

Baranello Joseph

From: James Merriman
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2010 4:54 AM
To: litt
Cc: Emary Aronson; Geoffrey Canada; Klein Joel I.; Joseph H. Reich; Duffy Michael; Phoebe Boyer; Christina Brown
Subject: RE: Ravitch, RTTT
Categories: Green Category

Thank you, Jeff. Much appreciated.

From: litt
Sent: Wednesday, January 13, 2010 7:10 PM
To: James Merriman
Cc: Emary Aronson; Geoffrey Canada; Joel I. Klein; Joseph H. Reich; Michael Duffy; Phoebe Boyer; Christina Brown
Subject: Re: Ravitch, RTTT

Hi James,

Once again, you serve as an outstanding spokesperson for charter leaders. It is unfortunate that your time has to be spent clarifying such obvious facts, but knowing that you head the organization gives all of us reason to be proud. Thank you so much for your willingness to take on the "opposition", I can only hope that one day all people involved in education will think of the children rather than self interests.

Have a nice evening.

Jeff

----- Original Message -----

From: James Merriman
Date: Wednesday, January 13, 2010 1:19 pm
Subject: Ravitch, RTTT
To: Emary Aronson , Geoffrey Canada , Jeffrey Litt , "Joel I. Klein" , "Joseph H. Reich" , Michael Duffy , Phoebe Boyer
Cc: Christina Brown

> I'm attaching the LTE that we are submitting to the Daily News in
> response to Diane Ravitch's disgraceful and intellectually dishonest
> piece today on the op-ed page (the column is pasted below). It's long
> and will likely get cut.
>
> To the Editor:
>
> In Diane Ravitch's piece on why charter school students are scoring so
> much better than their peers in traditional district schools, a point
> she once but no longer disputes ("New York City charter schools need
> to focus on the neediest," 1/13), Professor Ravitch makes the
> startling claim that charter schools are focusing on enrolling the
> students who are "likeliest to produce the highest test scores."
> Charter schools enroll predominantly poor minority students from
> Harlem, central Brooklyn and the South Bronx. Three of four students
> are poor enough to qualify for free and reduced price lunches. Would
> that it were otherwise, but sadly this is not a population that, in
> her words, is likeliest to ace the state tests. Professor Ravitch
> knows this better than anybody.

>
 > Professor Ravitch also speculates that charter schools get their
 > results because they have more resources. This is not true; charters
 > do not get facility funding and their operating aid is a fraction of
 > that for the system.

>
 > Finally, Ravitch calls for all students in the district having the
 > advantages that charter school students have. Those advantages-a
 > longer school day, a longer school year, a laser like focus on
 > academics, the ability of the school to hire the very best teachers,
 > provide flexible pay scales that reward success as well as move
 > quickly to not retain teachers who do not get results---could be
 > enacted tomorrow. Perhaps Ravitch's next column can explore the
 > barriers that stop that from happening rather than drawing a
 > grotesquely inaccurate picture of charter schools and the hardworking
 > leaders and teachers who work in them.

>
 >
 >
 >
 > _____
 >
 > On Race to the Top, we should have a better picture in a few hours. So
 > far, the Governor and the minority in the Senate (from which the
 > democrats will need some votes in order to get the necessary 32 votes)
 > are holding firm. We have worked hard to make clear that if a bill
 > emerges that is bad for charters, no matter how the points play out,
 > it will be perceived as a slap to the President and make it impossible
 > for Duncan to give money to New York. Our other message is that if a
 > bad bill comes out that has a cap lift, this will result in everyone
 > losing: the union and districts will be stuck with 200 more charters;
 > charters will be hobbled and won't provide a quality education and
 > we'll all lose the money including money for the teacher initiatives
 > that there is a seeming consensus to move forward with.

>
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >
 > New York City charter schools need to focus on the neediest By Diane
 > Ravitch Daily News Op-Ed January 13, 2010

>
 > Most of New York City's 99 charter schools, which enroll 30,000
 > students, have gotten superior results on state tests. It is important
 > to understand why many of them perform so well, since Mayor Bloomberg
 > has promised to double the number of charters over the next four
 > years.

>
 > Last fall, a report by economist Caroline Hoxby of Stanford University
 > hailed the city's charter schools and suggested that any student who
 > attended a charter school for nine years would be almost as well
 > educated as a student in well-heeled Scarsdale. A new study by
 > economist Margaret Raymond of Stanford has confirmed that many of the
 > city's charter schools get higher test scores. Raymond found that 51%
 > of New York City charters produced significant gains in math, but only

