

Fax for Mr. Albert Shanker

Room ~~205~~ 215

Sent by: Ted Kolderie
612/224-9703

From: Sen. Ember Reichgott
612/296-2889

Monday 11 February
0830h CST

Seven pages follow

AL →

The senator would very much appreciate it if you would give her a call and tell her what you think.

TEU

Sen. Reichgott:

I got your message. In case we can't talk by phone today:

The Bill

- Shaw/2*
1. The bill is clearly marked "Preliminary/Unofficial"
 2. He didn't say 'no' about testifying here.
 3. Louise might think it strange to be talking with him down there about a bill he'd seen and she hadn't.
 4. I can't be sure what provisions you're rethinking . . . but it's probably OK to have a few things at this stage that some folks might ask you to change; which you might then agree to change.
 5. You might want to call him there; partly to get his reaction and partly to make a pitch for the bill. (Marcia has the phone number of the hotel. He's approachable, but if he's busy go through Eve Sachs, his secretary. She's very helpful.

There's a lot in it he should like:

- * Site-management.
- * Schools started (possibly owned) by teachers.
- * Schools not under direct control of the board.
- * Outcome-based; measurement required.
- * Focus on the at-risk.
- * Choice, but not voucher-type.
- * Accountability to public body for performance.

Next Steps

1. To get together the drafting group, and others, we need a time when you can for-sure meet. Would early Friday be possible? (Either breakfast or early-after.) If not pick something and we'll do the best we can to get people.
2. We met at the Urban Coalition this morning with people from communities of color, most of whom are presently involved with the Minneapolis Contract schools. They have some positive ideas about how to put their folks on a level playing-field with others. They will have these in writing by the time you're ready to meet.
3. We're now finding interest among individual teachers, too. We can put you in touch with these whenever you're ready.

Fax for: Elaine Salinas

HETE

From : Ted Kolderie

Date: Monday 11 Feb 1430h

*

Right after our meeting I talked with Doug Wallace. The State Board is meeting today. (He says it voted to reaffirm its desire to be one of the chartering agencies.)

I gave him this summary of the group's feeling about what's necessary on the 'capacity' problem:

Chartering -- To offset the bent of the local education bodies toward majority/middle-class applicants there ought to be a process at the state level with a special sensitivity to proposals from groups representing people of color and people in poverty. For example:

* The State Board should be included among the chartering agencies.

* People proposing to form a school should be able to apply directly to the ~~State~~ State Board.

* The State Board should act on recommendation of a panel which it would appoint, made up so as reflect the needs and interests of these communities.

Outreach -- The bill setting up the chartering process (not some other bill) should contain both a requirement for outreach and an appropriation to fund that program.

* The appropriation should be in the amount of \$_____.

* The outreach should include both (a) technical assistance to groups proposing to form new schools and (b) information for parents wanting/needing to know about such schools, once formed.

* The outreach should inform parents not only about the new opportunities provided by charter schools but also about all the opportunities made available (1985-90) under other provisions of Minnesota's choice legislation.

* The appropriation should go to the Department of Education, but the law should require the Department to contract, for the actual services, with one or more organizations knowledgeable about and representative of the communities to be served.

Doug understands. I think this will help him in arguing for a role for the State Board.

Fax for: Elaine Salinas
From : Ted Kelderie
Date: Monday 11 Feb 1430h

*

Right after our meeting I talked with Doug Wallace. The State Board is meeting today. (He says it voted to reaffirm its desire to be one of the chartering agencies.)

I gave him this summary of the group's feeling about what's necessary on the 'capacity' problem:

Chartering -- To offset the bent of the local education bodies toward majority/middle-class applicants there ought to be a process at the state level with a special sensitivity to proposals from groups representing people of color and people in poverty. For example:

* The State Board should be included among the chartering agencies.

* People proposing to form a school should be able to apply directly to the ~~general~~ State Board.

* The State Board should act on recommendation of a panel which it would appoint, made up so as reflect the needs and interests of these communities.

Outreach -- The bill setting up the chartering process (not some other bill) should contain both a requirement for outreach and an appropriation to fund that program.

* The appropriation should be in the amount of \$_____.

* The outreach should include both (a) technical assistance to groups proposing to form new schools and (b) information for parents wanting/needing to know about such schools, once formed.

* The outreach should inform parents not only about the new opportunities provided by charter schools but also about all the opportunities made available (1985-90) under other provisions of Minnesota's choice legislation.

* The appropriation should go to the Department of Education, but the law should require the Department to contract, for the actual services, with one or more organizations knowledgeable about and representative of the communities to be served.

