The Washington State
BOARD OF EDUCATION

Charter Schools Report

Prepared by the Washington State Board of Education **2024**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

Contents

Executive Summary

This is the seventh annual report on the performance of charter schools in Washington completed by the Washington State Board of Education. In each of the annual reports we completed, we provided evidence showing that, as a group, students at charter schools perform as well or better than students at traditional public schools on traditional educational outcome measures. This finding is consistent with other charter school research conducted by nationally recognized organizations and researchers.

Notwithstanding this overall academic success at Washington's, charter schools, charter school students will benefit from changes in the Washington charter school law when the recommendations listed below are implemented. The recommendations center on the authorization of additional charter schools, remedying the inequitable funding of charter schools, and addressing issues regarding the authorizer oversight fees.

> **RECOMMENDATION 1: The SBE and charter school authorizers recommend that the window for authorization be reopened to allow additional charter schools to operate in Washington.**
>
> **RECOMMENDATION 2: The SBE and charter school authorizers recommend a close examination of the sufficiency of charter school funding and approaches used in other states in order to bring about equitable educational funding for Washington's schools.**
>
> **RECOMMENDATION 3: Explore options to create more flexibility in the use of authorizer fees and/or direct appropriation to cover charter school oversight costs.**

Charter schools have experienced a steady growth in student enrollment and often provide valuable educational opportunities for families in communities across Washington State. In 28A 710.030, the legislature affirmed their commitment to ensuring all authorized public charter schools in Washington are successful in their mission to serve Washington students. We believe that charter school students will continue to post successful educational outcomes in the future, but the charter school environment would yield even more successes with the implementation of our three recommendations.

Authorizing Legislation

The Washington State's Charter School Act (RCW 28A.710) took effect on April 3, 2016, for the primary purpose of allowing flexibility to innovate in areas such as scheduling, personnel, funding, and educational programs to improve student outcomes and academic achievement of "at-risk" student populations[1]. A charter school or charter public school is "a public school that is established in accordance with this chapter [28A.710], governed by a charter school board, and operated according to the terms of a charter contract executed under this chapter. As in many states including Washington, a charter school is a public school alternative to traditional common schools. The first public charter schools began operating in Washington in 2014 and then again under the Charter School Act in the fall 2016. The State Board of Education (SBE) issues an annual report to the Governor, the Legislature, and the public, as required in RCW 28A.710.250. This is the seventh annual report on Washington charter schools.

The statute requires the annual charter school report to include the following.

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

We also include the first reporting of charter school employment of noncertificated instructors, as required in recently enacted legislation from the 2023 legislative session. In addition to this

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

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

new reporting requirement, HB 1744 clarifies the responsibilities and accountability for the effective delivery and oversight of public education services to charter school students.

Key Findings on the Academic Performance of Charter Schools

Comparing the learning of charter school students to TPS students has been an interest to academicians, educators, policymakers, and the public for more than 30 years. Like traditional public school students, the academic achievement of charter school students varies a lot across the nation, from state to state, by school level, by presence and nature of a management organization, and results differ for different student groups. The evidence from many studies indicates no difference in achievement on tests between students who attend a charter school and those who attend a TPS.

> **The overall finding for all of the prior charter school reports and this seventh edition submitted by the SBE is that students attending Washington charter schools perform similar to or better than academically, economically, and ethnically similar students attending traditional public schools. The analyses of the one-to-one matching of students from the 2022-23 school year found that charter school students identifying as Black or African Americans, students identifying as Hispanic, students who are English learners, and students qualifying for the Free and Reduced Price Lunch program (FRL) outperformed their matched TPS peers on the ELA and math measures.**

The key findings listed below are for the charter schools operating in the 2022-23 school year. The findings come from the spring 2023 statewide tests, the winter 2024 Washington School Improvement Framework (WSIF), the Washington State Report Card, the charter school authorizer reports, and other publicly available data sources.

- For the most part, charter schools continue to serve higher percentages of systemically marginalized students as compared to the home school districts.
- Students at charter schools are more apt to have a teacher who is:
    a. a person of color,
    b. less experienced, and
    c. teaching out of endorsement.
- On average, the charter schools' winter 2024 WSIF scores are similar to the average WSIF score for the state.
- Official graduation rates were reportable for only four charter schools issuing diplomas for the class of 2023. Among the charter schools with reportable graduation rates, the rates for three charter schools were higher than the state rates.
- On the spring 2023 statewide tests, students at some charter schools performed better than or similar to students at the home school districts, depending on the content area

tested. In some cases, the charter school students' test results were lower than the home school district.

- Based on the matched peers comparison using the spring 2023 statewide testing, charter school students performed better than their TPS peer group on six of the eight measures and similar to TPS students on the two other measures.
- Charter school students who are Black or African American, students who are Hispanic and Latinx, students who are English learners, and students who qualify for the Free and Reduced Price Lunch program (FRL) did better than their matched TPS peers on the ELA and math measures do.
- The percentage of charter school students regularly attending school is lower than the rate for the students in the home school districts.
- The percentage of first time, 9th grade, charter school students who passed all of their courses (9th Graders On-Track) is higher than the rate for the students in the home school districts.
- The percentage of charter school students passing and finishing dual credit courses is lower than the rate for the students in the home school districts.

Key Developments Charter Schools

The Washington State Charter School Commission (CSC or Commission) and Spokane Public Schools Charter School Authorizer (Spokane PS) are the only charter school authorizers in the state. Aside from the Commission, a charter school authorizer is an SBE-approved school district, which reviews, approves, or rejects charter school applications; enters into, renews, or revokes charter contracts with applicants; and oversees the charter schools within the school district's boundaries. The Commission may authorize charter schools anywhere in Washington. The two authorizers oversaw 16 charter public schools operating in Washington during the 2022-23 school year. Total charter public school enrollment increased to 4,829 students in the 2022-23 school year from 4,642 students enrolled in public charter schools for the 2021-22 school year.

