Charter Schools Report

2020-2021

Prepared by:
the Washington State Board of Education

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Washington State Board of Education (SBE) staff would like to acknowledge the support provided by the Washington State Charter School Commission (CSC) and Spokane Public Schools which worked collaboratively to ensure accurate student performance data and identify suggested amendments to statute to strengthen the state's charter schools.

The SBE staff wishes to thank the Washington State Charter School Commission, Spokane Public School's charter school staff, and the Washington Charter School Association for reviewing and editing this report. Their collective efforts improved the report and included some insights and ideas as to improving future reports.

The SBE also wishes to thank the Student Information Office staff at the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) for providing certain data to the Board about the Washington charter schools.

Please direct questions regarding this report to the following SBE staff:

Dr. Andrew Parr, Research Director
Washington State Board of Education
Andrew.Parr@K12.wa.us

Contents

Executive Summary

The Washington State's Charter School Act (RCW 28A.710) was enacted on April 3, 2016 for the primary purpose of allowing flexibility to innovate in areas such as scheduling, personnel, funding, and educational programs to improve student outcomes and academic achievement of "at-risk" student populations[1]. A Washington charter school is a public school that is not a common school: a public alternative to traditional common schools. The first public charter schools began operating in Washington in 2014 and then again under the Charter School Act in the fall 2016. The State Board of Education (SBE) issues an annual report to the Governor, the Legislature, and the public, in accordance with RCW 28A.710.250.

> **This is the fifth annual report on the performance of the charter schools. RCW 28A.710.250 requires that the SBE, in collaboration with the CSC, include a recommendation regarding whether or not the legislature should authorize the establishment of additional charter public schools.**

In addition to the reporting requirement immediately above, the information required to be included in the annual charter school report is as follows:

- The performance of the state's charter schools during the preceding school year, including a comparison of the performance of charter school students with the performance of academically, ethnically, and economically comparable groups of students in traditional public schools[2] (TPS),
- The State Board of Education's assessment of the successes, challenges, and areas for improvement in meeting the purposes of the Washington Charter Public Schools Act (RCW 28A.710), including the Board's assessment of the sufficiency of funding for charter schools, the efficacy of the formula for authorizer funding, and
- Any suggested changes in state law or policy necessary to strengthen the state's charter schools.

---

[1] RCW 28A.710.010 defines an "at-risk student" as one who has an academic or economic disadvantage that requires assistance or special services to succeed in educational programs. The term includes, but is not limited to, students who do not meet minimum standards of academic proficiency, students who are at risk of dropping out of high school, students in chronically low-performing schools, students with higher than average disciplinary sanctions, students with lower participation rates in advanced or gifted programs, students who are limited in English proficiency, students who are members of economically disadvantaged families, and students who are identified as having special educational needs.

[2] Traditional public school (TPS) students are those students whose primary school assignment is a public common school and who were not enrolled in a charter public school at any time during the year. The TPS abbreviation is that which is most commonly used in educational research differentiating between charter schools and non-charter schools.

Key Findings on the Academic Performance of Charter Schools

The academic performance of charter school students in comparison to TPS students has been a great interest to academicians, educators, policymakers, and the public for more than 30 years. Like traditional public school students, the academic achievement of charter school students varies considerably across the nation, from state to state, by school level, by presence and nature of a management organization, and results differ for specific student groups. On average, the evidence from a myriad of studies indicates no difference in achievement on tests between students who attend a charter school and those who attend a TPS (Appendix A).

The meaningfulness and availability of most educational outcome data and other performance measures is greatly diminished because of the COVID pandemic. Many of the traditional educational outcome measures we rely on simply do not exist. Most notably, the physical closure of school buildings and cancellation or postponement of statewide summative assessments have all but eliminated most performance measures, while rendering other measures non-comparable to previous years.

Overall, students attending Washington charter schools perform similar to or a little better than similar students attending traditional public schools. The key findings listed below are derived in total from the five years in which charter schools have been in operation in Washington and not just the most recent year.

- For the most part, charter schools continue to serve higher percentages of systemically marginalized students as compared to the home school districts.
- Charter schools employ educators who are more likely to be a person of color, more likely to be less experienced, and more likely to be teaching out of endorsement.
- On average, the charter schools' Washington School Improvement Framework (WSIF) score is similar to or a little higher than the average WSIF score for the state.
- Official graduation rates were reportable for three charter schools. The rates for two charter schools were similar to the state average and the rates for the other charter school were a little lower than the state average.
- On the fall 2021 statewide assessments, some charter schools performed a little better than or similar to the home school districts, depending on the content area assessed. In some cased the charter school performance was a little lower than the home school district.
- Based on the matched peers comparison using the 2019 statewide assessments, charter school students performed a little better than their TPS peer group on nearly all assessment and growth measures.
- Charter school students identifying as Hispanic or Latinx, students who are English learners, and students who qualify for the Free and Reduced Price Lunch program (FRL) consistently outperform their matched TPS peers.

- The percentage of charter school students regularly attending school is a little higher than the rate for the students in the home school districts.
- The percentage of first time, 9th grade, charter school students who earned credit for all courses attempted (9th Graders On-Track) is a little higher than the rate for the students in the home school districts.
- The percentage of students not experiencing an exclusionary discipline event for the charter school students is similar to the rate for TPS students.

Key Developments Charter Schools

The Washington State Charter School Commission (CSC) and Spokane Public Schools continue as the only charter school authorizers in the state. The two authorizers oversaw 12 charter public schools operating in Washington during the 2020-21 school year. Total charter public school enrollment increased to 3,712 K-12 students in the 2020-21 school year from approximately 3,165 students enrolled in public charter schools for the 2019-20 school year.

Spokane International Academy relocated to a site outside the boundaries of the Spokane Public Schools (Spokane PS), which necessitated a transfer of their charter contract from Spokane PS to the Charter School Commission. The Board approved that transfer in 2020 effective for the 2020-21 school year.

Since the Charter School Act was passed in 2016, 24 charter schools have been authorized for operations. Of those 22 opened and as of the 2021-22 school year, 16 are currently operating, Five charter schools were opened and subsequently closed, one school chose not to re-open as a charter school after being classified an alternative learning experience (ALE), and two schools have yet to open for operations.

In April 2021 the timeframe for approval of new public charter schools ended. During the 2021 legislative session, the SBE supported legislation (HB 1195) to extend the time in which to approve additional charter public schools. If HB 1195 had passed, the timeframe for establishing up to 40 total charter schools would have been extended by five years into spring 2026. A new bill to extend the timeframe was introduced by Representative Entenman during the 2022 legislative session, but died early in session without receiving a public hearing. Amendments to the budget bills currently being considered provide local effort assistance funding for charter schools.

Key Developments - Charter School Commission

In the summer after the 2020-21 school year, the Executive Director of the CSC departed the agency. The search for a new Executive Director is ongoing as the CSC and the candidate of choice could not come to agreement on the terms of employment in fall 2021. Ms. Krystal Starwich (CSC Deputy Director) served as interim Executive Director until February 2022 when Ms. Jessica de Barros assumed the role of interim Executive Director. Ms. de Barros is expected

to continue as interim Executive Director until a permanent Executive Director is selected. Other CSC developments include the following:

- Ten CSC authorized charter schools were in operation for the entire 2020-21 school year.
- In August 2020, the CSC received four applications to open new charter schools, but two applicants withdrew their applications. Then in December 2020, the CSC approved one new charter school application while denying the other application.
- In January 2021, the CSC renewed the charter contracts for another five years for Rainier Prep, Spokane International Academy, Summit Olympus, and Summit Sierra.
- The CSC approved Spokane International Academy to expand to grades 9-12 beginning in the 2021-22 school year for students who wanted to complete their academic career at Spokane International.
- In May 2021 the CSC was notified of the voluntary closure of the Innovation (Willow) Charter School in Walla Walla due to lower than expected enrollment.
- 14 charter schools are currently in operation for the 2021-22 school year through CSC authorization.

Key Developments - Spokane Public Schools

During the 2020-21 school year, Spokane Public Schools was the authorizer of two operating charter schools.

- Pride Prep continued to have challenges meeting financial performance indicators. Corrective action plans and increased monitoring continued throughout 2019-20. Pride Prep has taken specific steps toward addressing areas of concern and are currently working closely with the Spokane PS Authorizer to improve areas of academic and financial concern. The Pride Prep charter contract as renewed in July 2021 and remains in effect through June 2024.
- Lumen High School completed its first full year of operation serving grades 9-12 by providing high academic standards, a specialized early learning center, and wrap around supports to meet the layered needs of teen parents in Spokane County.

The Spokane charter school authorizer staff strengthened their understanding of quality charter authorizing by participating in professional development trainings, and by partnering with NACSA and the Washington Charter Schools Association (WA Charters) to create a collaborative spirit with charter operators. The authorizer invested in the Charter Tools monitoring system as a method for monitoring the progress of each of our charter schools.

Key Findings on the Analysis of Funding Efficacy

A cursory review of school and district revenues and expenditures might give the reader the impression that charter schools have substantially greater per student revenues, but this ignores

key differences in how the costs are accounted for. Charter schools often seek out and receive significant grants to support start-up expenses, typically available for only a few years at most. Operating costs for charter schools generally include expenses that would be part of the capital budget for a TPS. For example, grant funds are often used to acquire space, renovate buildings, and purchase required school furnishings, and these monies are included in per student revenues but probably should not be included. In addition, the charter schools are ineligible for local levy funding. **Overall and when one-time grant monies are removed from the analysis, charter schools generally receive lower revenues than the home school districts.**

- The average total salary for charter school instructional staff is substantially lower than the salary allocation from the state.
- The average total salary for charter school instructional staff is substantially lower than the average total salary paid by the home school district.
- The state apportionment is similar for the charter school LEAs and the home school districts, but one-half of the charter school LEAs receive a lower state apportionment than the home school district.
- The average support from the Local and Other revenue source is approximately $2,400 per student for the home school districts and is approximately $105 per student for the charter school LEAs.

Recommendations

In January 2021, the Board approved changes to Chapter 180-19 WAC to align rule to current policy or practice, correct references to law, improve readability of the rule, align rule to SBE's recommendations in the annual charter school report, and make other changes identified by staff in collaboration with authorizers. As adopted, the final rules streamline the application process for authorizers, transition to a performance based authorizer fee structure, and adjust reporting dates to align with recent legislation.

The National Alliance for Public Charter Schools ranks Washington's Charter School Act as the third strongest in the nation, but highlights two major weaknesses. First, the law includes a cap of 40 charter schools over the first five years after enactment of the Charter School Act. The window to authorize new charter schools closed in April 2021 and now, no new schools may be authorized without a change to the law. Second, the inequitable funding for students in public charter schools. These two weaknesses are central to the recommendations being made this year and in previous years.

Authorizing Additional Charter Schools

Since the enactment of the 2016 Charter School Act, new charter schools opened in each school year. This is evidence that parents and educators continue to seek out alternatives to traditional public schools for the purpose of finding the best educational fit for their children. The Charter School Act allowed for the authorization of up to 40 schools within the first five years of the Act.

After a handful of charter schools closed in the previous years, 17 charter schools are operating in the 2021-22 school year. The count of operating charter schools is well below the cap of 40 schools authorized in statute. In the five years after enactment of the Charter School Act, the number of operating charter schools steadily increased, but at a rate lower than anticipated by the legislature. Currently, no new charter schools are allowed to be approved or authorized.

During the 2022 legislative session, Representative Entenman introduced legislation (HB 1962) that would extend the timeframe for establishing up to 40 total charter schools by another five years. In addition, Representative Dolan introduced legislation (HB 1591) that would provide local effort assistance funding to charter schools. Both bills died early in session without receiving a public hearing. Amendments to the budget bills currently being considered provide local effort assistance funding for charter schools. No additional charter schools will be approved or authorized unless the Legislature and the Governor pass and approve legislation to do so.

RECOMMENDATION 1: The SBE and CSC recommend that the window for authorization be extended to allow additional charter schools, up to 40 total, to operate in Washington.

Funding of Charter Schools

The SBE finds that charter schools face unique challenges with regard to funding due to lack of access to public funding for capital and lower appropriation per student due to a lack of access to local funding. The CSC continues to advocate for more equitable student apportionment and access to public funding for capital expenditures to ensure the sustainability of charter schools over time.

The SBE supports equitable funding for all Washington students in public schools. When the school apportionment model fails to include locally sourced levy funding for charter schools, charter school funding differs from and is lower than the funding of traditional public schools.

RECOMMENDATION 2: The SBE recommends a close examination of the sufficiency of charter school funding and approaches used in other states in order to bring about equitable educational funding for all students.

Authorizer Oversight Fees and Usage

Another focus of recommendations over the last several years centers on the authorizer oversight fees. In January 2021 the SBE finalized rules authorizing the SBE to adjust the authorizer oversight fee rate in consultation with the charter school authorizers. After consulting with authorizers, the SBE set the authorizer oversight fee rate at three percent for the 2021-22 school year, a decrease from the rate of four percent used in the previous school year.

While consulting with charter school authorizers, three additional issues arose regarding the authorizer oversight fees. The legislature could consider taking action to address the three issues briefly described below.

- Issue 1: What changes would be necessary for authorizers to use the authorizer oversight fees for purposes other than those specified in statute, provided the other purposes directly benefit the charter schools under its authority?
- Issue 2: When a charter school contract is transferred from one authorizer to another, what changes would be necessary for the originating authorizer to transfer all or a portion of unused authorizer fees to the receiving authorizer?
- Issue 3: The oversight fee is an expenditure unique to the charter schools that is diverted from the state apportionment. It would be more equitable if the charter schools were to receive the full apportionment for its students and the authorizers receive their authorizer fees directly through a state funding stream.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Explore options to create more flexibility in the use of authorizer fees and/or direct appropriation to cover charter school oversight costs.

Other Recommendations

The SBE notes that the charter school rules and statutes should undergo a thorough review. Given that no new schools may currently be authorized, that review should prioritize oversight of and support for existing schools.

Introduction

Legislative Authority

RCW 28A.710.250 (1) directs the State Board of Education (SBE) to issue a report on the performance of the state's charter schools. RCW 28A.710.250(2) stipulates that the annual report must be based on the reports submitted by each authorizer as well as any additional relevant data compiled by the State Board of Education. Information from the authorizer reports is incorporated into this SBE annual report. The charter school authorizer annual reports are accessible on SBE's website. Legislation in 2020 (HB 2853) changed the reporting timeline such that the final report is now due on March 1 of each year for the report covering the prior school year.

The Charter School Commission and Spokane Public Schools submitted authorizer reports to the SBE in February 2022 in compliance with RCW 28A.710. As specified in the authorizing legislation, the SBE used the authorizer reports and additional relevant data compiled by the SBE to complete this fifth annual report of the performance of the charter schools.

In addition to this short introduction and appended materials, the SBE's fifth annual report is divided into three main sections and each section addresses one of the three requirements specified in statute.

I. The performance of the state's charter schools during the preceding school year, including a comparison of the performance of charter school students with the performance of academically, ethnically, and economically comparable groups of students in other public schools,
II. The State Board of Education's assessment of the successes, challenges, and areas for improvement in meeting the purposes of the Washington Charter Public Schools Act (RCW 28A.710), including the Board's assessment of the sufficiency of funding for charter schools, the efficacy of the formula for authorizer funding, and
III. Any suggested changes in state law or policy necessary to strengthen the state's charter schools.

On March 13, 2020, the Governor required the physical closure of all Washington school buildings in response to the COVID-19 public health emergency. Through a subsequent action on April 6, the Governor directed that both public and private school buildings remain physically closed through the regular 2019-20 school year.

On March 20, 2020, the OSPI cancelled the spring 2020 summative statewide assessment administration after the USED approved the OSPI waiver request on March 27. The cancelled administrations include the Smarter Balanced assessments (SBAs), alternate assessment for students with significant cognitive challenges (WA-AIM), and the English language proficiency assessment (ELPA21).

Most K-12 public schools remained physically closed for the fall 2020 start of school due to the COVID pandemic and remained closed well into the winter 2021. As vaccines became more

widely available and COVID transmission declined, schools slowly began to open their doors to students for in-person instruction, while continuing to offer online instruction for those not yet ready for face to face classroom instruction. On March 21, 2021, the OSPI submitted a proposal to the ED to, among other things, administer the spring 2021 statewide summative assessment to a representative sample of students to minimize the health risks to students. The OSPI plan did not meet the ambitious goal of ED to assess as many students as possible during the spring 2021 assessment cycle. The ED did not approve the OSPI sampling plan but authorized the OSPI to postpone the spring 2021 assessment administration to the fall 2021 and to administer shortened assessments. As a direct result of the cancellation of spring 2020 assessment administration and the delay in the spring 2021 administration, the required evaluation of the performance of the charter schools became much more complicated.

The SBE is directed in RCW 28A.710.250 to issue the annual report on the performance of the state's charter schools during the preceding year, meaning that this report is to elaborate on the academic performance of the charter schools operating during the 2020-21 school year. The 2020-21 statewide assessment was administered in the fall of 2021.

The physical closure of school buildings due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the subsequent cancellation of the spring 2020 statewide assessment administration, and the delay of the spring 2021 statewide assessment administration eliminated much of the educational data used for the required analysis. This report includes charter school performance on the recently released fall 2021 statewide assessment administration, the detailed analyses reported on last year, and other analyses not previously reported on.

Charter Schools in Washington

Charter School Act

Washington State's Charter School Act (RCW 28A.710) was enacted in 2013 and later updated in 2016. Charter schools are common schools that are part of the general and uniform system of public schools provided by the Legislature as required by Article IX, section 2 of the state Constitution. Charter schools must be approved by a charter school authorizer before commencing operation. The Washington State Charter School Commission (CSC) has the authority to authorize charter schools throughout the state. In addition, school districts may apply to the State Board of Education (SBE) to become a charter school authorizer for schools within their district. The Act provided for the establishment of up to 40 charter schools through April 2021.

During the 2021 legislative session, Representative Dolan sponsored legislation (HB 1195) extending the timeframe for establishing up to 40 total charter schools by another five years, but the bill died in committee. During the 2022 legislative session, Representative Entenman introduced legislation (HB 1962) that would extend the timeframe for establishing up to 40 total

charter schools by another five years. Also, Representative Dolan introduced legislation (HB 1591) that would provide local effort assistance funding to charter schools. Both bills died early in session without receiving a public hearing. Amendments to the budget bills currently provide local effort assistance funding for charter schools. No additional charter schools will be approved unless the Legislature and the Governor pass and approve legislation to do so.

The primary purpose of Washington's Charter School Act is to allow flexibility to innovate in areas such as scheduling, personnel, funding, and educational programs to improve student outcomes and academic achievement of systemically marginalized student populations. Washington charter public schools:

- Are public schools (but are not common schools) that are alternatives to traditional common schools,
- Are open to all children free of charge and by choice, with admission based only on age group, grade level, and school enrollment, and
- Must be nonsectarian and nonreligious.

In addition, Washington charter public schools:

- Must be a Washington nonprofit public benefit corporation with federal tax exempt status under section 501(c)(3) of the IRS code,
- Must be governed by a nonprofit board according to the terms of a renewable, five-year performance-based charter contract executed with an approved authorizer and approved by the SBE that contains at least the 32 elements required by RCW 28A.710.130,
- Are subject to the supervision of the OSPI and SBE, including accountability measures and the performance improvement goals adopted by SBE, to the same extent as other public schools, must provide a program of basic education, and participate in the statewide student assessment system,
- Employ educators meeting the same certification requirements as traditional public school teachers, including background checks, and
- Must comply with local, state, and federal health, safety, parents' rights, civil rights, Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and nondiscrimination laws applicable to school districts.

The National Alliance for Public Charter Schools (National Alliance) publishes an annual report ranking the strength of each state's charter school laws. The purpose of the analysis is to encourage state laws and regulations to require best practices and guarantee charter school rights and freedoms so that state charter school movements will benefit from a supportive legal and policy environment. The ranking is based on 21 components of the National Alliance model law. The strength of Washington's charter school laws were ranked third strongest in the country for 2021. Per the National Alliance, a "strong" charter school law is one which requires best practices and guarantees the rights and freedoms of charter schools so that state charter school movement will benefit from a supportive legal and policy environment. The report summarized the findings for Washington as follows:

> "Washington's law allows multiple authorizers through local school districts and a statewide authorizer, has strong quality control components, and gives operational autonomy to public charter schools. The two major weaknesses of the law include a cap of 40 charter schools during the initial five years that it is in effect and inequitable funding for public charter school students. Potential areas for improvement include lifting the state's cap [on the number of charter schools], ensuring equitable funding, and strengthening accountability for full-time virtual charter schools."

Charter Schools. Students, and Educators

The charter schools in operation change from year to year (Table 1). Some emerging charter schools annually add one or two grade levels each year to accommodate the grade promotion of continuing students, meaning that the grade levels served at each charter school may also change from year to year. Throughout the text, some school names are shortened to enhance readability and the appearance of charts and tables. For example, Rainier Valley Leadership Academy is referred to as Rainier Valley, Impact | Puget Sound Elementary is most often referred to as Impact Puget Sound, and these types of shortened names are used for many of the charter schools.

Together, the Washington Charter School Commission and Spokane Public Schools oversaw 12 charter public schools operating in Washington during the 2020-21 school year (Table 1). Per the Washington State Report Card, 3712 students attended one of the 12 Washington public charter schools on the official count day for the 2020-21 school year (Table 2).

From the time the Charter School Act was passed, the total charter school enrollment more than tripled (Table 3), as total enrollment increased from approximately 1200 in fall 2015 to approximately 3,700 in the fall 2020. The increased enrollment occurs at all grade levels but is greatest for the high school grades. The fall 2020 charter school enrollment represents 0.34 percent of Washington's total K-12 public school enrollment.

