

# Education Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

**Bill No:** HB-5324 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

**Title:** AN ACT CONCERNING EDUCATION MANDATE RELIEF.

**Vote Date:** 3/16/2026

**Vote Action:** Joint Favorable Substitute

**PH Date:** 3/4/2026

**File No.:** 412

***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:**

The bill seeks to repeal and reduce education mandates, with four sections that target general statutes, detail proposed educational training programs, and outline initiatives behind the recycling and composting of organic material. If passed, school districts would be confident in better meeting standards and utilizing professional development time.

## **SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE (IF APPLICABLE):**

The substitute adds new sec. 4 (old sec. 4 becomes sec. 5) with the requirement that the Education Mandate Review Advisory Council review at least 10 education mandates and related duties.

## **RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:**

### **Connecticut Department of Administrative Services, Commissioner, Michelle Gilman**

Centers comments on Section 4 of the bill, highlighting that removing CET reporting requirements would reduce unnecessary data-collection on the local education agencies and the Commission for Educational Technology.

## **NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:**

### **Amity Regional School District No. 5, Superintendent of Schools, Jennifer Byars**

Supports the bill and considers its “most helpful” component the proposal to remove recurring refresher requirements for human-trafficking training for school employees. Ms. Byars says this is essential training, but with little professional development time, she hopes to devote

more time/attention to curriculum and instruction. She adds that the additional implementation deadline for organics recycling provides ample time to allow districts to budget accordingly. And draft plans. Ms. Byrars concludes, noting repealing lower-value mandates could help streamline district operations.

**Amity Regional School District No. 5, Finance Director, Theresa Lumas** Writes in support of delaying the implementation of the materials separation and recycling mandate. Ms. Lumas shares that additional time would help her school district comply with the proposed mandate and incorporate costs into future budget cycles.

**Connecticut Education Association, Teacher Development Specialist, Kate Field** Submits partial support, finding that the bill is too limited in scope. CEA believes in a more comprehensive, long-term strategy and supports Section 1, opposing, however, Sections 2-4. CEA believes diverting food waste accrues to our environment, exempting “overexposure” costs wrongly implies a distortion in district budgeting, and eliminating requirements lack review of impact and efficacy.

**Special Education Equity for Kids of Connecticut, President, John Flanders** Comments on Section 4 of the bill, which would repeal the family history questionnaire. They would support the Committee’s efforts to review data on the effectiveness of this measure.

**New London City Council, City Councilor, Christopher Clouet** Argues that Connecticut taxpayers cannot keep up with local school districts’ rising costs. Mr. Clouet adds that action is required, and that compromise won’t come easily when funding guardrails combine with various social programs.

#### **NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:**

**Connecticut Association of Schools, Executive Director, Glenn Lungarini** Opposes the bill as drafted due to its lack of including the comprehensive mandate implementation and review framework (as proposed by the Education Mandate Review Advisory Council). With the absence of these structural elements, CAS is concerned that the bill undermines the work of the Council, which in Mr. Lungarini’s view, more structurally approaches mandate management.

**Reported by: Zachary Robinson**

**Date: 3/30/2026**