2021 court ruling deemed the previous "through 21" language unlawful, and the current interpretation has greatly benefited students. Reducing the enrollment period would harm student success and support. In short, shortening special education services would create unnecessary uncertainty and negatively affect students whose birthdays fall before the end of the school year.

[Office of the Child Advocate, Acting Child Advocate, Christina Ghio](#): Opposes this bill saying that with the official cut off of September 1st for all kindergarten students turning age five would force many parents to pay for another year of out-of-pocket care for their children rather than utilize the public school system as they can now. The OCA believes this will cause inequality as a waiver system would benefit the financially able and disadvantage less financially able districts who cannot afford to do such an early enrollment option.

Also, reducing a child's time utilizing special education in the public school system by a year would increase waitlisting of students in ongoing care and disadvantage them greatly when it comes to developing social and emotional skills regarding post-graduate life.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

[Tracy Barney](#): Supports.

[Amity Regional School District No. 5, Director of Pupil Services, Tom Brant](#): Supports this bill because it would better fit with IDEA ending service on the student's 22nd birthday. Also, increasing ability for school districts to enroll students that turn five years old on or before September 1st of a school year will increase equity in such enrollment and benefit said students greatly.

[Connecticut Education Association, Legislative Coordinator, Louis Burch](#): Supports this bill because it clarifies the age of five by September 1st in a school district's academic year as the law for special educational enrollment in the state. Also, the waiver early enrollment programs some districts use would be benefited by this bill as reviewed by the school and other officials shall determine if the student is mentally ready for the start of kindergarten and therefore, the clarification is much needed and beneficial to school districts across the state.

[Amity Regional School District No. 5, Superintendent of School, Jennifer Byars](#): Supports this bill as it will bring the state better into line with IDEA and federal mandates regarding age of service termination and monetarily help school districts. Also, the strengthening of kindergarten enrollment date on September 1st of an academic year allows school districts flexibility in early enrollment as a date is mandated year on year and thus, makes operations less complex.

[Derby Public Schools, Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Matthew Conway Jr](#): Supports this bill because it would allow school districts to hasten transition periods before students become twenty-two and also allow students who are entering school to have a firm cut off date of September 1st for those turning age five as a deadline for regular enrollment.

[Ruth Gomez](#): Supports this bill because it would codify support through disabled student's twenty-second birthday, providing support for their transition into post-graduate life better than having it revoked at age eighteen.

[Salem School District, Superintendent, Brian Hendrickson](#): Supports this bill because it mandates consistent professional development by assessing and cutting funding for unused/under-used commissions and centralizing all training under the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE), which saves school districts, and the states, money.

[Connecticut Republican Assembly, National Director, Anne Manusky](#): Supports this bill for political reasons regarding faith and the need for further relief mandates for school districts facing other hardships.

[Mansfield Elementary School, Principal, Kate McCoy](#): Supports this bill because it provides developmental readiness clarifications, waiver programs, and lowers financial burdens on local school districts when it comes to kindergarten enrollment maintaining that one must achieve the age of five on or before September 1st of an academic year to be enrolled without submitting a waiver, which is to be evaluated by the proper authorities for readiness and need of enrollment.

[Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents, Executive Director, Fran Rabinowitz](#): Supports this bill citing clarification mandate relief regarding the implementation of September 1st as a cut off date for those aged five for enrollment in kindergarten.

[Putnam Public Schools, Superintendent, Steven Rioux](#): Supports this bill because it would save their school district over \$75,000 per student over a two-year period having to currently serve students until the end of the school year in which they turn twenty-two. It is difficult to pay this cost, so this bill would relieve their costs and help students while not financially over burdening the school system.

[Wilton Public Schools, Superintendent of Schools, Kevin Smith](#): Supports this bill because it reduces costs and creates a new consensus on what school districts are mandated to do when it comes to persons with disabilities and also when they are to allow students to enroll into kindergarten (Age five by September 1st, except if a waiver is submitted to an early acceptance program to be assessed and evaluated by the school authorities).

