

**Report of the State Board of Education
under RCW 28A.710.250
(Charter Schools Annual Report)**

Draft

Methodology

Staff have reviewed the annual authorizer reports submitted by the Washington State Charter School Commission and Spokane Public Schools in compliance with RCW 28A.710.100 (4) and WAC 180-19-210. Additional information has been sought from the authorizers where needed. Staff have analyzed Chapter 28A.710 RCW, in consultation with members, counsel, other state education agencies, and external entities to identify and discuss issues for implementation. This work began with enactment of Initiative Measure No. 1240 in 2012, and will continue beyond the date of this report. Staff met with the Washington State Charter School Commission, other state education agencies, legislative staff, and interested external parties to discuss possible changes to state law or policy necessary to strengthen the state's charter schools. The report meets the requirement of the law that it be issued in collaboration with the Washington State Charter School Commission, which has reviewed and commented on portions of the draft.

I. Introduction

In the November 2012 general election, Washington voters approved Initiative Measure No. 1240, Relating to public charter schools. This legislation made Washington the 43rd U.S. state to authorize the establishment of such publicly funded, privately operated public schools since Minnesota enacted the first charter school law in 1990. The act has been codified in the Common Schools title as [Chapter 28A.710 RCW](#).¹

Chapter 28A.710 sets duties for the State Board of Education (SBE) in nine sections of the law. These role of the SBE for charter schools is one of administration, oversight and reporting. This is consistent with the Board's statutory purpose to provide advocacy and strategic oversight of public education. (RCW 28A.305.130.) The Board has adopted rules to implement the law as [Chapter 180-19 WAC](#).

Among the oversight duties of the Board is to submit an annual report to the legislature, governor and the public on the state's charter schools. [RCW 28A.710.250](#) provides as follows:

RCW 28A.710.250

Annual reports — Recommendation regarding additional schools.

(1) By December 1st of each year beginning in the first year after there have been charter schools operating for a full school year, the state board of education, in collaboration with the commission, must issue an annual report on the state's charter schools for the preceding school year to the governor, the legislature, and the public at-large.

(2) The annual report must be based on the reports submitted by each authorizer as well

¹ The Legislature added an additional section to Chapter 28A.710 as RCW 28A.710.260. Charter schools oversight account. L 2014 C 221. Some provisions of I-1240 are codified under other titles of RCW.

as any additional relevant data compiled by the board. The report must include a comparison of the performance of charter school students with the performance of academically, ethnically, and economically comparable groups of students in noncharter public schools. In addition, the annual report must include the state board of education's assessment of the successes, challenges, and areas for improvement in meeting the purposes of this chapter, 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.

(3) Together with the issuance of the annual report following the fifth year after there have been charter schools operating for a full school year, the state board of education, in collaboration with the commission, shall submit a recommendation regarding whether or not the legislature should authorize the establishment of additional public charter schools.

[2013 c 2 § 225 (Initiative Measure No. 1240, approved November 6, 2012).]

As one public charter school has now operated for a full school year, the first of these reports by the SBE is to be submitted by December 1, 2015.

On September 4 of this year, the Washington Supreme Court issued its decision on review of the King County Superior Court decision in *League of Women Voters v. State of Washington*. The Court held that the provisions for funding of public charter schools in Chapter 28A.710 were unconstitutional, and further held that those provisions not severable, therefore invalidating the act in its entirety. On September 24, Attorney General Robert W. Ferguson submitted a motion for reconsideration of the majority opinion. It was followed on October 23 by a motion for reconsideration by intervenors including the Washington State Charter Schools Association, the League of Education Voters, and an initiative sponsor. The state has also filed a motion for stay of a mandate in the case through the end of the school year.

In light of the motions entered for the Court's consideration and the consequently uncertain legal status of Washington public charter schools, the SBE has been advised to move forward with work on the annual report as required by RCW 28A.710.250, pending further action by the Court.

In accordance with the statutory mandate, in this report the SBE will:

- Identify some of the successes, challenges and areas of improvement for meeting the purposes of the state's charter school law;
- Discuss the sufficiency of funding for charter schools;
- Discuss the efficacy of the formula for authorizer funding;
- Offer some initial suggestions for changes in state law or policy necessary to strengthen the state's charter schools.

Particular mention should be made of data limitations in preparation of this first annual SBE charter school report. In undertaking this work, the Board is cognizant not only of the still-open constitutional issue, but also that the experience with charter schools in Washington state is thus far so short that it is necessarily limited in the scope of the findings and suggestions it can make in this report.

The state has just one public charter school, First Place Scholars Charter School, in Seattle, that has operated for a full school year. First Place Scholars (FPS) had average monthly enrollment of 82.9 FTE pupils in the school year ending 2015. Federal privacy rules governing student data stipulate that when student counts in groups are less than 20, values for those groups are not reported in student performance data. All student groups at FPS were less than 20 in the 2014-15 school year. Therefore OSPI cannot report performance data for student groups at FPS, and none are included in this report.²

The suppression of student performance data to comply with federal rules, combined with the very small sample in both number of schools and years of operation, means that this initial report will not include a comparison of the performance of charter public school students with the performance of academically, ethnically and economically comparable groups of students in noncharter public schools. The Board has reviewed the high-quality research in which such comparisons are made and examined the methodologies employed. The Board will be prepared to provide such a comparative evaluation of charter school performance when sufficient data are available for an empirically valid study.

II. Successes in Meeting the Purposes of the Charter School Law

Demand for enrollment in public charter schools has been high.

All but one of the charter schools scheduled for opening for fall 2015, including both schools authorized by Spokane Public Schools, utilized lotteries for enrollment under RCW 28A.710.050 (4) because the number of applicants exceeded the schools' capacity as determined in consultation with their authorizers.

The authorizers and their schools are meeting the intent of the law to serve at-risk students.

RCW 28A.710.005 (Findings) states that Initiative 1240 will "Give priority to opening public charter schools that serve at-risk student³ populations or students from low-performing public schools." The

² By the same token, when too few group values are reported, there is no annual Achievement Index for a school, and there will be none for First Place Scholars when the Index is next released in early 2016.

³ "At-risk student" is defined in RCW 28A.710.010 to mean "a student 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, student 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."

authorizers have taken that intent to heart. The mission statement adopted by the Washington State Charter School Commission is “To authorize high quality public charter schools and provide effective oversight and transparent accountability to improve educational outcomes for at-risk students.” In its authorizer application to the SBE, Spokane Public Schools (SPS) stated that “The promise of charter schools for Spokane . . . is to help serve as a catalyst for school improvement, to provide new techniques and strategies to reach at-risk students, and to add choices to the portfolio of options available in Spokane public schools.” Based on Achievement Index data, SPS found “it is clear that there are particular regions of our city in which undeserved students reside. Consequently, we will be working diligently to recruit charter schools that meet our academic and citizenship goals, particularly in the Northeast and Northwest sections of the school district.”⁴

The demographic data on enrollment provided in the authorizer reports shows that the public charter schools approved and operating thus far are meeting the intent of serving at-risk students and a diverse student population. The table on page 20 of the Commission’s report shows the percentages of 2015-16 enrollment for each school by major subgroup. (Some groups overlap.)

- The percent Black/African American ranges from 18% at Summit Olympus to 38% at Excel and 60% at First Place.
- The percent Hispanic/Latino ranges from 8% at Summit Sierra to 36% at Rainier Prep and 44% at Summit Olympus.
- Enrollment at all seven schools is more than one-half low-income. The low-income percentages range from 51% at Excel to 87% at Green Dot Destiny and 99% (2014-15) at First Place Scholars.
- Bilingual enrollment ranges from 5% at Summit Olympus to 15% at First Place and 30% at Rainier Prep.
- All but Rainier Prep had percentages of Special Education enrollment of more than 10 percent. 21 percent of Green Dot Destiny students are served with special education services.

Spokane’s charter schools, Pride Prep and Spokane International, have much lower percentages of enrollment by ethnic minorities, but these reflect the much lower enrollments by these subgroups in district schools. (Black enrollment at SPS (2014-15) is 2.8 percent, and at the charter schools 4.6 percent and 4 percent, respectively.) Low-income enrollment is 50 percent at Pride Prep and 54 percent at Spokane International, compared with 58 percent at district schools in 2014-15.

Authorizers have well-developed performance frameworks to set standards for schools.

[RCW 28A.710.070](#) requires that the performance provisions within a charter contract “be based on a performance framework that clearly sets forth the academic and operational indicators, measures and metrics that will guide an authorizer’s evaluation of each charter school.” Both authorizers have developed strong and thoughtful academic, financial and organizational indicators to measure the performance of their schools against standards and help guide decisions on renewal, non-renewal, and revocation of charter contracts. Authorizers had assistance from the National Association of Charter School Authorizers, as well as from external reviewers including SBE staff, in development of the

⁴ Spokane Public Schools, Charter School Authorizer Application. (June 30, 2013). Pp. 4 and 7.

frameworks. Both have also, however, greatly increased their internal capacity to perform this and other more technical duties of an authorizer at a high level of quality.

III. Challenges in Meeting the Purposes of the Charter School Law

Start-up of statewide authorizer

The Washington State Charter School Commission is established in [RCW 28A.710.070](#) as an independent state agency with a statutory mission to authorize high- quality public charter schools throughout the state. The nine-member commission was not appointed until April 2013 (five months after enactment of I-1240), and the executive director not hired, after a long search, until October of that year. This afforded the Commission little time to organize itself, climb a steep learning curve, and issue the first request for proposals for charter applications by the next spring. Until January 2015, the Commission shouldered its workload with just an executive director and executive assistant, and only in August was it able, through a legislative appropriation, to add to staff capacity for oversight, legal compliance, and financial accountability for newly created charter schools. A properly supported statewide authorizer is essential to meeting the purposes of Washington’s charter school law.

