From: Joe Williams
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2010 11:09 PM
To: Whitney Tilson; James Merriman; Eva Moskowitz; Klein, Joel I.; David Levin; Bill Phillips; Charlie Ledley; John Petry; Ravenel Boykin; Curry
Subject: Re: I'm meeting with the editorial board of the NY Daily News tomorrow

Best to keep it general. Please don't get into specifics on NY's cap lift legislation. It's tricky and could implode at any moment, Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

-----Original Message-----
From: Whitney Tilson
Date: Tue, 25 May 2010 01:35:33
To: James Merriman; Eva Moskowitz; Joel Klein (jklein@schools.nyc.gov)<jklein@schools.nyc.gov>; David Levin; Bill Phillips; Charlie Ledley; Joe Williams; John Petry; Ravenel Boykin; Curry
Subject: I'm meeting with the editorial board of the NY Daily News tomorrow

I'm meeting with the editorial board of the NY Daily News tomorrow at 11:30am. Any thoughts/background you wish to share would be appreciated!

From: White John
Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2010 8:00 AM
To: phillips [illegible] 'MLasher@cityhall.nyc.gov';
Cc: peterson [illegible] 'joewilliams@dfer.org'; Best Michael (Legal Services); 'HWolfson@cityhall.nyc.gov'
Subject: Re: Fw: Draft re RFP

Why not say that all chartering entities (e.g. Regents, SUNY, districts) will be mandated to create rfps and that the commissioner has the authority to impose such an rfp in the event a chartering entity chooses not to.

From: Bill Phillips
To: Lasher, Micah ; Peter Murphy
Cc: peterson [illegible] ; joewilliams@dfer.org ; Best Michael (Legal Services); White John; Wolfson, Howard
Sent: Wed May 26 07:55:31 2010
Subject: RE: Fw: Draft re RFP

I agree that it looks like a carve out. We are confusing who currently serves as a charter entity with who is allowed to be a charter entity. All school districts are allowed by law to be a charter entity. The only restriction on them is the need for final Regents approval. The question becomes whether or not we want the regents creating the district rfps. I don't much care as long as the exemptions work.

From: Lasher, Micah [mailto:MLasher@cityhall.nyc.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2010 7:52 AM
To: Peter Murphy
Cc: Bill Phillips; peterson [illegible]; joewilliams@dfer.org; MBest2@schools.nyc.gov; JWhite8@schools.nyc.gov; Wolfson, Howard
Subject: Re: Fw: Draft re RFP

I dunno...still sounds like a carve-out for us...maybe unavoidable...but will stick out like a sore thumb to the assembly...

Micah C. Lasher
Director of State Legislative Affairs, City of New York
(212) 788-8820 or (518) 447-5200
mlasher@cityhall.nyc.gov

From: Peter Murphy
To: Lasher, Micah
Cc: phillips peterson joewilliams@dfer.org <joewilliams@dfer.org>; MBest2@schools.nyc.gov <MBest2@schools.nyc.gov>; JWhite8@schools.nyc.gov <JWhite8@schools.nyc.gov>; Wolfson, Howard
Sent: Wed May 26 07:39:45 2010
Subject: Re: Fw: Draft re RFP

You mean getting to do his own? Perhaps this is more clear:

Such request for proposals shall be consistent with the provisions pursuant to this article and all applicable law not inconsistent with the provisions of this article. Each such charter entity set forth in subdivision three of section twenty eight hundred fifty-one shall develop and issue such request for proposals by October first two thousand ten and may update such request annually by October first; provided, however, that the board of

regents shall prepare such request for proposals for a charter entity set forth in paragraph (a) of such subdivision other than for the chancellor of the city school district of the city of New York.

On Wed, May 26, 2010 at 7:20 AM, Lasher, Micah <MLasher@cityhall.nyc.gov> wrote:

Makes sense...so how do we not make it sound like Joel is getting something?