[Southern Connecticut State University, Interim Dean of Education, Christopher Trombly](#): Supports this bill saying that the Task Force to Study the Comprehensive Needs of Children in the State, of which he co-chairs, is insistent that such mandates that school districts must follow must be reduced, and this bill takes a step in doing so.

[Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents, Executive Director, Fran Rabinowitz](#): Supports this bill citing the increased clarification on both kindergarten enrollment and the cost savings and clarification on disability care termination after the student's twenty-second birthday. And as such, the executive director wishes all students to have a clear and successful transition out of the public education system following the termination of their services under its care.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

[Job Coach for public school, Sally Ajello](#): Opposes this bill because eliminating the ability for a student to continue working with his or her team of educators from school who provide them special education during their transitioning years, such benefits they provide in job searching and preparation for the future is lost. In essence, the students will be left in limbo without such support, and therefore, disadvantage them severely in terms of their future success and possible attendance of higher education or attainment of gainful employment.

[Medical Professional, Anonymous Anonymous](#): Opposes this bill because it removes benefits from students utilizing special education and penalizes them by reducing their time in programs to their birthday and not the end of the academic year that birth date lies within.

[Parent and Elementary Educator, Anonymous Anonymous](#): Opposes this bill because it would inordinately disenfranchise those with special needs by rescinding support they desperately need before their graduation (End of their school year when they turn twenty-two) compared to their classmates who do not receive such support who get to receive all benefits of the school curriculum until they graduate, no matter if their twenty-second birthday has elapsed before their final academic year has ended or not.

Anonymous Anonymous: Opposes this bill because it would threaten the rescinding and interruption of aid to such students in greatest need of special counseling and other such services included in their public education-provided special education to prepare themselves for life ahead along with job searching, which will greatly harm the prospects of our young people in need of this assistance.

Anonymously anonymous: Opposes this bill based on the budgetary need of students who receive such help and the negative effects such a cut of funding for students after their twenty-second birthday and before their graduation would have on them educationally.

Attorney, Lawrence Berliner: Opposes this bill citing Public Act No. 23-137 (Made effective July 1, 2023) in which the Department of Education mandates all school districts to maintain service to students, pursuant to Section 10-72a, until they graduate high school at the end of the year in which said student reaches the age of twenty-two.

This bill would therefore go against both this and the greater *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA) which also mandates that service be rendered to all students with disabilities until the completion of high school in the year in which they turn twenty-two years of age, not ending service exactly on a student's twenty-second birthday.

The greater impact this ending of service will have on students, as described by this petitioner, is incongruent to the reality on the ground as school districts do not suspend service before graduation currently. This is because such a termination would put the students in need of special education out of step with their fellow classmates and disadvantage them by rescinding vital post-graduation preparation that is vital to their success.

According to this attorney, such a bill would act as a discriminatory measure against our state's students with disabilities. Pursuant to "[T]he State Constitution of 1965 as amended by Article XXI enacted in 1984 that proscribes the denial of equal protection of the law, discrimination or segregation by the State, including state actors, such as local public schools, on the basis of an individual's physical or mental disability, in the absence of any compelling state interest as delineated in the Connecticut Supreme Court's decision in *Daly v. Delponte*, 225 Conn. 499 (1993)."

Moreover, there is no greater state interest for such a bill reducing time a student can benefit from services of public education after their twenty-second birthday, resulting in the finding that this bill is dilatory to the educational pursuits of persons with disabilities and overall a disservice to not them, but the state as a whole as no monetary savings would be made by this bill, pursuant to the fact that all assets needed by school districts to educate persons with disabilities and special needs are already allocated to them at the beginning of every school year, and therefore cannot be recalled on an individual basis on any student's twenty-second birthday.

