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We will be starting soon.
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April 21, 2010
Agenda

Todd Ziebarth, National Alliance for Public Charter Schools
   • Discussing a model state law that will improve the quality of charter school authorization

David Hartman, Minnesota Department of Education
   • Discussing Minnesota's model Request for Proposals (RFP) for authorizers.
A New Model Law For Supporting the Growth of High-Quality Public Charter Schools

Todd Ziebarth
A 18-month effort led by National Alliance for Public Charter Schools and funded by The Joyce Foundation
Goal:

- Create a model law grounded in principle, flexible enough to serve in a wide variety of state policy environments, and well-supported by empirical evidence.
A 16-member working group composed of individuals with deep expertise in public charter school law
It had been 18 years since MN enacted the nation’s first charter law.

There were resources developed in the early days of the movement to guide the development of legislation.
Why?

- Morrison Institute for Public Policy’s list of essential public charter school law criteria
- Ted Kolderie’s model law
- Marc Dean Millot’s model law
While these resources were helpful, we have since learned much about which factors in a charter law support the creation of effective charters – and which do not.
Initially, a law was considered strong if it:

- Placed few limits on how many schools could open
- Provided ample funding
- Ensured genuine autonomy
We have since learned that a strong law must address several other factors, including:

- Finding and financing a facility
- Authorizing
- Special education
More charters + more evidence of success = More intense legislative battles over charter laws.
Why?

Time is right for a new model law that supports more and better charters based upon lessons learned from experience, research, and analysis.
Our intent is for the model law to be useful to the 41 jurisdictions with charter laws as well as the 10 states that have yet to enact a charter law.
Strong charter law is necessary but insufficient factor in driving positive results for charters.
5 primary ingredients of a successful public charter school environment in a state, as demonstrated by strong student results are:
5 Ingredients of Strong Charter Sector

1. Supportive laws and regulations (both what is on the books and how it is implemented)

2. Quality authorizers
3. Effective charter support organizations

4. Outstanding school leaders and teachers

5. Engaged parents and community members
7 of the 20 components are focused on authorizing components

13 of the 20 components are focused on other components
Non-Authorizer Components

- No Caps
- Variety of Schools Allowed (including virtual)
Non-Authorizer Components

- Autonomous Schools with Independent Boards
- Clear Student Recruitment and Enrollment Procedures
Non-Authorizer Components

- Automatic Law Exemptions
- Collective Bargaining Exemption
- Educational Service Provider Provisions
Non-Authorizer Components

- Multi-School Charters and Multi-Contract Boards Allowed

- Interscholastic Provisions
Non-Authorizer Components

- Clear Identification of Special Education Responsibilities
- Equitable Operational and Categorical Funding
Non-Authorizer Components

- Equitable Capital Funding
- Employee Retirement System Access
Multiple Authorizers Available

- Establishment of state public charter school commission
- Requiring local school boards to affirm interest by registering with state
- Others may apply (e.g., mayors, city councils, non-profits, public/private postsecondary institutions
- The right mix will be state specific
Authorizing Components

Adequate Authorizer Funding
- Adequate and guaranteed funding
- Publicly report authorizer expenditures
- Separate contract for services purchased from authorizer by school
- Prohibition on authorizers requiring schools to purchase services from them
Authorizing Components

Transparent Application and Decision-making Processes
- Application elements for all schools
- Elements specific to conversions, virtuals, replications, and educational service providers
Authorizing Components

Transparent Application and Decision-making Processes (continued)

- Authorizer-issued RFP
- In-person interview and public meeting
- Decisions made in public meeting, with reasons for denials in writing
Performance-Based Contracts

- Created as separate document from application
- Defines roles, powers, and responsibilities of both parties
- Defines academic and operational expectations based upon a performance framework
Authorizing Components

Performance-Based Contracts (continued)
- Initial term of five years
- Unique requirements for virtuals
Authorizing Components

Comprehensive School Monitoring and Data-Collection Processes

- Collection and analysis of data
- Financial accountability
- Authority to conduct or require oversight activities
- Annual school performance reports
Comprehensive School Monitoring and Data-Collection Processes (continued)

- Notification of perceived problems, with opportunities to remedy
- Authorizer authority to take appropriate corrective actions
Clear Renewal, Nonrenewal and Revocation Processes

- Authorizers must issue school performance renewal reports
- Schools seeking renewal must apply for it
- Authorizers must issue renewal application guidance
- Clear criteria for renewal and nonrenewal/revocation
Authorizing Components