Micah C. Lasher
Director of State Legislative Affairs, City of New York
(212) 788-8820 or (518) 447-5200
mlasher@cityhall.nyc.gov

----- Original Message -----
From: Peter Murphy <_____>
To: Lasher, Micah; phillips peterson
joewilliams@dfer.org <joewilliams@dfer.org>; MBest2@schools.nyc.gov <MBest2@schools.nyc.gov>; JWhite8@schools.nyc.gov <JWhite8@schools.nyc.gov>; Wolfson, Howard
Sent: Wed May 26 07:18:54 2010
Subject: Re: Fw: Draft re RFP

Its not a carve-out for nyc. The mandate is for all CE to do an Rfp to
prevent gatekeeping. Rather than make the other 685 school distrct CE
each do one, this makes the regents do it for them, but not for nyc
which must do their own
It may need to be drafted better, but that is the intent

On 5/26/10, Lasher, Micah <MLasher@cityhall.nyc.gov> wrote:
> I thinkl the NYC-carve-out will not be sellable. Why not just let any of the
> official charter entities do an RFP?
>
>
> Micah C. Lasher
> Director of State Legislative Affairs, City of New York
> (212) 788-8820 or (518) 447-5200
> mlasher@cityhall.nyc.gov
>
> _____
>
> From: Peter Murphy
> To: Bill Phillips
> Cc: Lasher, Micah; peterson
> joewilliams@dfer.org <joewilliams@dfer.org>; MBest2@schools.nyc.gov
> <MBest2@schools.nyc.gov>; JWhite8@schools.nyc.gov <JWhite8@schools.nyc.gov>;
> Wolfson, Howard
> Sent: Wed May 26 06:58:19 2010
> Subject: Re: Draft re RFP
>
>
> Gentlemen:
>
> On Bill's question, you could insert RFP language from the initial paragaph
> into the opening paragraph of 2851(2). Importantly, as i've added, you have
> to mandate the charter entity to produce an RFP; (I've mandated the regents
> produce the RFP for school district charter entities other than NYC).
>
> Please also review and consider additional edits, attached.

>
> Thanks.
>
> -Peter
>
>
> On Tue, May 25, 2010 at 10:48 PM, Bill Phillips
> wrote:
>
>
> Made simple change to get rid of the "only" in first paragraph. Hope it
> now reads as if the "normal" process is to use the rfp with listed
> requirements, BUT that nothing precludes an applicant from coming outside
> the normal process.
>
>
>
> Peter – is that 2nd exemption strong/safe enough? It really is the whole
> deal. My read is that it does not preclude an applicant from opening a
> charter school anywhere in the state. Do you agree that they don't have to
> be "asked via rfp" in order to apply?
>
>
>
> Guys – for clarity purposes, any thoughts about just adding that new list
> to the current listed requirements? Keep the description of the Rfp, then
> reference the current part of law that has the application requirements
> (with the new req'mnts), then add the two exemptions at the end.
>
>
>
> From: Lasher, Micah [mailto:MLasher@cityhall.nyc.gov]
> Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2010 10:26 PM
> To: Bill Phillips; petersor joewilliams@dfer.org; Peter
> Murphy
> Cc: MBest2@schools.nyc.gov; JWhite8@schools.nyc.gov; Wolfson, Howard
> Subject: Fw: Draft re RFP
>
>
>
> Hot off the email -- pls share your thoughts.
>
>
> Micah C. Lasher
> Director of State Legislative Affairs, City of New York
> (212) 788-8820 or (518) 447-5200
> mlasher@cityhall.nyc.gov
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: Best Michael (Legal Services) <MBest@schools.nyc.gov>
> To: White John <JWhite8@schools.nyc.gov>
> Cc: Lasher, Micah
> Sent: Tue May 25 22:18:23 2010
> Subject: Draft re RFP
>
>
> Try this. Wasn't sure I understood everything you wanted, but I tried--was
> particularly confused by what you were getting at with the last point about
> not limiting chartering authority (see last sentence of attached). But
> maybe I got it right.
>

> Let me know thoughts.
>
>
>

--
Sent from my mobile device

From: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2010 2:26 PM
To: James Merriman; Emary Aronson; Geoffrey Canada; Jeffrey Litt; Joseph H. Reich; Duffy Michael; Phoebe Boyer
Subject: RE: when sorrows come they come not as single spies but in battalions

When we learned about this weekend I ordered it stopped.