Elaine Bernier: Opposes this bill because it would drastically shorten the time students with special needs may benefit from the transition program. They derive major benefits from said programs including job and life coaching and other such preparatory training for life ahead.

With these continued programs (Those that are threatened by this bill) the state would save money with more and more students with special needs and disabilities being better trained for life and work ahead and augmenting our state's workforce.

And, by keeping the transition period in place until the end of the academic year in which the student turns twenty-two years of age, special education teachers will be able to focus more on education and not rush through things as this bill threatens to do. With more time, the students and their teachers are better served and overall success rates increase compared to when things are rushed and transition periods are cut short when the student reaches their twenty-second birthday, which itself is an arbitrary date compared to the set end of the academic year for each school district, thus making scheduling and education during this period very difficult for special educators in this state.

[Katie Biga](#): Opposes this bill because it disqualifies students with disabilities from completing their education fully, threatening to "age them out" of benefiting fully from the services provided to them by the transition period already practiced in our states public school until the completion of their high school diploma at the end of the academic year in which they achieve twenty-two years of age.

[Marissa Bishop](#): Opposes this bill given the threat a sudden arbitrary discharge on students in vulnerable circumstances at their twenty-second birthday from public education would have on their educational success and overall wellbeing.

[Tricia Bresnahan](#): Opposes this bill due to the thread disruption in education is to disabled student's lives and the detrimental effects it has on their future success with limited ability to transition into the wider world for work and/or higher education.

[CT DD Council, Parent, Laurie Cantwell](#): Opposes this bill because of the negative effects abrupt ending of education coverage for those with disabilities have on students and their families.

[Neetha Chilukuri](#): Opposes this bill as a lack of continuing transition periods for students up to the end of the school year in which they turn twenty-two will cause more of them to be waitlisted for continuing care and inordinately disadvantage them.

[Heather Christopher](#): Opposes this bill due to the arbitrariness of a birthdate as a cutoff date for education for those with disabilities.

[Connecticut General Assembly, House of Representatives, Representative Lucy Dathan](#): Opposes this bill because it threatens to revoke transitional programs for those over the age of 21, but still in high school, utilizing special education. In essence, leaving them in limbo and removing their civil right to completing an education in this state. Also, this bill would remove an entire year of transition periods from these needy students, thereby disadvantaging them in the job market and life on a grander scale, of which these vital transition programs are meant to build and educate for in the first place.

[Julie Dauria](#): Opposes this bill citing the damage revocation of a year of transition periods have on students, including her grandson, who will miss out on vital services that prepare them for the future and facilitate better development.

[Tori Dauria](#): Opposes this bill citing the inability of their son to transition at 18 to Middlesex Community College at the current rate of education due to major lack of social skills that would be benefited by the current two-year transition period through their local school district. And hence, revoking such policies arbitrarily end on the student's twenty-second birthday is a disservice not only to their son, but to all persons needing such aid in the public school system around the state.

[Kristin Davis](#): Opposes this bill because it would deprive students, including their son, of vital services that they need through their IEPs to prepare them for life ahead. With a revocation of a year of such transition periods in which IEPs are used to prepare students such things, the students are left confused and disadvantaged, as well as the families who are left to navigate the extremely confusing situation regarding continuing care and/or how to go about utilizing such through other agencies.

[Advocate, Patricia Donovan](#): Opposes this bill because it would not give students with special needs access to a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) and would not be congruous to the interpretations of IDEA. Hence, cutting off a year of transitional periods for students utilizing such services would be a threat to their greater wellbeing and would stand contrary to law already passed regarding the subject.

[Para Educator, Amy Doyle](#): Opposes this bill changing the "age out" date to a student's twenty-second birthday.

[Retired, Kids are stupid, Harold Dubuc](#): Opposes.

[Marsha Elbourne](#): Opposes.

[Kristy Faulkner](#): Opposes this bill because it violates disabled students' civil rights to achieve an education by decreasing the time they benefit from services from the end of the year in which they become twenty-two to their twenty-second birthday.