RCW 28A.710 directs the CSC to authorize high quality charter public schools throughout the state, especially schools that are designed to expand opportunities for systemically marginalized (at-risk) students. Washington statute defines an at-risk (systemically marginalized) student as a student who has an academic or economic disadvantage that requires assistance or special services to succeed in educational programs. The SBE and a number of other agencies no longer use the term "at-risk", as the term implies flaws in the student rather the educational system. The demographics of students enrolled in charter schools (Table 4) during the 2020-21 school year vary considerably from school to school. On a school by school basis, most of the charter schools serve higher percentages of students qualifying for the Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRL) program, higher percentages of students with disabilities, higher percentages of students of color, but lower percentages of English Learners than the state average or the home school districts.

Table 1: shows the charter public schools in operation over the most recent school years.

2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
			Ashé Preparatory Academy*	
Green Dot Destiny Middle School	Green Dot Destiny Middle School	Green Dot Destiny Middle School		
Green Dot Excel Middle School	Green Dot Excel Middle School	Green Dot Excel Middle School		
	Green Dot Rainier Valley Leadership Academy	Green Dot Rainier Valley Leadership Academy	Rainier Valley Leadership Academy	Rainier Valley Leadership Academy
		Impact | Puget Sound Elementary	Impact | Puget Sound Elementary	Impact | Puget Sound Elementary
PRIDE Prep School	PRIDE Prep School	PRIDE Prep School	PRIDE Prep School	PRIDE Prep School
Rainier Prep	Rainier Prep	Rainier Prep	Rainier Prep	Rainier Prep
SOAR Academy	SOAR Academy	SOAR Academy		
Spokane International Academy	Spokane International Academy	Spokane International Academy	Spokane International Academy	Spokane International Academy
	Summit Atlas	Summit Atlas	Summit Atlas	Summit Atlas
Summit Olympus	Summit Olympus	Summit Olympus	Summit Olympus	Summit Olympus
Summit Sierra	Summit Sierra	Summit Sierra	Summit Sierra	Summit Sierra
		Innovations (Willow) Charter School	Innovations (Willow) Charter School	Innovations (Willow) Charter School
				Impact | Salish Sea Elementary
				Catalyst Public School
				Lumen High School

*Note: after opening for the 2019-20 school year, Ashé Prep closed in late October 2019.

Table 2: shows some basic information for the charter schools operating for the 2020-21 school year.

School Name	Authorizer	Home District*	Grades Served	Enrollment
Catalyst Public School	State Charter School Commission	Bremerton	K-1 and 5-6	167
Rainier Valley Leadership Academy	State Charter School Commission	Seattle	6-12	158
Impact | Puget Sound Elementary	State Charter School Commission	Tukwila	K-3	415
Impact | Salish Sea Elementary	State Charter School Commission	Tukwila	K-1	128
Lumen High School	Spokane Public Schools	Spokane	9-12	31
PRIDE Prep School	Spokane Public Schools	Spokane	6-12	722
Rainier Prep	State Charter School Commission	Highline	5-8	346
Spokane International Academy	State Charter School Commission	Spokane	K-8	599
Summit Atlas	State Charter School Commission	Seattle	6-12	509
Summit Olympus	State Charter School Commission	Tacoma	9-12	201
Summit Sierra	State Charter School Commission	Seattle	9-12	385
Innovations School (Willow)	State Charter School Commission	Walla Walla	6-8	51

Note: The home district is the school district in which the charter school is physically situated. Enrollment data is from the Washington State Report Card. Impact | Salish Sea Elementary was co-located with Impact | Puget Sound Elementary in Tukwila for the 2020-21 school year. Beginning in 2021-22 the school moved into its permanent location in South Seattle.

Table 3: shows the charter school enrollment changes over time by grade level.

Grade Level	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Kindergarten	117	98	93	214	168	369
1st Grade	106	99	91	148	189	248
2nd Grade	16	89	95	81	124	207
3rd Grade	20	0	92	94	47	139
4th Grade	17	0	0	86	46	69
5th Grade	85	77	154	151	136	157
6th Grade	505	385	512	559	437	363
7th Grade	138	470	393	629	479	405
8th Grade	0	133	397	386	465	456
9th Grade	212	128	353	383	374	427
10th Grade	0	196	142	335	322	334
11th Grade	0	0	180	132	264	295
12th Grade	0	0	0	165	114	243
All Grades	**1216**	**1675**	**2502**	**3363**	**3165**	**3712**

Note: data is from the Washington State Report Card and the OSPI Data Portal.

Table 4: 2020-21 student demographics for charter schools, home school districts, and Washington public schools.

	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian	Black African American	Hispanic or Latinx	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	English Learners	Low-income*	Special Education*
Catalyst Public School	0.6	1.8	9.6	14.4	1.2	59.9	12.6	0.0	0,0	7.8
Bremerton SD	***0.8***	***3.6***	***5.7***	***23.4***	***2.1***	***48.4***	***15.9***	***10.3***	***64.5***	***17.5***
Rainier Prep	0.0	7.2	49.4	34.7	0.0	4.9	3.8	22.5	74.0	10.4
Highline SD	***0.7***	***14.9***	***15.2***	***39.7***	***3.5***	***18.5***	***7.6***	***29.9***	***60.8***	***15.3***
Summit Atlas	0.6	2.6	28.9	16.2	0.4	38.7	12.6	0.0	42.6	16.1
Rainier Valley	0.0	1.9	71.5	14.6	0.0	2.5	9.5	12.0	77.8	23.4
Summit Sierra	0.0	4.2	33.6	15.0	0.5	32.8	13.9	0.0	30.6	18.7
Seattle PS	***0.4***	***13.1***	***15.0***	***13.1***	***0.4***	***45.7***	***12.2***	***12.5***	***32.6***	***14.9***
Lumen High School	0.0	0.0	6.9	0.0	3.4	79.3	10.3	0.0	74.2	22.6
PRIDE Prep	3.5	1.5	5.4	11.8	0.4	69.1	8.2	0.0	58.2	17.6
Spokane International	2.2	2.0	2.5	11.5	0.2	65.8	15.9	0.0	49.7	11.5
Spokane PS	***1.1***	***2.2***	***3.2***	***11.5***	***2.2***	***66.1***	***13.5***	***6.6***	***59.1***	***16.7***
Summit Olympus	2.0	2.0	21.8	26.9	4.6	26.4	16.2	0.0	57.7	17.9
Tacoma SD	***1.0***	***8.9***	***13.1***	***21.8***	***3.3***	***35.9***	***16.0***	***10.6***	***62.5***	***15.3***
Impact | Puget Sound	0.2	12.5	52.5	15.9	0.5	14.7	3.6	40.5	65.3	3.9
Impact | Salish Sea	0.0	12.5	66.4	9.4	0.8	8.6	2.3	41.4	58.6	1.6
Tukwila SD	***0.9***	***26.1***	***20.1***	***32.0***	***4.2***	***10.8***	***6.0***	***37.1***	***75.2***	***12.1***
Innovations (Willow)	0.0	0.0	0.0	39.2	0.0	58.8	2.0	13.7	39.2	27.5
Walla Walla PS	***0.3***	***1.2***	***0.7***	***41.8***	***0.1***	***52.2***	***3.7***	***15.2***	***55.9***	***14.8***
Charter School Average	***0.8***	***4.0***	***29.0***	***17.5***	***1.0***	***38.5***	***9.2***	***10.8***	***52.3***	***14.9***
Home District Average	***0.7***	***10.0***	***10.4***	***26.2***	***2.3***	***39.7***	***10.7***	***17.5***	***58.7***	***15.2***
Washington	***1.3***	***8.3***	***4.6***	***24.7***	***1.2***	***51.1***	***8.8***	***11.9***	***44.5***	***14.1***

Note: throughout the report, Low-Income and FRL are used interchangeably and mean the students qualifying for the Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRL) program. Special Education refers to students with a disability (SWD) who are receiving special educational services through an Individualized Educational Plan (IEP). English learners (ELs) are students receiving bilingual educational supports.

The teacher workforce at charter schools differs from the teacher workforce at the home school districts on the basis of teacher race or ethnicity. For the 2019-20 school year, approximately 31 percent of teachers at charter schools were people of color, while only 19.4 percent of home school district teachers were people of color (Table 5). In every instance, the percentage of teachers of color at charter schools exceeds the percentage of teachers of color at the home school districts.

Table 5: shows the percentage of teachers who are people of color by school and home school district.

Charter School and Home School District	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Rainier Prep	38.1%	38.1%	40.0%
Highline SD	***20.0%***	***24.2%***	***26.2%***
Excel Charter School	27.3%	56.2%	
Kent SD	***18.5%***	***20.5%***	***19.3%***
Summit Atlas	41.7%	36.0%	25.0%
Rainier Valley	30.0%	45.0%	48.3%
Summit Sierra	37.5%	42.3%	23.1%
Seattle PS	***20.2%***	***20.5%***	***20.9%***
PRIDE Prep	20.7%	9.4%	8.8%
Spokane International	42.9%	41.7%	38.7%
Spokane PS	***6.7%***	***6.5%***	***7.2%***
Green Dot Destiny	36.0%	30.8%	
SOAR Academy	70.0%	27.3%	
Summit Olympus	25.0%	41.2%	30.8%
Tacoma SD	***17.9%***	***19.0%***	***19.0%***
Impact | Puget Sound Elementary		40.0%	47.6%
Tukwila SD	***26.7%***	***27.9%***	***28.2%***
Innovation Schools (Willow)		50.0%	16.7%
Walla Walla PS	***15.2%***	***15.7%***	***15.1%***
Charter School Average	***36.9%***	***38.2%***	***31.0%***
Home District Average	***17.9%***	***19.2%***	***19.4%***
Washington	***12.2%***	***13.0%***	***13.2%***

Note: the number of teachers in the home school districts range from less than 200 to approximately 3500, while the number of teachers in the charter schools ranges from less than 10 to approximately 30. 2020 data for Green Dot Excel, Green Dot Destiny, and SOAR Academy are absent because the schools ceased operations at the end of the 2018-19 school year. Data taken from the Washington State Report Card and the OSPI Data Portal.

Not only do the charter schools differ from the home school districts by teacher race and ethnicity (Table 5), the characteristics of the classroom teachers differ in two additional important ways (Table 6). First, the charter schools consistently engage teachers with considerably less teaching experience than teachers in the home school districts (an average of 3.6 years for charter school teachers *vs.* 12.7 years for home school district teachers in the 2019-20 school year). Second, the percentage of teachers with a Master's degree or higher at charter schools (29.5 percent) is much lower than the percentage of teachers with a Master's degree or higher at the home school districts (62.1 percent). The percentage of teachers who are fully certified at charter schools (98.8 percent) is a little lower than the corresponding measure for the home school districts (99.4 percent).

Table 6: shows certification status, the years of teaching experience, and highest education level attained by teachers for charter school LEAs and home school districts.

Charter School and Home School District	2019 Fully Certified Teachers Percent*	2019 Teaching Experience (Ave. Yrs.)	2019 MA+ Percent	2020 Fully Certified Teachers Percent*	2020 Teaching Experience (Ave. Yrs.)	2020 MA+ Percent
Rainier Prep	100%	3.2	28.6%	100%	3.3	20.0%
Highline SD	***99.4%***	***9.7***	***57.2%***	***99.4%***	***10.1***	***57.5%***
Summit Atlas	92.0%	3.8	28.0%	96.4%	4.2	32.1%
Rainier Valley	95.0%	2.1	30.0%	93.1%	3.4	34.5%
Summit Sierra	100%	3.8	34.6%	100%	3.5	19.2%
Seattle PS	***99.0%***	***10.6***	***66.6%***	***99.0%***	***10.9***	***66.3%***
PRIDE Prep	100%	1.6	12.5%	100%	1.6	26.5%
Spokane International	100%	4.4	50.0%	100%	5.7	48.4%
Spokane PS	***99.7%***	***13.6***	***63.3%***	***99.7%***	***14.6***	***65.7%***
Summit Olympus	100%	2.9	23.5%	100%	3.6	23.1%
Tacoma SD	***99.6%***	***14.1***	***57.4%***	***99.3%***	***14.4***	***58.7%***
Impact | Puget Sound ES	90.0	2.8	20.0%	100%	1.5	28.6%
Tukwila SD	***99.4%***	***11.3***	***62.4%***	***99.4%***	***11.6***	***60.9%***
Innovation Schools (Willow)*	100%	4.7	66.7%	100%	5.6	33.3%
Walla Walla PS	***98.9%***	***14.9***	***70.5%***	***99.4%***	***14.9***	***68.6%***
Charter School Average	***97.4%***	***3.2***	***37.2%***	***98.8%***	***3.6***	***29.5%***
Home District Average	***99.3%***	***12.3***	***62.0%***	***99.4%***	***12.7***	***62.1%***
Washington	***99.0%***	***12.8***	***60.6%***	***99.1%***	***13.1***	***60.8%***

Note: the number of teachers in the school districts range from less than 200 in Tukwila SD to nearly 3500 in Seattle PS. The number of teachers in the charter schools ranges from less than 10 to approximately 30. MA+ means Master's degree or higher. *Note: Data taken from the OSPI Data Portal.

Because of the teacher characteristics presented in Table 6 (above), student access to experienced and qualified educators differs between the charter schools and home school

districts and by content area. Students at charter schools are also more likely to be taught by an English language arts (ELA) or math teacher who is inexperienced and or who might be teaching out of endorsement (Table 7)

Regarding access to experienced and qualified ELA educators:

- Approximately 26 percent of students at charter schools are taught by an experienced ELA teacher, while 72 percent of students in the home school districts are taught by an experienced ELA teacher.
- Approximately 72 percent of students at charter schools are taught by fully endorsed ELA teacher, while 96 percent of students in the home school districts are taught by fully endorsed ELA teacher.

Regarding access to experienced and qualified math educators:

- Approximately 46 percent of students at charter schools are taught by an experienced math teacher, while 71 percent of students in the home school districts are taught by an experienced math teacher.
- Approximately 79 percent of students at charter schools are taught by fully endorsed ELA teacher, while 94 percent of students in the home school districts are taught by fully endorsed ELA teacher.

Table 7: shows some of the teacher characteristics by charter school LEA and home school district by content area.

Organization	% of All Students with Access to an Experienced ELA Educator	% of All Students with Access to an ELA Educator Teaching In Field	% of All Students with Access to a Fully Certified ELA Teacher	% of All Students with Access to an Experienced Math Educator	% of All Students with Access to a Math Educator Teaching In Field	% of All Students with Access to a Fully Certified Math Teacher
Rainier Prep	23.3	100	100	N.D.	100	100
Highline SD	***52.4***	***92***	***98.7***	***67.5***	***92.9***	***92.2***
Summit Sierra	34.5	34.4	100	15.8	100	100
Summit Atlas	50.8	100	100	49.5	100	77.4
Rainier Valley	31.5	58.3	84.4	29.0	82.9	70.5
Seattle PS	***70.2***	***92.8***	***97.4***	***69.9***	***92.1***	***95.4***
Spokane International	13.7	100	100	N.D.	100	100
PRIDE Prep	3.3	50.5	100	N.D.	78.4	100
Spokane PS	***92.4***	***97.2***	***99.6***	***89.1***	***91.6***	***99.8***

Organization	% of All Students with Access to an Experienced ELA Educator	% of All Students with Access to an ELA Educator Teaching In Field	% of All Students with Access to a Fully Certified ELA Teacher	% of All Students with Access to an Experienced Math Educator	% of All Students with Access to a Math Educator Teaching In Field	% of All Students with Access to a Fully Certified Math Teacher
Summit Olympus	N.D.	100	68.2	36.5	36.5	100
Tacoma SD	***74.6***	***96.5***	***95.9***	***76.3***	***91.3***	***97.6***
Impact | Puget Sound						
Tukwila SD	***82.5***	***97.1***	***100***	***62.3***	***98.4***	***100***
Innovations (Willow)	N.D.	28.6	100	100	32.7	100
Walla Walla PS	***82.7***	***98.8***	***93.8***	***66.5***	***99.6***	***93.1***
Charter School Average	***26.2***	***71.5***	***94.1***	***46.2***	***78.8***	***93.5***
Home District Average	***71.7***	***95.5***	***97.1***	***70.9***	***93.5***	***95.6***
Washington	***75.4***	***95.9***	***97.9***	***75.3***	***95.0***	***97.7***

Note: N.D. indicates no data.

Overview of the Performance of Charter Schools

The first charter school opened in the upper mid-west nearly 30 years ago, and since then, the academic performance of charter school students in comparison to TPS students has been a great interest to academicians, educators, policymakers, and the public. Like traditional public school students, the academic achievement of charter school students varies considerably across the nation, from state to state, by school level, by presence and nature of a management organization (Appendix B), and results differ for specific student groups. **On average, the evidence from a myriad of studies indicates no difference in achievement on tests between students who attend a charter school and those who attend a TPS.**

Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO) is one of the most credible entities researching charter schools. In 2013, CREDO published the *National Charter School study* on the academic performance of students attending charter schools. Using CREDO's matched peers[3]

[3] The CREDO work relies on a peer-reviewed methodology utilizing a virtual control record (VCR) method of analysis. The VCR approach creates a "virtual twin" for each charter student who is represented in the data using student records that match the student's demographic and academic characteristics. Potential matches are obtained from traditional public schools that serve as "feeders". In many cases, the "virtual twin" is a composite of up to ten different students fitting the matching criteria. In theory, this "virtual twin" would differ from the charter student only on a single factor: attending a charter school.

methodology, the study found that students attending charter schools exhibit slightly higher levels of learning in reading and approximately the same level of learning in math as compared to their TPS peers. The 2019 report titled "*School Choice in the United States*" conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics found no measurable differences in the 2017 reading and math test scores between charter school and TPS students.

However, other evidence shows that urban charter schools serving systemically marginalized and low-income students following a "no excuses" philosophy have a demonstrable and positive impact on student outcomes. No excuses schools emphasize high academic and behavioral expectations, extended instructional time, and other prescribed educator practices. As did other studies of Boston, New York, and Denver charter schools, the CREDO 2013 study concluded that Black students, students from low-income households, and English learners appear to benefit most from attending charter schools. A body of work summarized in "*Charter Schools and the Achievement Gap*" concludes that a subset of charter schools that includes but is not limited to the "no excuses" schools yields significant and positive effects on educational outcomes.

In another important publication titled "*Urban Charter School Study: Report on 41 Regions*" by CREDO in 2015, the authors reported that Black and Hispanic/Latinx students, students from low-income households, English learners, and students receiving special education services all posted larger academic gains in urban charter schools as compared to their matched peers in urban TPS. The report provided evidence that low-income Black students and low-income Hispanic students posted much larger academic gains that their TPS peers.

In another summary of research (*The National Charter School Landscape*) concurred that the most successful charter schools are those serving low-income students, usually in urban areas. In this subset of charter schools, the effects are largest for students of color, low-income students, and those with special education needs. In addition, English learners with the lowest level of English proficiency make some of the largest gains on statewide assessments after enrolling in a charter school.

A just released study of the performance of charter school students compared to TPS students on the National Assessment of Student Progress (NAEP) over time found that charter school students are improving at a higher rate than TPS students are. The greatest gains for charter school students, relative to TPS students, are for Black students and students of low socioeconomic status.

In January 2019, CREDO released the preliminary results of a study on the *Charter School Performance in the State of Washington* covering the 2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17 school years. While acknowledging the challenges of reporting on a small number of schools and their short history of school operations, the authors concluded that on average, charter school students in Washington experience annual growth in reading and math similar to the educational gains made by their matched peers who enroll in the TPS the charter school

students would otherwise have attended. The CREDO authors characterized the performance of the charter schools as promising but not yet definitive.

Later in January 2019, the SBE delivered the second annual report to the educational committees of the Legislature and the Governor on the academic performance of charter school students for the 2017-18 school year. The study followed a rigorous design, and similar to the CREDO study covering earlier school years, concluded that charter school students perform approximately the same as demographically similar TPS students on the statewide ELA, math, and science assessments.

The SBE delivered the third annual report on Washington charter schools to the Governor, the Legislature, and the public in January 2020. The report concluded that the performance of individual charter schools in comparison to the home district on statewide assessments varied, as some schools posted higher proficiency rates on the statewide assessments and others posted lower proficiency rates. Two charter schools reported adjusted cohort graduation rates and these were similar to or a little lower than the home district graduation rates. Likewise, the performance of charter schools on the Washington School Improvement Framework (WSIF) was limited and mixed.

The SBE's third annual report also included the results of an SBE analysis showing that, as a group, charter school students posted scale scores similar to the scale scores achieved by demographically and academically similar TPS students on the ELA assessment, but higher scale scores than TPS students on the math and science assessments. The analysis yielded effect sizes showing that the effect associated with charter school enrollment was small to very small. The student growth percentiles (SGPs) for charter school students were mostly similar to or higher than the TPS student group.

In fall 2020, CREDO released an updated report titled *Charter School Performance in the State of Washington*. Using assessment results through the 2017-18 school year, the CREDO researchers provide evidence that on average, Washington charter school students demonstrated annual academic growth in ELA and math similar to the growth of their matched peers in traditional public schools. Students from low-income households, Black, and Latinx student groups posted gains that were higher on average but statistically similar to the gains of their respective TPS peers. The CREDO researchers show that the academic growth made by English learners and Latinx English learners was different and higher than their TPS peers in ELA and/or math were.

Using a rigorous evaluation, the SBE's fourth annual report showed that, as a group, charter school students performed higher than the TPS student group on seven of the eight assessment and growth measures analyzed. In addition, charter school students identifying as Hispanic/Latinx, students who are English learners, and students who qualify for FRL (low-income) consistently outperformed their TPS matched peers. The analyses yielded effect sizes showing that the effect associated with charter school enrollment was very small to small.

In fall 2021, Harvard researchers released a study comparing the performance of students from charter schools to those of regular school districts on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) administrations from 2005 to 2017. After adjusting for student background characteristics, the test scores for students at charter schools improved approximately one-third of a year's worth of learning more than scores for students at district schools. The study also found that Black/African American and Hispanic students and students from low-income households at charter schools made greater gains (approximately one-half year worth of learning) than students at regular public schools. The authors report that two-thirds of the relative gain in the charter sector cannot be explained by demography. The authors assert that the rate of change for the charter schools is greater either because the charter sector, relative to the district sector, is attracting a more proficient set of students in ways that cannot be detected by demographic characteristics, or because charter schools and their teachers are doing a better job of teaching students.