Clear Renewal, Nonrenewal and Revocation Processes (continued)

- Authorizers must ground renewal decisions based on evidence regarding the school’s performance
- Authorizer authority to vary length of charter renewal contract terms based on performance or other issues
Clear Renewal, Nonrenewal and Revocation Processes (continued)

- Authorizers must provide charters with timely notification of potential revocation or non-renewal (including reasons) and reasonable time to respond
- Authorizers must provide charter schools with due process for nonrenewal and revocation decisions
Clear Renewal, Nonrenewal and Revocation Processes (continued)

- All charter renewal, non-renewal, and revocation decisions made in a public meeting, with authorizers stating reasons for non-renewals and revocations in writing
Clear Renewal, Nonrenewal and Revocation Processes (continued)

- Authorizers must have school closure protocols to ensure timely parent notification, orderly student and record transitions, and property and asset disposition
Authorizer Accountability System

- Annual report which summarizes the authorizer’s activities as well as the performance of its school portfolio
- Regular review process by authorizer oversight body
- Authorizer oversight body authority to sanction authorizers
- The right authorizer oversight body will depend on the state
Authorizer Accountability System (continued)

- The right authorizer oversight body will depend on the state
- Must be committed to the success of public charter schools and authorizers
- Could be housed with a legislative office, the governor’s office, the state board of education, the state department of education, or a university
Questions?

Raise your hand or enter your question in the chat box on the lower left hand side of your screen.
State Charter Law Rankings Database:
http://www.publiccharters.org/charterlaws
Questions?

Raise your hand or enter your question in the chat box on the lower left hand side of your screen.
## Model Law Concepts in Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Law</th>
<th>Minnesota RFP requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Authorizer accountability  
*Sections A and C*                                             | All authorizers must be approved by the state commissioner of education. They must collect data on the academic and fiscal performance of schools. |
| Transparent Application Process  
*Section B*                                                     | Authorizers must submit application policies/practices, application evaluations, capacity interview materials, and staff recommendations. |
| Performance-based contracts  
*Section B*                                                      | Authorizers must provide executed contracts for each currently operating school and their charter contract template |
| Monitoring and data collection  
*Section B*                                                       | Authorizers must provide monitoring policies and practices.                                  |
| Clear Processes for renewal, nonrenewal, revocation  
*Section B*                                                    | Authorizers must provide renewal decision policies/practices, records of renewal decisions, and evidence of school performance. |
Minnesota Department of Education’s Request for Proposals for Authorizers

David Hartman
Application Components

Part A: Statement of Interest

- Section A.1: Mission and Vision
- Section A.2: Capacity and Infrastructure
- Three to five page description of the authorizer's purpose, vision and capacity for charter school authorizing going forward.
- Relevant resumes and a five-year financial plan are requested as attachments to this section.
- 25 percent weighting in the overall rating.
Application Components

Part B: Evaluation of Existing or Proposed Practices

- Section B.1: Application Decision-Making
- Section B.2: Contracting and Oversight
- Section B.3: Performance-Based Accountability
- Section B.4: School Autonomy
- Documentary evidence related to the authorizer’s existing practices or proposed practices.
- 25 percent weighting in the overall rating.
Application Components

Part C: Evaluation of School Performance

- Section C.1: Academic Performance
- Section C.2: Fiscal Performance
- Analysis of fiscal and academic data associated with an authorizer.
- 25 percent weighting in the overall rating.
Part D: Authorizer Interview

- Interview of individuals relevant to the organization’s authorizing duties.
- School directors associated with active authorizers will be surveyed and invited to participate in an interview.
- 25 percent weighting in the overall rating.
Questions?

Raise your hand or enter your question in the chat box on the lower left hand side of your screen.
Federal Support

Office of Innovation and Improvement Charter Schools Program

- Notice Inviting Applications for New Awards for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010
- (CFDA) Number: 84.282A.
- The SEA's plan to monitor and hold accountable authorized public chartering agencies through such activities as providing technical assistance or establishing a professional development program, which may include providing authorized public chartering agency staff with training and assistance on planning and systems development, so as to improve the capacity of those agencies to authorize, monitor, and hold accountable charter schools.
We would like to hear from you.

Complete the webinar evaluation at:

http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/WEB22AHL34

JPCB
Thank you for participating.

• This webinar will be archived at: http://www.charterschoolcenter.org/events

• The next webinar will be held on May 19th – Launching SEA Communities of Practice