[Beth Ann Fegley](#): Opposes this bill because it threatens special education services and the continuing wellbeing of students with disabilities.

[Special Education Equity for Kids in Connecticut \(SEEK\), Legislative Chair, Andrew Feinstein](#): Opposes this bill as it is intended as a measure to circumnavigate law already passed in blatant opposition of A.R. v. Connecticut State Board of Education, 5 F.4th 155 (2d Cir. 2021) and the extension thereof by the legislature of service to the end of the year when a student becomes twenty-two. In essence, this petitioner claims that this bill would in effect make life worse for those students in need of this aid and further make confusing the processes by which they can receive said support given the context of decreasing federal investment in and attention to such educational rights.

[Gina Fratini](#): Opposes this bill citing the damage done to students who are unsupported during their twenty-second year through the school system and before their graduation from high school.

[Bethel public schools, Job coach, Felicia Graham](#): Opposes this bill given the fact that support programs are minimal after students with disabilities graduate from high school and, therefore, revoking support at their twenty-second birthday and not using their twenty-second year to train and educate them further on social and other such important skills would drastically debilitate them further in future life.

[Jillian Griswold](#): Opposes this bill because it circumnavigates already passed court ruling A.R. v. Connecticut State Board of Education, 5 F.4th 155 (2d Cir. 2021) and following laws upholding student's access to care until the end of the school year in which they turn twenty-two years of age. And therefore, with the revocation of the final months of many students' educations given their birthdays land before the end of the academic year, their overall quality of life will drastically decrease if this bill is passed.

[Tara Harrison](#): Opposes this bill due to the impact it will have on disabled students and their families if transition periods are eliminated through the reduction of their education by a year.

[Newington Public Schools, Melissa Hart](#): Opposes this bill for many reasons, but mainly for the negative effects ending student's coverage at their twenty-second birthday will have on them and their families by depriving them of these vital transitional services as many have trouble dealing with change and would be at a major disadvantage as a direct result.

[Kathy Haughton](#): Opposes this bill due to the limited existence of adult support programs and the already underfunded status of public-school support systems which this bill threatens to cut or otherwise endanger.

[Grandmother, Maribeth Hemingway](#): Opposes this bill and its stipulations of making September 1st of the year a cut off for those achieving five years of age to be enrolled into kindergarten. In this petitioner's estimation, of which her family is an example, many students will be held back from joining a more sensible cohort of students that would better fit their family need with developmental acuity to back it up. The format that the bill takes is also contrary to the mandate of the State Department of Education who already offer waivers for early enrollment.

This petitioner also maintains support for an effective date of July 1, 2026, or 2027 to allow for more discussion and agency input on some of the bills more shortsighted and objectionable stipulations as detailed above.

[Attorney and Parent, Laura Heneghan](#): Opposes this bill citing students she represents who receive coverage under IDEA Section 504. By repealing Public Law 23-137, students will be greatly disadvantaged if they have a disability as they will be deprived of a year of transitional training between the time, they turn twenty-two years of age and the end of the school year in which they turn that age. Without this support, students will atrophy skill wise and be unable to interact with the world as effectively and succeed in life as time goes on post-graduation, which is the purview of training which these programs that this bill threatens with repeal counter.

Many individuals oppose this bill because it would eliminate the ability of students (specifically at Post University) to engage in the Ed Advance program which supports disabled students and prepares them for the future.

These persons include:

[Erin Hogan](#)

[Julia Hogan](#)

[Michael Hogan](#)

[Horizons, Assistant Director, Zachary Hope](#): Opposes this bill because it would be incongruent to the interpretations of IDEA and violate the decision of *A.R. v. Connecticut Board of Education*. Also, reversing Public Act 23-137 would disproportionately disadvantage and harm disabled students, not help them by depriving them of the achievement of educational milestones (Like graduation with their peers) by implementing an arbitrary birthdate end to access to the vital services they need to complete their education and transition into the greater world successfully after the completion of the academic year in which they turn twenty-two.