From: James Merriman
Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2010 1:37 PM
To: Emary Aronson; Geoffrey Canada; Jeffrey Litt; Klein Joel I.; Joseph H. Reich; Duffy Michael; Phoebe Boyer
Subject: when sorrows come they come not as single spies but in battalions

See below for story Williamsburg Charter High School and Believe Academy schools paying $100 to kids to recruit other kids (but only if they stay a semester)—sleazy but shrewd all at the same time. Asked Eddie for his side of story but he declined. Told Times it was unacceptable and notified SED.

We are waiting for language from Assembly around the RFP process which they are still pushing and it will be a barometer of how far they think they can push without our side walking away. Will keep you posted.

James

.....

James D. Merriman
Chief Executive Officer

NEW YORK CITY CHARTER SCHOOL CENTER
111 Broadway, Suite 604, New York, NY 10006
T: 212.437.8302 F: 212. 227.2763
www.nycCharterSchools.org

It's about great public schools

From: James Merriman
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 7:22 AM
To: Emary Aronson; Phoebe Boyer; Joseph H. Reich; Klein Joel I.; Geoffrey Canada;

Cc: Christina Brown; Kerri Lyon
Subject: And then nothing happened

Assembly still slinging around poison pills etc. No deal as of yet.

James Merriman
NYC Charter School Center
111 Broadway, Suite 604
NY, NY 10006

From: tusk
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 2:15 PM
To: Klein Joel I.
Subject: Re: Deck

Got it.
------Original Message------
From: Klein Joel I.
To: Bradley Tusk
Subject: Deck
Sent: May 27, 2010 1:57 PM

I wouldn't do Rhee or Ackerman on charters. Very few supes good on this. Paul Pasorek, Commr in La or Vallas in N.O. are, aside from us, the strongest.

From: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 3:27 PM
To: tusk
Subject: andrew acceptance speech

Can u send me copy? Also give me call when you get a sec.

From: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 5:06 PM
To: merriman
Subject: Re: it will be a late night

Not true

----- Original Message -----
From: James Merriman <
To: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Thu May 27 17:04:30 2010
Subject: Fw: it will be a late night

If true bad. As you know, having charters just be a state issue will weaken future by in.
James Merriman
NYC Charter School Center
111 Broadway, Suite 604
NY, NY 10006

From: Joe Williams
To: Stefan Friedman · : Bradley Tusk
Sent: Fri May 28 06:48:21 2010
Subject: Fw: notes on new Assembly charter bill A.11310

Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

From: James Merriman
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 8:29 AM
To: Klein Joel I.
Subject: do you support this bill?

From: Bradley Tusk
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 8:32 AM
To: Merriman lasher 'joewilliams 'friedman Best Michael (Legal Services); White John; Cantor David
Subject: Re: Can you guys do 9:45 call

9:30 work for everyone?

----- Original Message -----
From: James Merriman
To: lasher williams williams
Bill Phillips Bradley Tusk; Stefan Friedman
Michael Best <MBest2@schools.nyc.gov>; John White <JWhite8@schools.nyc.gov>; David Cantor <dcantor@schools.nyc.gov>
Sent: Fri May 28 07:28:07 2010
Subject: RE: Can you guys do 9:45 call

can do then or earlier.

From:
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 8:14 AM
To: williams James Merriman; Bill Phillips; Bradley Tusk; Stefan Friedman; Michael Best; John White; David Cantor
Subject: Re: Can you guys do 9:45 call

Adding more.

