

Re: Support for LD 2192 – An Act to Protect Students by Ensuring Schools Have Complete Information About School Employees and Applicants for Employment

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing in strong support of LD 2192. I am a Maine resident and a survivor of employee misconduct that occurred within a Maine school district approximately 25 years ago. I am sharing my experience because it illustrates precisely the gap in protection that this legislation seeks to close.

When I was a freshman in high school, a teacher's aide in my homeroom began passing me unsolicited letters of a personal and sexual nature. I was fifteen years old. When the matter was brought to the attention of school administration, the employee was asked to resign — and subsequently hired at another district. There was no mechanism to prevent this. There was no requirement that the receiving school be informed. He simply moved on.

What followed his departure was not, in fact, a clean ending. The employee obtained my home address through school records and appeared at my family's home on multiple occasions. A restraining order was eventually issued by York County District Court. These are not the consequences of a minor personnel matter — they are the consequences of a system that prioritized a quiet resolution over the safety of a child.

I want to be clear about the long-term impact of these events. I developed significant anxiety, OCD, and chronic insomnia that affected my functioning well into adulthood and required treatment. These are documented, recognized responses to chronic stress and trauma exposure during adolescence. I am now in my forties, professionally employed, and an engaged member of my community — but the path here was harder than it needed to be, and the difficulty was not inevitable. It was the result of institutional failure.

The core problem LD 2192 addresses is straightforward: when a school employee is under investigation for misconduct — particularly misconduct involving students — there is currently nothing to prevent that person from resigning and being hired elsewhere before the investigation concludes. The receiving school may have no knowledge of the circumstances of the departure. Students at that school have no protection from someone whose fitness for working with children is actively in question.

I respectfully urge the committee to support this legislation. Children in Maine schools deserve the protection of complete, accurate information in the hands of the people responsible for hiring the adults who will have daily access to them. This is a reasonable, overdue standard.

Thank you for your time and for your service to Maine's students.

Sincerely,



Kate Beever, Portland

Kate Beaver
Portland
LD 2192

I am writing in strong support of LD 2192. I am a Maine resident and a survivor of employee misconduct that occurred within a Maine school district approximately 25 years ago. I am sharing my experience because it illustrates precisely the gap in protection that this legislation seeks to close.

When I was a freshman in high school, a teacher's aide in my homeroom began passing me unsolicited letters of a personal and sexual nature. I was fifteen years old. When the matter was brought to the attention of school administration, the employee was asked to resign — and subsequently hired at another district. There was no mechanism to prevent this. There was no requirement that the receiving school be informed. He simply moved on.

What followed his departure was not, in fact, a clean ending. The employee obtained my home address through school records and appeared at my family's home on multiple occasions. A restraining order was eventually issued by York County District Court. These are not the consequences of a minor personnel matter — they are the consequences of a system that prioritized a quiet resolution over the safety of a child. I want to be clear about the long-term impact of these events. I developed significant anxiety, OCD, and chronic insomnia that affected my functioning well into adulthood and required treatment. These are documented, recognized responses to chronic stress and trauma exposure during adolescence. I am now in my forties, professionally employed, and an engaged member of my community — but the path here was harder than it needed to be, and the difficulty was not inevitable. It was the result of institutional failure.

The core problem LD 2192 addresses is straightforward: when a school employee is under investigation for misconduct — particularly misconduct involving students — there is currently nothing to prevent that person from resigning and being hired elsewhere before the investigation concludes. The receiving school may have no knowledge of the circumstances of the departure. Students at that school have no protection from someone whose fitness for working with children is actively in question.

I respectfully urge the committee to support this legislation. Children in Maine schools deserve the protection of complete, accurate information in the hands of the people responsible for hiring the adults who will have daily access to them. This is a reasonable, overdue standard.

Thank you for your time and for your service to Maine's students.

Sincerely,

Kate Beaver, Portland