[Jennifer Iannuzzi](#): Opposes this bill because it would leave students with serious disabilities, like her own child, in a grave predicament trying to enroll in ongoing care services that would replace the ones removed from them by this bill after they turn twenty-two years of age.

[Parasol LLC, Special Education Advocate, Jay Loretta](#): Opposes this bill because it would deprive students with disabilities with vital transition time and education that is granted to them under Public Law 23-137. Without these trainings and increased social skills, etc., many individuals find themselves abandoned by the system and incapable of achieving a good quality of life due to lack of independence that these programs would grant to students with disabilities.

[Mark Jiminez](#): Opposes this bill because reducing the time students can benefit from special education in schools will be negatively affected by a sudden revocation of this care. Students who are capable of graduation on time (Before their twenty-second birth year) also usually take their diplomas and do not need to be enrolled in transition programs anyway, so this bill in essence is ending a program that is used by a subsection of those persons who are most in need of this care and diminishes their chances of future success by taking away their preparation/transitional period between school and post-graduation life.

[Alison Kerry](#): Opposes this bill because it decreases the development of life and job skills for those in need of special education and disadvantages them in their post-graduation prospects.

[Bob Kelley](#): Opposes.

[Sheryl Knapp](#): Opposes this bill because it would be a threat to the most needy of students (Who make up a very small subset of all students who need special education in public-schools) to being left in an ambiguous situation when it comes to finding continuing support and disadvantages them by depriving this vital support service provided to them by their schools for a year between when they turn twenty-two and the end of that academic year.

[Laviano & Gagne, Attorney, Jennifer Laviano](#): Opposes this bill because it would disadvantage those who have IEPs and make more confusing the criteria that must be met to

decide who has a disability and is thus eligible for said IEP. In effect, these measures are harmful to both students with disabilities and their families because it cuts off support to these students before they can complete their transition periods and/or graduate at all.

[Elizabeth Lebo](#): Opposes this bill because it would threaten the ability that her son would be able to live independently after he graduates high school.

[OEC, AFAO, Latoya Ledbetter](#): Opposes this bill because it disadvantages vulnerable people with disabilities and is a great disservice to them, their families, and Connecticut taxpayers.

Many individuals oppose this bill due to the danger it poses to students who will not be able to fully benefit from the transition period, because it would be more costly for the state as less people will be able to enter the workforce without this transition period and because it makes teachers less able to focus on teaching during the academic year.

These persons include:

[Elizabeth Lengvinis](#)

[Qing Liu](#)

[Amity High School – ATA, Mother, Miriam McMilleon](#)

[anonymous anonymous](#)

[Horizons Programs INC., Director, Educational Support Services, Casey Lenihan- Mikelonis](#):

Opposes this bill because it is incongruous to IDEA by revoking care at a person's twenty-second birthday and not to the end of the year in which they turn twenty-two, which is harmful to those in need of transition periods in line with IDEA.

[Susan Lim](#): Opposes this bill citing the threat this bill will have on equality in the public-school system.

[Karen Linder](#): Opposes this bill because it circumnavigates A.R. v. Connecticut State Board of Education, 5 F.4th 155 (2d Cir. 2021) and makes life more difficult for those with disabilities and their families when it comes to their education and life preparedness once they graduate from high school.

[Advocacy for Kids LLC., Special Education Advocate, Laurie Markus](#): Opposes this bill citing the threat it is to vulnerable students who need support through special education pursuant to the stipulations of Public Law 23-137 which extend coverage of special education for disabled individuals to the end of the academic year in which they turn twenty-two years old.

[Mrs. Kristen Marquis](#): Opposes on the grounds of the threat disallowing students from graduating with their classmates due to ageing out at their twenty-second birthday will heavily disadvantage them and cause them harm mentally and emotionally.

