

22 December 92

I sat down the other day and went through the '91 law, trying to think about what's been proposed to be changed or added.

What follows contains suggestions both for changes to the existing program and for major additions. The additions involve

(a) introducing a real professional option for teachers and

(b) giving the local board the flexibility provided in the law for its own schools if it is willing to give these schools the authority/autonomy provided in the law).

Some technical changes may also be needed. The Department of Education would know about this.

*

PURPOSES:

No change.

APPLICABILITY:

No change

SPONSOR:

Revise (a) to provide that an outcome-based school may be sponsored by:

A local board (but strike from Subd. 4 the requirement that a local board secure the approval of the state board. Provide for notice-only to the state board, so it can keep track of the order of application, re: the total-allowable in the state.)

Add: A board of education may on its own motion convert to charter status any or all of its existing schools, notwithstanding the limit on schools-per-district in Subd. 3(b).

The state board of education.

In a city of the first class, the city council.

Revise (b) to raise the total number of outcome-based schools that may be approved to ___ and the number which may be approved by any particular local board to ___.

FORMATION Make it read roughly as follows:

An outcome-based school may be formed in either of two ways:

* By one or more licensed teachers, as provided in the current law, with teachers to be employed and with teachers to make up a majority of the board.

* By parents, an individual, or an organization; so long as the instructional program is provided on contract to the school through an organization formed by one or more licensed teachers (a cooperative under Chapter 308A or partnership). In this case teachers need not be a majority of the board of directors of the school itself.

CONTRACT

Pull down into this subd. what is now (d) in the subdiv. above, about the sponsor's authorization taking the form of a written contract.

Otherwise no change.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

No change

EXEMPTION

No change

REQUIREMENTS

No change.

ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Drop the language about limiting admission to pupils with "specific affinity for the teaching methods, learning philosophy or subject".

PUPIL PERFORMANCE

No change

EMPLOYMENT ETC.

Change so it continues the requirement for teachers to be licensed, but fits to the provision in Subd. 4 that would permit them to work either as employees of the school or as members of the professional group. Remove any implication that they can only be employees.

HANDICAPPED

No change

LENGTH OF YEAR

No change

REPORTS

No change

TRANSPORTATION

No change

LEASED SPACE

Give a school the option to lease space in the general market in the community, including the educational wing of a church (as districts like Minneapolis are doing at the moment).

INITIAL COSTS

No change

INFORMATION

Provide some appropriation to pay both for information to help teachers and others form schools and to help parents choose schools; in this or in some other bill.

LEAVE TO TEACH

No change

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

May not need change, so long as it's understood this applies only to the situation in which the teachers are employees; not to the situation (per Subd. 4) in which the teachers elected to work as members of the professional group.

NONRENEWAL

No change

ENROLLMENT

No change

GENERAL AUTHORITY

No change

IMMUNITY

No change

Finance provisions

GENERAL EDUCATION REVENUE

Would this amount increase if the Legislature should act in '93 to equalize the referendum levies?

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE REVENUE

Q: Add all/part of capital facilities revenue, to be used -- consistent with Subd. 5 below -- only for lease.

SPECIAL EDUCATION AID

No change

OTHER AIDS, GRANTS, REVENUE

No change

USE OF STATE MONEY

No change