

RÉSUMÉ DIGEST

SB 145

2022 Regular Session

Talbot

Present law authorizes the establishment of charter schools, provides for different types of charter schools, and provides for the chartering process, including delineating which types of charter proposals are submitted to the local school board and which are submitted to the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE).

Present law authorizes charter schools to have corporate partners.

Present law provides that a corporate partner is any legal entity registered with the secretary of state, except those holding gaming licenses, that has donated specified facilities or improvements to the charter school.

Proposed law would have added the following as authorized corporate partners: a regional airport, or any federal or state entity or agency, including a public postsecondary education institution.

Proposed law would have provided that a proposal for a charter school with a corporate partner may be made first to BESE as a Type 2 charter school.

Proposed law would have otherwise retained present law.

Would have become effective upon signature of the governor or lapse of time for gubernatorial action.

(Proposed to amend R.S. 17:3983(A)(2)(a)(i) and 3991.1(C)(intro para) and enact R.S. 17:3983(A)(2)(a)(iv) and 3991.1(A)(5))

VETO MESSAGE:

"Please be advised that I have vetoed Senate Bill 145 of the 2022 Regular Session.

This bill would allow any charter school group with a corporate partner to submit a proposal directly to BESE for approval, bypassing the authority of the local school board for the jurisdiction in which the charter school intends to locate. When the legislature first enacted the Charter School Demonstration Programs Law, its stated intent was to authorize city and parish school boards to experiment with the creation of innovative kinds of independent public schools for students. Currently, a local school board has the autonomy to determine whether a charter school proposal is in the best interests of its community, considering among other things constituent input from the public hearing on the proposal, the impact of the loss of MFP dollars that would be diverted to the charter school, how local education dollars are spent, and whether the proposal is educationally sound and financially well-structured. Furthermore, if a local school board does not approve a proposal, the chartering group then has the opportunity to submit a charter proposal to BESE.

Although this bill was couched as necessary to cut through the red tape a charter school has to go through for approval, the consequences of eliminating local approval of charter schools and diverting MFP dollars far outweighs any administrative benefit that may be received. For these reasons, I have vetoed the bill."