[Rebecca Martorella](#): Opposes this bill because it would harm students with disabilities by arbitrarily revoking support for their special education at their twenty-second birthday and leave them with a gap between then and the end of the academic school year, disadvantaging them greatly compared to their peers.

[Connecticut Association of Boards of Education, Inc., Executive Director, Patrice, McCarthy:](#) Opposes this bill claiming that it circumnavigates the legislative process and should be subjected to proper Education Mandate Review as created in the 2024 Legislative Session to initiate mandate relief.

[Horizons INC., CEO, Chris McNaboe:](#) Opposes this bill because it is contrary to IDEA and is in violation of the court's decision in *A.R. v. Connecticut Board of Education*. In effect, this bill will make life more difficult for students graduating from high school with disabilities and lessen time for transition periods, which is mandated to be held until the completion of the year in which they turn twenty-two according to Public Act 23-137, which this act means to repeal.

[Tara Mele:](#) Opposes this bill because it would negatively affect the transition training and ability to integrate into society post-graduation for disabled students if their care is withdrawn arbitrarily on their twenty-second birthday and not extended to the end of the school year wherein their twenty-second birthday lies.

[Parent, Clio Nicolakis:](#) Opposes this bill because it would disadvantage their 22-year-old child who is not yet ready for engagement in the wider world without completion of the transition program given to them currently and is threatened to be ended under this bill.

[Ephemia Nicolakis:](#) Opposes this bill because the disruption of education to people with disabilities, especially their sister, would be greatly disadvantaged and harmed by the lack of social and intellectual education provided by these transitional periods given to disabled persons until the end of the academic year in which they turn twenty-two.

[Kassi Nicolakis:](#) Opposes this bill because, as a disabled person themselves, they have seen firsthand how beneficial these programs are for students like them and having them withdrawn at their twenty-second birthdays would harm them greatly including not allowing them to graduate with their peers and educate them further on how to integrate with the wider world of which many are unable to do currently, including this petitioner.

[Parent, Theodore Nicolakis:](#) Opposes this bill because it is considered unconstitutional and dormitory against disabled persons in this state by depriving them of a year of education that they need desperately to better prepare them for life post-graduation.

[Parent Advocate, Kimberley Perschmann:](#) Opposes this bill because it would not follow IDEA and remove a FAPE from students with disabilities in this state. Also, it would disproportionately affect those with limited monetary means as they will suffer more to get replacement support that they will have lost from these transition programs until the end of the academic year in which the student turns twenty-two.

[Daniel Primavera:](#) Opposes this bill because it is not beneficial to disabled students, like his two children, and harms them by not covering them fully and preparing them for life.

[Kim Quinn:](#) Opposes this bill citing the fact that it could rise child homelessness by not supporting them fully.

[Mishelle Quintano](#): Opposes this bill citing the injustice that it poses by making the time in which disabled students may benefit from these programs shorter.

[Grandmother, Transsexuals in the Classroom, Barbara Ripple](#): Opposes.

[CPAC, Parent CPAC Board Member, Leticia Rivera](#): Opposes this bill citing the danger it poses to disabled students and their families on a civil rights basis.

[Kathryn Satterfield](#): Opposes this bill because it disadvantages students in need of special education by revoking education a year before vital transition programs can effectively be completed, which limit their ability to grow and harm both them and their families.

[Ellen Sefransky](#): Opposes this bill, attaching a link to a series of testimonies from students who clamor against this bill stating that they do not wish to be "Left Behind" and/or "Aged Out" in education after they reach their twenty-second birthdate and before the end of the academic year that falls upon.

[Mrs. Noreen Simmons](#): Opposes this bill because her sons with Autism would be heartily disadvantaged and in no way benefit fully from the transition programs that foster better success and integration rates with society post-graduation, cutting off service arbitrarily at their twenty-second birthdate.