Section I – Washington Charter School Performance

This section of the annual report is divided into two parts in accordance to 28A.710.250 (2). Part A is comprised of selected analyses on the academic performance or achievement of students at charter schools compared to the home district and the state. Part B summarizes the comparisons of the academic performance of students at charter schools to similar students in traditional public schools described in earlier SBE charter school reports.

This report elaborates on the performance of charter schools through data posted to the Washington State Report Card and other student results from the 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19 school years, and the fall 2021 shortened statewide assessment administration. As was stated for the previous four charter school reports assessing the performance of charter schools and charter school students, the findings presented continue to be preliminary. Earlier reports stated that it would be premature to make any judgements about the performance of the charter schools until multiple years of results (at least five years) are available. Even though this is the fifth-year report, we are in the position of having to report on the academic performance of the charter schools based on only three years of regular assessments and additional information from the fall 2021 assessment, which was shortened but is considered to provide essentially the same information regarding content area proficiency as the longer regular assessment.

When comparing the performance of the charter schools to their TPS counterparts, a couple of other challenges should be noted. First, most of the charter schools add one or two new grades each year. This means that schools must build curriculum, hire new teachers, and provide training each year to new teachers. This challenge is unique to the charter schools, as most traditional public schools used for comparison have been fully built out for years. Second, the enrolling of a high percentage of systemically marginalized students means that a charter school needs to allocate more resources to ensure every student is making good academic progress.

The effects of concentrating systemically marginalized students in a school building creates teaching and learning challenges, about which we are just beginning to learn.

A limitation of this work centers on the fact that only 16 charter schools have been in operation over the most recent five-year period and only 12 charter schools were in operation for the full 2020-21 school year. As explained earlier, there is scant educational data to report on for 2019-20, limited data for the 2020-21 school year, and a limited number of assessment records for charter school students over the previous five years. Recently approved charter schools will commence operations in the coming years and the overall enrollment of the charter schools will likely increase. The meaningfulness of the statistical analyses will increase with the additional years of data, larger student counts, and additional schools.

Summary of Findings on the Performance of the Charter Schools

1. Information about the performance of charter schools on the winter 2020 version of the WSIF is limited and mixed. On average, the charter schools WSIF score is similar to or a little higher than the state average.
2. Official adjusted cohort graduation rates for the class of 2021 were reportable for three charter schools. The rates for two charter schools were similar to the state average and the rates for the other charter school were a little lower than the state average. Data was suppressed for one charter school because of a small student count. For the two Spokane charter schools, the unofficial graduation rate for one school was higher and one was lower than the district graduation rate.
3. The percentage of charter school students regularly attending school is a little higher than the rate for the students in the home school districts.
4. The percentage of 9th grade charter school students who earned credit for all courses attempted (9th Graders On-Track) is a little higher than the rate for the students in the home school districts.
5. The percentage of students not experiencing an exclusionary discipline event for the charter school students is similar to the rate for the students in the home school districts.
6. Charter school students performed similar to or better than their TPS matched peers on nearly all assessment and growth measures.
7. Students identifying as Hispanic or Latinx, students who are English learners and students who qualify for FRL (low-income) opting for the charter school alternative consistently outperform their TPS peers.

Part A – Performance of Charter Schools

RCW 28A.710.250 directs the SBE to report on the performance of the state's charter schools during the preceding school year, and include a comparison of the performance of charter school students with the performance of academically, ethnically, and economically comparable groups of students in traditional public schools. This report is to elaborate on the academic performance of the charter schools operating during the 2020-21 school year.

Statewide Assessments

The OSPI cancelled spring 2020 summative statewide assessment administration after the ED approved the OSPI waiver request on March 27 because of the physical closure of school buildings. The cancelled administrations include the Smarter Balanced assessments (SBAs), alternate assessment for students with significant cognitive challenges (WA-AIM), and the English language proficiency assessment (ELPA21).

Many K-12 schools remained physically closed for the fall 2020 start of school due to the COVID pandemic and remained closed into the winter 2021. Many schools began to open their doors to students for in-person instruction in January 2021, while continuing to offer online instruction for those opting to do so. On March 21, 2021, the OSPI submitted a proposal to the ED to, among other things, administer the spring 2021 statewide summative assessment to a representative sample of students to minimize the health risks to students. The ED did not agree to the OSPI sampling plan but authorized the OSPI to administer the spring 2021 assessment in fall 2021 and to administer shortened assessments.

The fall 2021 assessment administration was meant to represent student outcomes for the previous school year, so students sat for the grade level assessment for the grade they were enrolled in for the 2020-21 school year. For the spring 2022 administration, students will be assessed again, but this time on the grade level assessment in which they are currently enrolled. For 2021-22 school year, students will sit for the statewide assessments twice in the same school year, once in the fall 2021 and again in the spring 2022 and each in different grade levels. In mid-February 2022, the OSPI posted the school- and district-level results of the fall 2021 assessments to the Washington Report Card.

Simply comparing the test results, educational inputs, or educational outcomes of students enrolled in a charter school to those of students in the home school district or another traditional public school can be misleading. In choosing to attend a charter school, the student demonstrates the motivation to seek an educational opportunity outside the norm, an educational alternative making him or her different from peers in traditional public schools. Students enrolling in charter schools do so for a variety of reasons making them different from students attending a TPS based on school choice at a minimum. With the knowledge of the existence of unobserved student differences, it becomes a challenge to determine whether test score differences reflect the student population differences or something about the school.

The conclusions drawn from the evaluation of the performance charter school in comparison to the home school districts are limited. The reader should bear in mind that the level of comparison is not equivalent. Each charter school is a Local Educational Agency (LEA), which in many respects is roughly equivalent to a school district. This means that for this analysis, the performance of a charter school is compared to the performance a school district. Such a comparison has the potential to be misleading in at least a couple of ways:

- A charter school serving high school grades (for example) is compared to a school district serving all grade levels. Measures like the percentage of students who regularly attend school differs by grade level and school level.
- Individual charter school enrollment ranges from approximately 100 to 500 students, whereas the home districts for the majority of charter schools (Seattle PS, Spokane PS, and Tacoma SD) serve 30,000 to 55,000 students. A comparison would be more meaningful if the group sizes were more comparable.

The most recent results for the performance of students at charter schools as compared to students in the home school district on the fall 2021 statewide assessments are summarized in Table 8 and are tabulated in Appendix A. In summary, six of ten charter schools performed higher than or similar to the home school district on all three content area assessments administered in the fall 2021.

Table 8: summarizes the performance of charter schools in comparison to the home school district based on the fall 2021 statewide assessment administration.

	English Language Arts	**Math**	**Science**
Charter school results are mostly higher than the home school district results.	Catalyst, Impact Puget Sound ES, Spokane International, Summit Olympus, and Rainier Prep	Catalyst, Impact Puget Sound ES, Spokane International, and Rainier Prep	Catalyst, Impact Puget Sound ES, Lumen, Spokane International, Summit Atlas, Summit Olympus, Summit Sierra, and Rainier Prep
Charter school results are similar to the home school district results.	Summit Atlas and Summit Sierra	Summit Atlas and Summit Olympus	PRIDE Prep
Charter school results are mostly lower than the home school district results.	Rainier Valley, Lumen, and PRIDE Prep	Rainier Valley, Lumen, PRIDE Prep, and Summit Sierra	Rainier Valley

Washington School Improvement Framework

The OSPI published the first version of the Washington School Improvement Framework (WSIF) in the winter 2018 based on educational data three school years. The WSIF was last computed in the winter 2020 based on educational data form the 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 school years. The WSIF results shown below are somewhat outdated but are included for those who might be reviewing this report for the first time. The decile averages and the WISF scores are limited and mixed, as only seven schools earned a WSIF rating. The average decile rating for the

charter schools on each of the WSIF indicators (except for the EL Progress indicator) is mostly similar to or a little better than the state average (Table 9).

Table 9: shows the winter 2020 WSIF school rating in decile points for the All Students group by indicator for the charter schools in operation for the 2020-21 school year and for which a final decile could be computed.

School Name	Prof. Decile	SGP Decile	Graduation Rate Decile	EL Progress Decile	SQSS Decile	Total Decile*
Rainier Valley	3.00	6.50	N.D.	1.00	3.33	4.40
PRIDE Prep	5.00	3.00	N.D.	N.D.	2.67	3.55
Rainer Prep	7.50	10.00	N.D.	3.00	7.00	8.30
Spokane International	8.00	6.00	N.D.	N.D.	9.00	6.95
Summit Atlas	6.50	9.50	N.D.	2.00	4.33	7.00
Summit Olympus	5.00	N.D.	5.00	N.D.	6.00	5.15
Summit Sierra	6.00	N.D.	6.00	2.00	5.67	6.65
Charter Schools (Average)	***5.86***	***7.00***	***5.50***	***2.00***	***5.43***	***6.00***
Washington Public Schools (Average)	***5.97***	***5.61***	***5.84***	***5.60***	***5.22***	***5.69***

Note: N.D. means No Data. The Total Decile is the final WSIF rating based on a weighted average of each of the individual decile ratings.

The WSIF data file created by the OSPI provides final decile ratings for student groups if the minimum reporting requirements are met. The winter 2020 WSIF final decile ratings for student groups at the charter schools (Table 10) are limited and mixed. For the charter schools in operation for the 2020-21 school year and each of the student groups for which a final decile could be computed, the charter school average score was a little higher than the state average.

Table 10: shows the winter 2020 WSIF school ratings (final total decile) for all reportable student groups for the charter schools earning a final decile rating*.

School Name	All Students	Native American	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Pacific Islander	White	Two or More	Limited English	Low Income	Special Education
PRIDE Prep	3.55	N.D.	N.D.	2.15	N.D.	N.D.	3.55	6.05	N.D.	2.70	1.80
Rainier Prep	8.30	N.D.	9.90	8.25	8.70	N.D.	9.25	9.45	6.10	8.60	3.85
Rainier Valley	4.40	N.D.	N.D.	4.15	4.35	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	3.55	4.15	3.75
Spokane International	6.95	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	5.05	N.D.	6.40	6.00	N.D.	5.50	3.65
Summit Atlas	7.00	N.D.	N.D.	6.15	6.90	N.D.	8.75	7.45	N.D.	6.50	5.15
Summit Olympus	5.15	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	4.30	N.D.
Summit Sierra	6.65	N.D.	N.D.	6.45	N.D.	N.D.	6.90	N.D.	N.D.	5.45	N.D.
Charter School (Average)	***6.00***	***N.D.***	***9.90***	***5.43***	***6.25***	***N.D.***	***6.97***	***7.24***	***4.83***	***5.31***	***3.64***
Washington Public Schools (Average)	***5.69***	***2.98***	***7.88***	***4.11***	***4.64***	***3.53***	***6.24***	***5.91***	***3.20***	***4.38***	***2.89***

Note: N.D. indicates No Data, as the decile was not computed.

High School Graduation Results

Simply comparing the high school graduation rates of students enrolled in a charter school to graduation rates for students in the home school district or another traditional public school can be misleading. As mentioned earlier and because the students at charter schools are not exactly the same as their TPS peers because of their decision to opt for an alternative educational experience, it is impossible to know whether differences in the high school graduation rates reflect the student differences or something about the charter school. Additionally, graduation rates in the comparison school districts vary across different schools within each district.

The 2020-21 school year was the third year in which charter public schools served 12th graders and posted an official four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (ACGR). Rainier Valley had only three students in the adjusted cohort and was excluded from Table 11 as the data were not reportable. The four-year graduation data for PRIDE Prep and Lumen High School were incorrectly uploaded to the OSPI. The incorrect data is currently suppressed on the Washington State Report Card and were also intentionally excluded from Table 11.

- Summit Olympus is within the Tacoma School District boundaries. The high school graduation rates of the reportable student groups are lower than the corresponding state graduation rates and are mostly lower than the corresponding rates for the Tacoma School District and for the state.

- Summit Atlas is within the Seattle PS boundaries. The high school graduation rates of the reportable student groups are a little higher than the corresponding state graduation rates and are mostly similar to or a little higher than the corresponding rates for the Seattle PS.
- Summit Sierra is also within the Seattle PS boundaries. The high school graduation rates of the reportable student groups are a little higher than the corresponding state graduation rates and similar to the corresponding rates for the Seattle PS.
- Lumen High School is within the Spokane PS boundaries, and Spokane PS is the authorizer. The charter authorizer reported that the nine graduating students resulted in the school's 56.3 percent graduation rate, which is lower than the 89.4 percent district graduation rate reported by Spokane PS.
- PRIDE Prep reported that the 84 graduating seniors resulted in 97.7 percent graduation rate, which is higher than the 89.4 percent district graduation rate for Spokane PS.

Table 11: shows the official four-year graduation rates for reportable student groups for the charter schools, the home school districts, and Washington public schools.

Class of 2021 Four-Year Graduation Rate	Summit Olympus	Tacoma SD	Summit Atlas	Summit Sierra	Seattle PS	Washington
All Students	**67.5**	**88.4**	**86.5**	**85.2**	**87.2**	**82.5**
Native Amer./Alaskan Native	N.R.	75.0	N.R.	N.R.	>90.0	67.1
Asian	N.R.	93.5	N.R.	N.R.	91.3	92.2
Black/African American	N.R.	88.4	>90.0	83.8	83.1	77.7
Hispanic/Latinx	70.0	83.3	N.R.	72.7	73.9	77.6
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Isl.	N.R.	91.9	N.R.	N.R.	85.7	75.3
White	80.0	90.1	>90.0	84.2	90.8	84.2
Two or More Races	N.R.	87.7	N.R.	>90.0	89.2	81.8
English Learners	N.R.	76.0	N.R.	>90.0	67.1	68.9
Low-Income	68.4	84.7	>90.0	83.3	79.7	73.9
Students with Disabilities	72.7	68.0	N.R.	81.5	68.0	63.9
Section 504	N.R.	90.2	N.R.	80.0	90.6	82.2
Migrant	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	60.0	74.4

*Note: N.R. means Not Reportable, as the data were suppressed to protect personal information or the student group was not represented in the graduation cohort for the school. The unofficial graduation rates for the two Spokane charter schools are not shown with these official graduation rates. From the Washington State Report Card.

The OSPI created a special COVID-19 display of truncated data covering the same time period (September 1 to February 28) for the 2017-18, 2018-19, and 2019-20 school years in order to create a meaningful trend comparison. These data represent what was happening in schools before the Governor's order to physically close school buildings in the spring 2020 and in each of the two previous school years over the same time period. Unfortunately, the trend analysis of

truncated data was broken with the delay in physically opening school buildings in the fall 2020. Data for the 2020-21 school year is comparable to neither the truncated data set nor the last full year of in-person learning, the 2018-19 school year.

Regular Attendance

On the measure the percentage of students regularly attending school for the 2020-21 school year, the average for the charter school LEAs is a little higher than the corresponding measures for the home school districts and the state (Table 12).

Table 12: shows the percentage of students who regularly attend school for the 2020-21 school year by race, ethnicity, and program participation status.

Regular Attendance	American Indian or Alaskan	Asian	Black African American	Hispanic or Latinx	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	English Learners	Low-income*	Special Education*
Catalyst Public School	N.D.	N.D.	86.7	89.3	N.D.	93.1	>90	N.D.	94.5	84.2
Bremerton SD	***73.2***	***90.4***	***74.9***	***75.8***	***69.1***	***80.8***	***75.3***	***75.4***	***73.0***	***70.4***
Rainier Prep	N.D.	>90	88.2	79.0	N.D.	88.9	84.6	82.7	83.6	75.0
Highline SD	***57.4***	***81.9***	***68.4***	***60.7***	***43.8***	***80.0***	***73.3***	***62.9***	***62.4***	***62.1***
Summit Atlas	N.D.	>90	>98	>96	N.D.	>98	>95	>95	>99	>97
Rainier Valley	N.D.	N.D.	92.2	>90	N.D.	N.D.	>90	>90	94.1	86.8
Summit Sierra	N.D.	86.7	81.9	66.7	N.D.	78.7	58.8	89.1	73.5	63.0
Seattle PS	***73.5***	***94.5***	***79.8***	***81.8***	***70.9***	***95.4***	***90.4***	***84.3***	***78.4***	***82.9***
Lumen High School	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	83.3	N.D.	N.D.	78.0	N.D.
PRIDE Prep	68.0	81.8	64.1	62.8	N.D.	71.3	56.7	N.D.	63.6	66.7
Spokane International	>90	>90	>90	93.0	N.D.	97.3	92.8	>90	93.2	92.9
Spokane PS	***69.4***	***91.5***	***82.1***	***78.9***	***63.2***	***85.7***	***77.2***	***72.6***	***75.7***	***73.8***
Summit Olympus	N.D.	N.D.	>93	>95	N.D.	>94	>90	>90	>97	>92
Tacoma SD	***44.9***	***74.6***	***50.1***	***55.6***	***35.6***	***73.5***	***60.4***	***51.9***	***52.1***	***52.0***
Impact | Puget Sound	N.D.	90.2	90.0	81.8	N.D.	93.4	>90	90.2	87.6	>90
Impact | Salish Sea	N.D.	87.5	83.1	81.8	N.D.	81.8	N.D.	82.2	78.9	N.D.
Tukwila SD	***88.9***	***94.7***	***88.0***	***87.9***	***82.8***	***90.4***	***87.8***	***89.9***	***88.9***	***84.1***
Innovations (Willow)	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	>90	N.D.	>91	N.D.	N.D.	>90	>90
Walla Walla PS	***78.3***	***91.2***	***54.1***	***65.9***	***N.D.***	***80.3***	***75.6***	***64.8***	***64.6***	***67.5***
Charter School Average	***79.0***	***>88***	***>87***	***>84***	***N.D.***	***>88***	***>86***	***>89***	***>86***	***>84***
Home District Average	***69.4***	***88.4***	***71.1***	***72.4***	***60.9***	***83.7***	***77.1***	***71.7***	***70.7***	***70.4***
Washington	***59.0***	***91.9***	***73.0***	***71.7***	***55.3***	***84.2***	***79.3***	***71.0***	***68.8***	***72.1***

Note: Low-Income means the students qualifying for the Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRL) program. Special Education refers to students with a disability (SWD) who are receiving special educational services through an Individualized Educational Plan (IEP). English learners (ELs) are students receiving bilingual educational supports. From the Washington State Report Card.

9th Grade On-Track

On the measure the percentage of first time 9th graders who are on-track for the 2020-21 school year, the average for the charter school LEAs is a little higher than the corresponding measures for the home school districts and the state Table 13.

Table 13: shows the percentage of first time 9th graders who are on-track for the 2020-21 school year by race, ethnicity, and program participation status.

9th Grade On-Track	American Indian or Alaskan	Asian	Black African American	Hispanic or Latinx	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	English Learners	Low-income*	Special Education*
Summit Atlas	N.D.	N.D.	>90	>90	N.D.	>91	99.0	90.0	>92	>90
Rainier Valley	N.D.	N.D.	>90	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	>91	>90
Summit Sierra	N.D.	N.D.	71.4	60.0	N.D.	78.0	83.3	66.7	65.9	43.8
Seattle PS	***82.4***	***90.9***	***81.7***	***83.9***	***85.0***	***92.1***	***90.3***	***80.0***	***79.6***	***80.1***
Lumen High School	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.
PRIDE Prep	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	90.0	N.D.	80.0	80.0	N.D.	80.6	75.0
Spokane PS	***46.9***	***87.3***	***68.4***	***66.5***	***61.5***	***76.7***	***66.4***	***73.5***	***61.9***	***68.0***
Summit Olympus	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	85.0	N.D.	61.1	N.D.	N.D.	77.1	N.D.
Tacoma SD	***55.6***	***63.4***	***43.3***	***48.2***	***27.6***	***67.1***	***54.8***	***33.8***	***43.8***	***42.5***
Charter School Average	***N.D.***	***N.D.***	***>84***	***>81***	***N.D.***	***>78***	***87.4***	***78.4***	***81.3***	***>75***
Home District Average	***61.6***	***80.5***	***64.5***	***67.8***	***58.0***	***78.6***	***70.5***	***62.4***	***61.8***	***63.5***
Washington	***43.3***	***87.4***	***66.0***	***53.1***	***47.6***	***74.0***	***69.3***	***46.5***	***51.8***	***58.0***

Note: Low-Income means the students qualifying for the Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRL) program. Special Education refers to students with a disability (SWD) who are receiving special educational services through an Individualized Educational Plan (IEP). English learners (ELs) are students receiving bilingual educational supports. From the Washington State Report Card.

Dual Credit

On the measure the percentage of high school students earning dual credit for the 2020-21 school year, the average for the charter school LEAs is lower than the corresponding measures for the home school districts and the state Table 14.

Table 14: shows the percentage of high school students earning dual credit for the 2020-21 school year by race, ethnicity, and program participation status.

Dual Credit	American Indian or Alaskan	Asian	Black African American	Hispanic or Latinx	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	English Learners	Low-income*	Special Education*
Summit Atlas	N.D.	N.D.	36.7	37.2	N.D.	33.3	26.3	41.9	41.0	28.6
Rainier Valley	N.D.	N.D.	<6	<10	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<10	<6	<10
Summit Sierra	N.D.	53.3	43.7	41.7	N.D.	55.7	53.1	40.0	40.2	52.8
Seattle PS	***51.2***	***71.1***	***56.7***	***57.8***	***51.2***	***67.9***	***63.7***	***50.9***	***57.2***	***36.2***
Lumen High School	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	>9	N.D.	N.D.	<6	<10
PRIDE Prep	25.0	N.D.	17.6	11.1	N.D.	25.5	21.7	N.D.	21.8	4.2
Spokane PS	***41.5***	***59.9***	***37.0***	***45.3***	***25.9***	***54.4***	***48.3***	***27.8***	***43.4***	***22.6***
Summit Olympus	N.D.	N.D.	33.3	34.5	N.D.	27.7	51.9	30.8	32.5	42.1
Tacoma SD	***83.3***	***90.8***	***87.4***	***87.1***	***85.6***	***91.9***	***90.3***	***83.4***	***88.1***	***78.6***
Charter School Average	***25.0***	***53.3***	***<33***	***<33***	***N.D.***	***<37***	***38.3***	***<39***	***<24***	***<24***
Home District Average	***58.7***	***73.9***	***60.4***	***63.4***	***54.2***	***71.4***	***67.4***	***54.0***	***62.9***	***45.8***
Washington	***43.0***	***77.5***	***61.5***	***57.0***	***58.4***	***62.4***	***63.3***	***48.3***	***54.3***	***40.5***

Note: Low-Income means the students qualifying for the Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRL) program. Special Education refers to students with a disability (SWD) who are receiving special educational services through an Individualized Educational Plan (IEP). English learners (ELs) are students receiving bilingual educational supports. From the Washington State Report Card.