Few district authorizers of charter schools

RCW 28A.710.080 provides that eligible authorizers of charter schools, in addition to the Commission, include school district boards of directors that have been approved by the State Board of Education, for charter schools located within the district’s own boundaries.⁵ The process for SBE approval of a school district to be a charter authorizer is established in RCW 28A.710.090, and implemented in WACs 180-19-020-050. On June 30, 2013 Spokane Public Schools submitted an application for approval as an authorizer. After a thorough evaluation and scoring of the application, the Board approved Spokane as an authorizer at its September 2013 meeting. Its two authorized schools, Pride Prep and Spokane International, opened their doors to students for the 2015-16 school year.

While several other school districts have expressed interest in being a charter authorizer, so far no other has submitted an application to the SBE. No district submitted a non-binding notice of intent to submit an application by the June 15 due date this year.

There are a number of possible reasons for the small response thus far to the opportunity for school districts to be authorizers of charter schools. These may include a lack of identified need for charter schools, insufficient capacity to carry out the duties of an authorizer, the workload associated with applying for approval as an authorizer, the uncertainty created by the legal challenge to the law, and political opposition.

⁵ Washington is one of 36 states in which local education agencies are eligible authorizers of charter schools.

If the intent of the voters in approving I-1240 was that there be multiple authorizers of charter schools to include local school districts, bringing different visions and approaches to chartering, then this purpose of the law clearly has not been met so far. School districts also bring to the task staff expertise and an appreciation for local needs and circumstances that can be difficult for a statewide authorizer to duplicate.

The Board makes no suggestions at this time for changes to state law or policy to address the rarity of district authorizers in Washington. It may be a topic for exploration, however, if the law is ultimately sustained by the courts or reinstated by the legislature.

IV. Assessment of the sufficiency of funding for charter schools

Access to local levies

RCW 28A.710.220 presents a question of statutory interpretation with significant implications for the startup of charter schools. Subsection (7) provides, “New charter schools are not eligible for local levy moneys approved by the voters before the start-up date of the charter school as determined by the authorizer unless the local school district is the authorizer.”

It is unclear what is intended by the term “start-up date,” as it is not defined in the law. Alternative interpretations include, for example, the date the school was approved by its authorizer, the date its charter contract was executed, and the date the school opened and commenced instruction of students, each of them legitimate. A school whose “start-up date” was after voter approval of a maintenance and operations levy — depending on the interpretation — starts with the handicap of a much smaller per pupil allocation than other schools because it is reliant entirely on its state allocation.⁶ This comes when the school may be bearing large start-up costs for items such as purchase of materials and supplies and renovation of facilities, costs that may be more easily borne by schools operated by charter management organizations than by “home-grown” schools. At the same time, the intent of the provision seems to be that voters are informed about the charter schools their taxes will help support when they go to the polls.

In August the Superintendent of Public Instruction, joined by the Washington State Charter School Commission, requested a formal opinion of the Attorney General on this question. Because the Supreme Court decision in *League of Women Voters* was issued shortly after receipt of the request, the Office of the Attorney General has delayed any response, pending resolution of the case.

The SBE takes no position on the difficult question of when a new charter school first becomes eligible for levy moneys under RCW 28A.710.220 (4). It urges, however, resolution of the issue if the courts ultimately sustain the law or the legislature reinstates it.

⁶ For the 2013-14 school year, average state revenue to school districts statewide was \$7,140 per pupil, and average local levy revenue \$2,034 per pupil. In Seattle, home to x charter schools, state revenue per pupil was \$6,994 per pupil, and local levy revenue \$3,254 per pupil. Source: OSPI, *Financial Summary, 2013-14*, p. 9.

Facilities

In an influential 2009 publication, the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools found that “One of the biggest challenges facing public charter schools is finding and financing school facilities. The 41 [now 44] jurisdictions with public charter school laws vary greatly in how they provide facility support to public charter schools.”⁷

Facilities are addressed in Washington’s law in [RCW 28A.710.230](#). It provides in its first sentence that “Charter schools are eligible for state matching funds for common school construction.” This appears, as in the preceding section on operating funding, to have been an effort to treat public charter schools in a roughly equal way as non-charter schools with regard to capital funding.

As a practical matter, however, charter schools are unlikely to ever access this funding. To be eligible for state assistance through the School Construction Assistance Program (SCAP) administered by OSPI, a school district must demonstrate local support for the proposed project by raising local revenues. The primary source of revenue for the local match is general obligation bonds. This runs straight into the prohibition in [RCW 28A.710.030](#) (2) on a charter school board from or issuing tax-backed bonds.

In addition, the decision of the Superior Court in *League of Women Voters* prohibited access of public charter schools to the resources of the Common School Construction Account, from which most state assistance for facilities is provided, on the basis that public charter schools are not common schools. (The state Supreme Court sustained that finding, while also finding it not severable from the other parts of the law.)

Washington charter schools therefore have no practical means of state assistance for facilities.⁸ This makes them perhaps inappropriately dependent, as public schools, on philanthropic assistance to begin operation. It also creates a risk that charter schools, particularly those without the resources of charter management organizations, will serve students in low-quality facilities that adversely affect learning.

The SBE has no present suggestions on state funding for facilities for public charter schools. It is prepared to work with OSPI and legislature on this subject, at their request, if the courts ultimately sustain the charter school law or the Legislature reinstates it.⁹

⁷ National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. *A New Model Law for Supporting The Growth of High-Quality Public Charter Schools* (June 2009), p. 23. The National Conference of State Legislatures observes in a 2011 policy brief [citation], “Challenges in securing facilities has led to lower quality charter school buildings . . . Charter schools often occupy facilities that lack standard amenities such as gymnasiums, libraries or kitchens.”

⁸ The Board would observe that this is also true of school districts that have authority to issue tax-supported bond levies, but such low fiscal capacity that they are unable to pass them.

⁹ The Board notes that federal grants for facilities for public charter schools require a form of state match for the schools to receive the federal assistance .

V. Efficacy of the formula for authorizer funding

[RCW 28A.710.110](#) requires the SBE to establish a statewide formula for an authorizer oversight fee, calculated as a percentage of the state operating funding allocated to each charter school. The oversight fee is deducted from each charter school's allocation by the Superintendent of Public Instruction and transmitted to its authorizer.

The law stipulates that the fee may be up to four percent, and that the SBE may establish a sliding scale formula in which the funding percentage would decrease after the authorizer has reached a certain threshold in authorizing activity. In [rule](#), the Board set the oversight fee at four percent, with the fee decreasing to three percent after an authorizer has authorized ten charter schools.

Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines "efficacy" as "the power to produce a desired result or effect." The desired result of the fee established in this section presumably is to provide sufficient financial resources to charter authorizers to enable them to carry out their statutory duties in a high-quality way without excessive impact on the schools they oversee.

It is helpful here to take an initial look at the funding of the state's largest authorizer, the Washington State Charter School Commission. The Legislature appropriated \$1.0 million General Fund-State in the 2013-15 biennial budget for support of the Commission, prior to receipt of any revenue from oversight fees. In the 2015-17 budget, the Legislature shifted all financial support for the Commission to the newly created Charter School Oversight Account in which the fees are deposited. In the table on page 22 of the Commission's Authorizer report, we find that the agency is currently anticipated to underspend its allotment by about 7 percent.

Spokane Public Schools reported receipt of no authorizer oversight fees from OSPI as of the date of preparation of this report.

At this early stage the Board has no changes to suggest in statute or rule on authorizer funding. It continues to find the sliding scale for the fee appropriate, based on the economies of scale an authorizer should be able to achieve after it oversees a "critical mass" of schools.¹⁰

The Board takes this position knowing that it is very difficult, from a survey of research literature and experience elsewhere, to estimate the costs an authorizer should properly incur in carrying out its duties at the standard expected by our charter law. It is also aware that under the formula in statute, funding transmitted to the authorizer is funding not available to the charter school for instruction of students.

SBE WAC 180-19-060 thus requires the Board to "periodically review the adequacy and efficiency of the authorizer oversight fee for the purpose of determining whether the formula should be adjusted to ensure fulfilling the purposes of Chapter 28A.710." The Board is committed to ongoing review of the oversight fee and proposing any changes to authorizer funding that best serve the purposes of the charter school law, should the courts ultimately sustain or the Legislature reinstate it.

¹⁰ National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, *Model Law*, p. 12.

VI. Suggested changes in state law or policy necessary to strengthen the state’s charter schools

A number of issues of interpretation or implementation of Washington’s charter school law have arisen since approval by voters of Initiative Measure No. 1240 in 2012. Some were apparent from the beginning; others surfaced over time. This is in no way surprising, as almost any major piece of legislation, whether adopted by the Legislature or by the people acting in their legislative capacity, is likely to require adjustments, refinements and other amendment as experience with the law unfolds. It is a part of the process.

In this initial report under RCW 28A.710.250, the Board takes an appropriately modest approach to the directive to include in it “any suggested changes in state law or policy necessary to strengthen the state’s charter schools.” As a guiding principle for this portion of the report, the SBE defers any suggestions for larger policy changes to the law until:

- a. The legal status of charter schools has been resolved by the courts or by action of the Legislature, and
- b. There is much greater experience with the operation of the charter school law and the performance of multiple charter schools than at the time of this report.

The intent, therefore, is to limit suggested changes in law or policy to:

1. Technical fixes and clarifications needed to implement the law effectively.
2. Changes that improve school accountability without unduly compromising school autonomy.

We would characterize none of the changes suggested as central to the functioning or sustainability of the law. The Board is happy to discuss in greater detail any of the changes listed on the following pages, especially as some are quite technical in nature, and difficult to describe in short form.