[Horizons INC., Associate Director, Transition Education, Rochelle St. Jean](#): Opposes this bill because it is in clear violation of Public Law 23-137 and the decision of the court in *A.R. v. Connecticut Board of Education*. This bill will harm disabled students by revoking necessary transitional time and thereby disadvantaging them through not preparing them fully for the world ahead of them.

[Mrs. Kathryn Strout](#): Opposes this bill because it is extremely disruptive and, according to this petitioner, disrespectful to her own child's needs.

[Special education teacher, Melissa Sullivan](#): Opposes this bill because it interrupts the education of and disenfranchises disabled students throughout this state.

[Special Education Attorney, Corinna Taubner](#): Opposes this bill because it is detrimental to transition programs that help students with disabilities in this state.

[Sarah Taylor](#): Opposes this bill because it jeopardizes the feeling of safety and security one feels when they enter the classroom, especially for those with disabilities and their families.

[Mom, Christine Tonelli](#): Opposes this bill because it breaks with consistency by making some students (Those with disabilities) ineligible for graduation and continued services after they turn twenty-two years of age.

[Alisa Trachtenberg](#): Opposes this bill because it will cost our state more due to a decrease in students who are disabled who end up not getting jobs because they are unable to benefit from transition periods which this bill threatens and eliminates with the reduction of coverage for a year between when the person becomes twenty-two and the end of said academic year.

[Law Office of Anne I. Treimanis, attorney, Anne Terimanis](#): Opposes this bill because it creates more confusion regarding enrollment in kindergarten and when coverage ends for those with disabilities because birth dates are arbitrary means of clarification. It should therefore be based on academic years in which the person is to be that age (five and twenty-two, respectively) and not based on the dates on which those birthdays land.

[Parent Educator, Lisa Vaccino](#): Opposes this bill because it would make the transition process more difficult for students with disabilities and tax their families to an inordinate amount as they try to find interim aid for their children that could, and is, already provided to them through school special education that this bill seeks to eliminate.

[Psychologist and parent, MaryJo Vasquez](#): Opposes this bill because many disabled persons are unable to transition to post-graduate situations at age eighteen, and thus transition periods until the end of the school year in which they turn twenty-two years old is necessary. Facilitating this mental growth is vital to their future success, and this bill's elimination of them would be detrimental to their success and be an injustice to all disabled students in the state.

[Christy Vitale](#): Opposes this bill because it breaks with routine and creates discord in disabled children, including her son's, educational careers and mental/intellectual growth, harming them greatly in the process.

[Horizons Programs Inc., Chief of Staff, Simon Wells](#): Opposes this bill citing the blatant violation that it is to Public Law 23-137 and the court's decision regarding *A.R. v. Connecticut Board of Education*.

[CT Community Nonprofit Alliance, Senior Public Policy Advisor, Julia Wilcox](#): Opposes this bill because of its incongruence with Public Law 23-123 and *A.R. v. Connecticut State Board of Education*, 5 F.4th 155 (2d Cir. 2021), which repealing them would harm disabled students and prove to be a disservice to their families and themselves if the state cuts services to save the school districts money. In effect, the money that school districts save will be put onto the backs of these families and students, who struggle to find minimally existent replacement services that school already provide for them.

[Dianne Willcutts](#): Opposes this bill, citing Public Law 23-123 and *A.R. v. Connecticut State Board of Education*, 5 F.4th 155 (2d Cir. 2021).

[Christine Yang](#): Opposes this bill given the danger revocation of service a before the end of the academic year based on a person's twenty-second birthdate to those students with IEP-requiring disabilities and their families.

[Anonymous, Anonymous](#): Opposes this bill citing personal family experience seeing the benefits of transition periods until the end of the academic year in which a student with disabilities achieves the age of twenty-two and fears the dangers posed by revoking these programs for a time between that birthdate and the end of said academic year.

Reported by: Tom Atwood

Date: 4/16/2025