Exclusionary Discipline Measure (OSPI Truncated Dataset)

The measure is the percentage of students who do not experience any out-of-school exclusionary disciplinary events during the school year. After excluding outlier values, the charter school average is a little lower than the home school district average (Table 15).

Table 15: shows the percentage of the All Students group who did not experience at least one out of school exclusionary discipline event by charter school LEA and home school district.

Organization	2017-18 School Year	2018-19 School Year	2019-20 School Year	3-Year Average
Rainier Prep	97.1	99.1	97.4	97.9
Highline SD	***98.6***	***98.5***	***98.4***	***98.5***
Summit Atlas	97.7	>99.0	98.9	98.5
Summit Sierra	90.5	98.8	96.6	95.3
Rainier Valley Leadership Academy*	89.8	80.6	88.6	86.3
Seattle PS	***98.6***	***98.8***	***98.8***	***98.8***
PRIDE Prep	94.0	95.9	99.0	96.3
Spokane International Academy	97.1	92.4	>99.0	96.2
Spokane PS	***96.3***	***96.5***	***96.5***	***96.4***
Summit Olympus*	86.9	>99.0	>98.0	94.6
Tacoma SD	***94.9***	***95.7***	***96.6***	***95.7***
Impact | Puget Sound Elementary	N.D.	>98.0	>99.0	98.5
Tukwila SD	***98.8***	***98.8***	***99.8***	***99.3***
Innovation Schools*	N.D.	78.7	>94.0	86.3
Walla Walla PS	***96.6***	***96.4***	***96.4***	***96.4***
Charter School Average	***95.3***	***97.5***	***97.7***	***96.8***
Home District Average	***97.1***	***97.5***	***97.8***	***97.5***
Washington Average	***97.4***	***97.5***	***97.8***	***97.6***

*Note: identifies a charter school LEA posting results for at least one school year which was an outlier (<90.0 percent) and was excluded from the calculation of averages. Neither Impact | Puget Sound nor Innovations School (Willow) was in operation for the 2017-18 school year and are denoted with N.D. indicating No Data.

Part B – Academic Performance of Charter School Students and Similar TPS Students

For the analyses that follow, the charter school group and the TPS groups represent the aggregation of the charter schools open in the 2019-20 school year. In other words, all of the charter school students are combined into one large group to assess for differences in the groups' performance, and those students are all from the charter schools in operation for the entire 2019-20 school year. The ensuing discussion of student performance is based on assessment administrations through the 2018-19 school year, as the spring 2020 summative assessment was cancelled because of the COVID pandemic and the spring 2021 assessment was postponed to the fall 2021. The results of the analyses (first presented in the 2019-20 charter school report) are summarized below, while the statistics and other details are included in Appendix A.

Overview of Results for the All Students Group

Of the eight academic measures examined and based on statewide assessments prior to the cancelled 2020 assessments, charter school group performed different and higher than TPS group on seven of the measures. On the remaining measure, the charter school group performed similarly to the TPS group (Table 16). The following results are evident:

- For the **ELA and math assessments**, charter school students performed different and higher than the TPS student group on average scale score and on the proficiency rate.
- On the **science assessments**, charter school students performed different and higher than the TPS group on average scale score, and similar to TPS group on the proficiency rate.
- On the **student growth percentiles (SGPs),** the charter school students performed different and higher than the TPS group on the median math SGP and on the median ELA SGP.

Table 16: summarizes the performance of the charter school students compared to the performance of demographically and academically similar TPS group aggregated over multiple school years.

Academic Measure	Charter School Students Perform Different and Higher than TPS Students	Charter School Students Perform Similar to TPS Students	Charter School Students Perform Different and Lower than TPS Students
ELA Assessment (Three-Year Aggregation)	Average Scale Score & Proficiency Rate		
ELA Growth Model (Three-Year SGP Aggregation)*	Median SGP		
Math Assessment (Three-Year Aggregation)	Average Scale Score & Proficiency Rate		
Math Growth Model (Three-Year SGP Aggregation)*	Median SGP		
Science Assessment (Two-Year Aggregation)*	Average Scale Score	Proficiency Rate	

*Note: The ELA and math average scale scores reflect data aggregated over the 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 school years, while the science data is aggregated over the 2017-18 and 2018-19 school years. The student growth percentiles (SGP) are available for 4th through the 8th grade students with valid Smarter Balanced assessment results. SGPs are not available for science.

Overview of Results by Race/Ethnicity and Program Participation

In aggregating the educational outcome data over a three-year period, group sizes increase sufficiently to report on and to be more meaningful. With only one exception, the charter school students performed as well or better than the TPS groups on all the measures (Table 17). Charter school students identifying as Hispanic/Latinx, students who are English learners, and students who qualify for FRL (low-income) consistently outperform their TPS matched peers.

- **Native American and Alaskan Natives**: charter school attendees identifying as Native American or Alaskan Natives perform similarly to the TPS students on all measures for which a result is reportable.
- **Asian**: charter school attendees identifying as Asian performed similar to TPS students on average ELA and math scale scores and higher than TPS students on the median ELA and math SGPs.
- **Black/African American**: students identifying as Black at charter schools performed similar to TPS students on average ELA scale score and the median ELA SGP and higher than TPS group on the math scale score and a higher median math SGP.
- **Hispanic/Latinx**: students at charter schools performed higher than the corresponding TPS group on all of the measures.
- **White**: charter school students performed similar to TPS students on all of the measures, except for the math median SGP measure, where the White students at charter schools performed lower than the TPS group.
- **Two or More Races**: charter school students performed similar to TPS students on all of the measures, except for the math median SGP measure, where the charter school students identifying with Two or More Races performed higher than the TPS group.
- **Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander**: on all the measures, the count of matched students with valid results was too small (less than 20) to report on.
- **English Learners**: charter school students performed higher than the TPS group on all of the measures, except for the ELA median SGP measure, where the charter school English learners performed similar to the TPS group.
- **Low-Income**: students at charter schools performed higher than the corresponding TPS group on all of the measures.
- **Special Education**: charter school attendees receiving special education services perform similarly to the corresponding TPS group on all measures, except for the average, math, scale score, which was higher than the TPS group.

Table 17: summary of group performance on ELA and math assessments and SGPs by race/ethnicity and program participation by charter school enrollment.

Academic Measure	Charter School Students Perform Different and Higher than TPS Students	Charter School Students Perform Similar to TPS Students	Charter School Students Perform Different and Lower than TPS Students
ELA Assessment (Three-Year Aggregation)	Hispanic, *English Learners, Low-Income*	Native American, Asian, Black, White, Two or More Races, *Special Education*	
ELA Growth Model (Three-Year SGP Aggregation)*	Asian, Hispanic, and *Low-Income*	Native American, Black, White, Two or More Races, *English Learners, and Special Education*	
Math Assessment (Three-Year Aggregation)	Black, Hispanic, *English Learner, Low-Income, and Special Education*	Native American, Asian, White, Two or More Races	
Math Growth Model (Three-Year SGP Aggregation)*	Asian, Black, Hispanic, Two or More Races, *English Learner, and Low-Income*	*Special Education*	White

For purposes here, Low Income and FRL are interchangeable and means the students qualifying for the Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRL) program. Special Education refers to students with a disability (SWD) who are receiving special educational services through an Individualized Educational Plan (IEP). English learners (ELs) are students receiving bilingual educational supports.

Section II – Meeting the purposes of Washington's Charter Schools Act

28A.710.250 directs the SBE to include in this annual report its assessment of the successes, challenges, and areas for improvement in meeting the purposes of the Washington Charter Public Schools Act (RCW 28A.710), including the Board's assessment of the sufficiency of funding for charter schools, and the efficacy of the formula for authorizer funding.

The Board approves of school districts as charter school authorizers pursuant to RCW 28A.710.090. The Spokane PS is the only local educational authority (LEA) or school district to file an application and then to be approved as a charter public school authorizer. All charter school authorizer applications must include:

- Vision for chartering,
- Plan to support that vision including budget information and commitment to quality authorizing,
- Draft application for charter schools to apply with the authorizer,
- Draft performance framework that would guide the establishment of a charter contract,

- Draft of the proposed renewals, revocation, and nonrenewal process,
- Statement of assurance that the authorizer is committed to meeting expectations of a charter authorizer and will engage in training with the state if provided or required, and
- Statement assuring public accountability and transparency for all authorizing practices, decisions, and expenditures.

The Washington State Charter School Commission (CSC) and Spokane PS are the only charter school authorizers in the state. Together, the Washington Charter School Commission and Spokane PS oversaw 12 charter public schools operating in Washington during the 2020-21 school year, an increase of two schools compared to the 2019-20 school year. Per the Washington State Report Card, 3,712 students attended one of the 12 Washington public charter schools on the official count day for the 2020-21 school year (Table 2). The total charter school enrollment represents an increase of approximately 550 students from the 2019-20 school year and the total charter school enrollment represents approximately 0.34 percent of all public school K-12 students.

RCW 28A.710 directs the CSC to authorize high quality charter public schools throughout the state, especially schools that are designed to expand opportunities for "at-risk (systemically marginalized) students". As defined in statute, an at-risk student is one who has an academic or economic disadvantage that requires assistance or special services to succeed in educational programs. The term includes, but is not limited to the following:

- Students not meeting minimum standards of academic proficiency,
- Students who are at risk of dropping out of high school,
- Students in chronically low-performing schools, students with higher than average disciplinary sanctions,
- Students with lower participation rates in advanced or gifted programs,
- Students who are limited in English proficiency,
- Students who are members of economically disadvantaged families, and
- Students identified as having special educational needs.

The demographics of students enrolled in charter schools during the 2020-21 school year (Table 4) indicate that, for the most part, the Washington charter public schools serve systemically marginalized students at a rate higher than the home school districts.

Key Developments for Charter School Authorizers

Charter School Commission – Authorizer Developments

Ten CSC authorized charter public schools were in operation during the 2020-21 school year, which represents an increase of two schools from the 2019-20 school year. All of the CSC authorized charter schools were subject to stringent oversight from the CSC and the OSPI.

The CSC issued its New Charter School Application in April 2020. In August 2020, the CSC received four applications to open new charter public schools, but two of those applicants withdrew their applications. In December 2020, the CSC approved one new school application while denying the other. The CSC did not authorize any new schools in 2021 due to the expiration of the authorization window set forth in RCW 28A.710.150.

The 2020-21 school year was the first year in which Spokane International Academy (SIA) operated under CSC authorization, after transferring its charter contract from Spokane Public Schools to the Charter School Commission. The CDC approved the expansion request of SIA to grow their grades served to include a small high-school program designed for students who wanted to complete their academic career at SIA.

Two new schools opened for the 2020-21 school year (Catalyst Public School and Salish Sea Elementary School). Fourteen public charter schools are in operation for the 2021-22 school year through CSC authorization. Two additional schools are approved and scheduled to commence operations for the 2022-23 school year.

The CSC completed its first renewal process in 2020-21. Rainier Prep, Spokane International Academy, Summit Sierra, and Summit Olympus all received full five-year charte5r contract renewals after an extensive renewal process was completed by the CSC.

Like this report, the CSC was unable to report on the operational charter public school's financial performance for the 2020-21 school-year because the OSPI had not yet completed and made available school financial analyses. The CSC committed to updating the authorizer report later in 2022 once the financial statement audits have been received and analyzed. In lieu of 2020-21 financial data, the CSC provided the SBE with 2019-20 charter public school financial data.

Using the 2019-20 financials, the CSC determined that Rainier Valley, Summit Atlas, Summit Olympus, and Summit Sierra did not meet standard on the enrollment variance measure of the Financial Performance Framework. The enrollment variance indicates whether or not the school is meeting its enrollment projections. A school that does not meet its enrollment targets may not be able to meet its budgeted expenses. As enrollment is a key driver of revenue, variance is important to track the sufficiency of revenues generated to fund ongoing operations.

Narrative on the Closure of Innovations (Willow) Charter School

Innovation (formerly Willow Public School) voluntarily ceased operation June 16, 2021. Innovation opened on August 20, 2018 to serve students in the Walla Walla community. Nearing the end of school's first year of operation, concerns began to emerge about programmatic and operational compliance as well as the overall governance of the school. After a site visit by CSC staff, these concerns appeared founded and an official investigation began.

After an intensive investigation, the CSC determined that Innovation was in violation of its charter school contract and was not operating in alignment with the school's stated educational program terms. The school's also experienced a significant leadership transition with the school's founders resigning from their roles. The school's board brought in an experienced

charter school operator as the new superintendent, who was charged with getting the school back on track. In an attempt to prevent disruption to student learning and to the larger community, a Stay of Stipulation agreement was put in place between the CSC and the school in order to give the school the ability to remedy its deficiencies. The agreement outlined what the school would need to do to avoid contract revocation. The school was subject to increased oversight and accountability through the 2018-19 and 2019-20 school year.

The school remained in compliance with the terms of the agreement, but began to experience enrollment challenges, despite a concerted effort to recruit new students. Ultimately the school's board determined that the enrollment challenges were insurmountable, particularly as the school navigated the COVID-19 pandemic. Then on April 29, 2021, the school announced that it would cease operations as a charter public school on June 16, 2021.

Spokane Public Schools – Authorizer Developments

During the 2020-2021 school year, two district-authorized charter schools (Pride Prep and Lumen High School) were in operation. These schools were subject to oversight from the district and the OSPI.

Pride Prep continued to grow by adding a new grade level each year and served over 700 students in the 6th through 12th grades in the 2020-21 school year. In the 2019-20 school year, Pride Prep had challenges in meeting certain performance indicators, but the implementation of action plans and increased monitoring lowered the authorizer's concerns. PRIDE Prep is working closely with the Spokane PS to improve areas of academic and financial concern. Because of the school's low academic performance on the winter 2020 WSIF (the most recent), Pride Prep did not meet the Washington State academic performance requirements. Pride Prep was notified in their Renewal Report (issued May 1, 2020) of their ineligibility for renewal status under RCW 28A.710.200 (2), unless they were able to demonstrate exceptional circumstances that the Authorizer finds justifiable. Pride Prep submitted a response to demonstrate exceptional circumstances on June 15, 2020, as well as a renewal application on July 1, 2020. The Spokane charter school authorizer determined that Pride Prep demonstrated exceptional circumstances that were deemed to be justifiable, and the Pride Prep charter contract was renewed on July 1, 2021 and will be in effect through June 2024.

Lumen High School completed planning and development in 2019-20 and commenced operations for the 2020-21 school year. Lumen High School is in downtown Spokane and serves pregnant and parenting teens in Spokane and the surrounding community. Lumen High School enrolled 31 students in grades 9 through 12 in the fall 2020 which was lower than anticipated. The school intends to serve 120 students at full capacity.

In order to sustain capacity, Spokane International Academy transferred to a site outside of the district boundary, and is currently authorized by the Washington State Charter School Commission, effective for the 2020-21 school year. The SBE approved the transfer in January 2020.

Funding Sufficiency for Charter Schools

In recent years, the legislature acted to increase state funding for education and eliminate school district reliance on local levy funds for basic education. The legislature intends that state funding for charter schools be distributed equitably with state funding provided for other public schools (RCW 28A.710.280(1)), but RCW 28A.710.030(3) does not entitle public charter schools to receive local levy funds. Charter schools receive state funding as specified through the prototypical school funding model on the same basis as traditional school districts although the monies originate from a different funding source.

Charter schools must report student enrollment to the OSPI in the same manner and based on the same definitions of enrolled students and annual average full-time equivalent enrollment as other public schools. OSPI allocates funding for charter schools including general apportionment, special education, categorical, and other non-basic education moneys in the same manner and based on the same funding formulas as school districts in the state. While the equitable funding of charter schools is the intent of the legislature, the charter public schools are not entitled to any local levy funds, nor do the schools have access to facilities or capital bonds, as do traditional public schools.

Public charter schools face three unique funding challenges with regard to funding.

- **Startup funding**: because funding is provided to charter public schools based on enrollment, there are substantial front-end costs that must be addressed through other sources (e.g., private philanthropy, local fundraising, federal grants, or some combination of these sources). This makes it challenging for schools to start-up, particularly as schools move from the planning phase to implementation, finding and outfitting a space, and hiring staff.
- **Capital funding**: public charter schools do not have access to local bonds or state capital funds typically used to finance the purchase of land and school construction. As a result, charter public schools generally acquire leased space paid for through their operating budget. Per the WA Charters and the CDC and because of the manner in which charter school funds are allotted, charter schools spend a substantial portion of their basic education allocation on facilities, which results in a reduction of the monies available to support teaching and learning.
- **Authorizer oversight fee**: Charter public schools receive an allotment through the OSPI based on student enrollment and the prototypical school funding model. For the purposes of the funding allotment, each charter public school is a local education agency. The state funding allotment, and any private funds received by the school must cover both capital and all operating costs. A portion of the per pupil funding allotment (three percent for both the CSC and Spokane PS authorizers) is also provided to the authorizer for specified oversight purposes outlined in RCW 28A.710.100.
- **Another concern**: identified by Spokane PS subsequent to their 2019 annual report relates to disbursement policies rather than sufficiency. A challenge stems from the fact

that apportionment is paid out unevenly across the 12 months. School districts receive a lower amount from the state in November and May because they receive tax levy dollars in those months, but charter public schools do not receive levy funds. This creates a significant cash flow challenge for charter school LEAs. These disparate payment percentages can result in a charter school LEA appearing to fail to meet financial performance indicators in those two months, where they would otherwise meet the indicators if the apportionment payment percentages were the same across all months.

Summary of Findings on Revenues and Expenditures

As was noted in the authorizer reports, these findings are based on the 2019-20 school year because the 2020-21 fiscal information had not yet been made publicly available at the time of this writing.

- In the 2019-20 school year, per student revenue for nearly all of the charter schools is approximately $1,000 to $5,000 lower that the home district when the Outside revenues (gifts, grants, donations, and support from foundations) are excluded.
- The charter school LEAs per student expenditure was a little higher than the home school district expenditure (approximately $17,500 vs. $16,250) because of outside grant funding and donations. However, the categorical spending by the charter school LEAs and home school districts are considerably different.
    - The charter school LEA Administration costs are substantially higher than the home school districts (approximately $3,275 vs. $2,000 per student).
    - The charter school LEA per student costs attributed to Maintenance and Operations are more than double that of the home school districts ($2,468 vs. $1,127).
    - The charter school LEA per student costs attributed to Teaching are substantially lower than the Teaching costs for the home school district (approximately $8,950 vs. $11,550).

SBE Review of Revenues

The SBE examined the 2019-20 revenues and expenditures reported on the OSPI Student Apportionment and Fiscal Services (SAFS) website for the charter LEAs and the home school districts. The most up to date version of the allocation of state funding to support the instructional program of basic education is described in RCW 28A.150.260. The basic education allocation or allotment is a dollar amount derived from the prototypical school model based on school district full time enrollment by grade level, and distributed to school districts each month

throughout the year. This review is limited to revenues coming from state, local and other sources and intentionally excludes the revenue contributions from federal sources.

The conclusions drawn from this preliminary evaluation of the efficacy of funding of charter schools are limited, and the reader should bear in mind that the level of comparison available is not equivalent. Each charter school is a Local Educational Agency (LEA), which in many respects is roughly equivalent to a school district for OSPI SAFS reporting. This means that for fiscal reporting, per pupil revenue (or expenditure) for a charter school is compared to per pupil revenue (or expenditure) for a school district. Such a comparison has the potential to be misleading in at least a couple of ways:

- A charter school serving high school grades (for example) is compared to a school district serving all grade levels. High school grades get a greater allocation than other grade levels, so it might appear that a charter high school is receiving a larger allocation than the home school district when, in fact, the per student allocation for the high school students is roughly equivalent.
- Individual charter school enrollment ranges from approximately 100 to 500 students, whereas the home districts for the majority of charter schools (Seattle PS, Spokane PS, and Tacoma SD) serve 30,000 to 55,000 students. When considering per student expenditures, regular school districts benefit from economy of scale as compared to the standalone charter school LEAs.

For purposes here, the following discussion uses the concept of "per pupil" and "per student" interchangeably. In addition, per student or per pupil revenues and expenditures are computed using the total dollar amount for a category divided by the number of full-time enrollment (FTE) reported by the OSPI on the SAFS webpage. The full-time enrollment will differ from the official count day enrollment data provided by the OSPI on the Washington State Report Card.

The OSPI publication titled *Organization and Financing of Washington's Public Schools (2020)* provides an overview of the manner in which K-12 public schooling is funded. The document describes the changes to how school districts were funded for school staff salaries in the 2017 and 2018 legislative sessions by the Washington Legislature. Most importantly, the document explains how the Legislature discontinued the "staff mix" factor after the 2017–18 school year and no longer provides funding to each school district for teacher salary and benefits tied to the teachers' education level and certificated years of experience.

For this analysis, revenues are described as coming from State sources, Local sources, or Outside sources. State revenues are subdivided into General Purpose Apportionment or Special Purpose revenue (Table 18). The State General Purpose Apportionment revenue represents the sum the basic apportionment, and add-ins for special education and for local effort assistance. The State Special Purpose revenue represents the sum of monies for special education services, learning assistance, bilingual education, highly capable services, food services, transportation operations, and other line items. In 2019-20, some school districts received additional state funding (e.g.

infant special education funds, institutional, child-care funding, pilot program funding, funding from other state agencies, and other assigned state monies) that the charter schools did not receive.