------Original Message------
From: Joe Williams
To: James Merriman
To: Bill Phillips
To: Bradley Tusk
To: Micah Lasher
To: Stefan Friedman
ReplyTo: williams
Subject: Can you guys do 9:45 call
Sent: May 28, 2010 8:11 AM

Once we have all done wrapping our arms around this?
Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

From: James Merriman
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 9:21 AM
To: White John
Subject: buildings

the STATUS QUO must remain on buildings in the city. Outside of the city is tough but schools upstate will effectively be fucked.

Inside city, they cannot possibly meet the health, safety, etc.--safety can be broadly defined and there is no way that private developers can afford public school code. Must be non-public school code.

J.

From: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 12:05 PM
To: James Merriman; Joe Williams; ' tusk(
Subject: FW: it's nysut
Attachments: oppose%255B1%255D%5B1%5D[1].doc

fyi

nysut A Union of Professionals

OPPOSES

A. 11310 (Rules) - S. 7990 (Oppenheimer)

STATEMENT OF OPPOSITION:

This legislation would more than double the number of charter schools in New York State without providing meaningful reform of charter school operations in the areas of accountability, equity and fairness. In addition this bill does not provide necessary protections against the abuse of power, fraud, misuse of public funds, or protection of parent and student rights. Not only would it significantly increase pressure on local property taxes, particularly in districts like Albany and Buffalo that are already saturated with charter schools, but this proposal would be **the largest unfunded mandate in education in recent history**. This legislation amounts to a long term financial liability for local school districts in the pursuit of a non-recurring, one time grant.

In New York state, we currently have 140 charter schools operating in 2009-10, serving about 44,000 kids. Traditional public schools sent $530 million this year to charter schools via their tuition payments. Tuition payments come from a combination of state and local dollars. In the 2009-10 school year, almost 50 percent or $263 million came from local revenue or property taxes.

If the state legislature raises the charter cap to 460 we will more than double the number of schools, and significantly increase the number of students and overall costs to taxpayers. If school sizes remain consistent, New York will have 145,000 kids in charter schools and taxpayers will be sending **$2 billion** to charter schools per year. If the new charter schools are similarly distributed around the state – this would add an additional **$1 billion cost to property taxpayers per year**. This is an overall increase in costs which is more than twice the value of Race to the Top, a one-time grant. Before the cap is addressed, the law must be fixed to provide:

FAIRNESS FOR STUDENTS – Level the playing field to ensure charter operators serve the same population as regular public schools, including students with disabilities, students who are English language learners and students most in need. **Fairness in resources means charter school funding cannot come at the expense of neighborhood public schools. Under the provisions of this bill, public school districts and local property taxpayers will continue to shoulder the burden of paying for the creation of 260 additional schools.**

FAIRNESS FOR SCHOOLS – Ensure that schools are fairly funded, not disadvantaged or penalized by an influx of new operators. Every child should have a quality public education in a safe and healthy learning environment, whether they attend a charter school or a regular public school. **We must offer relief to cities and community school districts already over saturated with charter schools. This bill fails to address the issue of oversaturation in any meaningful way.**

FAIRNESS FOR TAXPAYERS –Not all charter schools are created equal. **"Charter corporate" is fighting tooth and nail to avoid prohibitions on conflict of interest that all other public schools adhere to. This bill does not prohibit such abuses by charter school boards.** Kids must come before profits.

NYSUT STRONGLY URGES DEFEAT OF THIS LEGISLATION.

From: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 12:34 PM
To: tusk
Subject: RE: FW: it's nysut

Not a problem

From: tusk [mailto: tusk
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 12:36 PM
To: Klein Joel I.
Subject: Re: FW: it's nysut

From: "Klein Joel I." <JKlein@schools.nyc.gov>
Date: Fri, 28 May 2010 12:32:48 -0400
To: Bradley Tusk
Subject: RE: FW: it's nysut

I've got a call in. not gonna be a problem

From: Bradley Tusk
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 12:32 PM
To: Klein Joel I.
Subject: Re: FW: it's nysut

may be good for you to call murdoch to tell him why this is a good bill.

