

9/4

Ted:

Somewhat desultory PIPS/TIPS meeting 8/29 (I thought, at least). As you know, next one scheduled for 9/12, same time and place; also, those in attendance agreed we shud meet 9/19 and 9/26, same time/place.

Attendance: Curt, PV, Christina, Lundell, Rydell, Ruth Anne, John Poupart (left early), Rafael, Doug W., Wedl. ✓

Note: Previous Sunday while cutting grass, Tom Nelson had heart problem, by 8/29 had had the drag-the-balloon-through-blocked-vein-procedure, was scheduled for release by end of last week, and presumably before long return to duty.

Distributed your good notes from 8/22 meeting, along with agenda for 8/29 meeting. *Sent notes to Verne, Joe, Carol, who weren't here 8/29.*

Curt reported (perhaps you are source) that Steve Trimble is upset about post-2ndary options on grounds being used too much by middle, *not* enuf by lower, class.

Curt said we ought to try to decide what is essential for change in law, confine goals/discussion to that.

We worked through (perhaps a bit sloppily) basically the first page (side) of your suggested agenda, didn't get to flip side.

Ruth Anne said she still thinks "capacity-building" should be in any bill, she thought we'd agreed to that at 8/22 meeting, and it isn't in the minutes.

?
Long (and I think inconclusive) discussion of transportation. Curt said isn't our assumption that most/all charter schools will be at neighborhood level, so transp. won't be a problem? Ruth Anne said we don't want to/can't set up so that poor parents who need transpo. can't get it, while others can afford to pay for it; I lost my argument that we ought not saddle any bill with appropriations for charter school transportation. Discussion of current transpo -- who pays, when, what's situation re open-enrollment pupils resident in another district, etc. If there was an "outcome," I missed it.

Long discussions about the problem of informing parents, so that they can take advantage of choice, and difficulties of informing minorities etc., and resulting uneven playing field in terms of their info/ability to pick a school for their kids. *7/20/81*

Re computerized info system, Wallace reported he had been at Fair and played with it for a long time, and it's a long way from "being there" yet -- altho he's hopeful. I think the problem is availability of info/software.

How demonstrate are doing adequate job/should stay in business? Brad said charter schools would probably have to "walk the extra mile" on this; Wallace got back into his discussion of "essential learner outcomes" and optimistic assessment that before long the State Board will have adopted same; I said just do the "charter schools should do whatever it is the public school in the district is required to do re testing of graduates/outcomes/etc." bit.

Can there be any number of schools/sponsors? Loud "YES"
No pilot, no, no, no. Who wants to take the position they're limiting innovation?

Wedl and I (at least) agreed that as a practical matter you have to determine what responsibilities "follow state money," can't expect Legislature to simply hand out public \$ to just anyone.

Group came down fairly clearly, I think, on this: ALL charter schools must get a charter from State Dept. of Education. The few "rules" (no discriminate, no sectarian, etc.) should be in the charter. Charter would/could be revoked if school violates the charter. Presumably SDE will not have a police force, but would look at given school in response to complaints. So long as the school meets its charter, it should not have problems. In terms of "outcomes," it would be required to produce/do whatever the public district must (presumably if no "outcomes" are required of public, neither are they of charter.)

The group's opinion was that, whether OR NOT (contrary to what I thought we'd been saying earlier) a group gets some public body to "sponsor" (from Mankato State to Mpls. city council) a charter school, it still must get its charter from SDE.

I think that's about it.

Pete

*Said their name
option to SDE
was who all sponsor?*