- Across the state, approximately 80 percent of the total per student revenue for a school district comes from the State General Purpose and the State Special Purpose Apportionment, while 67 percent of the total per student revenue for the charter school LEAs comes from the State General and Special Purpose Apportionments.
- The state apportionment is similar for the charter school LEAs and the home school districts, ranging from approximately $10K to $17K per student. Regarding the total State revenue (per student average), the apportionment for one charter school LEA is similar to the home school district, four charter school LEAs are lower than the home school district, and four charter school LEAs are higher than the home school district.

Table 18: summary of revenues (expressed as per pupil dollars) for the 2019-20 school year for the charter school LEAs and the home school districts.

District (LEA) Name	Total State Revenue $/Pupil	Total Local* Revenue $/Pupil	Outside** Revenue $/Pupil	Total Revenue Includes Outside** $/Pupil	Total Revenue Excludes Outside** $/Pupil
Rainier Prep	11,719	72	1.295	13,087	11,792
Highline SD	***12,944***	***2,457***	***53***	***15,524***	***15,472***
Summit Sierra	11,442	42	4,140	15,604	11,464
Summit Atlas	12,187	41	2,530	14,758	12,228
Rainier Valley	16,773	229	11,393	28,397	17,003
Seattle PS	***12,397***	***3,407***	***243***	***16,444***	***16,201***
PRIDE Prep	10,331	225	395	11,748	11,353
Spokane International	10,750	176	8,959	21,222	12,263
Spokane PS	***12,123***	***1,415***	***20***	***13,598***	***13,578***
Summit Olympus	13,428	15	4,928	18.371	13,443
Tacoma SD	***12,281***	***2,208***	***47***	***14,776***	***14,729***
Impact | Puget Sound	13,354	57	459	13,869	13,410
Tukwila SD	***12,802***	***2,361***	***115***	***15,285***	***15,170***
Innovations (Willow)	16,787	89	27,450	46,490	19,041
Walla Walla SD	***11,846***	***1,624***	***15***	***13,493***	***13,478***
Washington	***12.012***	***1,821***	***52***	***14,039***	***13,988***

*Note: total Local revenue amount excludes Outside revenues (Source Category 2500 - Gifts, Grants and Donations). **Note: Outside revenue includes Gifts, Grants and Donations (Source Category 2500 – Local Non-Tax Source) and support from Foundations (Source Category 8200 – Other Financial Revenues).

Local and Other revenues are divided into Local Property Tax, Local Non-Tax, and Other revenue categories by the OSPI. The Local Property Tax is just that, with small contributions from sale of property and timber excise tax. The Local Non-Tax is a broad category, in which the revenue is

the sum of miscellaneous tuition/fees, childcare tuition/fees, sales of good/services, school food sales, and the grouping of gifts, grants, and donations. The Other revenue is a catchall that includes monies from other governmental agencies, equipment sales, money transfers, and monies from private foundations. For this analysis, the grouping of gifts, grants, and donations and monies from private foundations is broken out as a separate revenue source (Outside Revenues) and described in the next section.

- Across the state, approximately 12.5 percent of the total per student revenue for a school district comes from the Local Tax and Local Non-Tax, categories. Less than two percent of the total per student revenue for a charter school LEA comes from the Local Tax and Local Non-Tax categories
- The average student support from the Local and Other revenue source is approximately $2400 for the home school districts and is approximately $105 for the charter school LEAs

Funding of School Staff

The state allocates funding for charter school LEAs in the same manner and based on the same prototypical funding formulas as the traditional public school districts. Charter schools report enrollments to the OSPI in the same manner as the public school districts, and then the enrollments are used to compute the annual average full-time equivalent number of students which dictates the number of allocated certificated instructional, certificated administrative and classified staff units. Based on the FTE and the corresponding staff determination, money is transferred to the school district or LEA at regular intervals throughout the school year.

State salary allocations are updated as necessary to provide market-rate salaries throughout the state, while regionalization adjustments are applied to reflect economic differences between school districts, such as housing costs for staff. Districts with median residential value exceeding the statewide average receive a regionalization factor of 1.00 to 1.24 in 0.06 increments.

Certificated instructional staff (CIS) unit salary allocations are calculated by multiplying the statewide salary allocation rate for CIS ($66,520 for 2019–20) times the school district's regionalization factor for that school year. Beginning in the 2019–20 school year, a 0.04 experience factor added for school districts with above-average education and experience for their certificated instructional staff.

School districts and charter schools are provided a predetermined amount of revenue for each staffing unit, but may actually staff a school differently. For example, the prototypical school model might allocate $665K for 10 teachers ($66,520 x 10) and the school might choose to employ 12 teachers at an average salary of $50K per year for a total expense of $600K. It would be acceptable to do this and use the remaining $65K for other expenses such as facilities costs. School districts and charter schools are afforded considerable latitude in the manner in which they spend their allocations, which has the potential to create substantial salary disparities between charter schools and the home school districts (Table 17).

- In every case, the average total salary for charter school instructional staff is approximately $4,650 to $32,400 lower than the salary allocation from the state.
- In every case, the average total salary for charter school instructional staff is approximately $16,400 to $44,136 lower than the average total salary paid by the home school district.

Table 17: shows the 2019-20 instructional staff salary allocation, average salary and differences by charter school and home school district.

Organization	Regionalization Adjustment* 2020	Salary Allocation 2020	Average Total Salary 2020	Allocation vs. Salary Difference* 2020	Charter/Home District Difference* 2020
Rainier Prep	1.18	$78,494	$58,213	-$20,281	-$27,709
Highline SD	***1.18***	***$78,494***	***$85,922***	***$7,428***	
Summit Sierra	1.18	$78,494	$68,808	-$9,686	-$21,406
Summit Atlas	1.18	$78,494	$73,837	-$4,657	-$16,377
Rainier Valley	1.18	$78,494	$46,078	-$32,416	-$44,136
Seattle PS	***1.18***	***$78,494***	***$90,214***	***$11,720***	
Spokane International Academy	1.06	$70,512	$53,834	-$16,678	-$34,079
PRIDE Prep Charter SD	1.06	$70,512	$56,388	-$14,124	-$31,525
Spokane PS	***1.06***	***$70,512***	***$87,913***	***$17,401***	
Summit Olympus	1.12	$74,503	$65,983	-$8,520	-$28,533
Tacoma SD	***1.12***	***$74,503***	***$94,516***	***$20,013***	
Impact | Puget Sound ES	1.18	$78,494	$62,037	-$16,457	-$32,291
Tukwila SD	***1.18***	***$78,494***	***$94,328***	***$15,834***	
Innovation Schools	1.00	$66,520	$57,624	-$8,896	-$21,029
Walla Walla SD	***1.04***	***$69,181***	***$78,653***	***$9,472***	

Note: the 2020 Regionalization Adjustment includes the experience adjustment. The Allocation vs. Salary Difference is computed as the Average Total Salary minus the Salary Allocation for 2020. A negative value means the Average Total Salary was lower than the Salary Allocation. A positive value means the Average Total Salary was greater than the Salary Allocation. The Charter/Home District Difference is computed as the charter school Average Total Salary minus the home school district Average Total Salary for 2020. A negative difference means that the Average Total Salary for the charter school was lower than the Average Total Salary for the home school district.

Outside Revenues: Grants, Donations, and Gifts for Charter Schools

Outside revenues includes monies from gifts, grants, and donations (source category = 2500) and private foundations (source category = 8200). This Outside revenue source is examined separately, an approach endorsed by the CSC in previous charter school reports. While the Outside revenues can be substantial for some charter schools (Table 18), the revenue source is most often awarded for a limited period and designated for a specific purpose (e.g. start-up

costs or building improvements). For example, the Washington Charter School Association (CSA) was awarded nearly $20M through the federal Charter Schools Program Grant. Most of the monies will be sub-granted to schools for the purpose of supporting the opening of new charter schools and expanding existing high-quality charter schools. Beginning in July 2020, the CSA awarded grants totaling $1.25M to $1.5M over five years to 11 charter schools opening or expanding school operations. These types of grants can increase revenues and expenditures by more than $3000 per student per year but are limited in scope and duration.

- Across the state, approximately $180 (0.9 percent of the total) per student revenue for a school district comes from Outside sources.
- For the charter school LEAs, approximately $6800 (25 percent on the total) per student revenue comes from Outside sources.

Table 18: shows some examples of the contributions, grants, and donations provided to charter schools. These do not include monies for charter schools affiliated with a charter management organization.

Charter School LEA	Fiscal Year Ending	Contributions and Grants
Spokane International	August 2019	$3,408,295
PRIDE Prep	August 2019	$526,373
Rainier Prep	August 2019 and 2020	$2.326,602
Innovations (Willow)	August 2018 and 2019	$1,556,280
Catalyst Public School	December 2019 and 2020	$2,551,172
Lumen High School	December 2019 and 2020	$1,405,574

Note: data come from the organizations' IRS Form 990 filing.

Total Revenue (Excluding Outside Revenue)

This preliminary analysis does not include Federal revenues, which increases revenues by an average of approximately $1,000 per pupil to the total revenue for both school districts and charter school LEAs. This amount represents approximately 6.0 percent of the total revenue for home school districts and 8.6 percent of the total for charter school LEAs.

This category includes State and Local revenue, while excluding Outside (gifts, grants, and donations (source category = 2500) and Private Foundations (source category = 8200)) revenues (Table 19). The charter school LEAs received an average revenue of approximately $12,900 per student, while the home school districts yield an average of approximately $14,800. Per student, revenue for most of the charter schools is approximately $1,000 to $5,000 lower than the home district after excluding the Outside revenues.

Table 19: summary of the 2019-20 per pupil revenues for school district and charter school LEAs. Dollar amounts shown are the average for home school districts and charter school LEAs.

District (LEA) Name	Total State Revenue $/Pupil	Total Local* Revenue $/Pupil	Outside** Revenue $/Pupil	Total Revenue Includes Outside** $/Pupil	Total Revenue Excludes Outside** $/Pupil
Charter School LEAs	12,495	107	4,262	17.132	12,869
Home School Districts	12,399	2,245	178	14,853	14,771

Note: the Total Local Revenue for charter school LEAs does not include the data for Innovations School, which was identified as an outlier.

SBE Review of Expenditures

Charter school LEA and school district expenditures are broken out into the categories of expenses attributed to Administration, Teaching, Maintenance and Operations, School Food Service, Student Transportation, and Other expenses (Table 20).

Administration expenditures include costs attributed to the board of directors, superintendent's office, business office, human resources, public relations, supervision of instruction, school principal's office, and supervision of food services, transportation, and maintenance and operations. The home school districts expend approximately $1,995 (12 percent of the total) per student on administration, while the charter school LEAs expend approximately $3,276 per student (25 percent of the per student total) on administration. The Rainier Valley and Innovations (Willow) schools posted the highest administration expenses (approximately $11,000 to $16,400 per student), which were identified as outliers and were excluded from the calculation of averages.

The Teaching expenditures include a wide range of activities attributed to instruction, which include but are not limited to learning resources, guidance and counseling, student health services, classroom instruction, extracurricular activities, professional learning, and curriculum. The charter school LEAs reported teaching expenditures far less than the home school districts (approximately $8,950 vs. $11,550) per student. All of the charter school LEAs (except for Innovations (Willow), which spent $4,400 more) spent approximately $1,600 to $5,500 per student less than the home school district.

The Maintenance and Operations expenditure category includes activities such as grounds maintenance, operations of buildings, building maintenance, cost of utilities, and costs attributed to building and property security. On average, the charter school LEAs spend more than double the amount (approximately $2,468 vs. $1,127) per student as the home school districts. The home school districts spend approximately 7.1 percent of total expenditures on Maintenance and Operations, while the charter school LEAs rate was 10.3 percent of the total per student expenditures.

Table 20: summary of expenditures (expressed as per pupil dollars) for the 2019-20 school year for the charter school LEAs and the home school districts.

District (LEA) Name	Total Admin. $/Pupil	Total Teaching $/Pupil	Maintenance Operations $/Pupil	School Food Service $/Pupil	Student Transport. $/Pupil	Other $/Pupil	Total $/Pupil
Rainier Prep	3,212	6,881	608	608	789	87	11,951
Highline SD	***2,170***	***12,209***	***1,081***	***399***	***316***	***460***	***16,634***
Summit Sierra	4,841	9,026	1,419	228	652	101	16,267
Summit Atlas	4,843	7,852	1,718	334	542	113	15,401
Rainier Valley	10,915	10,974	2,645	498	940	1,900	31,522
Seattle PS	***2,116***	***12,607***	***1,169***	***263***	***720***	***609***	***17,483***
PRIDE Prep	2,153	7,215	1,015	396	1066	1,684	13,529
Spokane Intl.	2,331	7,312	11,007	536	567	172	21,924
Spokane PS	***1,499***	***10,408***	***884***	***323***	***363***	***518***	***13,995***
Summit Olympus	7,307	9,148	2,187	259	101	160	19,162
Tacoma SD	***2,098***	***11,620***	***1,159***	***321***	***501***	***618***	***16,317***
Impact PS	3,276	7,600	2,629	617	304	196	14,621
Tukwila SD	***2,148***	***12,391***	***1,139***	***527***	***273***	***372***	***16,850***
Willow	16,390	14,535	3,877	2,513	70	761	38,144
Walla Walla SD	***1,938***	***10,103***	***1,333***	***476***	***271***	***522***	***14,642***
Charter Schools Average*	***3,276***	***8,949***	***2,468***	***405***	***559***	***227***	***17,493***
Home Districts Average	***1,995***	***11,556***	***1,127***	***367***	***407***	***545***	***16,256***
Washington	***1,819***	***10,590***	***978***	***332***	***482***	***459***	***14,660***

Note: school district and LEA expenditures exceed the revenues shown on Table 21 because the revenue amounts do not include federal funds and cash on hand at the start of the school year. *Outliers are not included in the Charter school average expenditure calculations.

The School Food Service expenditure category includes the cost of school food and food service operations. The home school districts spent approximately $367 (2.4 percent of the total) per student on School Food Service, which is similar to the state average of $323 (2.3 percent of the total) per student. The charter school LEAs spent a little more on school food service $405 (2.4 percent of the total) per student.

The Student Transportation expenditure category includes costs attributed to transportation operations, maintenance, and insurance. The charter school LEAs spent an average of approximately $559 (3.4 percent of the total) per student on transportation, while the home school districts spent approximately $407 (2.5 percent of the total) per student on transportation. Two charter school LEAs each spent approximately $1,000 per student on transportation.

The catchall category of Other expenditures includes but is not limited to costs attributed to certain insurance, information systems, printing, warehousing/distribution, motor pool, interest,

principal, debt service, and public activities. Most of the charter school LEAs spend approximately $100 to $7500 (0.7 to 2.0 percent of the total) per student expenditures and the home school districts spend approximately the same amount per student.

Total Expenditures

In the 2019-20 school year, the charter school LEAs expended approximately $17,493 per student (Table 21), which is approximately $1,200 higher than the home school districts expenditure of approximately $16,256. Charter school LEA per student costs attributed to Administration are more than 50 percent higher than that of the home school districts ($3,276 vs. $1,995). The charter school LEA per student costs attributed to Teaching are far less than the costs for the home school district ($8,949 vs. $11,556). The charter school LEA per student costs attributed to Maintenance and Operations are more than double the home school districts ($2,468 vs. $1,127). The expenditures related to Food Service, Student Transportation, and Other expenses for charter school LEAs ($1,191) and home school districts ($1,319) are similar.

Table 21: summary of the 2019-20 per pupil expenditures for home school district and charter school LEAs. Dollar amounts shown are the average for home school districts and charter school LEAs.

District (LEA) Name	Total Admin $/Pupil	Total Teaching $/Pupil	Maintenance Operations $/Pupil	School Food Service $/Pupil	Student Transport. $/Pupil	Other $/Pupil	Total $/Pupil
Charter School LEAs	3,276	8,949	2,468	405	559	227	17,493
Home School Districts	1,995	11,556	1,127	367	407	545	16,256

Charter school LEAs must budget for an expenditure not applicable to the traditional public school districts, the authorizer oversight fee. In the 2019-20 school year and as provided for in RCW 28A.710.110, the CSC collected three percent of the state funds allocated to the charter schools under the CSC authority, while the Spokane Public School collected four percent of the state funds allocated to the two charter schools under the Spokane's authority. The authorizer must use the oversight fee exclusively for fulfilling the authorizer's duties specified in statute, which include but are not limited to the following:

- Soliciting, evaluating, and approving charter applications,
- Monitoring the performance and legal compliance of charter schools,
- Determining whether each charter contract merits renewal, nonrenewal, or revocation.

Equitable Funding of Charter Schools

Two of the 21 essential components comprising the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools' model law are: 1) equitable operational funding and equal access to all state and federal categorical funding, and 2) equitable access to capital funding and facilities. Washington's Charter School Act is rated low on both of these components.

Equitable operational funding and equal access to all state and federal categorical funding is an important element of the model law. An equitable model means monies flow to the school in a timely fashion and in the same amount as district schools following eligibility criteria similar to all other public schools. The state's low rating likely reflects lower per student revenues resulting from the lack of a local (levy) funding stream. On a Likert-type (0 to 6) rating scale with "6" being the best, Washington was rated a "1". Exemplars include Colorado, Illinois, New Mexico, and Utah.

Equitable access to capital funding and facilities, including multiple provisions such as facilities funding, access to public space, and access to financing tools. On the "0" to "6" rating scale with a higher number indicating more equitable access, again, Washington was rated as a "1". Exemplars include California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, New Mexico, Tennessee, Texas, and Utah.

Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah are highlighted as exemplars of states providing equitable operation funding, equal access to all state and federal categorical funding, equitable access to capital funding, and equitable access to facility financing tools. More research is needed to learn more about exactly what sets the exemplars apart from lower rated state systems, like ours.

Efficacy of the Funding for Charter School Authorizers

In accordance with RCW 28A.710.110, the SBE has, through rulemaking, established a statewide formula for an authorizer oversight fee, not to exceed four percent of each charter school's annual funding (WAC 180-19-060. Under the new rule, the SBE sets the authorizer fee annually in consultation with the authorizers. The authorizer fee for the 2021-22 school year was set at three percent for both of the charter school authorizers.

State law (RCW 28A.710.110 (4)) stipulates that an authorizer must use its oversight fee exclusively for fulfilling its charter school authorizing duties (under RCW 28A.710.100). The Spokane PS suggests a statutory change that would allow more flexibility in the allowable uses of the authorizer fee to enable the authorizer to assist the charter schools in areas of mutual benefit to both the authorizer and the school if excess funds are available.

The National Alliance for Public Charter Schools cites Washington as an exemplar on the topic of adequate authorizer funding. Having a uniform statewide formula that guarantees annual authorizer funding that is not subject to annual legislative appropriations. The January 2021 rule

change should not negatively impact Washington's exemplar status because the authorizer fee cannot fall below a certain level and is mutually agreed upon by the authorizer and the SBE.

Section III - Recommended Changes to State Law or Policy

Charter School Commission

The Washington Charter School Commission provided four specific recommendations in order to improve the Charter School Act.

Washington State Charter School Commission Recommendations
Support any legislation that would re-open the authorizing window for charter schools to operate in Washington State, meeting the intent of the original citizen initiative and subsequent Charter School Act passed by the legislature.
Continue to explore the sufficiency of charter public school funding in combination with an authorizer's oversight fee. The oversight fee is a tax that only charter public school must pay and this increases the inequity of public funding between charter public schools and traditional public schools.
Clarify that a charter public school administrator can directly file complaints regarding certificated staff for immorality, violation of written contract, unprofessional conduct, intemperance, or crime against the law of the state directly to the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. Currently, charter public school administrator must file the complaint with their local Educational Service District who is then tasked with making the formal complaint to OSPI. Clarification of RCW 28A.410.090(1)(a) and (b) are required to make this change.
Consider updating RCW 28A.300.750(e)(i) and (ii) to include charter public authorizers. This would make it clear that charter public schools may seek a waiver from the State Board of Education regarding graduation requirements while respecting the role the authorizer plays in a charter public schools' existence.

Spokane Public Schools Charter Authorizer

Potential changes to RCW 28A.710 that the Spokane Charter School Authorizer believes would strengthen the state's charter schools and authorizing practices are as follow.

Spokane Charter School Authorizer Recommendations
28A.710.110(4): Increase the flexibility in the allowable use of the authorizer fee to enable the authorizer to assist the charter schools in areas of mutual benefit to both the authorizer and the school.
The timing of school district apportionment has lower payments in the months that levy dollars are received by traditional districts. Given charter schools do not receive levy dollars this creates cash flow challenges in those months. We would recommend evaluation of the payment schedule and make an adjustment to the payment schedule.

Over the most recent years, the Charter School Commission, Spokane Public School Authorizer, and the SBE have been identifying language in statute and rule that do not align with practice and a number of these were addressed in rule by the SBE. In January 2021, the Board approved changes to Chapter 180-19 WAC to align rule to current policy or practice, correct references to law, improve readability of the rule, align rule to SBE's recommendations in the annual charter school report, and make other changes identified by staff in collaboration with authorizers. As adopted, the final rules streamline the application process for authorizers, transition to a performance based authorizer fee structure, and adjust reporting dates to align with recent legislation.

The National Alliance for Public Charter Schools ranks Washington's Charter School Act as one of the strongest in the nation, but highlights two major weaknesses. First, the law includes a cap of 40 charter schools over the first five years after enactment of the Charter School Act, and the window to authorize new charter schools closed in spring 2021. The second perceived weakness is in regards to the inequitable funding for students in public charter schools. These two weaknesses are central to the recommendations being made this year and in previous years.

