



ED, CharterRegs

From: Meagan Donnelly <donnelyi170p@pavcs.us>
Sent: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 12:37 PM
To: ED, CharterRegs
Subject: [External] Opposition to Regulation #6-349

ATTENTION: This email message is from an external sender. Do not open links or attachments from unknown sources. To report suspicious email, forward the message as an attachment to CWOPA_SPAM@pa.gov.

October 6, 2021

To: The Pennsylvania Independent Regulatory Review Commission
333 Market St, 14th Floor Harrisburg, PA 17101
RA-EDCharterRegs@pa.gov

RE: Regulation #6-349: Charter Schools and Cyber Charter Schools

I am writing to express my opposition to Regulation #6-349: Charter Schools and Cyber Charter Schools. In regards to this regulation, there are two specific areas of contention that need to be addressed.

First, this regulation does not create a fair playing field between authorizers and charter school operators trying to give parents another choice in K-12 education. As it is written, the regulation creates a minimum standard that all authorizers must meet, but it does not restrict the ability of the authorizing party to create “over the top” and burdensome requirements during the application process. Authorizers can drown charter school administrators in red tape whenever they try to keep their schools open with a renewed charter or attempt to expand their schools due to growth. With such open-ended restrictions, the regulation leaves too much opportunity for school districts to mandate requirements which inevitably end up being anti-charter, leading to charter denials for renewals, expansions, and new charter proposals. How is this helping Pennsylvania families that must look for alternative educational model options as public school districts lose enrollment? How is this fair representation of taxpayer families who still pay increasing taxes for school districts where their children don't attend? These regulations are unbalanced and are not offered to help Pennsylvania parents but seem to only help the authorizing school districts.

My second area of contention stems from the redirection of this issue by Governor Wolf from the General Assembly. Circumventing democratic processes to create self-serving laws through unelected bureaucracy is not what American democracy is all about. If such a law were to be made, it should be made fairly and through the due process expected of all other relevant laws and decisions. This issue not only affects school choice, but the foundation of American lawmaking. What other laws could be established or proposed without the standard democratic procedure? This is a troubling precedent to set and could ignite a chain reaction of other personal agendas being satisfied through the manipulation of established law making principles. If laws are hard to make now, imagine what they could be like without regulation and if they could be imposed at the whim of the individuals they would benefit.

Our family is diverse in its educational background with experience in private, brick and mortar, homeschool, and cyber charter school models. The cyber charter school model works best for our children and meets their individual educational needs while ensuring a safe, dynamic, learning environment unlike the experiences they held at the local brick and mortar school. Despite our sole educational engagement with our cyber school, we pay thousands of dollars to our local school district every year and maintain a pleasant, communicative relationship with school district leaders. We are not anti-brick and mortar education, we are pro-school choice

and believe each family deserves the right to make the decisions that are best for their children and that the government is put into power to protect its constituents and their law-protected liberties.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Meagan and Patrick Donnelly
donnellyi170p@pavcs.us