On Fri, May 28, 2010 at 12:05 PM, Klein Joel I. <JKlein@schools.nyc.gov> wrote:

fyi

From: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Friday, Mav 28. 2010 2:43 PM
To: merriman aronsor boyer canada reich Duffy Michael; litt
Subject: Re: Where we are at and what we should do

I never had power to approve, always a recommender (previousl to SED, now to SUNY also and with value in approval process for both). I'm assured that the building rules don't apply in NYC where they will still be subject to Building Department as in past. On the big issues -- district saturation, compromising SUNY's independence and vetoes over co-location, we prevailed. For-profits not key to our strategy.

From: James Merriman
To: Emary Aronson ; Phoebe Boyer ; Geoffrey Canada ; Joseph H. Reich ; Klein Joel I.; Duffy Michael; Jeff Litt

Sent: Fri May 28 14:29:33 2010
Subject: FW: Where we are at and what we should do
Sorry, this should have reached you an hour ago but for tech reasons did not.

From: James Merriman
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 1:12 PM
Cc: Kerri Lyon; Michael Regnier; Vincent Marrone
Subject: Where we are at and what we should do

Folks,

After a lot of clarification and one amendment to the Assembly bill, I am prepared to offer the Center's measured support for it--I will forward you our intended statement. It is up to the Senate to pass a same as bill. The bill is much worse for the association, Tom Carroll and their supporters (it knocks out for profits, its facility provisions are more onerous and the rfp process less friendly). As such the Association is trying to block the Senate from passing the bill and it is possible they succeed in which case we shall see what we shall see.

Chancellor Klein is enthusiastic about the Assembly bill as it is amended and he and the Mayor strongly support its passage in the Senate.

The large CMOs will be favorable as they want to see more charters available; the small school with no interest in growing will be more skeptical and not see a lot in it for them (and they are not wrong). Below is a brief and incomplete synopsis of the bill.

I'm on my cell if you need to speak with me. RIght now I don't think a board call is necessary but open to that as well.

The Assembly bill that passed this monring and then was amended provides as follows:

We have a bill that raises the cap by 260 charters. I have been assured by Governor and Senate counsel that they believe that all charters can be issued under the new RFP process for issuing charters (there was an issue whether the process would mean that a lot of charters would exist in name only). Only 114 of these charters can be issued in NYC.

New charters will be given out according to a once a year RFP which suny and SED have authority to issue independently of each other. There is direction as to what those RFPs have to prefer, etc., but none that are debilitating. They are workable and sufficiently flexible.

SUNY retains its authorizing independence. This did not seem to be the case in the bill that came out this morning. This has been fixed and the governor's office took a lead role in making the fix, backed strongly by the Mayor's office.

The Chancellor's continuing role in authorizing schools is vague but it is not clear that his role is meaningfully diminished. At worst, it takes away the power for the Chancellor to actually approve applications and instead makes him a recommender. As he and we all know, this is a distinction without much of a difference. Without the ability to over-ride the Regents, he was always at their mercy to some degree. Whether he retains authority over charters he recommends is not clear at this early stage but it is possible to read the provisions as if he does.

The safety, health and sanitary provisions of the state ed's building code will apply to new schools in private space. This is the most troublesome of the remaining provisions and it is not clear how much trouble or cost this will be to schools. Probably in the short run, not much--but it could be game-changing over time in increasing construction costs. something to be watched.

We are still studying whether the provision in the bill as to multi-site really works to allow existing CMOs to consolidate. It is too early for me to say one way or another.

There are modest additional process constraints to co-location siting and then ongoing in the form of a more detailed analysis of the effect, the actual space that will be alloted and so forth and so on. WE will need to work closely with DoE to see that it gets this right; the present court case will provide clarity.

A new provision is added to renewal which both requires the schools to lay out their plans for enrolling comparable numbers of SPED, ELL and F&RPL eligible students as well as retaining them--and a ground for non-renewal is not meeting those benchmarks though good faith efforts permit renewal where the targets are not met. This is overall reasonable and a good compromise. This replaces the mandatory lottery structure that the senate bill had envisioned.

From: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 3:06 PM
To: sternberg(
Cc: Duffy Michael
Subject: Re: Where we are at and what we should do

From: Marc Sternberg
To: Klein Joel I.
Cc: Duffy Michael
Sent: Fri May 28 15:04:33 2010
Subject: Re: Where we are at and what we should do

On Fri, May 28, 2010 at 2:56 PM, Klein Joel I. <JKlein@schools.nyc.gov> wrote:

From: Duffy Michael
To: Klein Joel I.
Cc: 'Marc Sternberg'
Sent: Fri May 28 14:47:48 2010
Subject: RE: Where we are at and what we should do

From: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 2:43 PM
To: merriman aronson bover canada(reich Duffy Michael litt
Subject: Re: Where we are at and what we should do

I never had power to approve, always a recommender (previousl to SED, now to SUNY also and with value in approval process for both). I'm assured that the building rules don't apply in NYC where they will still be subject to Building Department as in past. On the big issues -- district saturation, compromising SUNY's independence and vetoes over co-location, we prevailed. For-profits not key to our strategy.

From: James Merriman
To: Emary Aronson ; Phoebe Boyer ; Geoffrey Canada ; Joseph H. Reich ; Klein Joel I.; Duffy Michael; Jeff Litt
Sent: Fri May 28 14:29:33 2010
Subject: FW: Where we are at and what we should do

Sorry, this should have reached you an hour ago but for tech reasons did not.

From: James Merriman
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 1:12 PM
Cc: Kerri Lyon; Michael Regnier; Vincent Marrone
Subject: Where we are at and what we should do

Folks,

After a lot of clarification and one amendment to the Assembly bill, I am prepared to offer the Center's measured support for it--I will forward you our intended statement. It is up to the Senate to pass a same as bill. The bill is much worse for the association, Tom Carroll and their supporters (it knocks out for profits, its facility provisions are more onerous and the rfp process less friendly). As such the Association is trying to block the Senate from passing the bill and it is possible they succeed in which case we shall see what we shall see.

Chancellor Klein is enthusiastic about the Assembly bill as it is amended and he and the Mayor strongly support its passage in the Senate.

The large CMOs will be favorable as they want to see more charters available; the small school with no interest in growing will be more skeptical and not see a lot in it for them (and they are not wrong). Below is a brief and incomplete synopsis of the bill.

I'm on my cell if you need to speak with me. RIght now I don't think a board call is necessary but open to that as well.

The Assembly bill that passed this monring and then was amended provides as follows:

We have a bill that raises the cap by 260 charters. I have been assured by Governor and Senate counsel that they believe that all charters can be issued under the new RFP process for issuing charters (there was an issue whether the process would mean that a lot of charters would exist in name only). Only 114 of these charters can be issued in NYC.

New charters will be given out according to a once a year RFP which suny and SED have authority to issue independently of each other. There is direction as to what those RFPs have to prefer, etc., but none that are debilitating. They are workable and sufficiently flexible.

SUNY retains its authorizing independence. This did not seem to be the case in the bill that came out this morning. This has been fixed and the governor's office took a lead role in making the fix, backed strongly by the Mayor's office.

The Chancellor's continuing role in authorizing schools is vague but it is not clear that his role is meaningfully diminished. At worst, it takes away the power for the Chancellor to actually approve applications and instead makes him a recommender. As he and we all know, this is a distinction without much of a difference. Without the ability to over-ride the Regents, he was always at their mercy to some degree. Whether he retains authority over charters he recommends is not clear at this early stage but it is possible to read the provisions as if he does.

The safety, health and sanitary provisions of the state ed's building code will apply to new schools in private space. This is the most troublesome of the remaining provisions and it is not clear how much trouble or cost this will be to schools. Probably in the short run, not much--but it could be game-changing over time in increasing construction costs. something to be watched.

We are still studying whether the provision in the bill as to multi-site really works to allow existing CMOs to consolidate. It is too early for me to say one way or another.

There are modest additional process constraints to co-location siting and then ongoing in the form of a more detailed analysis of the effect, the actual space that will be alloted and so forth and so on. WE will need to work closely with DoE to see that it gets this right; the present court case will provide clarity.

A new provision is added to renewal which both requires the schools to lay out their plans for enrolling comparable numbers of SPED, ELL and F&RPL eligible students as well as retaining them--and a ground for non-renewal is not meeting those benchmarks though good faith efforts permit renewal where the targets are not met. This is overall reasonable and a good compromise. This replaces the mandatory lottery structure that the senate bill had envisioned.

--

Marc S. Sternberg

From: Duffy Michael
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 3:09 PM
To: sternberg
Subject: Re: Where we are at and what we should do

From: Marc Sternberg
To: Klein Joel I.
Cc: Duffy Michael
Sent: Fri May 28 15:04:33 2010
Subject: Re: Where we are at and what we should do

On Fri, May 28, 2010 at 2:56 PM, Klein Joel I. <JKlein@schools.nyc.gov> wrote:

From: Duffy Michael
To: Klein Joel I.
Cc: 'Marc Sternberg'
Sent: Fri May 28 14:47:48 2010

From: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 2:43 PM
To: merriman
Duffy Michael;
Subject: Re: Where we are at and what we should do

I never had power to approve, always a recommender (previousl to SED, now to SUNY also and with value in approval process for both). I'm assured that the building rules don't apply in NYC where they will still be subject to Building Department as in past. On the

big issues -- district saturation, compromising SUNY's independence and vetoes over co-location, we prevailed. For-profits not key to our strategy.

From: James Merriman
To: Emary Aronson ; Phoebe Boyer ; Geoffrey Canada ; Joseph H. Reich ; Klein Joel I.; Duffy Michael; Jeff Litt
Sent: Fri May 28 14:29:33 2010
Subject: FW: Where we are at and what we should do

Sorry, this should have reached you an hour ago but for tech reasons did not.

From: James Merriman
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 1:12 PM
Cc: Kerri Lyon; Michael Regnier; Vincent Marrone
Subject: Where we are at and what we should do

Folks,

After a lot of clarification and one amendment to the Assembly bill, I am prepared to offer the Center's measured support for it--I will forward you our intended statement. It is up to the Senate to pass a same as bill. The bill is much worse for the association, Tom Carroll and their supporters (it knocks out for profits, its facility provisions are more onerous and the rfp process less friendly). As such the Association is trying to block the Senate from passing the bill and it is possible they succeed in which case we shall see what we shall see.

Chancellor Klein is enthusiastic about the Assembly bill as it is amended and he and the Mayor strongly support its passage in the Senate.

The large CMOs will be favorable as they want to see more charters available; the small school with no interest in growing will be more skeptical and not see a lot in it for them (and they are not wrong). Below is a brief and incomplete synopsis of the bill.

I'm on my cell if you need to speak with me. RIght now I don't think a board call is necessary but open to that as well.

The Assembly bill that passed this monring and then was amended provides as follows:

We have a bill that raises the cap by 260 charters. I have been assured by Governor and Senate counsel that they believe that all charters can be issued under the new RFP process for issuing charters (there was an issue whether the process would mean that a lot of charters would exist in name only). Only 114 of these charters can be issued in NYC.

New charters will be given out according to a once a year RFP which suny and SED have authority to issue independently of each other. There is direction as to what those RFPs have to prefer, etc., but none that are debilitating. They are workable and sufficiently flexible.

SUNY retains its authorizing independence. This did not seem to be the case in the bill that came out this morning. This has been fixed and the governor's office took a lead role in making the fix, backed strongly by the Mayor's office.

The Chancellor's continuing role in authorizing schools is vague but it is not clear that his role is meaningfully diminished. At worst, it takes away the power for the Chancellor to actually approve applications and instead makes him a recommender. As he and we all know, this is a distinction without much of a difference. Without the ability to over-ride the Regents, he was always at their mercy to some degree. Whether he retains authority over charters he recommends is not clear at this early stage but it is possible to read the provisions as if he does.

The safety, health and sanitary provisions of the state ed's building code will apply to new schools in private space. This is the most troublesome of the remaining provisions and it is not clear how much trouble or cost this will be to schools. Probably in the short run, not much--but it could be game-changing over time in increasing construction costs. something to be watched.

We are still studying whether the provision in the bill as to multi-site really works to allow existing CMOs to consolidate. It is too early for me to say one way or another.

There are modest additional process constraints to co-location siting and then ongoing in the form of a more detailed analysis of the effect, the actual space that will be alloted and so forth and so on. WE will need to work closely with DoE to see that it gets this right; the present court case will provide clarity.

A new provision is added to renewal which both requires the schools to lay out their plans for enrolling comparable numbers of SPED, ELL and F&RPL eligible students as well as retaining them--and a ground for non-renewal is not meeting those benchmarks though good faith efforts permit renewal where the targets are not met. This is overall reasonable and a good compromise. This replaces the mandatory lottery structure that the senate bill had envisioned.

--

Marc S. Sternberg

From: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Friday, May 28. 2010 3:33 PM
To: williams
Subject: Re: Murphy

Bad for him to be in times pissing on - fine to say he wanted more

---

From: Joe Williams
To: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Fri May 28 15:31:22 2010
Subject: Re: Murphy
yeah, inside coalitional crap. we can, and will, resolve quickly.

On Fri, May 28, 2010 at 3:30 PM, Klein Joel I. <JKlein@schools.nyc.gov> wrote:

You mean we took it over and have a different agenda?

From: Joe Williams
To: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Fri May 28 15:29:25 2010
Subject: Re: Murphy
i think the real issue is one of control. this will be resolved. i promise.

On Fri, May 28, 2010 at 3:28 PM, Klein Joel I. <JKlein@schools.nyc.gov> wrote:

Yep but ridiculous to think this is worse than nothing -- look at last Assembly bill. Other than profits hard to see the real dents.

From: Joe Williams
To: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Fri May 28 15:25:44 2010
Subject: Re: Murphy
we have been trying. this is a mess within our coalition.

On Fri, May 28, 2010 at 3:22 PM, Klein Joel I. <JKlein@schools.nyc.gov> wrote:
Any way to walk him off the ledge?

--
Joe Williams
Executive Director
Democrats for Education Reform
24 W. 46th St. Suite #4
New York, NY 10036
www.dfer.org

From: Joe Williams [joewilliams@dfer.org]
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 4:17 PM
To: James Merriman
Cc: Lasher Micah; Bradley Tusk White John
Subject: Re: thank you

agreed. great work, folks.

get some sleep.

On Fri, May 28, 2010 at 4:15 PM, James Merriman · wrote:
Gentlemen,

I know it was a long slog and not always a pleasant one either. The end product is sound and productive, moves us forward and lets the chancellor and ed reform community continue its work--and maybe we even get the $700 million. We are appreciative for your efforts, and the Mayor's support and care on this issue, and look forward to working with you.

James

--
Joe Williams
Executive Director
Democrats for Education Reform
24 W. 46th St. Suite #4
New York, NY 10036
www.dfer.org

From: Bradley Tusk
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 4:20 PM
To: James Merriman; Lasher Micah; White John; Joe Williams (joewilliams@dfer.org)
Subject: RE: thank you

You beat me to it. This was a great effort, a true team effort, it's never pretty making the sausage but the end result is good. What's next?

From: James Merriman
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 4:15 PM
To: Micah Lasher; Bradley Tusk; White John; Joe Williams (joewilliams@dfer.org)
Subject: thank you

Gentlemen,

I know it was a long slog and not always a pleasant one either. The end product is sound and productive, moves us forward and lets the chancellor and ed reform community continue its work--and maybe we even get the $700 million. We are appreciative for your efforts, and the Mayor's support and care on this issue, and look forward to working with you.

James