Authorizing Additional Charter Schools

Since the enactment of the 2016 Charter School Act, new charter schools opened in each school year. This is evidence that parents and educators continue to seek out alternatives to traditional public schools to find the best educational fit for their children. The Charter School Act allowed for the authorization of up to 40 schools within the first five years of the Act. After a handful of charter schools closed in the previous years, 16 charter schools are operating in the 2021-22 school year. The count of operating charter schools is well below the cap of 40 schools authorized in statute.

During the 2022 legislative session, Representative Entenman introduced legislation (HB 1962) that would extend the timeframe for establishing up to 40 total charter schools by another five years. In addition, Representative Dolan introduced legislation (HB 1591) that would provide local effort assistance funding to charter schools. Both bills died early in session without receiving a public hearing. However, amendments to the budget bills currently provide local effort assistance funding for charter schools. No additional charter schools will be approved or authorized unless the Legislature and the Governor pass and approve legislation to do so.

> **RECOMMENDATION 1: The SBE and CSC recommend that the window for authorization be extended to allow additional charter schools, up to 40 total, to operate in Washington.**

Funding of Charter Schools

The SBE finds that charter schools face unique challenges with regard to funding due to lack of access to public funding for capital and lower appropriation per student due to a lack of access to local funding. The CSC continues to advocate for more equitable student apportionment and access to public funding for capital expenditures to ensure the sustainability of charter schools over time.

The SBE supports equitable funding for all Washington students in public schools. When the school apportionment model fails to include locally sourced levy funding for charter schools, charter school funding differs from and is lower than the funding of traditional public schools.

RECOMMENDATION 2: The SBE recommends a close examination of the sufficiency of charter school funding and approaches used in other states in order to bring about equitable educational funding for all students.

Authorizer Oversight Fees and Usage

Another focus of recommendations over the last several years centers on the authorizer oversight fees. In January 2021 the SBE finalized rules authorizing the SBE to adjust the authorizer oversight fee rate in consultation with the charter school authorizers. After consulting with authorizers, the SBE set the authorizer oversight fee rate and three percent for the 2021-22 school year, a decrease from the rate of four percent used in the previous school year.

While consulting with charter school authorizers, three additional issues arose regarding the authorizer oversight fees. The legislature could consider taking action to address the three issues briefly described below.

- Issue 1: What would be necessary to make it allowable for authorizers to use the authorizer oversight fees for purposes other than those specified in statute, provided the other purposes directly benefit the charter schools under its authority?
- Issue 2: When a charter school contract is transferred from one authorizer to another, how could it be made allowable for the originating authorizer to transfer all or a portion of unused authorizer fees to the receiving authorizer?
- Issue 3: The oversight fee is an expenditure unique to the charter schools that is diverted from the state apportionment. It would be more equitable if the charter schools were to receive the full apportionment for its students and the authorizers receive their authorizer fees directly through a state funding stream.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Explore options to create more flexibility in the use of authorizer fees and/or direct appropriation to cover charter school oversight fees paid to authorizers.

Other Recommendations

The SBE notes that the charter school rules and statutes should undergo a thorough review. Given that no new schools may currently be authorized that review should prioritize oversight of and support for existing schools.

Appendix A: Detailed Performance Analysis

Part A: Academic Performance of the Charter Schools

On March 13, 2020, the Governor required the physical closure of all Washington school buildings as part of the COVID-19 public health emergency. Through a subsequent action on April 6, the Governor directed that both public and private schools remain physically closed through the regular 2019-20 school year. As a result, the OSPI cancelled spring 2020 summative statewide assessment administration after the USED approved the OSPI waiver request on March 27.

Many K-12 schools remained physically closed for the fall 2020 start of school due to the COVID pandemic and remained closed into the winter 2021. Many schools began to open their doors to students for in-person instruction in January 2021, while continuing to offer online instruction for those opting to do so. On March 21, 2021, the OSPI submitted a proposal to the U.S. Department of Education (ED) to, among other things, administer the spring 2021 statewide summative assessment to a representative sample of students to minimize the health risks to students. The ED did not agree to the OSPI sampling plan but authorized the OSPI to administer the spring 2021 assessment in fall 2021 and to administer shortened assessments.

The fall 2021 assessment administration was meant to represent student outcomes for the previous school year, so students sat for the grade level assessment for the grade they were enrolled in for the 2020-21 school year. For the spring 2022 administration, students will be assessed again, but this time on the grade level assessment in which they are currently enrolled. In the 2021-22 school year, students will sit for the statewide assessments twice in the same school year, once in the fall 2021 and again in the spring 2022. In mid-February 2022, the OSPI posted the school- and district-level results of the fall 2021 assessments to the Washington Report Card.

In the following tables, the percentage of students meeting standard on the content area assessments is shown for the charter schools and the corresponding home school district. To make the comparison more meaningful, the home school district data is for the same grade levels as the charter school. In other words, if a charter school tested students in the 7th and 8th grades only, the corresponding home school district data is also for the 7th and 8th grades only. In addition, the results for each are for the Smarter Balanced assessments and the Washington Comprehensive Assessments of Science (WCAS) only. Results from the WA-AIM are not included in the aggregations.

Innovation School (Willow) ceased operations at the end of the 2020-21 school, so no fall test rests are available. Impact | Salish Sea was open for the 2020-21 school year but did not serve students in the assessed grade levels.

Table A1: shows the fall 2021 assessment results for Catalyst Public School and the home school district.

Student Group	Catalyst PS ELA	Catalyst PS Math	Catalyst PS Science	Bremerton SD ELA	Bremerton SD Math	Bremerton SD Science
All Students	**52.9%**	**39.2%**	**60.0%**	**35.1%**	**17.3%**	**50.9%**
Native American or Alaskan	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.
Asian	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	47.3%	35.5%	61.5%
Black African American	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	41.7%
Hispanic or Latinx	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	24.8%	10.5%	31.1%
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	61.5%
White	57.4%	44.1%	65.7%	45.0%	23.3%	62.3%
Two or More Races	50.0%	21.4%	N.D.	26.3%	11.9%	50.0%
English Learners	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<10%	<10%	13.8%
Low-Income	42.1%	36.8%	66.7%	28.8%	11.6%	44.3%
Students with Disabilities	18.8%	18.8%	N.D.	11.3%	15.0%	22.2%

Notes: Catalyst PS is the shortened version of Catalyst Public School and Bremerton is the home school district. N.D. means No Data most often due to data suppression techniques applied to protect student identifying information. In other cases, data suppression is evident when the less than (<) or greater than (>) symbol is used. Data from the Washington State Report Card and the OSPI Data Portal.

Table A2: shows the fall 2021 assessment results for Rainier Valley and the home school district.

Student Group	Rainier Valley ELA	Rainier Valley Math	Rainier Valley Science	Seattle PS ELA	Seattle PS Math	Seattle PS Science
All Students	**36.4%**	**9.9%**	**23.0%**	**59.6%**	**40.8%**	**44.9%**
Native American or Alaskan	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	37.7%	27.5%	33.1%
Asian	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	60.9%	47.0%	45.6%
Black African American	35.7%	8.3%	21.4%	27.2%	9.6%	17.7%
Hispanic or Latinx	23.1%	<10%	N.D.	37.6%	19.2%	27.5%
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	32.0%	<10%	<10%
White	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	74.7%	54.2%	58.2%
Two or More Races	41.7%	25.0%	N.D.	65.7%	47.0%	49.9%
English Learners	<10%	<10%	N.D.	9.0%	4.7%	8.8%
Low-Income	31.2%	9.1%	15.8%	32.5%	15.0%	23.7%
Students with Disabilities	<10%	<10%	<10%	30.3%	15.6%	22.3%

Notes: Rainier Valley is the shortened version of Rainier Valley Leadership Academy and the home school district is Seattle Public Schools. N.D. means No Data most often due to data suppression techniques applied to protect student identifying information. In other cases, data suppression is evident when the less than (<) or greater than (>) symbol is used. Data from the Washington State Report Card and the OSPI Data Portal.

Table A3: shows the fall 2021 assessment results for Impact Puget Sound and the home school district.

Student Group	Impact PS ELA	Impact PS Math	Impact PS Science	Tukwila SD ELA	Tukwila SD Math	Tukwila SD Science
All Students	**56.2%**	**56.9%**	**N.D.**	**23.3%**	**19.2%**	**N.D.**
Native American or Alaskan	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.
Asian	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	30.2%	34.0%	N.D.
Black African American	44.7%	48.6%	N.D.	23.5%	11.8%	N.D.
Hispanic or Latinx	64.3%	71.4%	N.D.	11.3%	6.5%	N.D.
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	30.0%	<10%	N.D.
White	72.7%	72.7%	N.D.	33.3%	28.6%	N.D.
Two or More Races	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	33.3%	33.3%	N.D.
English Learners	38.9%	41.2%	N.D.	8.6%	11.1%	N.D.
Low-Income	49.0%	52.1%	N.D.	19.2%	15.4%	N.D.
Students with Disabilities	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<10%	<10%	N.D.

Notes: Impact PS is the shortened version of Impact | Puget Sound ES and the home school district is Tukwila. N.D. means No Data most often due to data suppression techniques applied to protect student identifying information. In other cases, data suppression is evident when the less than (<) or greater than (>) symbol is used. Data from the Washington State Report Card and the OSPI Data Portal.

Table A4: shows the fall 2021 assessment results for Lumen High School and the home school district.

Student Group	Lumen HS ELA	Lumen HS Math	Lumen HS Science	Spokane PS ELA	Spokane PS Math	Spokane PS Science
All Students	**20.0%**	**<10%**	**50.0%**	**43.3%**	**18.9%**	**32.1%**
Native American or Alaskan	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	25.4%	<10%	14.9%
Asian	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	56.0%	32.5%	36.5%
Black African American	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	24.3%	<5%	18.8%
Hispanic or Latinx	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	32.3%	9.9%	26.3%
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<10%	<10%	<10%
White	N.D.	N.D.	70.0%	49.0%	22.8%	36.6%
Two or More Races	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	36.5%	15.3%	24.6%
English Learners	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<5%	<5%	5.4%
Low-Income	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	30.6%	10.0%	23.6%
Students with Disabilities	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	9.5%	2.2%	7.9%

Notes: Lumen HS is the shortened version of Lumen High School and the home school district is Spokane Public Schools. N.D. means No Data most often due to data suppression techniques applied to protect student identifying information. In other cases, data suppression is evident when the less than (<) or greater than (>) symbol is used. Data from the Washington State Report Card and the OSPI Data Portal.

Table A5: shows the fall 2021 assessment results for PRIDE Prep and the home school district.

Student Group	PRIDE Prep ELA	PRIDE Prep Math	PRIDE Prep Science	Spokane PS ELA	Spokane PS Math	Spokane PS Science
All Students	**35.2%**	**15.1%**	**47.5%**	**46.2%**	**24.5%**	**39.6%**
Native American or Alaskan	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	25.0%	<10%	23.2%
Asian	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	55.8%	38.7%	47.4%
Black African American	20.0%	<10%	<10%	31.5%	<10%	22.7%
Hispanic or Latinx	29.3%	5.3%	42.5%	35.4%	14.6%	33.5%
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	12.5%	<10%	<10%
White	17.8%	52.3%	38.1%	52.0%	18.3%	44.8%
Two or More Races	26.9%	9.6%	33.3%	38.1%	29.1%	30.4%
English Learners	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<5%	<5%	7.0%
Low-Income	29.2%	10.1%	40.9%	32.1%	13.0%	29.5%
Students with Disabilities	7.1%	<4%	33.3%	10.9%	3.3%	11.4%

Notes: PRIDE Prep is the shortened version of PRIDE Prep Academy and the home school district is Spokane Public Schools. N.D. means No Data most often due to data suppression techniques applied to protect student identifying information. In other cases, data suppression is evident when the less than (<) or greater than (>) symbol is used. Data from the Washington State Report Card and the OSPI Data Portal.

Table A6: shows the fall 2021 assessment results for Rainier Prep and the home school district.

Student Group	Rainier Prep ELA	Rainier Prep Math	Rainier Prep Science	Highline SD ELA	Highline SD Math	Highline SD Science
All Students	**47.9%**	**21.3%**	**58.0%**	**30.6%**	**15.4%**	**40.2%**
Native American or Alaskan	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	16.7%
Asian	47.6%	28.6%	N.D.	41.7%	26.7%	54.9%
Black African American	48.1%	18.6%	62.0%	24.4%	8.7%	41.2%
Hispanic or Latinx	38.1%	16.5%	55.6%	19.9%	7.5%	27.5%
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	15.9%	<7%	12.5%
White	>90%	45.5%	N.D.	52.6%	33.1%	63.5%
Two or More Races	80.0%	60.0%	N.D.	37.1%	16.5%	45.9%
English Learners	13.0%	<3%	32.0%	4.6%	<2%	14.0%
Low-Income	43.8%	20.3%	55.0%	22.5%	9.0%	34.3%
Students with Disabilities	12.0%	<10%	N.D.	9.9%	5.2%	14.2%

Notes: Rainier Prep is the shortened version of Rainier Prep Academy and the home school district is Highline. N.D. means No Data most often due to data suppression techniques applied to protect student identifying information. In other cases, data suppression is evident when the less than (<) or greater than (>) symbol is used. Data from the Washington State Report Card and the OSPI Data Portal.

Table A7: shows the fall 2021 assessment results for Spokane International Academy and the home school district.

Student Group	SIA ELA	SIA Math	SIA Science	Spokane PS ELA	Spokane PS Math	Spokane PS Science
All Students	**53.7%**	**35.9%**	**62.7%**	**47.0%**	**30.0%**	**47.4%**
Native American or Alaskan	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	26.9%	<10%	28.6%
Asian	73.3%	60.0%	N.D.	51.7%	40.8%	57.9%
Black African American	38.5%	38.5%	N.D.	32.3%	<14%	25.2%
Hispanic or Latinx	33.3%	23.3%	N.D.	35.3%	19.7%	36.4%
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<10%	<10%	9.3%
White	56.9%	38.1%	67.3%	52.9%	35.0%	54.4%
Two or More Races	55.1%	28.6%	66.7%	39.3%	23.3%	37.1%
English Learners	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<10%	<5%	7.3%
Low-Income	43.6%	29.7%	56.1%	32.6%	17.3%	34.3%
Students with Disabilities	17.5%	<8%	40.0%	14.5%	7.2%	13.5%

Notes: SIA is the shortened version of Spokane International Academy and the home school district is Spokane Public Schools. N.D. means No Data most often due to data suppression techniques applied to protect student identifying information. In other cases, data suppression is evident when the less than (<) or greater than (>) symbol is used. Data from the Washington State Report Card and the OSPI Data Portal.

Table A8: shows the fall 2021 assessment results for Summit Atlas and the home school district.

Student Group	Summit Atlas ELA	Summit Atlas Math	Summit Atlas Science	Seattle PS ELA	Seattle PS Math	Seattle PS Science
All Students	**52.8%**	**28.5%**	**51.4%**	**59.6%**	**40.8%**	**44.9%**
Native American or Alaskan	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	37.7%	27.5%	33.1%
Asian	52.9%	47.1%	60.0%	60.9%	47.0%	45.6%
Black African American	39.6%	15.4%	34.8%	27.2%	9.6%	17.7%
Hispanic or Latinx	40.3%	24.2%	35.1%	37.6%	19.2%	27.5%
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	32.0%	<10%	<10%
White	65.9%	34.1%	67.2%	74.7%	54.2%	58.2%
Two or More Races	60.4%	37.7%	62.5%	65.7%	47.0%	49.9%
English Learners	20.8%	12.5%	25.8%	9.0%	4.7%	8.8%
Low-Income	39.4%	16.1%	31.3%	32.5%	15.0%	23.7%
Students with Disabilities	24.1%	13.8%	35.1%	30.3%	15.6%	22.3%

Notes: Summit Atlas is the shortened version of Summit Public School: Atlas and the home school district is Seattle Public Schools. N.D. means No Data most often due to data suppression techniques applied to protect student identifying information. In other cases, data suppression is evident when the less than (<) or greater than (>) symbol is used. Data from the Washington State Report Card and the OSPI Data Portal.

Table A9: shows the fall 2021 assessment results for Summit Olympus and the home school district.

Student Group	Summit Olympus ELA	Summit Olympus Math	Summit Olympus Science	Tacoma SD ELA	Tacoma SD Math	Tacoma SD Science
All Students	**48.4%**	**10.0%**	**43.4%**	**35.3%**	**12.8%**	**25.9%**
Native American or Alaskan	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	23.4%	<10%	13.2%
Asian	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	39.1%	19.5%	25.8%
Black African American	42.3%	<10%	33.3%	20.3%	3.8%	13.1%
Hispanic or Latinx	54.8%	12.9%	43.3%	26.9%	<5%	17.6%
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	12.5%	<5%	8.3%
White	47.1%	<10%	N.D.	48.1%	20.6%	37.2%
Two or More Races	54.5%	27.3%	56.3%	34.5%	10.1%	26.5%
English Learners	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	5.9%	<5%	4.0%
Low-Income	45.5%	<6%	32.6%	24.5%	5.9%	18.3%
Students with Disabilities	<10%	N.D.	33.3%	12.4%	1.5%	8.0%

Notes: Summit Olympus is the shortened version of Summit Public School: Olympus and the home school district is Tacoma School District. N.D. means No Data most often due to data suppression techniques applied to protect student identifying information. In other cases, data suppression is evident when the less than (<) or greater than (>) symbol is used. Data from the Washington State Report Card and the OSPI Data Portal.

Table A10: shows the fall 2021 assessment results for Summit Sierra and the home school district.

Student Group	Summit Sierra ELA	Summit Sierra Math	Summit Sierra Science	Seattle PS ELA	Seattle PS Math	Seattle PS Science
All Students	**53.8%**	**23.6%**	**50.0%**	**54.9%**	**34.4%**	**33.9%**
Native American or Alaskan	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	31.3%	<20%	26.1%
Asian	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	57.7%	41.4%	34.0%
Black African American	40.0%	8.9%	35.3%	25.6%	6.8%	11.5%
Hispanic or Latinx	37.0%	<10%	32.1%	35.2%	15.1%	18.9%
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<25%	<10%	<10%
White	73.5%	50.0%	76.9%	68.4%	45.7%	45.4%
Two or More Races	52.4%	19.0%	36.4%	62.7%	43.1%	39.8%
English Learners	34.6%	<10%	13.0%	9.8%	4.3%	3.3%
Low-Income	35.6%	8.9%	27.7%	31.1%	12.5%	15.6%
Students with Disabilities	38.7%	19.4%	41.2%	26.8%	11.5%	13.4%

Notes: Summit Sierra is the shortened version of Summit Public School: Sierra and the home school district is Seattle Public Schools N.D. means No Data most often due to data suppression techniques applied to protect student identifying information. In other cases, data suppression is evident when the less than (<) or greater than (>) symbol is used. Data from the Washington State Report Card and the OSPI Data Portal.

Limitations

Because students in the charter schools differ from the students in the home school districts, simply comparing the test results of students enrolled in a charter school to results for students in the home school district or another traditional public school would be misleading. In choosing to attend a charter school, the students demonstrate the motivation to seek an educational opportunity outside the norm, an educational alternative making them different from peers in traditional public schools. With the knowledge that the students are different, it becomes impossible to know whether test score differences reflect the student differences or something about the school.

Another limiting factor is that the assessment results pulled from the Washington State Report Card and reported on here do not provide any information about the length of time spent in the home school district or the charter school, just that the test record came from that entity. Therefore, the attribution of scores to one entity over another may not be entirely appropriate. In a larger school district, these records have little impact when averaging. However, for a charter school with lower student counts, every student record has greater impact on the overall performance.

Part B: Performance of Charter School Students and Similar TPS Students.

Methodology

RCW 28A.710.250 (2) requires that the charter school performance include a comparison of the academic performance of students at charter schools to demographically and academically similar TPS students. The best manner in which to generate causal estimates of program effects would be to analyze the educational outcomes of lottery-generated, randomly selected, charter school attendees in comparison to those students not selected through the over-subscribed charter school lottery. The Washington Charter School Association (WSCA) reported that a number of charter schools were oversubscribed at some point in their operations and conducted lotteries to select enrollment for some grades. However, the inconsistent need to conduct lotteries and the unavailability of lottery results make it impossible to use lottery selection as a basis for the group analyses.

When the random selection of participants is not possible, the next best approach (as used here) is to control for differences between charter school and TPS students in a study relying on student-to-student matching. The overarching idea of such a design is to create two groups differing only by charter school enrollment status and then to analyze the performance of the groups on the assessments and other metrics. Any difference in performance is evidence of but not proof that attending a traditional public school versus a charter school is associated with a different performance on an educational outcome.

> It is very important to note that these findings are **non-causal** because the design does not include randomized group assignment and does not take into

account other confounding factors. It would be misleading to report that attending a charter school **causes** or **results** in a higher performance on educational outcomes. For this reason, we use non-causal terminology (e.g., associated, related, and correlated) to describe the result that attending a charter school is **associated** with a higher performance on educational outcomes.

Even this non-causal approach makes it possible to estimate the strength of the relationship between charter school attendance and the outcome measures. However, even with the most precise matching protocol, some selection bias will always exist because the students making up the matched groups will differ in unobservable ways. Differences in group performance could be attributable to unobserved student traits, but could also be attributable to other confounding factors not considered in this report, some of which include the following:

- Differences in educator quality or effectiveness,
- Differences in educational materials, technology, and other facilities of the school,
- Differences in student engagement and or parent/guardian engagement,
- Differences in student motivation,
- Differences in access to and attendance of before- and after-school support programs and other enrichment activities, and
- Differences in the curriculum delivered and the learning opportunities provided to students.

In the design, a comparison group was created following a student-by-student matching process to be as identical as possible to the treatment group of charter school students (Appendix A). In such a design, each charter school student is matched to or paired with a demographically and academically similar TPS student ("TPS twin"), followed by the evaluation of group means using the Independent Samples *t*-Test or the nonparametric Mann-Whitney U-Test. The effect size of the difference is reported as Cohen's *d* or eta squared, depending on the statistical test.