Since the Charter School Act became law, 24 charter schools have been authorized to operate. Of those, 18 are currently operating, five charter schools were opened and subsequently closed, and one school ended its charter and re-opened as a tuition-free private school. As of fall 2023, all previously authorized charter schools opened for operations or opened and subsequently closed.

In April 2021, the timeframe for approving new public charter schools ended. During the 2021 and 2022 legislative sessions, the SBE supported legislation to extend the time in which to approve additional charter schools but the legislation failed to pass. No new charter schools can be authorized unless the current law is changed.

In the 2023 legislative session, HB 1744 was clarified the responsibilities and accountability for the effective delivery and oversight of public education services to charter school students. The legislature passed the bill, which was signed into law by the Governor, and took effect on July

23, 2023. The final bill report explains the changes that include but are not limited to the following:

- Charter schools must report the employment of all noncertificated instructional staff to the authorizers and must post and maintain on its website information about the school's process and instructions for submitting complaints about the operation and administration of the charter school.
- Each charter school board must ensure that its members and administrative staff receive annual training to support the effective operation and oversight of the charter school.
- Authorizers must help with the effective administration and operation of charter schools by providing technical assistance to charter schools or charter school boards when requested. In addition, the Commission must establish and maintain an online system for students attending charter schools and their parents, to submit complaints about their charter school.
- Charter school authorizers must hold the charter school board of each authorized charter school accountable for ensuring that students in the charter school have opportunities for academic success. In addition, authorizers must ensure that charter school boards comply with the annual training requirements to support the effective operation and oversight of charter schools.
- The State Board of Education role of overseeing the performance and effectiveness of authorizers that are school districts is expanded to include all authorizers, which includes the Commission.

Partially in response to the enactment of HB 1744, the SBE filed a CR 101 with the Code Reviser's Office in May 2023 indicating the Board's intent to review and update the charter school rules (WAC 180-19). The Board, in consultation with the authorizers, identified a number of issues in rule to address during this revision. SBE sent draft rules to the charter school authorizers (Charter School Commission and Spokane PS) for review and comments. The Board approved proposed rules on October 12, 2023 and after a December 11, 2023 public hearing on the proposed rule changes, the Board adopted the final rules on February 15, 2024.

Key Developments - Charter School Commission

A key focus for the Commission staff is to work with other groups and agencies to broaden awareness of the Commission's oversight and accountability role. The Commission started and continues to meet regularly with the State Auditor's Office, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Board of Education, and Washington State Charter Schools Association, and is communicating regularly with legislators and the Governor's Office.

In 2021-22, the Commission staff continued their professional development for quality charter authorizing through trainings with the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA) and the Washington State School Directors Association (WSSDA). Other CSC developments include the following:

- Fourteen Commission authorized charter schools were in operation for the entire 2022-23 school year. Sixteen Commission authorized charter schools are open for the 2023-24 school year.
- Impact | Black River and Rooted Schools of Vancouver opened in the fall 2023 for the 2023-24 school year.
- Rainier Valley Leadership Academy was approved for expansion, adding grades K-5 to the existing grades 6-12.
- In October 2023, the CSC approved the expansion Catalyst Public Charter School from serving grades K-8 to K-12.
- Also in October, the Commission approved Summit Atlas' renewal application for a three-year term beginning October 12, 2023.
- In April 2023, the Commission voted to start a new strategic planning process by creating a Strategic Planning Advisory Committee. The Commission hired a consultant to help the process, which will include partner outreach. The Commission plans to adopt a new strategic plan in summer 2024.
- After the legislature passed ESHB 1744, the Commission talked to multiple partners before creating the new process for students, parents and guardians to make complaints against charter schools. The new online complaint process launched on October 25, 2023.
- The Commission made a supplemental budget request to the Legislature to cover the costs of implementing ESHB 1744. In particular, the Commission asked for more funding to cover the added cost of providing technical assistance to the charter schools the Commission oversees, a new responsibility added by HB 1744. These funds will allow the Commission to fully implement the intent of the new legislation.

In response to the enactment of HB 1744, the Charter School Commission filed a CR101 with the Code Reviser's Office in June 2023 indicating the Commission's intent to create new rules reflecting the addition of a complaint process consistent with HB 1744. After extensive outreach with families, school leaders, educational agencies and organizations, and those who might use the process and/or those who might be most impacted by the process, the Commission developed and received feedback on draft rules. The Commission held a November 21, 2023 public hearing on the proposed rule changes, and the Commission adopted the final rules on December 14, 2023.

On March 15, 2024, the Charter School Commission voted to give notice to Pullman Community Montessori of the Commission's intention to revoke the school's charter contract. This is the first step in a process in which the school will have an opportunity to respond, and which may or may not ultimately result in revocation of the charter school contract. On March 22, 2024, the Commission sent the Notice to Revoke to Pullman Community Montessori. The school remains open and the school's Board of Directors have 30 days to respond.

Key Developments - Spokane Public Schools

During the 2022-23 school year, Spokane Public Schools (SPS) continued working with each charter school it oversees in support of continued improvement. Spokane PS provides oversight, technical assistance, and measures accountability for each charter school using three performance frameworks. In addition, Spokane PS monitors for compliance with state and federal laws, in collaboration with the Office of Superintendent of Public Institution and the State Auditor's Office.

PRIDE Prep serves secondary students in a comprehensive school model with project based learning and International Baccalaureate programming. During the 2022-23 school year, PRIDE focused on internal processes and controls to strengthen organizational effectiveness while transitioning a new operations manager. Spokane PS provided technical assistance in the form of teacher professional development focused on reading and math intervention, coupled with the addition of adaptive online tools for reading and math intervention and acceleration. Over the 2022-23 school year, Spokane PS reviewed the conditions and required notifications set forth in PRIDE's Conditional Renewal and found that PRIDE met the additional conditions outlined in the renewal agreement. 2022-23 was the second year of Pride Schools' conditional renewal due, in part, to academic performance falling in the bottom quartile of schools on the Washington School Improvement Framework. Pride's charter contract was renewed on July 1, 2021 and since this time, the charter school has consistently improved their academic performance.