28A.710 Section	Title	Suggested Change	Comment
.010	Definitions	Clarify that "authorizer" means the Commission established in RCW 28A.710.070 as well as "an entity" (i.e., school district) approved by the State Board of Education under 28A.710.090.	Imprecise drafting that could be clarified.
.040	Requirements	Clarify the application of RCW 28A.150.220 (Minimum instructional requirements -- Program accessibility), as well as RCW 28A.150.210 (Basic education goals) to public charter schools.	The language of RCW 28A.710.040(2) leaves unclear whether charter schools are subject to the requirements of RCW 28A.150.220 for basic education. All present charter contracts require compliance with RCW 28A.150.220. The SBE nevertheless finds clarification of the law in this regard desirable to resolve any questions about the responsibility of charter schools for basic education.
.090	Authorizers -- Approval Process	Provide for procedures for renewal or nonrenewal of an authorizing contract with a school district, or require the SBE to establish a process for renewal or nonrenewal of an authorizing contract, to be done through rule-making in accordance with Chapter 34.05 RCW.	This is an omission in 28A.710.090. It provides for a six-year, renewable authorizing contract between SBE and the approved district authorizer, but (unlike the sections on the charter contract) provides no direction as to how or on what basis the contract would be renewed. The SBE does not believe it has authority to adopt rules on this subject.
.100	Authorizers -- Annual Report	In (4), In "The academic and financial performance of all operating charter schools," insert "organizational".	A technical addition that matches up with "board performance and stewardship" in RCW 28A.710.170(2)(h) (Performance framework). Conforms with NACSA Principles & Standards, as required in this section, and with the current practices of authorizers.
.150	Maximum number of charter schools -- Certification	Clarify the meaning of "establish" in (1), to clearly define the beginning and end of the "five-year period" over which a maximum of 40 schools may be "established," and no more than eight can be "established" in a single year.	The meaning determined for "establish" in this section affects how SBE certifies approved charters as within the limits on the maximum number of charter schools that may be established. "Establish" is variously interpreted to mean, for example, (a) approval of the charter application by the authorizer, and the school's opening for operation. Counsel to the SBE, OSPI and the Charter Commission were commencing discussion of the question when the Supreme Court issued its ruling on September 4.

.150	Maximum number of charter schools -- Certification -- Lottery	Amend (3) to eliminate the "race to the finish line" for notice to SBE by authorizers of approved charters for certification. Change "If the board receives simultaneous notification" to "if the board receives notification in any year".	The phrase "if the board receives simultaneous notification" has been interpreted by the SBE to mean that only those approvals that would cause the limit for any year to be exceeded go into a lottery for certification, and so implemented in rule. This creates an incentive for charter applicants to submit their applications quickly and for authorizers to approve quickly. In practice this has not yet been a problem, but as the incentive in law should be eliminated in the interest of high-quality authorizing. The change would say that if the number of approvals exceeds the limit that may be established in any year, ALL approved charters go into a lottery for certification.
.200	Charter contracts -- Nonrenewal or revocation	In (2) change "falls in the bottom quartile of schools on the accountability index" to "has a composite index rating in the bottom 25 percent or falls in the lowest two tiers on the achievement index" .	The language in this section does not fit with the design of the Achievement Index as developed by the SBE in consultation with OSPI. This suggested amendment makes the provision more workable while retaining the intent.
.200	Charter contracts -- Nonrenewal or revocation	In (2), strike "unless the charter school demonstrates exceptional circumstances that the authorizer finds justifiable."	This suggested change eliminates elastic language that may enable a low-performing charter school to be renewed. It sets down a clear line for the authorizer in renewal decisions, and enhances the accountability of schools for academic performance.
.220	Funding -- Allocations	Strike subsection (4) in its entirety, while also striking the reference to this subsection in OSPI WAC 392-21-400 (Apportionment of basic education moneys).	The provision of subsection (4) that allocations to a charter school in the school's first year of operation must be based on projections of first-year enrollment made in the school's charter contract creates not just the risk but the probability that schools will be overfunded in the first year, requiring OSPI to reclaim excess funding in the second year, or underfunded, as actual enrollments vary those projected at the time of the contract. Allocations to a charter school should be made in same manner as to a school district, a stated intent of subsection (2) of this same section.
.220	Funding -- Local levy moneys	In (7), define or replace "start-up date" to clarify when a new charter school becomes eligible for local levy moneys approved by the voters.	"Start-up date" as used in this section is ambiguous. If it is defined as the date the school is opened, rather than the date the school was authorized, a new school starts out with substantially less funding on a per pupil basis at a time when it also has high startup costs. The SBE takes no position on this question, but asks that it be resolved by the Attorney General or the Legislature should the law go forward.
.230	Facilities	In (2) "A charter school has a right of first refusal to purchase or lease at or below fair market value," strike "or below."	Suggested in response to a concern that the present language may result in long and unnecessary negotiations for a school district on leasing of facilities.

.250	Annual reports	In (1) Change "By December 1st of each year" to a later date to be determined in order to enable the authorizer annual reports and the SBE annual report to include graduation and Achievement Index data, as well as sufficient time for analysis of academic performance data. Amend WAC 180-19-210(1) to the change due date for the authorizer report from no later than November 1 of each year to a later date to be determined.	There is a long-recognized timing problem for the annual authorizer report and the SBE annual report. RCW 28A.710.250 requires SBE to submit annual report by December 1, and to base the report on the annual authorizer reports (as well as any other information it may compile). RCW 28A.710.100 requires SBE to set a due date for the authorizer reports. SBE has set it in rule at November 1, in order to have it enough time for the annual report. Some data required to be included in the authorizer report, however, is not available from OSPI by Nov. 1. The RCW and SBE WAC also require the authorizer to report data based on the Achievement Index, which is not available until after the beginning of the year. While this does not have a large impact now, it will if and when more schools have operated and have performance data to report.
.260	Oversight account	Strike "Moneys in the account may be spent only after appropriation."	The state Authorizer Oversight Account was created as an appropriated account for deposit of receipts from authorizer oversight fee. Given the formula for the oversight fee and the uncertainty of charter approvals, it is difficult to know ahead what receipts to the the account will be when the appropriation is made, with the potential for both overfunding and underfunding of Commission operations. The Commission has requested that the account be a non-appropriated account.



THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Governance | Accountability | Achievement | Oversight | Career & College Readiness

Authorizer:

RCW 28A.710.100 provided that each charter authorizer must submit annual report to the State Board of Education, according to a timeline, content and format specified by the Board, and states the information that must be included in the report. WAC 180-19-210 provides that each authorizer must, no later than November 1 of each year beginning in 2014, submit an annual report meeting the requirements of RCW 28A.710.100, and requires SBE to post a standard form for the report its public web site no later than September 1.

Attached is the standard form for submission of the authorizer annual report for 2014, with instructions for completing and submitting the form. For any questions concerning the annual authorizer report, please contact:

Jack Archer
Director of Basic Education Oversight
State Board of Education
360-725-6035
jackarcher@comcast.net

2015 Charter Authorizer Annual Report

Please complete the following report and submit via electronic mail to sbe@k12.wa.us. If the information requested for any part of the report is not available, please enter NA in the space provided. Please identify by item number below any attachments provided for purposes of this report.

Authorizer Name:

Washington State Charter School Commission

Authorizer Address:

1068 Washington St SE

PO Box 40996

Olympia WA 98504-0996

Contact for Additional Information:

Name: Joshua Halsey

Telephone Number: (360) 584-9272

Email Address: joshua.halsey@charterschool.wa.gov

Mailing Address: Same as Authorizer address

1. If a school district, date of approval as an authorizer by the SBE.

N/A

2. Names and job titles of personnel having principal authorizing responsibilities, with contact information for each.

Name: Joshua Halsey

Job Title: Executive Director

Telephone Number: (360) 584-9272

Email Address: joshua.halsey@charterschool.wa.gov

Mailing Address: Same as Authorizer address

Name: Dr. Catherine Fromme, Ed.D

Job Title: Deputy Director

Telephone Number: (360) 688-7369

Email Address: cathy.fromme@charterschool.wa.gov

Mailing Address: Same as Authorizer address

Name: Ebonee Jackson

Job Title: School Quality & Accountability Director

Telephone Number: (360) 878-9283

Email Address: ebonee.jackson@charterschool.wa.gov

Mailing Address: Same as Authorizer address

3. Names and job titles of any employees or contractors to whom the authorizer has delegated responsibility for the duties of an authorizer as set forth in RCW 28A.710.100, with contact information for each.

In pursuit of fulfilling its responsibility of evaluating charter applications under 28A.710.100, the Commission hired the following contractors as evaluators of proposals submitted in response to the Commission's 2015 Request For Proposals for New Charter Schools:

Name: Adam Aberman
Job Title: Charter School Application Evaluator
Telephone Number: (323) 806 9378
Email Address: adam@thelearningcollective
Mailing Address: 2515 13th Avenue, Los Angeles CA 90018

Name: Lynn Van Deventer
Job Title: Charter School Application Evaluator
Telephone Number: (206) 734 5451
Email Address: lynnvandev@yahoo.com
Mailing Address: 3224 14th Avenue S, Seattle, WA 98144

Name: David J. Hruby
Job Title: Charter School Application Evaluator
Telephone Number: (518) 421 3899
Email Address: dhruby26@yahoo.com
Mailing Address: 41 Patterson Drive, Glenmont, NY 12077

4. Please provide as an attachment an executive summary of authorizing activity over the last year, including but not limited to the status and performance of the charter schools since becoming an authorizer.
See Attachment: Washington State Charter School Commission.Q4
5. Please provide as an attachment your strategic vision for chartering, and an assessment of the progress made in achieving that vision since becoming an authorizer.
See Attachment: Washington State Charter School Commission.Q5
6. Please provide as an attachment information on the status of your charter school portfolio, identifying each charter school authorized in each of the following categories:
See Attachment: Washington State Charter School Commission.Q6
 - a) Approved but not yet operating, including, for each for each school:
 - i. The targeted student population and the community the school proposes to serve.

