

Mr. George,

As a doctoral-level behavior analyst working in Minnesota schools—specifically with students served in Setting IV programs—I strongly support the “Runway with Support” proposal. While the long-term goal of eliminating seclusion is understandable, a hard stop without fully implemented, funded, and fidelity-based alternatives creates a serious safety risk for students and staff. In high-acuity settings, seclusion is used rarely and only as a true last resort when there is imminent danger, and removing it prematurely risks increased physical restraint, law enforcement involvement, injuries, shortened school days, or loss of placement stability. Preserving seclusion temporarily while the state invests in evidence-based alternatives, training, and technical assistance (such as Ukeru and other preventative frameworks) is the only responsible path forward. A runway ensures we replace unsafe practices with safer ones—rather than simply removing a tool without providing what is needed to protect students, staff, and learning environments across Minnesota.

Sincerely,

Corey

--

Corey Stocco, Ph.D., BCBA-D, LBA