- The treatment group is comprised of students enrolled in charter schools.
- The comparison group is comprised of demographically and academically similar students enrolled in a traditional public school (TPS) usually, but not always, in the charter schools' home district.

Changes in Reporting from Previous Years

This report summarizes the results for each of the three most recent standard assessment administrations (2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19) to assess performance patterns, and the results of the aggregation of those three years to evaluate group performance differences.

In the results that follow, the performance of the groups is described as being different or similar. It is important to understand that differences in the performance between two groups

typically exist, may appear to be quite large, and yet, be characterized as similar. In other cases, scores can appear to be similar, the difference between the averages may be quite small, and be indicative of a different performance. The nature or the distribution of the data or scores for smaller *vs*. larger groups explains the paradox.

> A **similar** performance describes group means that do **not differ statistically.** The data tables that follow include a row showing the mean difference as a positive or negative value. More often than not, a mean difference exists, but the analyses so not show with a high degree of confidence that the difference is related to the test variable after evaluating the distribution and number of scores.
>
> When the performance of the groups is **different,** the group means were **statistically different**. In this case, the researcher can say with a high degree of confidence that the difference is related in some way to the test variable after evaluating the distribution and number of scores. Statistically different outcome measures are noted by the presence of a double asterisk (**).

Data Sources and Data Processing

The Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) Office of School Information provided the SBE with separate de-identified student enrollment, assessment, absence, exclusionary discipline, and SGP data files for the 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19, school years to complete the required analyses. The assessment files provided by the OSPI contained results for the Washington Access to Instruction and Measurement (WA-AIM) and the statewide Smarter Balanced assessments. A very small percentage of students at charter schools participated in the WA-AIM, the assessment for selected students with severe disabilities. The WA-AIM differs greatly from the SBA and WA-AIM scores vary considerably based on disability type, Because of this, the SBE made the decision to exclude the WA-AIM results from the analyses presented here. The findings in Part B come solely from the SBA ELA and math and the WCAS science assessments for the charter school and TPS student groups. Group mean differences were evaluated using the Independent Samples *t*-Test and the Mann-Whitney *U* Test. The group differences are reported as follows.

- A statistically similar performance between groups is a *t*-test of the group means resulting in a value of $p > 0.050$. In this case, the researcher cannot reject the null hypothesis of no difference between the means. **The researcher must conclude that the means do not differ and the performance is statistically similar.**
- A statistically different performance between groups is a *t*-test of the group means resulted in a value of $p \leq 0.050$. In this case, the researcher rejects the null hypothesis of no difference between the means. **The researcher concludes that the means differ and the performance is statistically different.**

While it is important to report on the statistical significance of group means in work of this nature, it is at least equally important to quantify the magnitude of the effect associated with the treatment or experimental variable (Table A11). When reporting on *t*-test results, Cohen's *d* is a standardized measure of effect size, which provides additional context regarding the magnitude of the difference between group means. For the Independent Samples *t*-test, Cohen's *d* is the mean difference between the two groups, divided the result by the pooled standard deviation. Results are characterized as "practically significant" when the difference is medium or large.

This work also relies on the Washington student growth percentiles (SGPs) as the method to determine the relative amount of learning a student makes during a school year. The SGP describes a student's growth compared to other students with similar prior test scores. The growth model data provides important information about the performance of academically similar students. Because SGP calculations require at least two years of assessment results, ELA and math SGPs are available for students in the 4th through 8th grades only. The OSPI created materials describing the Washington growth model for the public and school staff, which are available on the OSPI website.

Table A11: describes the effect size (Cohen's *d)* provides additional context as to the practical significance or meaningfulness of an experimental treatment.

Cohen's *d* From	**Cohen's *d* To**	**Description of Effect Size from the Experimental Variable**
	≤ 0.20	Effect from the treatment is trivial, negligible, or very small
0.20	< 0.50	Effect from the treatment is small.
0.50	< 0.80	Effect from the treatment is medium.
≥ 0.80		Effect from the treatment is large.

A student growth percentile (SGP) is a derived percentile value or rank, and when aggregated, SGPs are reported as a median value, which usually differs from the mean (average) value. Group differences in SGP medians and measures not meeting the parametric assumptions were evaluated through the Mann-Whitney *U* Test of medians. Eta squared is the measure of effect size providing additional context regarding the magnitude of the difference between group medians (Table A12). For the Mann-Whitney *U*-test, the eta squared effect size is $Z^2/(N-1)$.

Table A12: describes the effect size (eta squared) and provides additional context as to the practical significance or meaningfulness of an experimental treatment.

Eta squared From	Eta squared To	Description of Effect Size from the Experimental Variable
	≤ 0.01	Effect from the treatment is trivial, negligible, or very small
0.01	< 0.06	Effect from the treatment is small.
0.06	< 0.14	Effect from the treatment is medium.
≥ 0.14		Effect from the treatment is large.

This work primarily relies on the statewide assessments in ELA and math developed by the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC). Based on the items answered correctly, a scale score of approximately 2300 to 2800 is assigned to each student. A scale score of approximately 2425 to 2675 (depending on grade level and content area) is required to meet standard or be deemed as proficient. On the science assessments, scale scores range from approximately 340 to 1190 and a scale score of 700 is required to meet standard or be deemed as proficient. Because the range of scale scores differs by grade level, it is valuable to evaluate for scale score differences by grade level in addition to the whole group.

In addition to the average scale score by group, the scale score mean difference provides a meaningful measure of charter school, student performance in comparison to the TPS student performance. The mean difference is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school group. A negative mean difference indicates that the mean scale score for the treatment group (charter school students) was higher than the mean scale score for the comparison group (TPS students). A positive mean difference indicates that the mean scale score for the treatment group (charter school students) was lower than the mean scale score for the comparison group (TPS students).

The Independent Samples *t*-Tests and Mann-Whitney *U*-Tests determined whether the treatment group (charter school students) performed differently than the comparison group (TPS students) on the statewide ELA, math, and science assessments. For the analyses in Part B, the comparison and treatment groups are aggregated from all of the charter schools. In other words, all of the charter school students are combined into one large group to assess for overall group differences.

Design and Statistical Methods

The overarching idea of the design is to create two groups differing only by charter school enrollment status and then to analyze the performance of the groups on the assessments. Any difference in performance may then be associated to attending a traditional public school versus

a charter school. However, differences in performance can also be attributed to other factors not considered here, some of which include the following:

- Differences in educator quality or effectiveness,
- Differences in educational materials, technology, and other facilities of the school,
- Differences in student engagement and or parent/guardian engagement,
- Differences in access to and attendance of before- and after-school support programs and other enrichment activities, and
- Differences in the curriculum delivered and the learning opportunities provided to students.

In the design, a comparison group was created following a student-by-student matching process to be as identical as possible to the treatment group of charter school students. In such a design, each charter school student is matched to or paired with a demographically similar TPS student ("TPS twin") and the group means are then compared using the Independent Samples *t*-Test.

- The treatment group is comprised of students enrolled in charter schools with valid scores for either or both of the Smarter Balanced (SBA) English language arts (ELA) and mathematics assessments. Most, but not all of the treatment group members, also have valid results for the Washington Comprehensive Assessment of Science (WCAS) in the grade levels, which are tested.
- A comparison group comprised of demographically and academically similar students enrolled in traditional public schools (TPS) was created through a one-by-one matching process.

Exact matching criteria included grade level, gender, federal race and ethnicity coding, Free and Reduced Price Lunch program (FRL) status, English Learner (EL) status, and special education (SWD) status (Figure A16). The matching criteria included prior year SBA scale scores in ELA and math. In order to be matched or paired, the ELA or math scores could not differ by more than 25 scale score points, which is relatively small as typical SBA scores range from approximately 2200 to 2600.

Other matching criteria considered in the protocol included Section 504 status, the aggregated number of absences during the school year, the number of exclusionary discipline events, the number of days out of school related to exclusionary disciplinary events, and the language spoken at home. In the matching process, each student's home district was considered and used as matching criteria. As examples, a student at a Spokane charter school was matched to a similar student in a Spokane TPS, and a student at a Tacoma charter school was matched to a similar student in a Tacoma TPS and each would have scored approximately the same on the ELA and math assessments in the prior year. In some instances, the matched TPS student attended school in a different, but nearby school district.

Table A13: shows the matching criteria used in creating the control group of TPS students.

Matching Criteria	3rd Grade Students	4th to 8th Grade Students	10th Grade Students*	11th Grade Students*
Grade	Yes, exact	Yes, exact	Yes, exact	Yes, exact
Gender	Yes, exact	Yes, exact	Yes, exact	Yes, exact
Race/Ethnicity	Yes, exact	Yes, exact	Yes, exact	Yes, exact
Low Income (FRL) Status	Yes, exact	Yes, exact	Yes, exact	Yes, exact
English Learner (EL) Status	Yes, exact	Yes, exact	Yes, exact	Yes, exact
Special Education (SWD) Status	Yes, exact	Yes, exact	Yes, exact	Yes, exact
Previous Assessment Results	No	Yes, prior year (+/- 25 points)	Yes, two yrs. prior (+/- 25 points)	No
Number of Days Out of School*	Yes, approximately the same	Yes, approximately the same	Yes, approximately the same	Yes, approximately the same
Home Language	Yes, exact or similar	Yes, exact or similar	Yes, exact or similar	Yes, exact or similar
Home School District	Yes, exact or nearby	Yes, exact or nearby	Yes, exact or nearby	Yes, exact or nearby

*Note: The 10th grade matching based on two-year prior assessment history was limited to the 2018-19 school year only due to data accessibility. The 11th grade matching criteria are for the science assessment results only. The number of days out of school is the sum of days absent and days related to exclusionary discipline events.

Unfortunately, not all charter school students could be matched or paired based on exactly the same criteria (Table A13) but most are matched or paired on similar criteria. For purposes here, four distinct groups result when the matching criteria are applied to the charter school enrollees.

- Because the 3rd grade is the first year of statewide testing, students do not have previous assessment results from which to establish academic peers.
- Because 9th graders are not assessed, academic peers for the 10th graders were established on the basis of 8th grade testing two years prior, but only for the 2018-19 10th graders due to data availability.
- Science testing occurs every three years (5th, 8th, and 11th grades) which is not conducive to establishing academic peers based on prior science assessment results.

Table A14 and Table A15 show that the demographic characteristics of the comparison group (TPS students) are identical to the demographic characteristics of the treatment group (charter school students). Table A16 shows that the attendance patterns for each group is essentially the same and that the comparison and treatment groups are academically similar as indicated by the average prior ELA and math scores.

Table A14: Race and ethnicity composition of the comparison and treatment student groups for the 3rd through 10th grade students addressed in this analysis.

Student Group*	Native Amer. (%)	Asian (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	White (%)	Pacific Islander (%)	Two or More (%)
Comparison Group (TPS Students)	1.1	4.7	23.0	17.5	44.5	0.6	8.7
Treatment Group (Charter School Students)	1.1	4.7	23.0	17.5	44.5	0.6	8.7

Note: "Native Amer." is the shortened name for Native American or Alaskan and "Pacific Islander" is the shortened name for Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander.

Table A15: Program participation, attendance, and prior score patterns for the comparison and treatment groups for the 3rd through 10th grader students addressed in this analysis.

Student Group	FRL (%)	EL (%)	SWD (%)	Section 504 (%)	Days Out of School* (M)	Average Prior ELA Score	Average Prior Math Score
Comparison Group (TPS Students)	58.9	11.0	12.4	3.4	10.5	2522.3	2524.8
Treatment Group (Charter School Students)	58.9	11.0	12.4	3.4	10.4	2523.1	2526.4

*Note: the days out of school is the sum of absences and exclusionary discipline days. Absences data comes from the student absence file, which describes each absence as excused or unexcused and full day or part day. For this work, no distinction was made between excused or unexcused absences. Full day absences were coded as 1.0 day and a part day absence was coded as 0.25 days. The total days absent were summed from the individual absence events.

A number of charter school students with valid SBA results could not be matched with a TPS student due to an unusual number of days out of school in combination with other matching criteria. In addition, a number of matches were impossible to make as the required coding (e.g. race/ethnicity or FRL status) was not included in the various data files. For both the comparison and treatment groups, approximately 95 percent of the students were continuously enrolled in the school for the academic year. Student results were included in this comparison regardless of the continuously enrolled status in a manner similar to the Washington State Report Card reporting.

Data from the Statistical Analyses

English Language Arts (ELA) Results

On the three-year aggregation of statewide ELA assessment results, the charter school students group performed statistically higher than the TPS student group (Table A16). However, the effect sizes for each of the measures indicate a negligible or very small effect associated with attendance at a charter school.

- The charter school students group posted a different and higher average scale score than the TPS student group (2564 vs. 2556).
- The proficiency rate for the charter school group was different and higher than the TPS group rate (61.3 vs. 58.5 percent).
- The median SGP for the charter school students group was different and higher than the TPS group median SGP (53 vs. 56).

Table A16: summary of the differences for the ELA measures from the spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019 statewide assessments for 3rd to 10 grade students based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Assessments	Scale Score**	Percent Proficient**	Growth Model (SGPs)**
TPS Group	2556.1	58.5	53.0
Charter School Group	2563.7	61.3	56.0

**Note: the double asterisk denotes the assessment measures where the group performances were statistically different.

Mathematics Results

On the three-year aggregation of statewide math assessment results, the charter school students group performed statistically higher than the TPS student group (Table A17). The effect sizes for each of the measures indicate a negligible or very small effect associated with attendance at a charter school.

- The charter school students group posted an average score different and approximately nine scale score points higher than the TPS student group (2549 vs. 2540).
- The proficiency rate for the charter school students group is different and higher than the proficiency rate for the TPS group (45.5 vs. 49.0).
- The SGP median for the charter school group is different and higher than the TPS student group median SGP (57 vs. 49).

Table A17: summary of the differences for the math measures from the spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019 statewide assessments for 3rd to 10 grade students based on charter school enrollment.

Math Assessments	Scale Score**	Percent Proficient**	Growth Model (SGPs)**
TPS Group	2540.4	45.5	49.0
Charter School Group	2549.4	49.0	57.0

**Note: the double asterisk denotes the assessment measures where the group performances were statistically different.

Science Results

On the two-year aggregation of statewide science assessment results, the charter school students group performed statistically higher than the TPS student group on the scale score measure, and similar to the TPS group on the proficiency rate measure (Table A18). The effect

sizes for each of the measures indicate a negligible or very small effect associated with attendance at a charter school.

- The group means derived from the science scale scores are different with the charter school students group posting an average scale score approximately 8.5 scale score points higher (696 vs. 688). The effect sizes indicate a negligible to very small effect associated with attendance at a charter school.
- The science proficiency rate for the charter school students group is similar to the corresponding rate for TPS group (49.9 vs. 46.3).

Table A18: summary of the differences for the science measures from the spring 2018 and spring 2019 statewide assessments based on charter school enrollment.

Science Assessment	Scale Score**	Percent Proficient
TPS Group	687.8	46.3
Charter School Group	696.3	49.9

**Note: the double asterisk denotes the assessment measures where the group performances were statistically different.

ELA Tables

Table A19: ELA scale score differences from spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019 statewide assessments for 3rd to 10 grade students based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Assessment	2016-17**	2017-18	2018-19	2016-17 to 2018-19**
TPS Mean Scale Score (Standard Deviation)	2566.1 (101.405)	2553.1 (104.431)	2553.3 (102.757)	2556.1 (103.118)
CS Mean Scale Score (Standard Deviation)	2579.1 (98.668)	2557.9 (98.368)	2560.2 (101.945)	2563.7 (100.353)
Mean Difference*	-13.041	-4.786	-6.931	-7.601
T	-2.409	-1.056	-1.754	-2.905
P	0.016	0.291	0.080	0.004
Cohen's *d*	0.13	0.047	0.067	0.075
Number of students in each group	683	1001	1341	3025

*Note: the mean difference in ELA scale score points is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative mean difference indicates that the mean scale score for the charter school students was higher than the mean scale score for the TPS group. **Note: the double asterisk denotes the assessments where the group performances were statistically different.

Table A20: ELA scale score differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) of statewide assessments for 3rd to 10th grade students by grade level and based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Assessment	3rd Grade**	4th Grade	5th Grade	6th Grade	7th Grade	8th Grade**	10th Grade
TPS Group Mean SS (Standard Deviation)	2441.2 (80.722)	2516.3 (80.783)	2502.1 (89.559)	2529.8 (93.287)	2568.6 (93.619)	2584.7 (92.139)	2620.7 (109.846)
CS Group Mean SS (Standard Deviation)	2491.6 (77.772)	2508.6 (98.370)	2510.7 (91.450)	2530.7 (90.299)	2575.1 (91.223)	2598.7 (92.491)	2630.8 (97.639)
Mean Difference*	-50.381	7.708	-8.548	-0.994	-6.529	-13.975	-10.085
T	-4.119	0.420	-1.101	-0.234	-1.414	-2.261	-1.434
P	< 0.001	0.676	0.271	0.815	0.157	0.024	0.152
Cohen's *d*	0.63	0.09	0.10	0.01	0.07	0.15	0.10
Number of students in each group	84	48	272	936	802	446	437

*Note: the mean difference in ELA proficiency rate is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative mean difference indicates that the mean proficiency rate for the charter school group was higher than the mean proficiency rate for the TPS group. **Note: the double asterisk denotes the years where the group performances were statistically different.

Table A21: ELA proficiency rate differences from spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019 statewide assessments for 3rd to 10th grade students based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Assessment	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2016-17 to 2018-19**
TPS Group Percent Proficient	60.5	58.9	57.1	58.5
Charter School Group Percent Proficient	64.0	61.0	60.1	61.3
Mean Difference*	-3.514	-2.098	-2.983	-2.810
Z	-1.339	-0.958	-1.568	-2.229
P	0.181	0.338	0.117	0.026
Eta squared	0.00131	0.00046	0.00092	0.00082
N – 1	1365	2001	2681	6049
Number of students in each group	683	1001	1341	3025

*Note: the mean difference in ELA proficiency rate is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative mean difference indicates that the mean proficiency rate for the charter school group was higher than the mean proficiency rate for the TPS group. **Note: the double asterisk denotes the years where the group performances were statistically different.

Results by Race/Ethnicity

On the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment scale score (aggregated over the 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 school years), the Native American/Alaskan Native, Asian, Black/African American,

White, and Two or More Races student groups at charter schools yielded group means students that were similar to the corresponding group means of the TPS students (Table A22). The Hispanic/Latinx students at the charter schools posted scale scores different and higher than the average scale score for the TPS students. The effect sizes indicate a very small effect is associated with attendance at a charter school.

Table A22: ELA scale score differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) of statewide assessments for 3rd to 10th grade students by race/ethnicity and based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Assessment	Native American	Asian	Black	Hispanic**	White	Two or More Races
TPS Group Mean Scale Score	2547.9	2601.0	2521.6	2542.0	2571.7	2572.8
Charter School Group Mean Scale Score	2585.3	2615.2	2529.5	2555.4	2576.7	2574.6

**Note: the double asterisk denotes the student groups where the group performances were statistically different.

Aggregated over the 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 school years, the Native American/Alaskan Native, Black/African American, White, and Two or More Races student groups at charter schools posted ELA SGP medians similar to the corresponding medians for the TPS students (Table A23). The Asian and Hispanic/Latinx groups at charter schools posted ELA SGP medians different and higher than the TPS student groups. The effect sizes indicate a small effect is associated with attendance at a charter school.

Table A23: ELA SGP differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) for 4th to 8th grade students by race/ethnicity and based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Growth Percentiles	Native American	Asian**	Black	Hispanic**	White	Two Or More Races
TPS Group Median SGP	50.5	56.0	52.0	51.5	52.0	57.0
Charter School Group Median SGP	66.5	70.0	57.0	59.5	52.0	60.0

**Note: the double asterisk denotes where the group performances were statistically different.

For the three most recent years of statewide math assessments, the Native American, Asian, White, and Two or More Races groups of charter school students posted average scale scores similar to the corresponding TPS student groups (Table A24). The Black and Hispanic/Latinx student groups in charter school students posted different and higher scale scores than the TPS student groups. The effect sizes indicate a small to very small effect is associated with attendance at a charter school.

Table A24: math scale score differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) of statewide assessments for 3rd to 10th grade students by race/ethnicity and based on charter school enrollment.

Math Assessment	Native American	Asian	Black**	Hispanic**	White	Two or More Races
TPS Group Mean Scale Score	2532.3	2614.8	2508.2	2530.4	2551.3	2553.4
Charter School Group Mean Scale Score	2551.1	2631.3	2525.6	2555.4	2549.4	2561.4

**Note: the double asterisk denotes the student groups where the group performances were statistically different.

Regarding the math SGPs aggregated over the three most recent years, all of the charter school race/ethnicity student groups (except for the White student group) posted math SGP medians that were different and higher than the TPS SGP medians (Table A25). Most of the effect sizes indicate a small to very small effect is associated with attendance at a charter school, but for Hispanic/Latinx students a medium effect size is associated with attendance at a charter school.

Table A25: math SGP differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) for 4th to 8th grade students by race/ethnicity and based on charter school enrollment.

Math Growth Percentiles	Asian**	Black**	Hispanic**	White**	Two or More Races**
TPS Group Median SGP	63.0	47.5	43.0	52.0	48.0
Charter School Group Median SGP	73.0	66.0	68.0	42.0	58.5

**Note: the double asterisk denotes the assessment years where the group performances were statistically different.

Results by Program Participation

Students receiving special education services at charter schools posted an average scale score similar to that for special education students at the TPS. However, both the English learner student group and the students qualifying for the FRL program at charter schools yielded average ELA scale scores that were different and higher than the corresponding scale scores for the TPS students (Table A26). The effect sizes indicate a very small effect is associated with attendance at a charter school.

Table A26: ELA scale score differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) of statewide assessments for 3rd to 10th grade students by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Assessment	English Learners**	Low-Income**	Special Education
TPS Group Mean Scale Score	2464.5	2530.3	2461.3
Charter School Group Mean Scale Score	2479.5	2543.7	2472.2

**Note: the double asterisk denotes the student groups where the group performances were statistically different.

The English learner and special education students attending charter schools posted ELA SGP medians similar to those posted for TPS students (Table A27). Students qualifying for FRL program (Low-Income) posted a higher ELA SGP median than the TPS students. However, the effect size associated with charter school attendance on ELA SGP median is very small.

Table A27: ELA SGP differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) for 4th to 8th grade students by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Growth Percentiles	English Learners	Low-Income**	Special Education
TPS Group Median SGP	52.0	51.0	43.0
Charter School Group Median SGP	52.5	57.0	50.0

**Note: the double asterisk denotes the assessment years where the group performances were statistically different.

The charter school students participating in English learner, low-income, or special education programs posted average scale scores in math different and higher than the scale scores for the TPS students in corresponding groups (Table A28). However, the effect sizes are small to very small.

Table A28: math scale score differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) of statewide assessments for 3rd to 10th grade students by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

Math Assessment	English Learners**	Low-Income**	Special Education**
TPS Group Mean Scale Score	2456.7	2517.9	2434.2
Charter School Group Mean Scale Score	2485.6	2533.7	2449.5

**Note: the double asterisk denotes the student groups where the group performances were statistically different.

On the math SGPs, the special education students at charter schools posted a median math SGP that was similar to that for similar TPS students (Table A29). The charter school English learners

and low-income students groups posted median math SGPs different and higher than the median math SGPs for the TPS students. The effect size associated with charter school attendance is small to very small.

Table A29: math SGP differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) for 4th to 8th grade students by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

Math Growth Percentiles	English Learners**	Low-Income**	Special Education
TPS Group Median SGP	45.0	45.0	44.0
Charter School Group Median SGP	65.0	59.0	51.0

**Note: the double asterisk denotes the assessment years where the group performances were statistically different.

Table A30: ELA score differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) of statewide assessments for 3rd to 10th grade students by race/ethnicity and charter school enrollment.

ELA Assessment	Native American	Asian	Black	Hispanic**	White	Two or More Races
TPS Mean SS (Standard Deviation)	2547.9 (92.959)	2601.0 (100.082)	2521.6 (101.190)	2542.0 (99.278)	2571.7 (100.184)	2572.8 (104.890)
CS Mean SS (Standard Deviation)	2585.3 (86.992)	2615.2 (89.259)	2529.5 (101.288)	2555.4 (96.1010)	2576.7 (99.085)	2574.6 (98.295)
Mean Difference*	-37.406	-14.154	-7.805	-13.445	-4.995	-1.711
T	-1.662	-1.264	-1.761	-2.238	-1.036	-0.193
P	0.102	0.207	0.151	0.025	0.192	0.847
Cohen's *d*	0.415	0.149	0.078	0.137	0.050	0.018
Number of students in each group	32	143	696	528	1344	263

*Note: the mean difference in scale score points is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative mean difference indicates that the mean ELA scale score for the charter school group was higher than the mean ELA scale score for the TPS group. **Note: the double asterisk denotes the student groups where the group performances were statistically different.

Table A31: ELA scale score differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) of statewide assessments for 3rd to 10th grade students by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Assessment	English Learners**	Low-Income**	Special Education
TPS Mean SS (Standard Deviation)	2464.5 (82.853)	2530.3 (99.787)	2461.3 (88.441)
CS Mean SS (Standard Deviation)	2479.5 (95.646)	2543.7 (99.251)	2472.2 (92.103)
Mean Difference*	-14.966	-13.365	-10.896
T	-2.297	-4.008	-1.636
P	0.022	< 0.001	0.102
Cohen's *d*	0.168	0.135	0.121
Number of students in each group	335	1782	370

*Note: the mean difference in scale score points is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative mean difference indicates that the mean ELA scale score for the charter school group was higher than the mean scale score for the TPS student group. **Note: the double asterisk denotes the school years where the group performances were statistically different.

Table A32: ELA student growth percentile median differences from spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019 statewide assessments for 4th to 8th grade students based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Growth Percentiles	2016-17**	2017-18	2018-19	2016-17 to 2018-19**
TPS Group Median SGP	51.0	54.0	52.0	53.0
Charter School Group Median SGP	59.0	57.0	55.0	56.0
Median Difference*	-8.0	-3.0	-3.0	-3.0
Z	-2.696	-1.052	-1.902	-3.093
P	0.007	0.293	0.057	0.002
Eta Squared	0.00782	0.00077	0.00159	0.00206
N-1	929	1433	2271	4635
Number of students in each group*	465	717	1136	2318

*Note: The ELA median difference is the value of the TPS group minus the value of the charter school (CS) group. The negative median difference indicates that the median SGP for the charter school group was higher than the median SGP for the TPS group. **Note: the double asterisk denotes the school years where the group performances were statistically different.

Table A33: ELA SGP differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) for 4th to 8th grade students by race/ethnicity and based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Growth Percentiles	Native American	Asian**	Black	Hispanic**	White	Two Or More Races
TPS Group Median SGP	50.5	56.0	52.0	51.5	52.0	57.0
CS Group Median SGP	66.5	70.0	57.0	59.5	52.0	60.0
Median Difference*	-16.5	-14.0	-5.0	-8.0	0.0	-3.0
Z	-1.655	-2.450	-1.784	-3.702	-0.536	-1.000
P	0.098	0.014	0.074	< 0.001	0.592	0.318
Eta Squared	0.06370	0.02986	0.00305	0.01570	0.00014	0.00262
N-1	43	201	1043	873	2063	381
Number of students in each group*	22	101	522	437	1032	191

*Note: the median difference in percentile points is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative median difference indicates that the median for the charter school students was higher than the median for the TPS group. **Note: the double asterisk denotes where the group performances were statistically different.

Table A34: ELA SGP differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) for 4th to 8th grade students by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Growth Percentiles	English Learners	Low-Income**	Special Education
TPS Group Median SGP	52.0	51.0	43.0
CS Group Median SGP	52.5	57.0	50.0
Median Difference*	-0.5	-6.0	-7.0
Z	-0.777	-4.034	-1.063
P	0.437	< 0.001	0.288
Eta Squared	0.00115	0.00578	0.00198
N – 1	525	2817	571
Number of students in each group*	263	1409	286

*Note: the median difference in percentile points is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative median difference indicates that the median for the charter school students was higher than the median for the TPS students. **Note: the double asterisk denotes the assessment years where the group performances were statistically different.

Math Tables

Table A35: Math scale score differences from spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019 statewide assessments for 3rd to 10th grade students based on charter school enrollment.

Math Assessment	2016-17**	2017-18	2018-19**	2016-17 to 2018-19**
TPS Group Mean Scale Score (Standard Deviation)	2546.1 (100.090)	2545.1 (112.541)	2534.7 (107.794)	2540.4 (108.403)
CS Group Mean Scale Score (Standard Deviation)	2562.4 (105.772)	2550.7 (104.397)	2543.5 (110.654)	2549.4 (106.520)
Mean Difference*	-16.202	-5.603	-8.804	-8.989
T	-2.565	-1.150	-2.074	-3.137
P	0.010	0.250	0.038	0.002
Cohen's *d*	0.158	0.052	0.081	0.083
Number of students in each group	499	991	1324	2814

*Note: the mean difference in scale score points is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative mean difference indicates that the mean math scale score for the charter school students was higher than the mean math scale score for the TPS group. **Note: the double asterisk denotes the assessment years where the group performances were statistically different.

Table A36: Math scale score differences from spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019 statewide assessments by grade and based on charter school enrollment.

Math Assessment	3rd Grade**	4th Grade	5th Grade**	6th Grade	7th Grade	8th Grade	10th Grade
TPS Group Mean Scale Score (Standard Deviation)	2451.0 (84.119)	2498.8 (88.939)	2503.2 (88.592)	2529.2 (103.986)	2555.5. (101.996)	2565.5 (115.330)	2571.7 (125.628)
CS Group Mean Scale Score (Standard Deviation)	2476.3 (71.897)	2496.7 (80.601)	2530.2 (88.090)	2533.7 (101.782)	2563.2 (100.264)	2573.1 (118.836)	2579.1 (124.467)
Mean Difference*	-25.345	1.900	-26.941	-4.599	-7.713	-7.563	-7.448
T	-2.099	0.112	-3.660	-0.966	-1.496	-0.948	-0.689
P	0.037	0.911	< 0.001	0.334	0.135	0.343	0.491
Cohen's *d*	0.32	0.02	0.31	0.04	0.08	0.06	0.06
Number of students in each group	84	50	288	934	770	421	268

*Note: the mean difference in scale score points is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative mean difference indicates that the mean math scale score for the charter school students was higher than the mean math scale score for the TPS group. **Note: the double asterisk denotes the assessment years where the group performances were statistically different.

Table A37: math, proficiency rate, differences from spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019 statewide assessments for 3rd to 10th grade students based on charter school enrollment.

Math Assessment	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2016-17 to 2018-19**
TPS Group Percent Proficient	49.1	46.8	43.1	45.5
CS Group Percent Proficient	54.3	49.5	46.5	49.0
Mean Difference*	-5.210	-2.722	-3.399	-3.481
Z	-1.646	-1.213	-1.759	-2.616
P	0.100	0.225	0.079	0.009
Eta squared	0.00272	0.00074	0.00117	0.00122
N – 1	997	1981	2647	5627
Number of students in each group	499	991	1324	2814

*Note: the mean difference in math proficiency rate is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative mean difference indicates that the mean proficiency rate for the charter school students was higher than the mean proficiency rate for the TPS group. **Note: the double asterisk denotes the years where the group performances were statistically different.

Table A38: math score differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) of statewide assessments for 3rd to 10th grades by race/ethnicity and charter school enrollment.

Math Assessment	Native American	Asian	Black**	Hispanic**	White	Two or More Races
TPS Group Mean Scale Score (Standard Deviation)	2532.3 (77.754)	2614.8 (114.461)	2508.2 (104.991)	2530.4 (108.684)	2551.3 (104.944)	2553.4 (108.389)
CS Group Mean Scale Score (Standard Deviation)	2551.1 (77.882)	2631.3 (122.136)	2525.6 (99.954)	2555.4 (112.696)	2549.4 (101.879)	2561.4 (111.114)
Mean Difference*	-18.846	-16.491	-17.431	-25.057	1.855	-7.978
T	-0.873	-1.052	-3.507	-3.503	0.456	-0.799
P	0.387	0.294	0.002	< 0.001	0.648	0.425
Cohen's *d*	0.242	0.139	0.170	0.226	0.018	0.073
Number of students in each group	26	114	646	480	1293	241

*Note: the mean difference in math scale score points is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative mean difference indicates that the mean scale score for the treatment group (CS students) was higher than the mean scale score for the comparison group (TPS students). The positive mean difference indicates that the mean scale score for the treatment group (CS students) was lower than the mean scale score for the comparison group (TPS students). **Note: the double asterisk denotes the assessments where the group performances were statistically different.

Table A39: math scale score differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) of statewide assessments for 3rd to 10th grade students by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

Math Assessment	English Learners**	Low-Income**	Special Education**
TPS Group Mean Scale Score (Standard Deviation)	2456.7 (89.973)	2517.9 (104.481)	2434.2 (105.504)
CS Group Mean Scale Score (Standard Deviation)	2485.6 (91.233)	2533.7 (105.204)	2449.5 (97.740)
Mean Difference*	-28.904	-15.799	-15.240
T	-3.972	-4.333	-1.985
P	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.048
Cohen's *d*	0.319	0.151	0.150
Number of students in each group	309	1654	352

*Note: the mean difference in scale score points is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative mean difference indicates that the mean math scale score for the charter school students was higher than the mean math scale score for the TPS students. **Note: the double asterisk denotes the student groups where the group performances were statistically different.

Table A40: math student growth percentile median differences from spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019 statewide assessments for 4th to 8th grade students based on charter school enrollment.

Math Growth Percentiles	2016-17**	2017-18**	2018-19	2016-17 to 2018-19**
TPS Group Median SGP	44.0	48.0	51.0	49.0
CS Group Median SGP	54.0	59.0	56.0	57.0
Median Difference*	-10.0	-11.0	-5.0	-8.0
Z	-4.008	-3.489	-1.705	-4.930
P	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.088	< 0.001
Eta Squared	0.10803	0.00862	0.00131	0.00538
N-1	891	1413	2211	4517
Number of students in each group*	446	707	1106	2259

Notes: The math median difference is the value of the TPS group minus the value of the charter school (CS) group. The negative median difference indicates that the median math SGP for the charter school students was higher than the median math SGP for the TPS group. **Note: the double asterisk denotes the school years where the group performances were statistically different.

Table A41: math SGP differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) for 4th to 8th grade students by race/ethnicity and based on charter school enrollment.

Math Growth Percentiles	Asian**	Black**	Hispanic**	White**	Two**
TPS Group Median SGP	63.0	47.5	43.0	52.0	48.0
CS Group Median SGP	73.0	66.0	68.0	42.0	58.5
Median Difference*	-10.0	-18.5	-25.0	10.0	-10.5
Z	-2.840	-6.137	-8.071	-4.171	-2.122
P	0.005	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.034
Eta Squared	0.04223	0.03660	0.07858	0.00852	0.01240
N-1	191	1029	829	2041	363
Number of students in each group*	96	515	415	1021	182

*Note: the median difference in percentile points is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative median difference indicates that the median for the charter school students was higher than the median for the TPS students. The positive median difference indicates that the median for the charter school students was lower than the median for the TPS students. **Note: the double asterisk denotes the assessment years where the group performances were statistically different.

Table A42: math SGP differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) for 4th to 8th grade students by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

Math Growth Percentiles	English Learners**	Low-Income**	Special Education
TPS Median SGP	45.0	45.0	44.0
CS Median SGP	65.0	59.0	51.0
Median Difference*	-20.0	-14.0	-7.0
Z	-4.540	-6.713	-1.366
P	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.172
Eta Squared	0.04232	0.01648	0.00335
N-1	487	2735	557
Number of students in each group*	244	1368	279

*Note: the median difference in percentile points is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative median difference indicates that the median for the charter school students was higher than the median for the TPS students. **Note: the double asterisk denotes the assessment years where the group performances were statistically different.

Science Tables

Table A43: Science scale score differences from spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019 statewide assessments based on charter school enrollment.

Science Assessment	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19**	2017-18 to 2018-19**
TPS Group Mean Scale Score (Standard Deviation)	401.5 (28.54)	691.1 (104.597)	684.6 (80.712)	687.8 (78.301)
CS Group Mean Scale Score (Standard Deviation)	404.0 (31.17)	693.8 (101.719)	698.6 (77.967)	696.3 (74.594)
Mean Difference*	-2.457	-2.698	-14.016	-8.517
T	-0.655	-4.483	-2.383	-2.096
P	0.513	0.629	0.017	0.036
Cohen's d	0.084	0.026	0.176	0.111
Number of students in each group	127	344	364	708

*Note: the 2016-17 results are for 5th and 8th grade MSP only. Note: science assessment results for 2016-17 include only the 5th and 8th grades on the legacy Measures of Student Progress (MSP). *Note: the mean difference in scale score points is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative mean difference indicates that the mean science scale score for the charter school students was higher than the mean scale score for the TPS group. **Note: the double asterisk denotes the assessments where the group performances were statistically different.

Table A44: Science proficiency rate differences from spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019 statewide assessments based on charter school enrollment.

Science Assessment	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2017-18 to 2018-19
TPS Group Percent Proficient	57.5	47.7	45.1	46.3
CS Group Percent Proficient	63.8	47.4	52.2	49.9
Mean Difference*	-6.299	-2.907	-7.143	-3.531
Z	-1.025	-0.076	-1.930	-1.330
P	0.306	0.939	0.054	0.184
Eta squared	0.00415	< 0.00001	0.00512	0.00125
N – 1	253	687	727	1415
Number of students in each group	127	344	364	708

*Note: the 2016-17 results are for 5th and 8th grade MSP only Note: the 2016-17 results are for 5th and 8th grade MSP only*Note: the mean difference in science proficiency rate is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative mean difference indicates that the mean science proficiency rate for the charter school students was higher than the mean science proficiency rate for the TPS group.

Table A45: Science scale score differences from spring 2018 and spring 2019 statewide assessments for 5th, 8th, and 11th grade students based on charter school enrollment.

Science Assessment	**5th Grade**	**8th Grade**	**11th Grade**
TPS Group Mean Scale Score (Standard Deviation)	693.0 (76.052)	697.5 (75.852)	646.2 (77.633)
CS Group Mean Scale Score (Standard Deviation)	701.5 (76.103)	702.9 (70.352)	664.9 (77.865)
Mean Difference*	-8.540	-5.386	-18.765
T	-1.163	-1.012	-1.830
P	0.245	0.312	0.069
Cohen's *d*	0.11	0.07	0.24
Number of students in each group	215	378	115

*Note: includes 2018 and 2019 scores only. *Note: the mean difference in science scale score is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative mean difference indicates that the mean science scale score for the charter school students was higher than the mean science scale score for the TPS group.

Appendix B: Charter Management Organizations

Overview

Charter Management Organizations (CMOs) are not-for-profit educational entities that hold the charter and directly manage multiple public charter schools. Educational Management Organizations (EMOs) are for-profit entities that manage charter schools and perform similar functions as CMOs. CMOs and EMOs differ primarily by the organizations' tax status, and are similar in that both have considerable influence over the instructional design and operations of their affiliated charter schools. Both CMOs and EMOs contract with charter schools to provide specific services. Summit (Atlas, Olympus, and Sierra Charter Schools) and Impact schools (Puget Sound Elementary, Salish Sea Elementary, and Commencement Bay Elementary Schools) in Washington are contracted with CMOs.

CMOs were developed to address issues limiting the numbers and quality of charter schools. Charter schools are usually expected to pay for the buildings they occupy, purchase business services, instructional support, and recruit their own staff, but often receive fewer dollars per pupil than traditional district operated schools. CMOs were developed for the purpose of capturing economies of scale for groups of charter schools and supporting the performance and improvement efforts of groups of schools with similar approaches to teaching and learning.

CMOs are designed to help charter schools overcome the challenges of school start-up and uneven school quality in order to accelerate the expansion of high performing charter schools. CMOs are intended to gain efficiencies associated with scale and to capture and spread organizational learning across school units. CMOs exercise operational control over affiliated schools, and provide a broad range of assistance, such as curriculum development, teacher training, student assessment, legal, and financial services.

The majority of CMOs are fairly prescriptive, as they seek to ensure that all affiliated schools follow a set design for curriculum and instructional techniques, human resource functions, student behavior, and support programs. Overall, CMOs are most prescriptive regarding the provision of supports for struggling students, teacher evaluation, and teacher compensation. CMOs are generally least prescriptive on the provision of professional development and teacher hiring.

The *National Study of Charter Management Organization (CMO) Effectiveness* was published in 2010 by the Center for Reinventing Public Education (CRPE). The study was designed around a series of nested samples capable of producing complementary data through case studies. Interviews of traditional school district staff, surveys of CMO staff, reviews of CMO business plans, and analysis of fiscal documents. The study provided a number of observations on how CMOs compare to one another, the nature of interactions between CMOs and school districts, and the economics of CMOs.

In 2012, Mathematica published a report titled *Evaluating the Effectiveness of Charter Management Organizations (CMOs)*, which was conducted with the CRPE. The evaluation found that many CMOs have a significant positive impact on students' academic achievement, as captured by test scores, while others have significant negative impacts. Each CMOs impact on test scores is often consistent across schools, suggesting some degree of uniformity. In addition, some, but not all, CMOs substantially boost students' chances of graduating from high school and enrolling in postsecondary education.

In 2017, a report titled *Charter Management Organizations 2017* was published by CREDO. The report examined the performance of charter networks compared to traditional public schools (TPS) and independent charter schools. While acknowledging the many complexities, the report concludes that students attending a charter school which is part of a network or CMO have stronger growth than they would in TPS or an independent charter school.

CMOs with a Washington Presence

Impact Public Schools is a CMO with the overarching goal of expanding the number of high quality charter schools in Washington. More specific, Impact Public Schools (IPS) articulate the goal of eliminating the opportunity gap in Washington. The organization's website describes the development of transformative and lasting relationships between students and adult mentors who will help guide the way to college. The IPS team reportedly organizes their classrooms, curricula, program, and support with the expectation that each individual's learning journey is unique.

For the fiscal year ending August 2019, Impact's IRS Form 990 reported contributions, gifts, and grants totaling approximately $1.99M, of which $522K was indicated to be government grants and approximately $1,47M to be other grants or contributions. In 2019 and 2020, Impact | Puget Sound Elementary was awarded a total of $425K from the Louis Calder Foundation to support grade level growth and to pilot a transitional kindergarten program. In October 2020, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation committed approximately $125K to Impact Public Schools Washington for the purpose of providing support for professional development partnerships in Washington. In July 2020, Impact | Salish Sea was awarded a $1.30M grant from the Washington Charter School Association. In September 2020, Impact | Commencement Bay was awarded a $1.50M grant from the Washington Charter School Association.

Summit Public Schools is a leading network of public schools that prepares a diverse student population for success in a four-year college and to be thoughtful, contributing members of society. Summit's first school opened in 2003 and the CMO operates seven schools in the San Francisco Bay area and three charter schools in the Puget Sound area.

The pedagogy employed at Summit schools, dubbed "Summit Learning," is a personalized, project-based learning (PBL) curriculum that puts students "in charge" of their own learning.

Courses are built around projects done at students' own paces instead of traditional coursework modules, and teachers focus their energy on tutoring individual students.

Projects are the foundation of the academic experience and give students hands-on experience with real-world scenarios they'll encounter after graduation, like collaborating with a team, interpreting data, and presenting a persuasive argument. In the classroom, teachers teach cognitive skills and content through real-world projects and help students apply their knowledge to the world around them.

In August 2020, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation committed approximately $1.86M to Summit Public Schools Washington for the purpose of providing support to Summit Public Schools, create Summit Washington, and continue to launch high quality public schools in Washington.