- ii. The proposed location of the school or geographic area in which it will be located.
- iii. The projected enrollment at capacity.
- iv. The grades to be operated in each year of the charter contract.
- v. Names and contact information for each member of the governing board.
- vi. Date approved for opening.

b) Operating, including, for each school:

- i. Location (street address if available).
- ii. Grades operated.
- iii. Enrollment, total and by grade.
- iv. Enrollment, by grade, for each student subgroup as defined in RCW 28A.300.042, in totals and as percentages of enrollment.
- v. If charter has been renewed during the last year, please indicate, with date of renewal.
NOT APPLICABLE: Charter schools are not considered for renewal until year-four (4) of their charter contract, and actual renewal in year-five (5). First Place Scholars Charter School would be the first Commission-authorized school up for renewal in 2020, with six schools up for renewal in 2021.
- vi. If charter has been transferred to another authorizer within the last year, please indicate, with date of transfer.
NOT APPLICABLE: The Commission has not had one of its charters transferred to another authorizer.
- vii. If charter was revoked during the last year, please indicate, with date and reasons for revocation.
NOT APPLICABLE: The Commission did not revoke any charters in the 2014-15 school year.
- viii. If the school delayed its opening by more than one year by a grant of extension by the authorizer, please indicate, with date of approval of request for extension.
NOT APPLICABLE: The Commission did not grant an extension for the delay of opening of any charters in the 2014-15 school year.
- ix. If the school voluntarily closed, please indicate, with date of closing.
NOT APPLICABLE: No Commission-authorized schools voluntarily closed in the 2014-15 school year.
- x. If the school never opened, with no planned date for opening, please indicate.
NOT APPLICABLE: All Commission-authorized schools that opened during the 2014-15 school year did so on schedule.

7. As **Exhibit A**, please provide information on the academic performance of each school operated in the prior school year, The information must include:
- a) Student achievement, as applicable by grade, on each of the required indicators enumerated in **RCW 28A.710.100**, as applicable by grade:
 - i. Academic proficiency, for continuously enrolled students, as reported in the Washington Achievement Index.

SEE EXHIBIT A

- ii. Academic growth, for continuously enrolled students, as reported in the Washington Achievement Index.
NOT AVAILABLE: This data will not be available until the 2016-17 school year. Growth data is measured from the assessments given in the two previous academic school years.
- iii. Achievement gaps, for continuously enrolled students, as reported in the Washington Achievement Index.
NOT AVAILABLE: Data will not be available due to N-sizes <10.
- iv. Attendance
SEE EXHIBIT A
- v. Recurrent enrollment from the prior school year to the year before.
NOT AVAILABLE: This data will not be available until the 2016-17 school year due to First Place Scholars Charter School (the only operational Commission-authorized charter school during the 2014-15 school year) only being in their second year of operation.
- vi. Graduation rates, as reported in the Washington Achievement Index.
NOT APPLICABLE: Graduation rates are measured for grades 7-12. First Place Scholars Charter School serves grades K-5.
- vii. Postsecondary readiness, at such time as it is reported in the Washington Achievement Index.
NOT APPLICABLE: Postsecondary readiness, is measured for grades 7-12. First Place Scholars Charter School serves grades K-5.

b) Student achievement, as applicable by grade, on each additional indicator, if any, the authorizer has included in its academic performance framework.

- For each indicator of academic performance, data must be reported as:
 - 1) Absolute values, and
NOT AVAILABLE: Data is not available by grade due to N-sizes <10.
 - 2) The computed differences between actual performance and the annual performance targets set by the charter school in conjunction with the authorizer under RCW 28A.710.170(3).
NOT AVAILABLE: Computation between actual performance and annual targets will be completed in winter 2016 after the Academic Framework target setting trial runs have been completed.
- For each indicator of academic performance, data must be disaggregated by major student subgroup as enumerated in RCW 28A.710.170(5).
NOT AVAILABLE: To maintain compliance with OSPI guidelines, N-sizes <10, results are not reported on major subgroups and all data must be suppressed.

If this information is not yet available, please enter "Not Available" in the box below:

[Click here to enter text.](#)

8. As **Exhibit B**, please provide information on the financial performance over the last year of each charter school operated. The information must include performance on each of

the indicators and measures of financial performance and sustainability included in the authorizer's performance framework under RCW 28A.710.170(2)(g).

- For each indicator of financial performance, data must be reported as:
 - (1) Absolute values, and
 - (2) The computed differences between actual performance and the annual performance targets set by the charter school in conjunction with the authorizer under RCW 28A.710.170(3).

If this information is not yet available, please enter "Not Available" in the box below:

See attachment Washington State Charter School Commission Q8.

9. In the table in **Exhibit C**, please provide information on the organizational performance over the last year of the governing board of each school operated. Performance reported must be based on the indicators and measures of organizational performance in the authorizer's performance framework, including but not limited to compliance with all applicable laws, rules and terms of the charter contract.

- Where applicable, please compute and report the differences between actual performance on the indicators and the annual targets set by the charter school in conjunction with the authorizer under RCW 28A.710.170(3).

If this information is not yet available, please enter "Not Available" in the box below:

See Exhibit C.

10. Please provide as an attachment a presentation of operating costs incurred and expenditures made in the prior fiscal year that are specifically attributable to fulfilling the responsibilities of a charter authorizer under RCW 28A.710.100, as reported in annual financial statements that conform with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles and under any applicable reporting and accounting requirements of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

See Attachment: Washington State Charter School Commission.Q10

11. Please provide as an attachment a list of any contracted, fee-based services purchased in the prior year by the charter schools in the authorizer's portfolio. Please include for each:

- a) An itemized accounting of the revenue received from the schools from the services provided;
- b) An estimate of the actual costs to the provider of providing these services.

If this information is not yet available, please enter "Not Available" in the box below:

NOT APPLICABLE: The charter schools authorized by the Commission did not purchase services from the Commission.

Exhibit A

Please provide information on the academic performance of each school operated in the prior school year

Question 7(a)(i)

2014-15 First Place Scholars Charter School 3rd-5th Grade Proficiency

	ELA					Math				
	Total Students (tested and not tested)	Number of Students Tested	Percentage of Tested Students Meeting Proficiency			Total Students (tested and not tested)	Number of Students Tested	Percentage of Tested Students Meeting Proficiency		
			First Place	Seattle*	State*			First Place	Seattle*	State*
All Students	22	**	**	**	**	23	17	12%	65%	55%
Amer Indian-Alaskan Native	0	**	**	**	**	0	**	**	**	**
Asian	1	**	**	**	**	2	**	**	**	**
Black-African American	15	**	**	**	**	15	**	**	**	**
Hispanic-Latino	3	**	**	**	**	3	**	**	**	**
Pacific Islander	1	**	**	**	**	2	**	**	**	**
Two or More Races	0	**	**	**	**	0	**	**	**	**
White	2	**	**	**	**	2	**	**	**	**
Limited English	0	**	**	**	**	0	**	**	**	**
Special Education	0	**	**	**	**	0	**	**	**	**
Low Income	22	**	**	**	**	23	17	12%	41%	38%

Note: Numbers of student in subgroups do not total to the “All Students” total because students may be included in more than one category.

*State and district average proficiency rates include only the grades served by the charter school and are weighted to the charter school grade level enrollment to account for differences in charter school enrollment by grade and differences in statewide proficiency rates by grade. For example, if 40 percent of students tested in the charter school are in the 3rd grade, then the 3rd grade state proficiency rate counts for 40 percent of the weighted overall state proficiency rate.

**Following OSPI reporting [guidance](#), results are not reported for groups of tested students with fewer than 10 students or for groups of tested students with proficiency rates greater than 95 percent or lower than 5 percent.

Question 7(a)(iv): Attendance

REPORT 1251H		STATE OF WASHINGTON SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION										RUN AUG 18, 2015 @ 12:50	
SUMMARY OF HEAD-COUNT ENROLLMENT AS REPORTED ON FORM P223 FOR SCHOOL YEAR ENDING 2015													
First Place Scholars Charter S.D. No. 901				King County No. 17				Puget Sound E.S.D. 121					
Total K-12 Basic Education Enrollment													
GRADES	SEPTEMBER	OCTOBER	NOVEMBER	DECEMBER	JANUARY	FEBRUARY	MARCH	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	AVERAGE		
HALF-DY.									0.00	0.00	0.00		
FULL-DY.	27.00	27.00	28.00	19.00	22.00	22.00	21.00	21.00	20.00	20.00	22.70		
FIRST	12.00	13.00	17.00	13.00	12.00	12.00	13.00	12.00	13.00	13.00	13.00		
SECOND	15.00	17.00	16.00	17.00	16.00	17.00	16.00	15.00	16.00	16.00	16.10		
THIRD	21.00	20.00	20.00	16.00	15.00	16.00	14.00	14.00	14.00	13.00	16.30		
FOURTH	11.00	12.00	11.00	9.00	8.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	6.00	6.00	8.40		
FIFTH	8.00	8.00	7.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	5.00	6.40		
SIXTH									0.00	0.00	0.00		
SEVENTH									0.00	0.00	0.00		
EIGHTH									0.00	0.00	0.00		
NINTH									0.00	0.00	0.00		
TENTH									0.00	0.00	0.00		
ELEVENTH									0.00	0.00	0.00		
TWELFTH									0.00	0.00	0.00		
KINDERGARTEN	27.00	27.00	28.00	19.00	22.00	22.00	21.00	21.00	20.00	20.00	22.70		
GRADES 1-3	48.00	50.00	53.00	46.00	43.00	45.00	43.00	41.00	43.00	42.00	45.40		
GRADE 4	11.00	12.00	11.00	9.00	8.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	6.00	6.00	8.40		
GRADES 5-6	8.00	8.00	7.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	5.00	6.40		
GRADES 7-8									0.00	0.00	0.00		
GRADES 9-12									0.00	0.00	0.00		
*** TOTALS	94.00	97.00	99.00	80.00	79.00	80.00	77.00	75.00	75.00	73.00	82.90		
* - Months in Average		*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*			
Running Start	SEPTEMBER	OCTOBER	NOVEMBER	DECEMBER	JANUARY	FEBRUARY	MARCH	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	AVERAGE		
Open Doors [1418] - 10-month average of the school year's 12 months													
GRADES	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	AVERAGE

Exhibit B

	Ratio	Measures	Rating	8/31/2015
Near Term	Current Ratio	Current Ratio equals or exceeds 1.0	<i>Meets Standard</i>	<u>NA</u>
		Current Ratio is less than or equal to 1.0	<i>Does Not Meet Standard</i>	
	Unrestricted Days Cash	Days cash on hand equals or exceeds 30	<i>Meets Standard</i>	<u>NA</u>
		Days cash on hand is less than 30 days	<i>Does Not Meet Standard</i>	
	Debt Default	Not in default or delinquent	<i>Meets Standard</i>	<u>NA</u>
		Default or delinquent	<i>Does Not Meet Standard</i>	
	Enrollment Variance Ratio	Enrollment Variance equals or exceeds 95%	<i>Meets Standard</i>	<u>85%</u>
		Enrollment Variance is below 95%	<i>Does Not Meet Standard</i>	
Sustainability	Total Margin	Total Margin must be positive in both years	<i>Meets Standard</i>	<u>NA</u>
		Total Margin is negative in either year	<i>Does Not Meet Standard</i>	
	Debt to Asset	Debt to asset ratio is less than 0.90	<i>Meets Standard</i>	<u>NA</u>
		Debt to asset ratio equals or exceeds 1.0	<i>Does Not Meet Standard</i>	
	Cash Flow	Positive one-year Cash Flow	<i>Meets Standard</i>	<u>NA</u>
		Negative one-year Cash Flow	<i>Does Not Meet Standard</i>	

Exhibit C

Please provide information on the organizational performance over the last year of the governing board of each school operated.

Status & Performance of Commission-Authorized Charter Schools

Six New Schools, Opened in the 2015-16 School Year

After completing over thirty (30) pre-opening conditions over a ten (10) month period, the following Commission-authorized charter schools successfully opened for the 2015-16 school year:

1. Excel Public Charter School
2. Green Dot Public Schools Washington, Destiny Charter Middle School
3. Rainier Prep
4. SOAR Academy
5. Summit Public School: Olympus
6. Summit Public School: Sierra

Please see Attachment: Washington State Charter School Commission.Q6, response (b), for further information about operating Commission-authorized charter schools.

First Place Scholars, Opened in the 2014-15 School Year

On September 3, 2014 the State's first charter school a Commission-authorized charter school, First Place Scholars (FPS) opened in Seattle's Central District. Shortly after opening, the Commission began active oversight of (FPS) when the Commission became aware of a number of contractual violations committed by the school, including the failure to provide special education services to its students. As the Commission began its probe into these violations, further concerns surfaced around the school's English Language Learners' services, as well as the school's financial viability. On June 18, the Commission placed First Place Scholars Charter School (FPS) on probation for twelve months and imposed sanctions for:

- Committing material and substantial violations of the Charter Schools Act and its charter contract;
- Substantially violating material provisions of the laws governing special education;

- Failing to provide a complete expense budget for the 2015/16 school year; and
- Failing to fully satisfy the terms of its existing corrective action and probation.

The sanctions and terms of probation were, and continue to be:

- FPS must provide the Commission monthly progress reports demonstrating that required current and compensatory Special Education services are being delivered.
- FPS must demonstrate that appropriate roles and responsibilities have been assigned to school faculty and staff, and that those faculty and staff have been given sufficient time and resources consistent with their other responsibilities, to ensure the school can and will satisfy its legal obligations as an independent Local Education Agency (LEA) for Special Education services.
- FPS must describe and demonstrate how it will fulfill its contractual obligations of its charter contract or propose alternative language in the form of a contract amendment.
- Beginning July, 2015, 15 business days after the close of the month, FPS must submit a monthly financial report.
- FPS must propose a 2015/16 budget 30 days after the state's biennium budget is approved by the Governor.

Since the time the Commission began its active oversight, FPS has experienced an almost total turnover of its governing board. The new board has taken to heart the process of bringing the school into compliance. They have and continue to engage with the Commission to ensure that the terms of FPS' probation are met, with the ultimate goal of FPS successfully ending its probation in June 2016.

To date, FPS has submitted all due terms of probation in a timely fashion. On September 9, 2015, FPS opened successfully for its second year of classes as a charter school.

The following is the First place Scholars organizational performance as of July 1, 2015. Performance is based on the indicators and measures of the Commission Organizational Framework.

Exhibit C Cont.

1. EDUCATION PROGRAM				
School	1a. Material Terms of the Contract: <i>Is the school implementing the material terms of the education program as defined in the current charter contract?</i>	1.b. Education Requirements: <i>Is the school complying with applicable education requirements?</i>	1.c. Students with Disabilities Rights: <i>Is the school protecting the right of students with disabilities?</i>	1.d. English Language Learner (ELL) Student Rights: <i>Is the school protecting the rights of English Language Learner (ELL) students?</i>
<i>First Place Scholars Charter School (FPSCS)</i>	Does Not Meet the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Notes	<p>As of July 1, 2015, according to WAC 108-30-120 and the signed Commission Charter School Contract FPSCS did not meet compliance in the listed items: WAC 108-30-120 (3),(3)(a), (3)(b),(3)(e), (3)(f), (4), (5), (5)(a),(5)(c), (5)(d), and (5)(f). FPSCS has received letters of inquiry, concern, corrective action and a letter with conditions. FPSCS is continuously working toward corrective actions to best serve the need of their students.</p>			

2. FINANCIAL MANGAMENT AND OVERSIGHT		
School	2.a. Financial Reporting and Compliance: <i>Is the school meeting financial reporting and compliance requirements?</i>	2.b. Financial Management and Oversight (GAAP): <i>Is the school following Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP)?</i>
<i>First Place Scholars Charter School (FPSCS)</i>	Does Not Meet the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Notes	<p>According to RCW 28A. 710.040 (2)(e), Washington State Auditor’s Office, Commission Charter Contract, and WAC 108-30-020 (4)(c), FPSCS did not meet compliance. FCPS has received letters of inquiry, concern, corrective action and a letter with conditions. FPSCS is continuously working toward corrective actions to establish compliance.</p>	

3. GOVERNANCE AND REPORTING			
School	3.a. Governance Requirements: <i>Is the school governing board complying with governance requirements?</i>	3.b. Management Accountability: <i>Is the governing board holding the school management team accountable?</i>	3.c. Reporting Requirements: <i>Is the school complying with reporting requirements?</i>
First Place Scholars Charter School (FPSCS)	Does Not Meet the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Notes	<p>According to WAC 108-30-020 (5)(d), Washington State Auditor’s Office, Annual Site Visits, and the Commission Charter Contract, FPSCS did not have the necessary members to comply with the governing board requirement and did not adhere to the reporting requirements.</p> <p>FPSCS received letters of inquiry, concern and corrective action and a letter with conditions. FPSCS is continuously working toward corrective actions to establish compliance.</p>		

4. STUDENTS, PARENTS, AND EMPLOYEES					
School	4.a. Rights of Students: <i>Is the school protecting the rights of all students?</i>	4.b. Recurrent Enrollment: <i>Does the school’s recurrent enrollment rate indicate equitable access to the school?</i>	4.c. Teacher and Staff Credentials: <i>Is the school meeting teacher and other staff credentialing requirements?</i>	4.d. Employee Rights: <i>Is the school respecting employee rights?</i>	4.e. Background Checks: <i>Is the school completing required background checks?</i>
First Place Scholars Charter School (FPSCS)	Does Not Meet the Standard	Not Applicable	Does Not Meet the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Notes	<p>According to state and federal laws, RCW 28A. 710.040 (1)(a)(2)(c)(d); WAC 108-30-020 (5)(c), the Commission Charter Contract, Washington State Auditor’s Office and Annual Site Visits, FPSCS did not meet compliance.</p> <p>FPSCS has received letters of inquiry, concern and corrective action and a letter with conditions. FPSCS is continuously working toward corrective actions to establish compliance.</p>				

SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT			
School	5.a. Facilities and Transportation: <i>Is the school complying with facilities and transportation requirements?</i>	5.b. Health and Safety: <i>Is the school complying with health and safety requirements?</i>	5.c. Information Management: <i>Is the school maintaining and handling information appropriately?</i>
<i>First Place Scholars Charter School (FPSCS)</i>	Meets the Standard	Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Notes	According to the Annual Site Visit, Washington State Auditor’s Office, and the Commission Charter Contract, FPSCS did not meet compliance. FPSCS has received letters of inquiry, concern and corrective action and a letter with conditions. FPSCS is continuously working toward corrective actions to establish compliance.		

6. ADDITIONAL OBLIGATIONS	
School	6.a. Additional Obligations: <i>Is the school complying with all other obligations?</i>
<i>First Place Scholars Charter School (FPSCS)</i>	Does Not Meet the Standard
Notes	According to the signed Commission Contract FPSCS failed to implement the designed program. FPSCS has received letters of inquiry, concern and corrective action and a letter with conditions. FPSCS is continuously working toward corrective actions to establish compliance.

Attachment: Washington State Charter School Commission.Q4

Please provide as an attachment an executive summary of authorizing activity over the last year, including but not limited to the status and performance of the charter schools since becoming an authorizer.