Doug understands. I think this will help him in arguing for a role for the State Board.

\$55000

now: still need UW
348-2533 - not enough?

UC/fax

in the other
9000

dist cost
x5 to
cost?

①

Sec. 3. [APPROPRIATION.] The sum of \$ _____

is appropriated from the General Fund to the Department of Education to implement Sec. 1 Subd. 16 in fiscal years 1992 and 1993.

②

state-level chartering
authority

- direct approach; not appeal
- advisory panel to SBE
- who appoint?

③

process for info + tech assist.

- reg contract
- to reflect com to be served
- non consortium / coop of orgs

watch out for No Cost Accreditation

- MA
- 75% lic

revisions to proposed outcome-based schools legislation

1) subd. 3. (SPONSOR): in the proposed legislation "sponsors" are those entities that would be vested with charter-granting authority including a "public school district of any kind; an education district; an entity that includes a public school district and that is formed for public purposes....; a public post-secondary institution....; or the state board of education."

The recommended revision adds to the existing language by mandating that the state board of education establish a panel to consider and make recommendations regarding charter school proposals from low-income communities and communities of color. The panel would be comprised of two representatives each from the African American, American Indian, Asian-Pacific and Hispanic communities and white low-income communities. One representative from each community would be an urban resident and one a resident of Greater Minnesota, when such communities have significant out-state populations. At least one representative from each community would be a parent of a school-age child. The total panel would be comprised in such a way to ensure that half of those appointed are low-income. The state board would act on the recommendations of the panel, which will be appointed by the state board based on an open application process. (should there be a role for the four minority state councils in advising the state board regarding appointments to the panel?)

rationale: Public institutions have historically been less responsive to communities of color and low-income white communities. In order to ensure equal access and consideration in the chartering process, an independent panel representative and knowledgeable of low-income communities and communities of color, will be established to make recommendations which the state board is expected to act on. This process in no way pre-empts communities or individuals in the above groups from seeking a charter through a public chartering authority, nor does it in any way restrict the capability of the state board of education to consider charter requests from other groups. It is solely intended to provide an alternative route to charter status for communities of color and low-income communities to be used at their own discretion.

or

The recommended revision adds to the existing language by mandating that the state board of education establish a panel to consider and make recommendations regarding chartering proposals which are put forth by white low-income communities or communities of color and/or propose to serve 50% or more students of color. The panel would be comprised of two representatives each from the African American, American Indian, Asian-Pacific, Hispanic communities and white low-income communities. One representative from each community would be an urban resident and the other a representative

from Greater Minnesota; at least one representative from each community would be a parent of a school-age child; half of the panel members should be low-income. The panel members would be appointed by the state board of education based on an open application process. (again, should there be a role for the four minority councils in the appointment process?) As with the above revision, this process would be an alternative or option for communities of color, but a requirement for majority individuals/organizations which are seeking a charter to serve 50% or more students of color.

rationale: same as above with the exception that this language ensures that representatives of color will have some control and input into who is granted a charter to educate children of color. Otherwise, there is no check on majority folks being granted charters to educate children of color. In lieu of the current discussion and initiatives aimed at recruiting more staff of color for schools, and the movement toward culturally-based education, a law which allowed majority folks to be granted a charter to educate primarily children of color, without any review or endorsement by people of color, should be viewed as a major step backward.

Subd. 11. (DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION): the proposed legislation states that the State Department of Education must prepare and make available, directly or through school districts, information about how to apply to form and operate an outcome-based school.

The revision to this section of the bill would add outreach and technical assistance to inform the public, particularly low-income communities and communities of color, about how to apply to form and operate outcome-based schools. \$ 200,000 would be allocated for dissemination, outreach and technical assistance over the biennium. These activities would be carried-out by the state department of education through contracts with [community groups] which currently serve the targeted populations. Contracts would be initiated with groups/organizations in urban as well as rural areas of the state. Contracts would be let by the State Department of Education through an open RFP process. The special panel designated in the previous revision might be used to read and make recommendations to the State Department of Education regarding the outreach/technical assistance proposals received from low-income groups/organizations and communities of color.

Another possibility is to give the allocation to the State Board of Education. This should be talked about.

rationale: Low-income communities and communities of color generally have less access to and linkages with traditional educational entities. The proposed revision recognizes the need to do targeted outreach to these communities in order to make sure that they have equal access to the information about the opportunities available through the outcome-based schools legislation. In addition to information, these communities will

also need technical assistance in the formulation and development of charter school proposals. Inclusion of this revision will assure that equity has been built into the processes for seeking a charter and that those who are in greatest need of special outreach and information efforts will receive it.