

End of session: Ken Nelson 'conditions'

Here're a few thoughts, re the talk this morning about amendments etc.

1. Ken wants to do both the local-district veto and a limit on the number. If the first goes in, why should he worry about limiting the number? Let that be open.
2. If you have to accept the district (only, or along with SBE) as the sponsor, try to avoid restricting it to the local district. Try to leave it open for a district to sponsor a new school, in its own borders or outside. (Tom Deans will be trying to limit it to just the local district of course.)
3. It'd be important to keep the separate bargaining unit. Very important. Ken didn't say anything to me last night about pressure to change this, but it's predictable.
4. Ken did say something about an amendment requiring that in any charter school the teachers would have to be in charge. What is this? It could be some of the language in HF 350, which came in probably at the MFT request. This isn't necessarily bad. Maybe it could be traded for something you want.
5. The provision in Article 4 for parochial school surely isn't going to pass if charter schools doesn't pass, is it?
6. At what point is it better to tell the House that you'll just lay it all over to next session, so there's time to build up some bigger public awareness, network of support, etc.??
7. Keys in this decision probably are: the SBE as sponsor, the number of schools, the separate bargaining unit, the requirement for schools to be either non-profits or co-ops.

And of course the exemption from rules.

8. If somebody makes an issue about 'private schools' it's possible to do an amendment that says no charter may be given to an organization that has previously operated a non-public school; or maybe even to individuals involved previously with a non-public school. Not a great idea, probably, but possible.
9. If there's a chance to modify Ken's/MFT's pressure for the local-district veto, you might go back to the "right of first refusal" notion. Require applicants to notify the local board, and to bargain with the board in good faith if the board will do the same. Let the local board be the sponsor if they can mutually agree. But let the applicants to to the SBE if not. Then maybe limit the number that could be granted by SBE alone.

Or let the SBE be a sponsor just for schools in certain areas (central cities?) or just for schools for certain kinds of kids (at-risk?). Or just for rural areas (outside MFT territory).