Authorizing Activity

The Washington State Charter School Commission (Commission) has culminated its 2015 Request For Proposals (RFP) for New Charter Schools designed to solicit proposals from charter school operators seeking to open a high quality charter school in Washington state in the 2016-17 school year. This is the first year the Commission managed the entire RFP process, inclusive of:

- Revision of the RFP (clarifying language including Cultural Inclusiveness expectations)
- Development of an Evaluation Rubric
- Development of two full-day RFP trainings for potential applicants
- Management of RFQ process to select the Evaluation Team, training of evaluators, and management of panel calls and application evaluation
- Management of the Capacity Interviews (including the development and implementation of a performance task)
- Management of Public Forums
- Development of Recommendation Reports

The commission received eight (8) Notices of Intent (NOI) to apply to the 2015 RFP, with two (2) complete applications being submitted. After a thorough evaluation process, the Commission approved two (2) new schools to its portfolio for a total of ten (10) schools authorized since 2013. The newly authorized schools are:

1. Summit Public Schools Washington, Seattle #2
2. Willow Public School

Please see Attachment: Washington State Charter School Commission.Q6, response (a), for further information about approved but not yet operating Commission-authorized charter schools.

Schools Opened in the 2015-16 School Year

After completing over thirty (30) pre-opening conditions over a ten (10) month period, the following Commission-authorized charter schools successfully opened for the 2015-16 school year:

1. Excel Public Charter School
2. Green Dot Destiny Charter Middle School
3. Rainier Prep
4. SOAR Academy

5. Summit Public School: Olympus
6. Summit Public School: Sierra

Please see Attachment: Washington State Charter School Commission.Q6, response (b), for further information about operating Commission-authorized charter schools.

Other Authorizer Activity

In November 2014, The Commission launched an independent, user-friendly website.

In February 2015, The Commission developed a Charter School FAQ, which is posted on the Commission website.

Throughout 2014-15, the Commission continued to publish a quarterly newsletter.

The Commission collaborated with OSPI in the development of a one-day OSPI programs on-boarding/training for the six (6) Commission-authorized schools in their planning year, as well as the two (2) Spokane School District-authorized charter schools. The training occurred on April 27, 2015.

The Commission developed and conducted a one-day Commission on-boarding for the six (6) Commission-authorized schools in their planning year. Topics include relationship building, the Performance Framework, the charter contract, the Pre-Opening Conditions and Annual Compliance calendars. The draft versions of the Commission's New School Orientation and Site Visit Guides were disseminated at the training. The training occurred April 28, 2015.

The Commission has neared completion of its performance framework:

- On December 11, 2014, the Commission adopted the Financial Performance Framework.
- On January 14, 2015, the Commission approved the Organizational Performance Framework.
- The Commission is currently conducting target setting for the Academic Performance Framework, with the goal adopting the Academic Performance Framework at the February 2016 monthly Commission meeting

In February 2015, the Commission launched its online authorization and oversight portal, hosted by Charter Tools. Charter Tools allows the Commission to move seamlessly between the stages of a school's initial application, its authorization, and finally to oversight based upon the reporting and monitoring benchmarks set by the Commission's Performance Framework.

Throughout 2014-15, the Commission has collaborated on a number of occasions with the only district authorized, Spokane Public Schools.

Attachment: Washington State Charter School Commission.Q5

Please provide as an attachment your strategic vision for chartering, and an assessment of the progress made in achieving that vision since becoming an authorizer.

Per the Charter Schools Act, the Commission has established its strategic vision for authorizing to guide its work, within its Mission, Values, and Vision:

The Washington State Charter School Commission seeks to authorize high quality schools that will significantly improve student outcomes, particularly for at-risk students. The Commission will hold schools accountable for student learning using multiple measures of student achievement.

The Commission seeks to build a diverse portfolio of school delivery models that expands the authority of teachers and school leaders and encourages and accelerates the identification and use of best practices in teaching and learning. It also seeks to develop, test, and document innovative, new ideas that can be replicated in other Washington schools.

The Commission expects schools to have authentic and sustainable connections to the communities they serve. These connections are evidenced by strong commitments from community and business stakeholders, systems for ensuring cultural sensitivity, responsiveness to all students and their families, and effective, engaged governance boards.

Based upon this, the Commission has authorized ten (10) public charter schools since 2013, each intentionally positioned to serve at-risk students. The seven (7) operational Commission-authorized charter schools collectively enroll approximately 985 students. The majority of the students at these schools are eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch. At each school, between 5 and 29.5% of the students are English Language Learners. At each school, between 8 and 21% of the students require Special Education services. At each school, between 18 and 60% of the students at these schools are black.

Attachment: Washington State Charter School Commission Q6

Please provide as an attachment information on the status of your charter school portfolio, identifying each charter school authorized in each of the following categories:

- (a) *Approved but not yet operating*
- (b) *Operating*

Q6(a) Approved but not yet operating						
School	Student Population	Location	Projected Enrollment	Grades	Governing Board	Date Approved to Open
Green Dot Seattle	At-Risk	Seattle	1260	2016: Grade 6 2017: Grade 6, 7, 9 2018: Grade 6-10 2019: Grade 6-11 2020: Grade 6-12	Melannie Cunningham Andrew Buhayar Joe Hailey Marguerite Kondracke Patrick Pugh Victoria Woodards	August 15, 2016
Summit Public School: Seattle #2	At-Risk	Seattle	733	2016: Grade 6,9,10 2017: Grade 6,7,9,10 2018: Grade 6-11 2019: Grade 6-12 2020: Grade 6-12	Gordon Empey Michael Galgon Michael Orbino	August 13, 2016
Willow Public School	At-Risk	Walla Walla	255	2016: Grade 6-7 2017: Grade 6-8 2018: Grade 6-8 2019: Grade 6-8 2020: Grade 6-8	Jennifer Beckmeyer Katie Christianson Joe Cooke Nelly Pilaes-Manrique James Winchell	August 13, 2016

Q6(b)(i)-(iii) Operating						
School	Location	Grades Operated		2015 Total Enrollment	2015 Enrollment by Grade	
Excel	19300 108 th Ave SE Kent, WA 98055	2015: 6-7 2016: 6-8 2017: 6-9	2018: 6-10 2019: 6-11 2020: 6-12	143	6: 78.5 7: 64.5 8: 0 9: 0	10: 0 11: 0 12: 0
First Place	172 20th Ave Seattle, WA 98118	2015: K-5 2016: K-5 2017: K-5	2018: K-5 2019: K-5 2020: K-5	109.5	K: 25.5 1: 18.5 2: 17.5	3: 20.5 4: 17.5 5: 10
Green Dot Destiny	1301 East 34th Street Tacoma, WA 98404	2015: 6 2016: 6-7 2017: 6-8	2018: 6-8 2019: 6-8 2020: 6-8	198.5	6: 198.50 7: 0 8: 0	
Rainier Prep	10211 12th Ave S. Seattle, WA 98168	2015: 5-6 2016: 5-7 2017: 5-8	2018: 5-8 2019: 5-8 2020: 5-8	167	5: 80 6: 87 7: 0:	8: 0
SOAR	2136 MLK Jr. Way, Tacoma, WA 98405	2015: K-1 2016: K-2 2017: K-3	2018: K-4 2019: K-5 2020: K-6	65.5	K: 23 1: 42.5 2: 0	3: 0 4: 0 5: 0
Summit Olympus	409 Puyallup Ave. Tacoma, WA 98421	2015: 9 2016: 9-10 2017: 9-11	2018: 9-12 2019: 9-12	113	9: 113 10: 0 11: 0	12: 0
Summit Sierra	1025 S. King Street Seattle, WA 98104	2015: 9 2016: 9-10 2017: 9-11	2018: 9-12 2019: 9-12	116	9: 116 10: 0 11: 0	12: 0

***Total Enrollment listed above is based on the average of total enrolled students in the month of September and October.**

Q6(b)(iv) Operating											
School	White %	Black %	Hispanic /Latino %	American Indian %	Asian %	Native Hawaiian %	Low Income	Bilingual % (ELL)	Migrant %	SpEd %	504 %
Excel	28	38	18	0	9	2	51	13	0	14	3
First Place	4.8	60	14.4	0	0.8	2.4	99 (SY14-15)	15.2	0	11.2	0.8
Green Dot Destiny	18.93	33.98	13.59	2.91	2.91	1.46	87	9	0	21	1
Rainier Prep	7	26	36	1	13.6	0	75	29.5	2	8	1
SOAR	16.3	22.8	6.5	1.1	1.1	5.4	56	5.4	0	12	0
Summit Olympus	19	18	44	1	7	1	80	5	0	14	5
Summit Sierra	21	40	8	1	30	0	60	17	0	13	2.5

Source: Washington State Charter Schools Association (all percentages are estimates)

Attachment: Charter School Commission.Q10

Please provide as an attachment a presentation of operating costs incurred and expenditures made in the prior fiscal year that are specifically attributable to fulfilling the responsibilities of a charter authorizer under RCW 28A.710.100, as reported in annual financial statements that conform with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles and under any applicable reporting and accounting requirements of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

OFM

3590 - Washington Charter School Commission
Allotment Expenditure FYTD Flexible

Report Number: AEF01
 Biennium: 2015

Date Run: Oct 23, 2015 3:47PM

As of Fiscal Month: Adj FY2

Transactions Through: Oct 13, 2015 8:00PM

	FY Allotment	FYTD Allotment	FYTD Disbursement	FYTD Accrual	FYTD Encumbrance	FYTD Total Expenditures	FYTD Variance	FY Variance
By Account/Expenditure Authority Index								
001 - General Fund								
012 - Salaries & Expenses for Fy15	422,000	422,000	391,143.22	30,856.78	0.00	422,000.00	0.00	0.00
072 - Evaluation & Oversight	137,000	137,000	100,115.11	12,357.00	0.00	112,472.11	24,527.89	24,527.89
001 - General Fund	559,000	559,000	491,258.33	43,213.78	0.00	534,472.11	24,527.89	24,527.89
19L - Charter Schools Oversight Account								
030 - Salaries & Expenses	17,000	17,000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	17,000.00	17,000.00
Total for Agency	576,000	576,000	491,258.33	43,213.78	0.00	534,472.11	41,527.89	41,527.89
By Account/Expenditure Authority Index								
By Object								
A - Salaries and Wages	160,108	160,108	170,585.60	9,948.17	0.00	180,533.77	(20,425.77)	(20,425.77)
B - Employee Benefits	45,855	45,855	49,015.92	1,716.83	0.00	50,732.75	(4,877.75)	(4,877.75)
C - Professional Service Contracts	100,000	100,000	54,711.10	11,977.43	0.00	66,688.53	33,311.47	33,311.47
E - Goods and Other Services	217,438	217,438	183,721.12	17,024.29	0.00	200,745.41	16,692.59	16,692.59
G - Travel	48,599	48,599	30,799.27	926.37	0.00	31,725.64	16,873.36	16,873.36
J - Capital Outlays	4,000	4,000	2,425.32	1,620.69	0.00	4,046.01	(46.01)	(46.01)
Total for Agency	576,000	576,000	491,258.33	43,213.78	0.00	534,472.11	41,527.89	41,527.89
By Object								
By Staff								
	FY Allotment	FYTD Allotment	FYTD Disbursements	FYTD Accruals	FYTD Total	FYTD Variance	FY FY Variance	
Staff Months	26.00	26.00	26.83	1.50	28.33	(2.33)	(2.33)	
Months	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	0.00	
FTE	2.17	2.17	2.24	0.12	2.36	(0.19)	(0.19)	

OFM

Allotment Expenditure FYTD Flexible

Report Number: AEF01
Biennium: 2015

As of Fiscal Month: Adj FY2

Date Run: Oct 23, 2015 3:47PM
Transactions Through: Oct 13, 2015 8:00PM

Input Parameters:	Entered As	Interpreted As
User ID:	dlsa179	
Agency:	359	359
Fiscal Month:	24A-Adj FY2	24A-Adj FY2
Account:	*	All
Expenditure Authority:	*	All
Expenditure Authority Index:	*	All
Expenditure Authority Type:	*	All
Program:	*	All
Subprogram:	*	All
Activity:	*	All
Subactivity:	*	All
Task:	*	All
Program Index:	*	All
Object:	*	All
Subobject:	*	All
Sub-subobject:	*	All
Objects to Expand:	*	All
Division:	*	All
Branch:	*	All
Section:	*	All
Unit:	*	All
Cost Center:	*	All
Organization Index:	*	All
Budget Unit:	*	All
Project:	*	All
Subproject:	*	All
Project Phase:	*	All
Allotment Content:	Approved & Adjusted	Approved & Adjusted
Expenditure Content:	Cash, Accr(all)	Cash, Accr(all)

OFM

Allotment Expenditure FYTD Flexible

Report Number: AEF01
Biennium: 2015

As of Fiscal Month: Adj FY2

Date Run: Oct 23, 2015 3:47PM
Transactions Through: Oct 13, 2015 8:00PM

Program Function Content:	*	All
Report Group 1:	None	None
Report Group 2:	None	None
Report Group 3:	None	None
Report Group 4:	None	None
Report Group 5:	None	None
Account / Expenditure Authority Section:	Account/Expenditure Authority Index	Account/Expenditure Authority Index
Expenditure Authority Type Section:	None	None
Organization Structure Section:	None	None
Project Structure Section:	None	None
Custom Section 1 Group 1:	None	None
Custom Section 1 Group 2:	None	None
Custom Section 1 Group 3:	None	None
Custom Section 1 Group 4:	None	None
Custom Section 2 Group 1:	None	None
Custom Section 2 Group 2:	None	None
Custom Section 2 Group 3:	None	None
Custom Section 2 Group 4:	None	None
Object Structure Section:	Object	Object
Staff Section:	Yes	Yes

Department of Teaching and Learning
200 North Bernard Street
Spokane, WA 99201-0282

phone (509) 354-5966
fax (509) 354-5965
www.spokaneschools.org



To: Jack Archer, Director of Basic Education Oversight, State Board of Education
From: Jeannette Vaughn, Director of Innovative Programs, Spokane Public Schools
Re: Annual Charter Authorizer Report

Spokane Public Schools is pleased to submit the annual charter authorizer report, as mandated under RCW 28A.710.100. Please contact me should you have any questions or concerns with the information contained in this report.

Sincerely,

Jeannette Vaughn
Jeannette Vaughn



THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Governance | Accountability | Achievement | Oversight | Career & College Readiness

Authorizer:

RCW 28A.710.100 provides that each charter authorizer must submit an annual report to the State Board of Education, according to a timeline, content and format specified by the Board, and states the information that must be included in the report. WAC 180-19-210 provides that each authorizer must, no later than November 1 of each year beginning in 2014, submit an annual report meeting the requirements of RCW 28A.710.100, and requires SBE to post a standard form for the report on its public web site.

Attached is the standard form for submission of the authorizer annual report for 2015, with instructions for completing and submitting the form. For any questions concerning the annual authorizer report, please contact:

Jack Archer
Director of Basic Education Oversight
State Board of Education
360-725-6035
jack.archer@k12.wa.us

2014 Charter Authorizer Annual Report

Please complete the following report and submit via electronic mail to sbe@k12.wa.us. If the information requested for any part of the report is not available, please enter NA in the space provided, with a brief explanation of why the information cannot be submitted at this time. Please identify by item number below any attachments provided for purposes of this report.

Authorizer Name:

Spokane Public Schools

Authorizer Address:

200 N. Bernard Street

Spokane, Washington 99201

Contact for Additional Information:

Name: Dr. Steven Gering, Chief Academic Officer

Telephone Number: 509-354-7392

Email Address: steveng@spokaneschools.org

Mailing Address: 200 N. Bernard Street, Spokane, WA 99201

1. If a school district, date of approval as an authorizer by the SBE.

September 11, 2013

2. Names and job titles of personnel having principal authorizing responsibilities, with contact information for each.

Name: Jeannette Vaughn, Director Department of Innovation

Telephone Number: 509-354-7353

Email Address: jeannettev@spokaneschools.org

Mailing Address: 200 N. Bernard Street, Spokane, WA 99201

3. Names and job titles of any employees or contractors to whom the district has delegated responsibility for duties of an authorizer as set forth in RCW 28A.710.100, with contact information for each.

Name:

Telephone Number:

Email Address:

Mailing Address:

4. Please provide as an attachment an executive summary of authorizing activity over the last year, including but not limited to the status and performance of the charter schools since becoming an authorizer.

Please title the attachment: Name of Authorizer.Q4

For example: State Board of Education.Q4

5. Please provide as an attachment your strategic vision for chartering and an assessment of the progress made in achieving that vision since becoming an authorizer.

Please title the attachment: Name of Authorizer.Q5

6. Please provide as an attachment information on the status of your charter school portfolio, identifying each charter school authorized in each of the following categories:

Please title the attachment: Name of Authorizer.Q6

- a) Approved but not yet operating, including, for each for each school:

- i. The targeted student population and the community the school proposes to serve.
- ii. The proposed location of the school or geographic area in which it will be located.
- iii. The projected enrollment at capacity.
- iv. The grades to be operated in each year of the charter contract.
- v. Names and contact information for each member of the governing board.
- vi. Date approved for opening.

- b) Operating, including, for each school:

- i. Location (street address if available).
- ii. Grades operated.
- iii. Enrollment, total and by grade.
- iv. Enrollment, in total and by grade, for each student subgroup as defined in RCW 28A.300.042, in totals and as percentages of enrollment.
- v. If the charter has been renewed during the last year, please indicate, with date of renewal.
- vi. If the charter has been transferred to another authorizer within the last year, please indicate, with date of transfer.
- vii. If the charter was revoked during the last year, please indicate, with date and reasons for revocation.
- viii. If the school delayed its opening by more than one year by a grant of extension by the authorizer under RCW 28A.710.160, please indicate, with date of approval of request for extension.
- ix. If the school voluntarily closed, please indicate, with date of closing.
- x. If the school never opened, with no planned date for opening, please indicate.

7. As **Exhibit A**, please provide information on the academic performance of each school operated in the prior school year. The information must include:
- a) Student achievement, as applicable by grade, on each of the required indicators enumerated in **RCW 28A.710.100**, as applicable by grade:
 - i. Academic proficiency, for continuously enrolled students, as reported in the Washington Achievement Index.
 - ii. Academic growth, for continuously enrolled students, as reported in the Washington Achievement Index.
 - iii. Achievement gaps, for continuously enrolled students, as reported in the Washington Achievement Index.
 - iv. Attendance
 - v. Recurrent enrollment from the prior school year to the year before.
 - vi. Graduation rates, as reported in the Washington Achievement Index.
 - vii. Postsecondary readiness, at such time as it is reported in the Washington Achievement Index.
 - b) Student achievement, as applicable by grade, on each additional indicator, if any, the authorizer has included in its academic performance framework.
 - For each indicator of academic performance, data must be reported as:
 - 1) Absolute values, and
 - 2) The computed differences between actual performance and the annual performance targets set by the charter school in conjunction with the authorizer under RCW 28A.710.170(3).
 - For each indicator of academic performance, data must be disaggregated by major student subgroup as enumerated in RCW 28A.710.170(5).

If this information is not yet available, please enter "Not Available" in the box below, with a brief explanation:

Not available as this is the first year of school operation.

8. As **Exhibit B**, please provide information on the financial performance over the last year of each charter school operated. The information must include performance on each of the indicators and measures of financial performance and sustainability included in the authorizer's performance framework under RCW 28A.710.170(2)(g).

- For each indicator of financial performance, data must be reported as:
 - (1) Absolute values, and
 - (2) The computed differences between actual performance and the annual performance targets set by the charter school in conjunction with the authorizer under RCW 28A.710.170(3).

If this information is not yet available, please enter "Not Available" in the box below, with a brief explanation:

Not available as this is the first year of school operation.

9. In the table in **Exhibit C**, please provide information on the organizational performance over the last year of the governing board of each school operated. Performance reported must be based on the indicators and measures of organizational performance in the authorizer's performance framework, including but not limited to compliance with all applicable laws, rules and terms of the charter contract.
- Where applicable, please compute and report the differences between actual performance on the indicators and the annual targets set by the charter school in conjunction with the authorizer under RCW 28A.710.170(3).

If this information is not yet available, please enter "Not Available" in the box below, with a brief explanation:

Not available as this is the first year of school operation.

10. Please provide as an attachment a presentation of operating costs incurred and expenditures made in the prior fiscal year that are specifically attributable to fulfilling the responsibilities of a charter authorizer under RCW 28A.710.100, as reported in annual financial statements that conform with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles and under any applicable reporting and accounting requirements of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Please label the attachment: Name of Authorizer.Q10

11. Please provide as an attachment a list of any contracted, fee-based services purchased from the authorizer in the prior year by the charter schools in the authorizer's portfolio. Please include for each:
- a) An itemized accounting of the revenue received from the schools from the services provided;
 - b) An estimate of the actual costs to the provider of providing these services.

Please label the attachment: Name of Authorizer.Q11

Not applicable.

Spokane Public Schools. Q4

Date	Tasks, Events & Milestones
January 2015	Contracted with Charter Tools as a web-based oversight/compliance tracking tool for charter authorizers
February 2015	RFP for charter applications is posted and advertised
February 2015	SPS staff and school leader from Pride Prep charter co-present about district/charter collaboration at statewide conference for HR professionals
March 2015	Finalization of performance and financial frameworks
April/May 2015	SPS did not receive any 'notices of intent' or charter applications
May 2015	SPS staff presents at WA Charter conference on the topic of charter authorizing
June 2015	Staff attendance at the National Charter School conference
June-Aug 2015	Frequent pre-opening meetings with charter operators to ensure successful openings
August 2015	Both SPS authorized charter schools open their doors to students
October 2015	SPS staff attend the NACSA conference

Spokane Public Schools. Q5

According to Article IX, section 1 of the state constitution, "it is the paramount duty of the state to make ample provisions for the education of all children residing within its borders, without distinction or preference on account of race, color, caste, or sex." And RCW28A.710.005 (Findings for Initiative Measure No. 1240) declared that all students deserve excellent educational opportunities and the highest quality standard of public education

available. With these as the back drop, Washington State voters passed Initiative Measure 1240 to approve charter schools as options for the State of Washington.

Once voters approved this as a viable option, our superintendent was clear that Spokane should use this as an option to help move Spokane Public Schools forward on our academic mission. Additionally, our board of directors unanimously passed a resolution approving our school district to move forward with a charter school authorization application.

Spokane and the statutory language in RCW 28A.710.005 have similar views about the potential of charter schools. The promise of charter schools for Spokane, therefore, is to help serve as a catalyst for school improvement, to provide new techniques and strategies to reach at-risk students, and to add choices to the portfolio of options available in Spokane Public Schools (all explicitly mentioned in RCW 28A.710.005). Spokane Public Schools applied to be a charter school authorizer as it aligns with our mission and vision. By being an authorizer, and ensuring that we actively cultivate the types of charters that align our district to our vision statement of Excellence for Everyone, we strive to close the achievement gap and ensure that all students are prepared for a variety of post-secondary pursuits.

As part of our strategic planning efforts, Spokane Public Schools has identified the following as its education mission:

“The mission of Spokane Public Schools is to develop the skills and talents of all students through rigorous learning experiences, relevant real-life applications, and supportive relationships.”

Towards this end, we have examined a range of data from across our school system to track school progress and performance. For example, using the Washington State Achievement Index, it is possible to see a number of schools that are underperforming and are falling short in one or more areas of academic performance. It is clear that there are particular region(s) of our city in which underserved students reside. Consequently, we will have worked diligently to recruit charter schools that meet our academic and citizenship goals and that are targeted towards at-risk students, particularly in the Northeast and Northwest sections of the school district.

In addition to our comprehensive review of our data, we also conducted a large number of surveys and focus groups as part of our strategic planning initiatives. The community feedback showed that they want additional choice and options for their students. We have been researching, proposing and implementing new school program options within our district schools, and have been thoughtful about authorizing charters that fit with community demand and that add to our currently portfolio of options.

Serving At-Risk Students

Spokane Public Schools gives priority to charter schools that serve at-risk students as defined in RCW 28A.710.010 (2) in a number of ways. First and foremost, we explicitly have this in our charter school application materials. All charter school applicants must address recruitment of at-risk students in their application and this will be part of our consideration in the authorization process.

Secondly, we have published specific request for proposals and applications that

outline the types of schools and locations of the schools where we find the greatest need (based on at-risk student data). Our intent is that through our request for proposal process that we will provide tremendous clarity about regions of the city we are most interested in serving; types of schools and curriculum programs we are interested in offering; and our clear intent of providing priority for at-risk students.

Respecting and Protecting Charter School Autonomy

Spokane Public Schools is committed to following the charter school renewal, revocation, and non-renewal process. Successful charter school applicants enter into a five year agreement with Spokane Public Schools to run the school as outlined in their charter application. As the charter authorizer, we engage with charter operators in our regular review and evaluation process. In all other respects, the charter will have autonomy unless specific agreements have been established in the charter contract.

Since charter schools authorization is part of our strategic plan and vision, Spokane Public Schools is interested in a number of unique ways such as facilities and/or other fee-based services. However, Spokane Public Schools does not require this and for any fee-based services we may agree to provide schools are voluntary for schools.

Promoting and Ensuring Charter School Accountability

Along with a commitment to ensuring charter school accountability, we also have a plan for ensuring that charter schools authorized by Spokane Public Schools will be held accountable for their performance. Spokane will follow all of the criteria outlined in RCW28A.710.170. We are in the process of refining our performance framework now that we have two authorized schools and we have gained more knowledge about our charter oversight responsibilities. In addition, we are investing in a web-based tool which will assist both our district and the charter schools that we authorize in meeting targeted benchmarks and compliance deadlines.

Spokane views charters as one potential tool to assist us with our overall academic

mission. Consequently, if a charter school is underperforming and is not meeting expectations as outlined in our performance agreements, then it will be imperative that we use the revocation and/or non-renewal process accordingly as part of our accountability efforts. Although we anticipate that this process would be tremendously difficult, we also view this as strength of charter schools. With increased autonomy comes an increased level of accountability. Both of these tools (autonomy and accountability) are part of the package that comes with charters, and they need to be embraced.

Progress Made Toward Achieving the Vision

As far as creating additional education choices, we have added a handful of new programs (dedicated Montessori school, school expansions to include K-8 and 7-12 school models, a New Tech Network high school model, a future language immersion program and inclusion of two charter schools) to offer a portfolio of options to the families of Spokane. We've strengthened our understanding of quality charter authorizing by participating in professional development trainings, and by partnering with NACSA and WA Charters to create a collaborative spirit with charter operators. We are investing in Charter Tools management system as a method for monitoring the progress of each of our charter schools. Our district has utilized grant and district funds to support the authorization process and will continue to do so as we begin our responsibilities for oversight once the charters become operational. One future goal is to recruit a high-quality Charter Management Organization (CMO) to Spokane to expand our range of charter school options.

In summary, we believe that we have made great process toward our goals in a relatively short period of time. While we still have much to learn about high quality charter authorizing, we are committed to learning and leading the state as a district authorizer. We are committed to only authorizing schools which we believe will uphold our vision for excellence and have every intention of following proven and best practices for quality authorizing. Spokane, like all others across the state, await legal and legislative

action to fully understand the future of charter schools in the state of Washington. In the meantime, and at the time of this report submission, we are continuing the work of high-quality authorizing and collaboration with the two schools that were authorized by the Board of Directors of Spokane Public Schools.

Spokane Public Schools. Q6

Charter schools operating in Spokane

School	Location	Grades Served	2015 Total Enrollment	2015 Enrollment by Grade
Pride Prep	811 E. Sprague Spokane, WA 99202	6 th and 7 th grades	154	6 th - 77 7 th - 77
Spokane International Academy	2706 E. Queen Spokane, WA 99217	Kindergarten, 1 st and 6 th grades	158	K - 50 1 st - 50 6 th - 58

Subgroup	Pride Prep % of total enrollment	Spokane Int'l % of total enrollment
White	75	74
Black	4.6	4
Hispanic	5.3	12
American Indian	3.3	1
Asian	.7	3
Pacific Islander	.6	1
Two or more races	10.5	5
Low income	60	54
Transitional Bilingual	1	3
Migrant	0	0
Special Education	13	10
Section 504	6	4

Spokane Public Schools. Q10

Expenditure	Approximate Cost	Notes
Staffing	\$144,959	2.057 FTE to work in the Department of Innovation on both charter authorizing and assisting district school development. Approximately 50% of 2.057 FTE work load is related to charter authorizing, as opposed to working with other portfolio strategies. This percentage will increase in 2015-16 with the opening of our two charter schools.
Supplies/Equipment	\$5,495	Enrollment mailings; technology equipment and supplies for additional authorizing support staff; supplies for progress meetings with charter schools.
Contractual Services	\$2,412	Charter Tools on-line web-based monitoring system; Interpreter support for charter authorizing public forum.
Professional Development	\$18,698	Registration and travel costs to attend two NACSA events, National Charter School conference, CRPE meeting for portfolio districts, multiple WA Charter Commission meetings, and the WA Charters conference
Total Expenditures	\$171,564	