> 29% did so in reading.
>
> Last year, Raymond's research team conducted a national study of
> charter schools and found that only 17% had better results than
> traditional public schools; 83% produced gains that were no different
> or significantly worse. This study shredded the myth that charter
> schools are a sure cure for poor education.
>
> So why are charters in New York City doing so much better than those
> in the rest of the nation?
>
> Unlike Hoxby's study, Raymond's research did not say that all was well
> with the charter sector. After all, 49% of charter schools produced no
> significant gains in math, and 71% produced no significant gains in
> reading. Raymond concluded that charter students who were either
> special-education or English-language learners made no significant
> gains. She also found that charter students who had previously been
> held back in their grade made no gains at all in reading and were
> outperformed in math by similar students in traditional public
> schools.
>
> Charters in New York City have important advantages that make them
> different from the rest of the nation. Many have wealthy sponsors who
> donate millions of dollars to their schools. This helps them to have
> smaller classes and more resources than the local public schools.
>
> Another important factor in their success is that Schools Chancellor
> Joel Klein has placed 70 of the city's 99 charters in public school
> space, subsidizing the charters' facilities, utilities,
> transportation, custodial services, food services and whatever else is
> provided to the regular public school. In other districts, the
> charters must find their own space and bear these costs. This policy
> has set off bitter battles between charter school parents and those of
> students at public schools that lose classroom space to the favored
> charters, especially when the city renovates classrooms for the
> charter students, but not for the regular public school students.
>
> Most charters in New York City have lotteries for admission. The
> lottery screens out students whose families are not well informed. New
> York City's public schools have 50,000 homeless students, but only
> about 100 are enrolled in charters. The special-education students
> admitted to charters tend to be those with the mildest disabilities
> because charters are not equipped to meet the needs of those with
> extreme disabilities. In addition, charters are able to "counsel out"
> students who are "not a good fit," who then return to the traditional
> public schools.
>
> According to data compiled by the United Federation of Teachers, less
> than 4% of those enrolled in charter schools are English- language
> learners, compared with a citywide average of 14%. Less than 10% of
> charter students require special education, compared with a citywide
> average of 16%. Charters enroll fewer Hispanic or immigrant students
> than the regular public schools. The gaps are even larger when charter
> schools are compared with their neighborhood public schools, rather
> than citywide averages.
>
> Charter schools and public schools do not compete on a level playing

> field. Those who attend charters are enrolled in small classes with
> other motivated students, while those in public schools attend schools
> in overcrowded classrooms with a full range of students, including
> those who left charters.

>
> Critics may rightly wonder if charter school success has more to do
> with their admissions policies, their resources and their ability to
> remove low-scoring students than to their academic prowess. The city's
> Education Department should require charters to focus on the students
> whose needs are greatest, not on those who are likeliest to produce
> the highest test scores. And the department should make sure that
> every public school has the same advantages and resources as charter
> schools.

>
> Ravitch is a historian of education. Her latest book, "The Death and
> Life of the Great American School System: How Testing and Choice Are
> Undermining Education," will be published in March.

>

> 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, January 14, 2010 10:51 AM
To: Duffy Michael
Cc: Michael Regnier; Carson Benjamin
Subject: RE: CREDO date by authorizer

Very helpful. I think we will kill the kill suny/doe thing today.

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: Duffy Michael [<mailto:MDuffy12@schools.nyc.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2010 10:15 AM
To: James Merriman
Cc: Michael Regnier; Carson Benjamin
Subject: CREDO date by authorizer

Check out the attached and use extensively. Ben Carson is the author, contact him directly with questions.

-----Original Message-----

From: Joe Williams
To: Vincent N. Marrone
To: James Merriman
To: Bill Phillips
To: Stefan Friedman
To: Micah Lasher
To: Ken Peterson
To: Peter Murphy
ReplyTo: Joe Williams
Subject: Just talked to Gov again
Sent: Jan 14, 2010 10:24 AM

He spoke to Arne Duncan is armed and ready. Is going to publicly call leaders to meeting and emphatically state his position abt wanting to win.

He thinks SUNY stuff is dead.
Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

Sent via BlackBerry by AT&T

From: James Merriman
Sent: Friday, January 15, 2010 3:49 PM
To: Klein Joel I.; Lasher Micah
Subject: if Arne could say two things

One would be weighing in on dumping suny and you and second would be that where a state provides no facility financing/funding and then makes a decision to seek to stop use of public facilities by charters, this would be viewed negatively as inhibiting growth. Joe is conveying.

.....
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: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Saturday, January 16, 2010 11:33 AM
To: Lasher Micah; Duffy Michael; Best Michael (Legal Services); White John
Subject: Re: Fw:

----- Original Message -----

From: Lasher Micah
To: ; Klein Joel I.; Duffy Michael; Best Michael (Legal Services); White John
Sent: Sat Jan 16 11:28:14 2010
Subject: Re: Fw:

Micah Lasher
Executive Director of External Affairs
New York City Department of Education
(212) 374-4946 (o)
(917) 604-7406 (m)
mlasher@schools.nyc.gov

----- Original Message -----

From: Lasher Micah
To: Klein Joel I.; Duffy Michael; Best Michael (Legal Services); White John
Sent: Sat Jan 16 11:25:17 2010
Subject: Fw: Fw:

Charter bill language --

Micah Lasher
Executive Director of External Affairs
New York City Department of Education
(212) 374-4946 (o)
(917) 604-7406 (m)
mlasher@schools.nyc.gov

----- Original Message -----

From: James Merriman <
To: Lasher Micah; Michael Regnier ; Steve Williams
(SWilliams1@cityhall.nyc.gov) <SWilliams1@cityhall.nyc.gov>; Kevin P. Quinn, Esq.

Sent: Sat Jan 16 11:21:39 2010
Subject: FW: Fw:

From: Duffy Palmer <Duffy.Palmer@chamber.state.ny.us>
Date: Sat, 16 Jan 2010 10:52:12 -0500
To: 'vmarrone@publicstrategiesllc.net'
Subject:

DUFFY PALMER
Deputy Secretary for Education
Executive Chamber #236
NYS Capitol
Albany, New York 12224
518.408.2833

From: Duffy Michael
Sent: Saturday, January 16, 2010 1:43 PM
To: Klein Joel I.; Lasher Micah; White John; Best Michael (Legal Services)
Subject: Fw: NACSA's Greg Richmond: A Step Backward for New York Charter Schools
Attachments: A Step Backward for New York.docx

From: David Hansen
To: jonaschartock@suny.edu ; [jmerriman](#) [Murphy](#) [williams](#) ; Duffy Michael; [Boyer](#)
Sent: Sat Jan 16 13:25:23 2010
Subject: NACSA's Greg Richmond: A Step Backward for New York Charter Schools
We thought you'd be interested in these comments from NACSA's President and CEO Greg Richmond.

Hope this helps your efforts this weekend and be sure to call if we can assist you further.

Best regards,
David Hansen
Vice President, External Affairs
National Association of Charter School Authorizers
614.783.0309 cell

Contact: David Hansen, (614)783-0309 cell
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: January 16, 2010

A Step Backward for New York Charter Schools
Without SUNY and Chancellor Authorizing Charter Schools, New York's Children Would Lose

As states across the nation take action to strengthen their charter schools laws, the New York legislature is at risk of taking a step backward if it eliminates the ability of the State University of New York and the New York City Chancellor to approve and monitor charter schools.

"The legislature is moving the state in the wrong direction," said Greg Richmond, President and CEO of the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA). "As states across the country, from Massachusetts to Iowa to California, are strengthening their charter school laws, New York is about to make its law worse. Take away SUNY or the Chancellor as authorizers and overnight New York goes from being a leader to being a laggard."

"Most states would consider themselves lucky to have either SUNY or the Chancellor's Office working on behalf of the interests of children," Richmond continued. "Both are among the nation's strongest authorizers,

committed to quality, a model for authorizers across the country and a tremendous asset to New York's education system."

Authorizers are entities charged by law to approve new schools; oversee ongoing performance; and evaluate the performance of public charter schools to make renewal decisions. These main tasks of an authorizer together provide a powerful tool for improving student outcomes.

Quality charter schools are not randomly distributed; they are the result of dedicated educators who start and run schools, as well as good laws, policies and practices. NACSA's experience has shown that a quality charter school is more likely to exist and succeed where it is backed by a quality authorizer. This makes authorizers a cornerstone of quality charter schools. The work of authorizing in general – creating new schools, allowing them to innovate, and holding them accountable – is considered some of the smartest school improvement work being done in the country.

ABOUT THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORIZERS: *NACSA is the trusted resource and innovative leader working with educators and public officials to increase the number of high-quality charter schools in cities and states across the nation. NACSA provides training, consulting, and policy guidance to authorizers and education leaders interested in increasing the number of high-quality schools and improving student outcomes. To learn more about NACSA, go to www.QualityCharters.org.*

###



Contact: David Hansen, (614)783-0309 cell
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: January 16, 2010

A Step Backward for New York Charter Schools

Without SUNY and Chancellor Authorizing Charter Schools, New York's Children Would Lose

As states across the nation take action to strengthen their charter schools laws, the New York legislature is at risk of taking a step backward if it eliminates the ability of the State University of New York and the New York City Chancellor to approve and monitor charter schools.

"The legislature is moving the state in the wrong direction," said Greg Richmond, President and CEO of the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA). "As states across the country, from Massachusetts to Iowa to California, are strengthening their charter school laws, New York is about to make its law worse. Take away SUNY or the Chancellor as authorizers and overnight New York goes from being a leader to being a laggard."

"Most states would consider themselves lucky to have either SUNY or the Chancellor's Office working on behalf of the interests of children," Richmond continued. "Both are among the nation's strongest authorizers, committed to quality, a model for authorizers across the country and a tremendous asset to New York's education system."

Authorizers are entities charged by law to approve new schools; oversee ongoing performance; and evaluate the performance of public charter schools to make renewal decisions. These main tasks of an authorizer together provide a powerful tool for improving student outcomes.

Quality charter schools are not randomly distributed; they are the result of dedicated educators who start and run schools, as well as good laws, policies and practices. NACSA's experience has shown that a quality charter school is more likely to exist and succeed where it is backed by a quality authorizer. This makes authorizers a cornerstone of quality charter schools. The work of authorizing in general – creating new schools, allowing them to innovate, and holding them accountable – is considered some of the smartest school improvement work being done in the country.

ABOUT THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORIZERS: NACSA is the trusted resource and innovative leader working with educators and public officials to increase the number of high-quality charter schools in cities and states across the nation. NACSA provides training, consulting, and policy guidance to authorizers and education leaders interested in increasing the number of high-quality schools and improving student outcomes. To learn more about NACSA, go to www.QualityCharters.org.

###

From: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Saturday, January 16, 2010 4:19 PM
To: Merriman
Cc: friedman Dennis Walcott
Subject: Re: can we get Reverend Bernard to

For monday? Not going to be easy. Dennis, can u call him?

From: James Merriman
To: Klein Joel I.
Cc: Stefan Friedman
Sent: Sat Jan 16 16:17:20 2010
Subject: can we get Reverend Bernard to
write an op ed . We will of course assist with mechanics if you make the connection

From: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Saturday, January 16, 2010 4:53 PM
To: merriman
Subject: Fw: Charter bill update

----- Original Message -----

From: Nelson Smith
To: Klein Joel I.
Cc: Duffy Mary Jane
Sent: Sat Jan 16 16:45:53 2010
Subject: Fw: Charter bill update

Joel: see below for Brooks' point-by-point on the Assembly bill and RTTT; it could do serious damage. I've also forwarded the bill and notes to Arne's key staff. Let us know if there's anything else we can do (the analysis may be useful for press and we're happy to shape it up if so...) Best..

Nelson

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Device

-----Original Message-----

From: Brooks Garber
Sent: Saturday, January 16, 2010 3:24 PM
To: 'Chartock, Jonas'
Subject: RE: Charter bill update

In terms of lifting the cap, the application is clear. To receive the most points under the cap section, a state must have a cap that AT LEAST enables more than 10% of a states public schools to be charters. So, going to 454 (or 10% of schools in state would This is clear in the application package's note to reviewers, specifically:

High” points are earned if the State either has no cap on the number of charter schools, or it has a “high” cap (defined as a cap such that, if it were filled, ≥10% of the total schools in the State would be charter schools); and the State does not have restrictions, such as those referenced in the “note to reviewers” below, that would be considered even mildly inhibiting.

The additional criteria the above paragraph is referencing refers to types of caps on schools, so any attempt to restrict certain types of charters would count against the application, same with any attempts to cap schools based upon district expenditures, etc.... So, the amendments on pg. 4 starting at line 22 where by different procedures are in place for conversions vs. startups would count against the state application because they are applying different restrictions to certain types of charters vs. another. Pg. 6 line 5-6, the restriction on private school conversions also will hurt you (might be a place to go on the offensive here).

Pg. 3, line 11, new J-1. This new facilities clause would directly contradict with R2T application requirements around charters and facilities, specifically F(2)(iv): (iv)

The State provides charter schools with funding for facilities (for leasing facilities, purchasing facilities, or making tenant improvements), assistance with facilities acquisition, access to public facilities, the ability to share in bonds and mill levies, or other supports; and the extent to which the State does not impose any facility-related requirements on charter schools that are stricter than those applied to traditional public schools; and

Pg. 10, line 23 (c), this new requirement would not only be burdensome, but clearly a facility related requirement not placed on traditional public schools, see evidence point above. Again, this would hurt the application.

Pg. 11, line 21, the language around new schools being capped vs. conversions not falling under your cap will also hurt the application because again the state is treating different types of charters with different rules.

Pg. 12, line 5-6, the addition of a competitive bidding process for (I think school district authorizers) might be a reference to this guidance in the R2T application, BUT does not earn any points for applications, nor make sense here in the charter process:

XV. CONTRACTING FOR SERVICES

Generally, all procurement transactions by State or local educational agencies made with Race to the Top grant funds must be conducted in a manner providing full and open competition, consistent with the standards in Section 80.36 of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR). This section requires that grantees use their own procurement procedures (which reflect State and local laws and regulations) to select contractors, provided that those procedures meet certain standards described in EDGAR.

Because grantees must use appropriate procurement procedures to select contractors, applicants should not include information in their grant applications about specific contractors that may be used to provide services or goods for the proposed project if a grant is awarded.

Basically, states cant right into their R2T application TFA etc... unless their own procurement policies allows them, but this isn't a point thing at all, just the feds saying you have to comply with state procurement policies not override them with your money via this grant.

Additionally, the entire new language section around the competitive bidding process seems to be contrary to the first R2T criteria around charter points:

The State has a charter school law that does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high-performing charter schools (as defined in this notice) in the State, measured (as set forth in Appendix B) by the percentage of total schools in the State that are allowed to be charter schools or otherwise restrict student enrollment in charter schools.

I would argue, that by conducting this competitive bidding process you are EFFECTIVELY inhibiting charter growth. That word there, which is used in the application can give some leverage. I am guessing they are arguing this new process will make the state compliant with the R2T's focus on authorizers having:

The State has laws, statutes, regulations, or guidelines regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools

But, I would argue they have still failed to meet the goal here, which is to guide the authorization process and establish certain principles, not establish more bureaucracy to govern the process by creating a competitive bidding process. The evidentiary requests for this criteria F(2)(ii) still require standardization, and this hasn't done that. The application is asking for:

Evidence for (F)(2)(ii):

- A description of the State's approach to charter school accountability and authorization, and a description of the State's applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.
- For each of the last five years:
 - o The number of charter school applications made in the State.
 - o The number of charter school applications approved.
 - o The number of charter school applications denied and reasons for the denials (academic, financial, low enrollment, other).
 - o The number of charter schools closed (including charter schools that were not reauthorized to operate).

I guess they will say the Regents will through the competitive bidding process establish the criteria to be used by all authorizers, but still this wont help you by Jan 19th. Yes, they may be able to argue they will make these policies in place by the time the grant is awarded, but they I would argue you are likely going to be effectively inhibiting high quality charter growth given the regents have been a less than stellar authorizer, so you have just codified the practices of the least successful authorizer in NY. So, you have "met" one R2T criteria in exchange for voiding another.

Some of the language in the competitive bidding section, specifically pg. 14 line 18 through pg. 15 line 11, are all things the feds are looking for in R2T, and might be good to agree with the state on in some form or fashion. Additionally, some of the language appears to have been pulled from various federal laws (like the language around overcoming start ups an establishing a financially successful schools, that is from the CSP's dissemination program to document successful schools - that was smart whoever did that).

Pg. 19, lines 1 - 19, the dealing with charters being treated as non public schools for purposes of facilities, directly is in violation of the R2T criteria asking about charter facility access and the state placing different types of restrictions on charters than it does other public schools for the purposes of facilities. Same with every time, even though this is an existing law, to deal with documenting support upon attempted co-locaitons. Traditional public schools don't (to my knowledge) have these same requirements, therefore

the charter law would not be compliant with the R2T criteria and you are creating new requirements that will cost you points.

Pg. 20, lines 5 - 10, I don't know those NY citations, but if you tell me what they are or check them, we can figure out if they would hinder the R2T application.

Pg. 28, lines 10-13, this new language again is clearly going to get at the push to standardize information collection on charter closures, etc..., this is good might be good to have stuff like this you can point to in support of. Regulations will need to be administered so the paperwork can be standardized, thus some common classifications around charter closures will need to be developed.

Pg. 29, the new language around EMOs and turnaround is interesting. They aren't calling these schools charters, but if you could make a case they are or some if they are charters and I am missing it.

So, I haven't really read back through these comments. Read them and call me on my cell if you want to talk, I hope they make sense and are helpful, I wanted to get them to you asap knowing folks are meeting now.

BG

R. Brooks Garber
Federal Policy Director
National Alliance for Public Charter Schools
(202) 521-2822 (w)

brooks@publiccharters.org
<http://www.publiccharters.org>

-----Original Message-----
From: Chartock, Jonas [mailto:Jonas.Chartock@suny.edu]
Sent: Saturday, January 16, 2010 1:59 PM
To: Brooks Garber
Subject: FW: Charter bill update

See attached Assembly version and email thread below.

Charter Schools

State looks at doubling cap on charter schools New York Times
<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/16/education/16race.html>
<<https://wwwmail.suny.edu/exchweb/bin/redirect.asp?URL=http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/16/education/16race.html>>

Governor, Leaders Agree to Resolve Charter Schools Dispute Over the Weekend WXXI
<http://www.publicbroadcasting.net/wxxi/news.newsmain/article/0/0/1600220/WXXI.Local.Stories/Governor..Leaders.Agree.to.Resolve.Charter.Schools.Dispute.Over.the.Weekend>
<<https://wwwmail.suny.edu/exchweb/bin/redirect.asp?URL=http://www.publicbroadcasting.net/wxxi/news.newsmain/article/0/0/1600220/WXXI.Local.Stories/Governor..Leaders.Agree.to.Resolve.Charter.Schools.Dispute.Over.the.Weekend>>

Talks test charter school deadline

Times Union

<http://www.timesunion.com/AspStories/story.asp?storyID=889621&category=STATE>

TATE

<<https://wwwmail.suny.edu/exchweb/bin/redirect.asp?URL=http://www.timesunion.com/AspStories/story.asp?storyID=889621%26category=STATE>>

Paterson, lawmakers agree to more charters Associated Press

<http://www.timesunion.com/AspStories/story.asp?storyID=889429>

<<https://wwwmail.suny.edu/exchweb/bin/redirect.asp?URL=http://www.timesunion.com/AspStories/story.asp?storyID=889429>>

State leaders attempt to pound out application for \$700 million education grant Gannett News

<http://www.pressconnects.com/article/20100115/NEWS01/1150375/1112/State-leaders-attempt-to-pound-out-application-for--700-million-education-grant>

<<https://wwwmail.suny.edu/exchweb/bin/redirect.asp?URL=http://www.pressconnects.com/article/20100115/NEWS01/1150375/1112/State-leaders-attempt-to-pound-out-application-for--700-million-education-grant>>

Gov & Shel at war

New York Post

http://www.nypost.com/p/news/local/gov_shel_at_war_wNa3TbBMIPk8qcuIG8eLN

<https://wwwmail.suny.edu/exchweb/bin/redirect.asp?URL=http://www.nypost.com/p/news/local/gov_shel_at_war_wNa3TbBMIPk8qcuIG8eLN>

SUNY Trustees postpone vote on New Covenant Charter School's future Times Union

<http://www.timesunion.com/AspStories/story.asp?storyID=889408>

<<https://wwwmail.suny.edu/exchweb/bin/redirect.asp?URL=http://www.timesunion.com/AspStories/story.asp?storyID=889408>>

Fate of New Covenant Charter School undecided WRGB <http://www.cbs6albany.com/news/new-1270253-fate-albany.html>

<<https://wwwmail.suny.edu/exchweb/bin/redirect.asp?URL=http://www.cbs6albany.com/news/new-1270253-fate-albany.html>>

New Covenant decision pushed back

FOX

<http://www.fox23news.com/news/local/story/New-Covenant-Decision-Pushed-Back/au0HQFaAX0-H-SKkfs4dmA.csp>

<<https://wwwmail.suny.edu/exchweb/bin/redirect.asp?URL=http://www.fox23news.com/news/local/story/New-Covenant-Decision-Pushed-Back/au0HQFaAX0-H-SKkfs4dmA.csp>>

Jonas S. Chartock

Executive Director

SUNY Charter Schools Institute

41 State Street, Suite 700

Albany, New York 12207

Phone: (518) 433-8277

Fax: (518) 427-6510

<http://www.newyorkcharters.org>

----- Original Message -----

From: Klein Joel I.
To: Best Michael (Legal Services);
Lasher Micah; Duffy Michael; White John
Sent: Sat Jan 16 12:04:26 2010
Subject: Re: Fw:

----- Original Message -----

From: Best Michael (Legal Services)
To: Klein Joel I.; Lasher Micah; Duffy Michael;
White John
Sent: Sat Jan 16 11:57:16 2010
Subject: RE: Fw:

-----Original Message-----

From: lasher
Sent: Sat 1/16/2010 11:31 AM
To: Klein Joel I.; Lasher Micah; Duffy Michael; Best Michael (Legal Services); White John
Subject: Re: Fw:

Sent via BlackBerry by AT&T

-----Original Message-----

From: "Klein Joel I." <JKlein@schools.nyc.gov>
Date: Sat, 16 Jan 2010 11:33:03
To: Lasher Micah<MLasher@schools.nyc.gov>; Duffy
Michael<MDuffy12@schools.nyc.gov>; Best Michael (Legal Services)<MBest@schools.nyc.gov>;
White John<JWhite8@schools.nyc.gov>
Subject: Re: Fw:

----- Original Message -----

From: Lasher Micah
To: ; Klein Joel I.; Duffy Michael; Best Michael
(Legal Services); White John

Sent: Sat Jan 16 11:28:14 2010
Subject: Re: Fw:

Micah Lasher
Executive Director of External Affairs
New York City Department of Education
(212) 374-4946 (o)
(917) 604-7406 (m)
mlasher@schools.nyc.gov

----- Original Message -----

From: Lasher Micah
To: lasher Klein Joel I.; Duffy Michael; Best Michael
(Legal Services); White John
Sent: Sat Jan 16 11:25:17 2010
Subject: Fw: Fw:

Micah Lasher
Executive Director of External Affairs
New York City Department of Education
(212) 374-4946 (o)
(917) 604-7406 (m)
mlasher@schools.nyc.gov

----- Original Message -----

From: James Merriman
To: Lasher Micah; Michael Regnier ; Steve Williams
(SWilliams1@cityhall.nyc.gov) <SWilliams1@cityhall.nyc.gov>; Kevin P. Quinn, Esq.

Sent: Sat Jan 16 11:21:39 2010
Subject: FW: Fw:

From: Duffy Palmer <Duffy.Palmer@chamber.state.ny.us>
Date: Sat, 16 Jan 2010 10:52:12 -0500
To: 'marrone'
Subject:

DUFFY PALMER

Deputy Secretary for Education
Executive Chamber #236
NYS Capitol
Albany, New York 12224
518.408.2833

From: James Merriman
Sent: Saturday, January 16, 2010 4:17 PM
To: Klein Joel I.
Cc: Stefan Friedman
Subject: can we get Reverend Bernard to

write an op ed . We will of course assist with mechanics if you make the connection

From: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Saturday, January 16, 2010 10:01 PM
To: 'merriman'
Subject: Rally

How many parents can we get tues morn midtown to protest -- we've been too silent.

From: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2010 8:43 AM
To: Merriman
Subject: Re: Rally

Where is certificate of occupancy issue?

----- Original Message -----

From: James Merriman <JMerriman@nyccharterschools.org>
To: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Sun Jan 17 07:25:52 2010
Subject: RE: Rally

I didn't answer you last night because I was thinking about it. My strong view is (1) we can't pull something that would make a difference to member over a holiday weekend--such a rally would have to be vast and (2) things are just too fast moving. I'll send an update shortly but you likely have heard that senate now says it has a uni bill with assembly that raises cap by 200, includes suny (but I don't think includes you) with 65 of those charters and (i think) has all those charters going out according to an rfp. Don't know if suny override is still there. This is still a disaster and we will be pouring all energy into seeing that they don't have 32 votes and that they know they don't--as well as shoring up Governor which if done will further ensure they don't have 32 votes and they know it.

From: Klein Joel I. [JKlein@schools.nyc.gov]
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2010 5:38 AM
To: James Merriman
Subject: Rally

Is it worth trying to do something Monday or Tuesday with charter parents? Can we pull something sizable off?

From: James Merriman [
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2010 8:43 AM
To: Klein Joel I.
Subject: FW: Race to the Top Bill

From: James Merriman
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2010 8:36 AM
To: Vince Marrone; 'Bill Phillips'; 'Peter Murphy'; 'Ken Peterson'; 'Joe Williams'; 'Williams, Steve'; Michael Regnier
Subject: RE: Race to the Top Bill

ok, from quick read: bill is precisely the same except that in the RFP process:

suny and board of regents jointly develop the RFP process
suny gets an override for 65 charters but no more than 50% of charters in a given year can be suny overrides
RFP criteria look the same including the geographic restriction language
I haven't figured out whether suny and board of ed stay alive for monitoring and renewal purposes and will look at that.

Shared space issue remains--rfp requires that parents approve of shared space sitings
comptroller remains (we can actual give this up becuase it is uncon)
SED facility review (with waiver) remains

From: James Merriman
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2010 8:20 AM
To: Bill Phillips; Vince Marrone; Peter Murphy; Ken Peterson; Joe Williams; Williams, Steve; Michael Regnier
Subject: RE: Race to the Top Bill

two pager on RFP attached. Not sure if it is aligned to new bill.

-----Original Message-----

From: Katherine Grainger
Date: Sun, 17 Jan 2010 00:33:41
To: Katherine Grainger
Subject: Race to the Top Bill

As Shelly indicated in her earlier email, the Senate and Assembly have introduced Senate bill S.6468/A.9558. The bill language is attached. We will be conferencing the bill Tuesday morning at 8:30 am. Please do not hesitate to call with any questions.

Thank you,
Katherine

Katherine A. Grainger, Esq.
Deputy Director, Majority Counsel & Program
New York State Senate
mobile: 518-817-0962
office: 212-298-5561 (New York)
518-455-2660 (Albany)
email:

----- End of Forwarded Message

From: James Merriman
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2010 9:03 AM
To: Klein Joel I.; Lasher Micah;
Cc: Dennis Walcott
Subject: Re: AR Bernard

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

----- Original Message -----

From: Klein Joel I. <JKlein@schools.nyc.gov>
To: James Merriman; Lasher Micah <MLasher@schools.nyc.gov>
Cc: Dennis Walcott <dwalcott@cityhall.nyc.gov>
Sent: Sun Jan 17 09:01:38 2010
Subject: Fw: AR Bernard

Has anyone connected with AR?

From: Walcott, Dennis
To: Lasher Micah
Cc: Klein Joel I.; Walker, Dawn
Sent: Sat Jan 16 22:08:19 2010
Subject: Fw: AR Bernard

I have not heard back whether they connected? Can you double check status. Since Rev Bernard starts early tomorrow and his entire focus will be Haiti, if they have not called him already, best bet is to email him. Let me know what is up. Thanks.

----- Original Message -----

From: Walcott, Dennis
To: Williams, Steve; Klein, Joel
Cc: Walker, Dawn
Sent: Sat Jan 16 19:38:31 2010
Subject: Re: AR Bernard

Just talked to him and he is interested. Have them call him at 516 241-8008. Including Dawn who attends his church and is in our press office. Rev Bernard's email is

----- Original Message -----

From: Williams, Steve
To: Walcott, Dennis
Sent: Sat Jan 16 19:08:20 2010
Subject: Re: AR Bernard

Working on op ed and need someone other than us or charter advocates to author.

Steve Willliams

Mayor's Office of State Legislative Affairs----- Sent from my BlackBerry
Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message -----

From: Walcott, Dennis

To: Williams, Steve

Sent: Sat Jan 16 18:58:22 2010

Subject: Re: AR Bernard

Who will be the point person?

----- Original Message -----

From: Williams, Steve

To: Walcott, Dennis

Sent: Sat Jan 16 18:41:19 2010

Subject: Fw: AR Bernard

Can you help us on this?

Steve Willliams

Mayor's Office of State Legislative Affairs----- Sent from my BlackBerry
Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message -----

From: Williams, Steve

To: 'MLasher@schools.nyc.gov' <MLasher@schools.nyc.gov>

Sent: Sat Jan 16 18:32:29 2010

Subject: AR Bernard

Charter school folks trying to reach him re: op ed author and to engage him. His church is in Sampson's district and he has a charter school. He is speaking at Caucus weekend on charter schools but they need to reach him tonight. Perhaps Joel has his number and email?

Steve Willliams

Mayor's Office of State Legislative Affairs----- Sent from my BlackBerry
Wireless Handheld

From: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2010 10:35 AM
To: Merriman
Subject: Re: Canada

Any stroke in Senate -- need to hold handful of Dems.

----- Original Message -----
From: James Merriman
To: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Sun Jan 17 10:33:13 2010
Subject: RE: Canada

haven't reached out. But can. Lob in a call to the governor I guess.

From: Klein Joel I. [JKlein@schools.nyc.gov]
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2010 10:27 AM
To: James Merriman
Subject: Canada

Is he helping us?

From: James Merriman
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2010 10:54 AM
To: Klein Joel I.
Subject: RE: in fight of our life

my guess is that he has made his bed with sampson but bill is checking in with him as well and will know in 45 minutes or so.

From: Klein Joel I. [JKlein@schools.nyc.gov]
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2010 10:51 AM
To: James Merriman
Subject: Re: in fight of our life

Johnson told me he is solid. Malcolm can't be gotten?

From: James Merriman
To: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Sun Jan 17 10:47:33 2010
Subject: RE: in fight of our life
bill and joe doing the morning round up of calls. best bets are:

Johnson
Squadron
Espada
Diaz Sr.
Aubertine
Foley

but none are certain. Bill/Joe lobbying in calls to gov and bill shoring up republicans. Major tactic remains to deny 32 votes.

From: Klein Joel I. [JKlein@schools.nyc.gov]
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2010 10:45 AM
To: James Merriman
Subject: Re: in fight of our life

Ok -- how many dem senators do you think we have?

From: James Merriman
To: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Sun Jan 17 10:42:51 2010
Subject: FW: in fight of our life
there we are; will still ask to call governor.

From: James Merriman

To:

Sent: Sun Jan 17 10:35:53 2010

Subject: in fight of our life

do you have any sway in the senate with dems?

From: James Merriman
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2010 10:55 AM
To: Klein Joel I.
Subject: RE: in fight of our life

joe has been working and continues to work b staples. Richard stopol of course has Arthur on his board
-- I had asked him to talk to arthur three weeks ago--not sure if he did.

From: Klein Joel I. [JKlein@schools.nyc.gov]
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2010 10:54 AM
To: James Merriman
Subject: Re: in fight of our life

Can we get nyt to write edit?

From: James Merriman
To: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Sun Jan 17 10:47:33 2010
Subject: RE: in fight of our life
bill and joe doing the morning round up of calls. best bets are:

Johnson
Squadron
Espada
Diaz Sr.
Aubertine
Foley

but none are certain. Bill/Joe lobbying in calls to gov and bill shoring up republicans. Major tactic reminas to deny 32 votes.

From: Klein Joel I. [JKlein@schools.nyc.gov]
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2010 10:45 AM
To: James Merriman
Subject: Re: in fight of our life

Ok -- how many dem senators do you think we have?

From: James Merriman
To: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Sun Jan 17 10:42:51 2010
Subject: FW: in fight of our life
there we are; will still ask to call governor.

From: James Merriman

To: [REDACTED]

Sent: Sun Jan 17 10:35:53 2010

Subject: in fight of our life

do you have any sway in the senate with dems?

From: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2010 11:46 AM
To: Merriman
Subject: Re: in fight of our life

We're working on Squadron and Klein. Still fluid.

----- Original Message -----

From: James Merriman
To: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Sun Jan 17 11:43:39 2010
Subject: Fw: in fight of our life

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

----- Original Message -----

From: Bill Phillips
To: James Merriman; joewilliams@dfer.org <joewilliams@dfer.org>
Sent: Sun Jan 17 11:42:46 2010
Subject: Re: in fight of our life

James,

Relay to Joel in this order:

Diaz Sr and Johnson remain locked down. We've seen no negative (as in folding) behavior with Senate R's.

Espada says he's against bill but we view him as less reliable Will know more about Malcolm within the hour.

Joe and I are working with Johnson to lock Aubertine. That's winnable. Foley is a longer shot. Joel could help us with Squadron, and Mayor can help with Klein.

Bill

On 1/17/10 11:33 AM, "James Merriman" <

fyi.

From: Klein Joel I. [JKlein@schools.nyc.gov]
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2010 10:51 AM

To: James Merriman
Subject: Re: in fight of our life

Johnson told me he is solid. Malcolm can't be gotten?

From: James Merriman
To: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Sun Jan 17 10:47:33 2010
Subject: RE: in fight of our life

bill and joe doing the morning round up of calls. best bets are:

Johnson
Squadron
Espada
Diaz Sr.
Aubertine
Foley

but none are certain. Bill/Joe lobbying in calls to gov and bill shoring up republicans. Major tactic remains to deny 32 votes.

From: Klein Joel I. [JKlein@schools.nyc.gov]
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2010 10:45 AM
To: James Merriman
Subject: Re: in fight of our life

Ok -- how many dem senators do you think we have?

From: James Merriman
To: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Sun Jan 17 10:42:51 2010
Subject: FW: in fight of our life

there we are; will still ask to call governor.

From: James Merriman
To:
Sent: Sun Jan 17 10:35:53 2010
Subject: in fight of our life

do you have any sway in the senate with dems?

From: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2010 11:49 AM
To: Merriman
Cc: Lasher Micah
Subject: Re: in fight of our life

Looping Micah in. Mayor will be calling all Dems in play tomorrow.

----- Original Message -----
From: James Merriman
To: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Sun Jan 17 11:43:39 2010
Subject: Fw: in fight of our life

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

----- Original Message -----
From: Bill Phillips
To: James Merriman; joewilliams@dfcr.org <joewilliams@dfcr.org>
Sent: Sun Jan 17 11:42:46 2010
Subject: Re: in fight of our life

James,

Relay to Joel in this order:

Diaz Sr and Johnson remain locked down. We've seen no negative (as in folding) behavior with Senate R's.

Espada says he's against bill but we view him as less reliable Will know more about Malcolm within the hour.

Joe and I are working with Johnson to lock Aubertine. That's winnable. Foley is a longer shot. Joel could help us with Squadron, and Mayor can help with Klein.

Bill

On 1/17/10 11:33 AM, "James Merriman" <JMerriman@nyccharterschools.org> wrote:

fyi.

From: Klein Joel I. [JKlein@schools.nyc.gov]

Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2010 10:51 AM
To: James Merriman
Subject: Re: in fight of our life

Johnson told me he is solid. Malcolm can't be gotten?

From: James Merriman
To: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Sun Jan 17 10:47:33 2010
Subject: RE: in fight of our life

bill and joe doing the morning round up of calls. best bets are:

Johnson
Squadron
Espada
Diaz Sr.
Aubertine
Foley

but none are certain. Bill/Joe lobbying in calls to gov and bill shoring up republicans. Major tactic remains to deny 32 votes.

From: Klein Joel I. [JKlein@schools.nyc.gov]
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2010 10:45 AM
To: James Merriman
Subject: Re: in fight of our life

Ok -- how many dem senators do you think we have?

From: James Merriman
To: Klein Joel I.
Sent: Sun Jan 17 10:42:51 2010
Subject: FW: in fight of our life

there we are; will still ask to call governor.

From: James Merriman
To:
Sent: Sun Jan 17 10:35:53 2010
Subject: in fight of our life

do you have any sway in the senate with dems?

From: James Merriman
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2010 12:53 PM
To: Klein Joel I.
Subject: RE: RFP
Attachments: Race_to_the_Top[1].pdf

go to section 18 of the bill which is at line 30 or so on page 7--it lays out all the ugliness. but quick overview is:

rfp should be designed to get schools where there are no opportunities (and therefore by definition not put schools where there are existing charters)

schools favored if district says yes and disfavored if district says no.

suny trustees part of rfp creation process and can recommend 65 of the 200 that regents must accept but only 50% of charters authorized in a year can be the suny charter allotment.

All schools basically should be designed to serve special populations or at least have equivalent #s of every subgroup.

etc/

From: Klein Joel I. [JKlein@schools.nyc.gov]
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2010 12:42 PM
To: James Merriman
Subject: RFP

How does it work? What findings, process etc?