Lumen High School opened in the fall of 2020 for the 2020-21 school year, but the 2021-22 school year was the school's first year of year-round in-person instruction. Lumen continues to serve a small, special population of students that includes teen mothers and fathers. Due to the small enrollment, the current Academic Performance Framework indicators are not sufficient to evaluate the academic performance of the school. Spokane PS conducted national research of charter authorizers serving special populations to gather information about indicators that could be more informative. This research has been shared with Lumen and over the coming year, Spokane PS and Lumen will work together to update the Lumen High School Academic Performance Framework.

The Spokane charter school authorizer staff continues to strengthen their understanding of quality charter authorizing by participating in professional development trainings. In addition, the staff is working with the National Association of Charter School Authorizers and the Washington Charter Schools Association to create a collaborative spirit with charter operators.

Key Findings on the Analysis of Funding Efficacy

The 2024 Legislature included and approved a $7.8M expenditure in the supplemental budget from the Washington Opportunity Pathways Account to charter schools. The one-time budget allocation stipulates that the charter schools will receive $1,500 per enrollment for enrichment.

A brief review of the 2021-22 school and district revenues and expenditures (the most recent publicly available data) might give the reader the impression that charter schools have a lot higher per student revenues than the home school districts, but this ignores key differences in how the revenues are accounted for. Charter schools often seek out and receive grants from outside organizations to help with start-up or other expenses. However, these grants are often available for only a few years at most and often must be used for a specific purpose. Operating costs for charter schools generally include expenses that would be part of the capital budget for a TPS. For example, grant funds are often used to rent space for the school, renovate the school space, purchase required school furniture and equipment, and these grant monies are included in charter school per student revenues but generally would not be included for a TPS. In addition, the charter schools are not eligible to receive local levy funding.

When one-time grant monies and outliers are removed from the analysis, charter schools receive lower revenues from state and local sources than the home school districts.

- The average total salary paid for charter school instructional staff is much lower than the salary allocation received from the state and is much lower than the average total salary paid by the home school district.
- The state apportionment is similar for the charter school LEAs and the home school districts, but the charter school LEAs are not eligible to receive monies from local taxes.
- The average support from the Local Tax revenue source is about $2,685 per student for the home school districts and is about $346 per student for the charter school LEAs.

Recommendations

The National Alliance for Public Charter Schools ranks the Washington Charter School Act as one of the strongest in the nation but highlights two major challenges. First, the law includes a cap of 40 charter schools over the first five years after enactment of the Charter School Act. The window to authorize new charter schools closed in April 2021. This means that new charter schools cannot be approved without a change to the law. Second, Washington law limits funding in public charter schools, by not allowing charter schools to receive money from local taxes. These two challenges continue to be a focus of the SBE's annual recommendations.

Authorizing Additional Charter Schools

Since the 2016 Charter School Act took effect, new charter schools opened in each school year. In addition, the Commission recently reported that about 1,200 students are on waiting lists to enroll in charter schools across the state. This is evidence that parents and guardians continue to seek out alternatives to traditional public schools to find the best educational fit for their children. The 2016 Charter School Act allowed for the authorization of up to 40 schools within the first five years of the Act. After a handful of charter schools closed since the law took effect,

18 charter schools are operating in the 2023-24 school year. As of fall 2023, all authorized charter schools are open for the 2023-24 school year or subsequently closed. Since the Charter School Act took effect, the number of operating charter schools steadily increased, while remaining well below the cap of 40 schools authorized in statute.

During the 2021 and 2022 legislative sessions, legislation was introduced that would have extended the timeframe for establishing up to 40 total charter schools by another five years but the bills were unsuccessful. No additional charter schools will be approved or authorized unless the charter school law is changed.

We recommend that the window for the authorization of new charter schools be reopened to allow additional charter schools to operate in Washington.

Funding of Charter Schools

Charter schools face unique challenges concerning funding because charter schools do not have access to public funding for capital and the lack of access to local tax revenues. The Commission continues to advocate for more equitable student funding and access to public funding for capital costs to ensure the sustainability of charter schools over time.

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

We recommend a close examination of the sufficiency of charter school funding and approaches used in other states to bring about equitable educational funding for all students.

Authorizer Oversight Fees and Usage

Another focus of recommendations over the last three years centers on the authorizer oversight fees. In January 2021, the SBE finalized rules authorizing the SBE to adjust the authorizer oversight fee rate in consultation with the charter school authorizers. After consulting with authorizers, the SBE set the authorizer oversight fee rate at three percent for the 2022-23 and 2023-24 school years.

We recommend reviewing options to create more flexibility in the use of authorizer fees and/or direct appropriation to cover charter school oversight costs.

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

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

Other Recommendations and Ongoing Work

School district apportionment provides lower payments in the months that levy dollars are received by traditional school districts. Given that charter schools do not receive levy dollars, this creates cash flow challenges in those months. The SBE and Spokane PS recommend evaluation and adjustment of the payment schedule to address cash flow challenges.

Introduction

Reporting Authority

RCW 28A.710.250 (1) directs the State Board of Education (SBE) to issue a report on the performance of the state's charter schools. RCW 28A.710.250 (2) says the annual report must be based on the reports submitted by each charter school authorizer and any other relevant information compiled by the State Board of Education. The authorizer reports are on SBE's website. Legislation in 2020 (HB 2853) changed the reporting timeline such that the final report is now due on March 1 of each year for the report covering the prior school year. However, data required for this work (e.g., WSIF scores) are not made public until mid to late March.

The Charter School Commission and Spokane Public Schools submitted authorizer reports for the 2022-23 school year to the SBE in February 2024. The SBE used the authorizer reports and additional information to complete this seventh annual report on the performance of the charter schools.

In addition to this short introduction and appended materials, the SBE divided this report into four sections. The sections address the reporting requirements specified in statute and new reporting requirements in the recently enacted HB 1744.

I. The initial reporting of noncertificated instructors at the charter schools for the current and prior school years.
II. The performance of the state's charter schools for the preceding school year (2022-23), including a comparison of the performance of charter school students with the performance of academically, ethnically, and economically comparable groups of students in other public schools,
III. The State Board of Education's assessment of the successes, challenges, and areas for improvement in meeting the purposes of the Washington Charter Public Schools Act including the Board's assessment of the sufficiency of funding for charter schools, the efficacy of the formula for authorizer funding, and
IV. Any suggested changes in state law or policy necessary to strengthen the state's charter schools.

As noted above, this report includes the initial reporting of charter school employment of noncertificated instructors. This is a new requirement coming from the 2023 legislative session. HB 1744 clarifies the responsibilities and accountability for the effective delivery and oversight of public education services to charter school students.

The SBE must issue the annual report based on the performance of the state's charter schools during the preceding year. This seventh annual report describes the academic performance of the charter schools operating during the 2022-23 school year. Where necessary, we use certain data from the 2021-22 school year because the required data for the 2022-23 school year has not yet been made publicly available.

Charter Schools in Washington

Charter School Act

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

The window to authorize additional charter schools closed in April 2021. Efforts to extend or reopen the authorization window through legislation have not been successful. Authorizers may not approve new charter schools unless the current law is changed.

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

- Are public schools that are alternatives to traditional common schools,
- Are open to all children free of charge and by choice, with admission based only on age group, grade level, and school enrollment availability, and
- Must be nonsectarian and nonreligious.

In addition, Washington charter schools:

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

The National Alliance for Public Charter Schools (National Alliance) publishes an annual report ranking the strength of each state's charter school laws. The ranking is based on 21 components of the National Alliance model law. Washington's charter school laws are among the strongest in the country. Per the National Alliance, a "strong" charter school law is one, which requires best practices, and guarantees the rights and freedoms of charter schools so that charter school movement in a state benefits from a supportive legal and policy environment. The report summarized the findings for Washington as follows:

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

Charter Schools. Students, and Educators

The charter schools in operation change from year to year (Table 2). Some charter schools add one or two grade levels each year to allow for the grade promotion of continuing students. This means that the grade levels served at each charter school often change from year to year until the schools' approved grade levels are fully in place.

In this report, some school names are shortened to improve readability and the appearance of charts and tables. For example, Rainier Valley Leadership Academy is referred to as Rainier Valley, Impact | Puget Sound Elementary is most often referred to as Impact Puget Sound, and these types of shortened names are used for many of the charter schools.

The Washington Charter School Commission and Spokane Public Schools provided oversight for 16 charter public schools during the 2022-23 school year (Table 1). Per the Washington State Report Card, 4,829 students attended Washington charter public schools on the official count day for the 2022-23 school year (Table 2).

Since the Charter School Act took effect, the total number of charter school students nearly quadrupled (Table 3). The number of students increased from about 1,200 in fall 2015 to about 4,800 in the fall 2022. The increase occurs at all grade levels but is greatest for the high school grades. The fall 2022 charter school enrollment is about 0.4 percent of Washington's total K-12 public school enrollment.

The Charter School Act directs the CSC and any other authorizers to approve or authorize high quality charter public schools throughout the state, especially schools that are designed to benefit systemically marginalized (at-risk) students. Washington law defines an at-risk (systemically marginalized) student as one who has an academic or economic disadvantage that

requires assistance or special services to succeed in educational programs. The SBE and a number of other agencies stopped using the term "at-risk" whenever possible, because the term implies flaws or problems with the student rather the educational system. However, the term remains in statute.

The demographics of students enrolled in charter schools (Table 4) during the 2022-23 school year vary a lot from school to school. This occurs mostly because some but not all charter schools use strategies and practices specifically meant to support the learning of one or more specific student groups. For example, Black and African American students comprise a little less than five percent of the statewide K-12 enrollment, while five charter schools had percentages of Black African American students more than 50 percent. These are also more than double or triple the corresponding district rate.

We see demographic differences on a school-by-school basis, and when viewed as a group, the charter schools serve higher percentages of students of color than the home school districts and the state. In particular, the charter schools tend to serve higher percentages of Black African American students and lower percentages of Hispanic and White students.

The teacher workforce at charter schools differs from the teacher workforce in the home school districts based on teacher race or ethnicity. For the 2022-23 school year, approximately 33 percent of classroom teachers at charter schools were people of color, while only 17 percent of home school district classroom teachers were people of color (Table 5).

Not only do the charter schools differ from the home school districts by teacher race and ethnicity, but the characteristics of the classroom teachers also differ in other important ways (Table 6). First, charter schools more often engage teachers with a lot less teaching experience than teachers in the home school districts (an average of 3.9 years for classroom teachers at charter schools *vs.* 13 years for teachers at the home school district). Second, the percentage of teachers with a Master's degree or higher at charter schools (53 percent) is much lower than the percentage of teachers with a Master's degree or higher at the home school districts (72 percent). Finally, the percentage of fully certified teachers at charter schools (66 percent) is a lot lower than the corresponding measure for the home school districts (96 percent). In Washington, it is allowable for teachers who are not yet fully certified and who are in the process of being certified, to be classroom teachers.

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

2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Rainier Valley Leadership Academy	Rainier Valley Leadership Academy	Rainier Valley Leadership Academy	Rainier Valley Leadership Academy
Impact | Puget Sound Elementary	Impact | Puget Sound Elementary	Impact | Puget Sound Elementary	Impact | Puget Sound Elementary
PRIDE Prep School	PRIDE Prep School	PRIDE Prep School	PRIDE Prep School
Rainier Prep	Rainier Prep	Rainier Prep	Rainier Prep
Spokane International Academy	Spokane International Academy	Spokane International Academy	Spokane International Academy
Summit Atlas	Summit Atlas	Summit Atlas	Summit Atlas
Summit Olympus	Summit Olympus	Summit Olympus	Summit Olympus
Summit Sierra	Summit Sierra	Summit Sierra	Summit Sierra
Innovations Charter Sch. (Willow)			
Impact | Salish Sea ES	Impact | Salish Sea ES	Impact | Salish Sea ES	Impact | Salish Sea ES
Catalyst Public School	Catalyst Public School	Catalyst Public School	Catalyst Public School
Lumen High School	Lumen High School	Lumen High School	Lumen High School
	Pinnacles Prep	Pinnacles Prep	Pinnacles Prep
	Pullman Community Montessori	Pullman Community Montessori	Pullman Community Montessori
	Impact | Commencement Bay ES	Impact | Commencement Bay ES	Impact | Commencement Bay ES
	Why Not You Academy	Why Not You Academy	Why Not You Academy
	Whatcom IHS*	Whatcom IHS*	Whatcom IHS*
			Impact | Black River ES
			Rooted School

*Note: Whatcom IHS is the Whatcom Intergenerational High School.

Table 2: shows some basic information for the charter schools operating for the 2022-23 school year.

School Name	Authorizer	Home District*	Grades Served	Fall 2022 Enrollment
Catalyst Public School	Charter School Comm.	Bremerton	K-8*	439
Impact | Commencement Bay	Charter School Comm.	Tacoma	K-1	333
Impact | Puget Sound	Charter School Comm.	Tukwila	K-4	600
Impact | Salish Sea	Charter School Comm.	Seattle	K-2	351
Lumen High School	Spokane Public Schools	Spokane	9-12	36
Pinnacles Prep	Charter School Comm.	Wenatchee	6-7	168
PRIDE Prep School	Spokane Public Schools	Spokane	6-12	512
Pullman Community Montessori	Charter School Comm.	Pullman	K-5	97
Rainier Prep	Charter School Comm.	Highline	5-8	332
Rainier Valley Leadership Academy	Charter School Comm.	Seattle	6-12	146
Spokane International Academy	Charter School Comm.	Mead	K-9	740
Summit Atlas	Charter School Comm.	Seattle	6-12	463
Summit Olympus	Charter School Comm.	Tacoma	9-12	157
Summit Sierra	Charter School Comm.	Seattle	9-12	240
Why Not You Academy	Charter School Comm.	Highline	9-10	146
Whatcom IHS	Charter School Comm.	Bellingham	9-10	69

Note: The home district is the school district in which the charter school is physically situated. Enrollment data is from the Washington State Report Card and the OSPI Data Portal. *Note: in October 2023, Catalyst Public School was approved to expand grades served from K-8 to K-12.

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

Grade Level	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Kindergarten	117	98	93	214	168	369	738	760
1st Grade	106	99	91	148	189	248	435	407
2nd Grade	16	89	95	81	124	207	292	378
3rd Grade	20	0	92	94	47	139	239	277
4th Grade	17	0	0	86	46	69	161	236
5th Grade	85	77	154	151	136	157	186	233
6th Grade	505	385	512	559	437	363	420	411
7th Grade	138	470	393	629	479	405	430	408
8th Grade	0	133	397	386	465	456	360	407
9th Grade	212	128	353	383	374	427	479	348
10th Grade	0	196	142	335	322	334	358	413
11th Grade	0	0	180	132	264	295	277	299
12th Grade	0	0	0	165	114	243	267	252
All Grades	**1,216**	**1,675**	**2,502**	**3,363**	**3,165**	**3,712**	**4,642**	**4,829**

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

Table 4: 2022-23 student demographics for charter schools, home school districts, and the state.

	Native American or Alaskan Native	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latinx	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	English Learners	Low-Income*	Special Education*
Whatcom IHS	2.9	2.9	8.7	18.8	0.0	58.0	8.7	0.0	47.8	24.6
Bellingham SD	***0.9***	***4.7***	***1.4***	***19.0***	***0.3***	***64.8***	***8.8***	***8.4***	***41.2***	***17.9***
Catalyst Public School	0.9	3.6	8.7	15.0	0.5	59.2	12.1	0.0	49.2	15.7
Bremerton SD	***0.8***	***4.0***	***5.0***	***27.3***	***1.9***	***46.5***	***14.5***	***11.8***	***69.1***	***19.3***
Rainier Prep	0.0	6.6	58.4	26.5	0.9	2.4	5.1	35.2	72.6	6.6
Why Not You Acad.	0.0	4.1	51.4	26.0	3.4	10.3	4.8	17.8	95.2	18.5
Highline SD	***0.7***	***14.6***	***14.4***	***40.1***	***3.4***	***17.7***	***9.2***	***33.8***	***70.1***	***17.0***
Spokane International	1.2	3.6	4.2	13.2	0.7	63.2	13.8	3.2	53.8	11.4
Mead SD	***0.9***	***1.6***	***1.3***	***6.0***	***1.4***	***80.7***	***8.1***	***3.6***	***34.4***	***16.7***
Pullman Community Montessori	0.0	3.1	2.1	17.5	0.0	62.9	14.4	2.1	38.1	16.5
Pullman SD	***0.8***	***7.0***	***3.3***	***16.1***	***0.5***	***64.6***	***7.7***	***5.3***	***38.7***	***15.0***
Impact | Salish Sea	0.0	11.1	57.0	13.1	0.0	8.3	10.6	22.2	63.8	6.3
Rainier Valley	0.0	7.5	63.0	15.8	0.0	4.8	8.9	8.9	78.1	23.3
Summit Atlas	0.6	4.8	24.2	13.6	0.0	42.3	14.5	14.7	41.0	21.2
Summit Sierra	0.4	3.3	31.7	12.1	0.0	39.6	12.9	15.0	36.3	25.8
Seattle PS	***0.4***	***12.3***	***14.6***	***13.9***	***0.5***	***45.5***	***12.7***	***13.7***	***35.6***	***17.2***
Lumen High School	5.6	0.0	5.6	13.9	0.0	52.8	22,2	0.0	91.7	27.8
PRIDE Prep	0.8	1.0	1.9	16.6	0.4	66.7	12.7	0.0	60.8	23.0
Spokane PS	***1.1***	***2.3***	***3.2***	***11.4***	***2.6***	***66.1***	***13.3***	***8.0***	***62.1***	***19.2***
Impact | Commencement Bay	0.0	4.5	24.6	27.0	0.9	21.3	21.6	8.1	63.7	7.5
Summit Olympus	1.9	0.6	21.7	24.8	5.1	31.8	14.0	6.4	63.7	14.0
Tacoma SD	***0.8***	***8.6***	***12.7***	***22.7***	***3.7***	***35.1***	***16.3***	***10.8***	***56.7***	***16.9***
Impact | Puget Sound	0.2	10.5	54.7	18.7	0.7	11.3	4.0	29.0	67.8	5.8
Tukwila SD	***0.7***	***24.1***	***18.8***	***35.5***	***4.2***	***10.6***	***6.1***	***40.4***	***82.0***	***14.6***
Pinnacles Prep	0.6	1.2	1.2	34.5	0.0	61.3	1.2	12.5	50.6	18.5
Wenatchee SD	***0.5***	***1.0***	***0.6***	***54.0***	***0.1***	***41.0***	***2.9***	***22.7***	***60.0***	***16.0***
Charter School Ave.	***0.9***	***4.3***	***26.2***	***19.2***	***0.8***	***37.3***	***10.6***	***10.9***	***60.9***	***16.7***
Home District Ave.	***0.8***	***8.0***	***7.5***	***24.6***	***1.9***	***47.3***	***10.0***	***15.9***	***55.0***	***17.0***
Washington	***1.2***	***8.7***	***4.8***	***25.6***	***1.4***	***49.1***	***9.2***	***13.4***	***50.1***	***15.6***

Notes: throughout the report, Low-Income and FRL are used interchangeably and mean the students qualifying for the Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRL) program. Special Education refers to students with a disability (SWD) who are receiving special educational services through an Individualized Educational Plan (IEP). English learners (ELs) are students receiving bilingual educational supports. Charter school and home school district averages are not weighted averages. From the Washington State Report Card.

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

Charter School and Home School District	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Whatcom Intergenerational HS				25.0	25.0
Bellingham SD	***7.5***	***7.2***	***7.4***	***9.1***	***9.6***
Catalyst Public School			16.7	40.9	34.5
Bremerton SD			***11.4***	***13.3***	***13.7***
Rainier Prep	38.1	40.0	40.0	53.8	51.7
Why Not You Acad.				50.0	55.6
Highline SD	***19.4***	***20.3***	***20.2***	***19.3***	***26.4***
Spokane International	30.6	25.8	40.0	59.2	>12
Mead SD	***4.5***	***4.1***	***4.0***	***5.8***	***3.8***
Pullman Community Montessori				20.0	11.1
Pullman SD				***8.8***	***9.6***
Impact | Salish Sea			62.5	58.6	38.7
Rainier Valley	45.0	48.3	78.6	66.7	73.3
Summit Atlas	36.0	21.4	32.1	38.9	43.3
Summit Sierra	50.0	30.8	44.0	52.0	57.9
Seattle PS	***20.4***	***20.8***	***21.5***	***21.7***	***21.1***
Lumen HS			16.7	16.7	16.7
PRIDE Prep	15.6	11.8	14.0	15.6	<6
Spokane PS	***6.8***	***6.8***	***7.1***	***7.5***	***7.8***
Impact Commencement Bay				41.7	29.0
Summit Olympus	47.1	58.5	23.1	23.1	30.8
Tacoma SD	***20.1***	***19.4***	***20.1***	***20.3***	***20.6***
Impact Puget Sound	30.0	38.1	44.4	43.4	45.4
Tukwila SD	***27.9***	***28.2***	***28.2***	***29.8***	***34.5***
Pinnacles Prep				10.0	0.0
Wenatchee SD				***16.2***	***18.0***
Charter Schools (Average)	***36.6***	***34.3***	***39.5***	***38.5***	***>33***
Home Districts (Average)	***16.5***	***16.6***	***16.1***	***15.2***	***16.5***
Washington	***12.9***	***13.2***	***13.2***	***14.1***	***14.5***

Note: the number of teachers in the home school districts range from less than 200 to approximately 3500, while the number of teachers in the charter schools ranges from less than 10 to approximately 30. Blank cells indicate the school years in which the charter school was not yet in operation. Data taken from the Washington State Report Card. Charter School and home school district averages are numeric averages, not weighted averages.

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

Charter School and Home School District	2023 Fully Certified Teachers Percent*	2023 Teaching Experience (Ave. Yrs.)	2023 MA+ Percent
Whatcom IHS	87.5	9.6	62.5
Bellingham	***98.7***	***13.9***	***74.2***
Catalyst Public School	55.2	0.0	41.4
Bremerton SD	***94.7***	***14.1***	***66.7***
Rainier Prep	72.4	5.0	62.1
Why Not You Academy	38.9	4.1	38.9
Highline SD	***95.1***	***10.8***	***71.2***
Spokane International	98.2	6.7	75.0
Mead SD	***97.8***	***14.9***	***77.9***
Pullman Community Montessori	44.4	5.6	55.6
Pullman SD	***97.3***	***11.0***	***63.1***
Impact Salish Sea	25.8	2.1	16.1
Rainier Valley	60.0	2.7	46.7
Summit Atlas	76.7	4.4	46.7
Summit Sierra	84.2	2.1	47.4
Seattle PS	***94.2***	***11.3***	***78.9***
Lumen HS	100	6.5	100
PRIDE Prep	100	5.1	55.3
Spokane PS	***98.3***	***13.3***	***71.8***
Impact Commencement Bay	25.8	1.3	41.9
Summit Olympus	76.9	3.9	61.5
Tacoma SD	***97.0***	***14.3***	***73.4***
Impact Puget Sound	38.6	2.7	31.8
Tukwila SD	***97.0***	***12.1***	***78.8***
Pinnacles Prep	75.0	0.6	75.0
Wenatchee SD	***94.2***	***13.0***	***66.2***
Charter Schools (Average)	***66.1***	***3.9***	***53.6***
Home Districts (Average)	***96.4***	***12.9***	***72.2***
Washington	***95.4***	***13.0***	***71.7***

Notes: the number of teachers in the school districts ranges from less than 200 in Tukwila SD to nearly 3500 in Seattle PS. The number of teachers in the charter schools ranges from less than 10 to approximately 30. MA+ means Master's degree or higher. In Washington, it is allowable for teachers who are not yet fully certified and who are in the process of being certified to teach in the classroom. N.D. means no data. Charter school and home school district averages are numeric averages, not weighted averages. Data taken from the Washington State Report Card.

Overview of the Performance of Charter Schools

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

Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO) is one of the most credible groups researching charter schools. In 2013, CREDO published the *National Charter School study* on the academic performance of students attending charter schools. Using CREDO's matched peers[3] methodology, the study found that students attending charter schools exhibit slightly higher levels of learning in reading and about the same level of learning in math as compared to their TPS peers.

The 2019 report titled "*School Choice in the United States*" conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics found no measurable differences in the 2017 reading and math test scores between charter school and TPS students. Other research shows that urban charter schools serving systemically marginalized and low-income students following certain prescribed practices have a positive impact on student outcomes. As did other studies of Boston, New York, and Denver charter schools, the CREDO 2013 study concluded that Black students, students from low-income households, and English learners appear to benefit most from attending charter schools. A body of work summarized in "*Charter Schools and the Achievement Gap*" concludes that a subset of charter schools following certain prescribed practices yield significant and positive effects on educational outcomes.

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

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

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

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

In 2019, CREDO released their study on the *Charter School Performance in the State of Washington* covering the 2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17 school years. The authors concluded that on average, charter school students in Washington experience annual growth in reading and math similar to the gains made by their matched peers who enroll in the TPS the charter school students would have attended. The CREDO authors characterized the performance of the charter schools as promising but not yet definitive because charter schools were new to Washington.

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

The SBE delivered the third annual report on Washington charter schools to the Governor, the Legislature, and the public in January 2020. The report showed that, as a group, charter school students posted test scores similar to the test scores achieved by demographically and academically similar TPS students on the ELA assessment, but higher test scores than TPS students on the math and science tests. The analysis yielded effect sizes showing that the effect associated with charter school enrollment was very small to small. The student growth percentiles (SGPs) for charter school students were mostly similar to or higher than the SGPs for the TPS student group.

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

The SBE's fourth annual report on Washington charter schools showed that, as a group, charter school students performed higher than the TPS student group on seven of the eight testing and growth model measures analyzed. In addition, charter school students who are Hispanic and Latinx, students who are English learners, and students who are low-income consistently outperformed their TPS matched peers. The analyses yielded effect sizes showing that the effect associated with charter school enrollment was small to very small.

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

The Washington State Charter Schools Association recently developed an interactive webpage comparing the academic performance of charter schools to the home school districts and the state. In summary and for the All Students group, the charter schools collectively perform about the same as the home school districts and the state on the ELA, math, and science statewide tests. The website shows that students receiving special education services, students qualifying for the Free and Reduced Price Lunch program, Black African American, and Hispanic and Latinx students at charter schools performed higher than the corresponding student groups for the home school districts and the state.

The SBE's fifth annual report released in March 2022 showed that, as a group, charter school students performed higher than the TPS student group on seven of the eight testing and growth model measures analyzed. In addition, charter school students who are Hispanic/Latinx, students who are English learners, and students who are low-income consistently did better than their TPS matched peers. Finally, students who are Black or African American consistently did better than their TPS matched peers on the math scale score and growth model measures. However, the analyses yielded effect sizes showing that the effect associated with charter school enrollment was small to very small.

The SBE submitted the sixth annual charter schools report to the Governor's office and the Washington legislature in April 2023. The report showed that, as a group, charter school students scored higher than the TPS student group on four of the six testing measures and similar to the TPS group on the other two measures. In addition, charter school students who are Black African American, students who are English learners, and students who are low-income

consistently did better than their TPS matched peers. As reported in the previous SBE reports, the analyses yielded effect sizes showing that the effect associated with charter school enrollment was small to very small.

In June 2023, CREDO released the *2023 National Charter School Study* showing that the typical charter school student is scoring higher than their TPS peer by a significant margin. The authors report that Black and Hispanic charter students show the largest gains. Multiracial, Native American, and White students made similar progress as their TPS peers in reading, but weaker gains in math. In addition, Asian student performance in charter schools is about the same as that for their TPS peers. The authors also report that students qualifying for the free and reduced lunch program and English learner students did better than their TPS peers. Students receiving special education services had significantly weaker growth in both math and reading on average, though CMO-affiliated students with special education needs have learning similar to that of their TPS special education peers.

Section I – Reporting of Noncertificated Instructors at Charter Schools

HB 1744 was introduced in the 2023 legislative session to clarify the responsibilities and accountability for the effective delivery and oversight of public education services to charter school students. The legislature passed the bill, which the Governor signed into law. The new law took effect on July 23, 2023. The final bill report provides more information about the changes.

The new law requires charter schools to report the employment of all noncertificated instructional staff to their authorizer for the current and prior school years. The CSC and Spokane PS staff provided reports to the SBE for the charter schools each authorizes (Table 7). To summarize, most charter schools operating in the 2022-23 school year reported that one or more of the schools' instructional staff were not fully certified. Washington state law and rules allow for instructional staff certification and endorsement to be waived or in process while under the supervision of fully certified teachers and approved by the school's board.

Table 7: shows the number of noncertificated instructors employed by charter schools for the prior and current school years.

Charter School LEA	Authorizer	Number of Noncertificated Instructors in the Prior School Year (2022-23)	Number of Noncertificated Instructors in the Current School Year (2023-24)*
Lumen HS	Spokane PS	0	0
PRIDE Prep	Spokane PS	0	0
Catalyst Public School	CSC	7	1
Impact Black River	CSC	N.D.	0
Impact Commencement Bay	CSC	1	0
Impact Puget Sound	CSC	1	0

Charter School LEA	Authorizer	Number of Noncertificated Instructors in the Prior School Year (2022-23)	Number of Noncertificated Instructors in the Current School Year (2023-24)*
Impact Salish Sea	CSC	1	0
Pinnacles Prep	CSC	1	1
Pullman Community Montessori	CSC	4	4
Rainier Prep	CSC	1	0
Rainier Valley	CSC	1	0
Rooted School	CSC	N.D.	0
Spokane International	CSC	2	0
Summit Atlas	CSC	1	0
Summit Olympus	CSC	1	0
Summit Sierra	CSC	1	0
Whatcom IHS	CSC	1	0
Why Not You Acad.	CSC	1	0

*Note: The status for the 2023-24 school year is valid through November 1, 2023 and is subject to change by way of teacher turnover. N.D. means No Data, as the schools commenced operations in the current school year.

Section II – Washington Charter School Performance

This section of the annual report is divided into two parts in accordance with 28A.710.250 (2). Part A has selected analyses on the academic performance of students at charter schools compared to the home district and the state. This information comes mostly from publicly available data files available through the Washington State Report Card and the Washington Education Data Portal. Part B summarizes the comparisons of the academic performance of students at charter schools to demographically, ethnically, and economically similar students in traditional public schools.

This report describes the performance of charter schools based on the spring 2022 and spring 2023 statewide assessment administrations and from other educational outcome measures. Even though we have only a limited number of charter schools and the relatively small number of student assessment records available for analysis, **evidence from this year and prior years shows that the Washington charter school students, as a group, perform similar to or better than their TPS peers**.

When comparing the performance of the charter schools to their home school districts, a couple of challenges should be noted. Some of the charter schools add one or two new grades each year. This means that schools must build curriculum, hire new teachers, and provide training

each year for new teachers. This challenge is unique to charter schools, as most traditional public schools used for comparison have been fully built out for years. Second, the enrolling of a high percentage of systemically marginalized students means that a charter school needs to allocate more resources to ensure every student is making good academic progress. The effects of concentrating systemically marginalized students in a school building creates teaching and learning challenges, about which we are just beginning to learn.

In addition, charter schools are "schools of choice." Parents may have selected the charter school option because they felt that their child or children were not well served by traditional public schools. These children may have lagged behind their classmates or these children may be academically far in front of their classmates. In either case, the parents of these children may be more involved in their children's schooling and provide greater support and encouragement. Without additional information, it is challenging to determine how patterns of self-selection may have affected the outcomes presented here.

The biggest limitation of this work centers on the fact that about 20 charter schools have been in operation over the most recent five-year period and only 16 charter schools were in operation for the full 2022-23 school year. In addition, only several thousand charter school students sit for the statewide tests each year, while more than half million TPS students sit for the statewide tests. It is statistically challenging to make meaningful comparisons between groups with such large size differences. The meaningfulness of the statistical analyses will increase with the additional years of data, and larger student counts. However, these increases will not occur in the existing charter school environment because additional charter schools cannot be approved without a change in statute.

Summary of Findings on the Performance of the Charter Schools

- On average, the charter schools' winter 2024 Washington School Improvement Framework (WSIF) scores are similar to the average WSIF score for the state.
- Official graduation rates were reportable for four of the seven charter schools issuing diplomas for the class of 2023. Among the charter schools with reportable graduation rates, the rates for three charter schools were higher than the state rates.
- On the spring 2023 statewide tests, some charter schools scored better than or similar to the home school districts, depending on the content area assessed. In some cases, the charter school performance was lower than the home school district.
- Based on the matched peers comparison using the spring 2023 statewide assessments, charter school students performed better than their TPS peer group on six of the eight measures and similar to TPS students on the two remaining measures.
- Charter school students who are as Black or African American, students who are Hispanic, students who are English learners, and students who qualify for the Free and Reduced Price Lunch program (FRL) consistently did better their matched TPS peers.

- The percentage of charter school students regularly attending school is lower than the rate for the students in the home school districts.
- The percentage of first time, 9th grade, charter school students who earned credit for all courses attempted (9th Graders On-Track) is higher than the rate for the students in the home school districts.
- The percentage of charter school students participating in dual credit courses is lower than the rate for the students in the home school districts.

Part A – Performance of Charter Schools

RCW 28A.710.250 directs the SBE to report on the performance of the state's charter schools during the preceding school year. This year we are reporting on the academic performance of the charter schools operating during the 2022-23 school year.

Statewide Assessments

Simply comparing the test results, educational inputs, or educational outcomes of students enrolled in a charter school to those of students in the home school district or another traditional public school can be misleading. In choosing to attend a charter school, the student and parents or guardians are motivated to find an educational opportunity outside the norm. Students enrolling in charter schools do so for a variety of reasons making them different from students attending a TPS based on school choice at a minimum. With the knowledge of one or more unobserved student differences, it is a challenge to determine whether test performance differences are related to the student population differences or something about the school.

The findings coming from the evaluation of the performance charter school in comparison to the home school districts are limited. The reader should remember that the level of comparison is not equivalent. Each charter school is a Local Educational Agency (LEA), which in many respects is similar to a school district. This means that for this analysis, the performance of a charter school is compared to the performance of a school district. Such a comparison has the potential to be misleading in a number of ways:

- A charter school serving high school grades (for example) is sometimes compared to a school district serving all grade levels. Measures like the percentage of students who regularly attend school differs by grade level and school level. In this work, the performance comparisons between the charter school and the home school district are for the same grades, thereby improving comparability.
- Individual charter school enrollment ranges from about 50 to 600 students, whereas the home districts for most charter schools (Seattle PS, