

Draft

Tuesday, October 23, 12:00 noon – 5:00 pm, at the Cross State Office Building, 111 Sewall Street, Augusta, Room 400. The Commission will meet in Retreat in accordance with the agenda as outlined below:

October 23, 2012
Cross State Office Building
NOTES

1. How to avoid the Commission becoming consultants.

Consulting role makes us part of the problem if they do not go forward.

MACS has been through one round with us and know what our rules are and what we mean by them; they can be more effective now with applicants.

Executive Director should "clarify the details."

Do the "what" not the "how."

MACS principal resource for the "how."

Professional Review of RFP.

MCSC Response to Letter of Intent should include resources for "what."

MCSC's job is to review what is presented.

2. Approach to awarding new contracts this cycle.

Definitely next round with MCSC response to letter of intent a packet with resources, etc.

No substantive changes in contract phase.

Better application review.

If RFP-Application tightened up, it will make the contract phase go more smoothly.

3. First year of performance and monitoring.

There is a template for monitoring.

4. Local units as authorizers – should we promote this more.

Local district trying to do their own charter school. Have approached one of our applicants who wants to go statewide.

Eastport – residential art program with facilities available and arts community. No funding, but interest in local to start a consortium.

Have heard 7-8 superintendents very interested in local charter school – under the radar. Waiting politically for things to develop.

Promoting local units as authorizers is totally unrelated to our work and should be the Commissioner's responsibility to educate.

MCSC developing, organizing how to do it. We can be a model. Local units would not come under the cap of 10. MSMA has a two-day conference in the fall – may be appropriate for us to present there in the future.

5. Initial review of applications for completeness.

No applications in yet – 10-23-12.

Initial review for completeness will be done by Executive Director with the Administrative Assistant.

The commission shall notify the applicant of specific omissions and/or errors that make the application incomplete. Five days to correct.

We would not be able to reject on first review because of omission or error. If it doesn't come back complete, then we can reject.

Thought: Perhaps no applications for opening in 2014. Move to a 2-year cycle incorporates a

Draft

planning phase. Start with Mini-applications in 2013 for Opening in 2015.

Side Bar:

Chapter 2 has to go to Law by June 2014. This could change things. We are allowed to make changes now. After "law," has to go to Ed Committee then sent to the House and Senate – when they are done – goes to the Governor's desk.

Question: Is there a reason to invite outsiders to review?

Deb Friedman thought the intent of legislation to encourage outside experts to be part of the review process.

We are lining up Dept. People to review on certain topics – relating to meeting state standards. Reviews can cost \$750-\$1000.

Identify people who have expertise:

Anita Bernhart (sp?) – would be excellent with STEM.

Finances – Jim Rier and Sue Beaudoin, DOE.

List of people – no funds to pay them. Requires time commitment.

Some will review, give recommendations – do not want to put their name on it.

Department as a resource not as a reviewer.

Once involved – outside reviewers are liable to be questioned. It is a public process.

Budget for outside reviewers? Honorarium \$100 or \$500?

Legal requirements for reviewers?

6. Should we have some influence or say in directing the focus of the next charter schools in terms of populations served.

Bob checked on this with Sarah Forster. We do have authority to develop an RFP specific to a particular school/group/region/other.

P/Charter Schools/Minutes/Draft-Notes/10/23/12 Retreat Notes

11/19/12 dcl

Draft

Tuesday, October 23, 12:00 noon – 5:00 pm, at the Cross State Office Building, 111 Sewall Street, Augusta, Room 400. The Commission will meet in Retreat in accordance with the agenda as outlined below:

October 23, 2012
Cross State Office Building
NOTES

1. How to avoid the Commission becoming consultants.

Consulting role makes us part of the problem if they do not go forward.

MACS has been through one round with us and know what our rules are and what we mean by them; they can be more effective now with applicants.

Executive Director should "clarify the details."

Do the "what" not the "how."

MACS principal resource for the "how."

Professional Review of RFP.

MCSC Response to Letter of Intent should include resources for "what."

MCSC's job is to review what is presented.

2. Approach to awarding new contracts this cycle.

Definitely next round with MCSC response to letter of intent a packet with resources, etc.

No substantive changes in contract phase.

Better application review.

If RFP-Application tightened up, it will make the contract phase go more smoothly.

3. First year of performance and monitoring.

There is a template for monitoring.

4. Local units as authorizers – should we promote this more.

Local district trying to do their own charter school. Have approached one of our applicants who wants to go statewide.

Eastport – residential art program with facilities available and arts community. No funding, but interest in local to start a consortium.

Have heard 7-8 superintendents very interested in local charter school – under the radar. Waiting politically for things to develop.

Promoting local units as authorizers is totally unrelated to our work and should be the Commissioner's responsibility to educate.

MCSC developing, organizing how to do it. We can be a model. Local units would not come under the cap of 10. MSMA has a two-day conference in the fall – may be appropriate for us to present there in the future.

5. Initial review of applications for completeness.

No applications in yet – 10-23-12.

Initial review for completeness will be done by Executive Director with the Administrative Assistant.

The commission shall notify the applicant of specific omissions and/or errors that make the application incomplete. Five days to correct.

We would not be able to reject on first review because of omission or error. If it doesn't come back complete, then we can reject.

Thought: Perhaps no applications for opening in 2014. Move to a 2-year cycle incorporates a

Draft

planning phase. Start with Mini-applications in 2013 for Opening in 2015.

Side Bar:

Chapter 2 has to go to Law by June 2014. This could change things. We are allowed to make changes now. After "law," has to go to Ed Committee then sent to the House and Senate – when they are done – goes to the Governor's desk.

Question: Is there a reason to invite outsiders to review?

Deb Friedman thought the intent of legislation to encourage outside experts to be part of the review process.

We are lining up Dept. People to review on certain topics – relating to meeting state standards. Reviews can cost \$750-\$1000.

Identify people who have expertise:

Anita Bernhart (sp?) – would be excellent with STEM.

Finances – Jim Rier and Sue Beaudoin, DOE.

List of people – no funds to pay them. Requires time commitment.

Some will review, give recommendations ---do not want to put their name on it.

Department as a resource not as a reviewer.

Once involved – outside reviewers are libel to be questioned. It is a public process.

Budget for outside reviewers? Honorarium \$100 or \$500?

Legal requirements for reviewers?

6. Should we have some influence or say in directing the focus of the next charter schools in terms of populations served.

Bob checked on this with Sarah Forster. We do have authority to develop an RFP specific to a particular school/group/region/other.

P/Charter Schools/Minutes/Draft-Notes/10/23/12 Retreat Notes

11/19/12 del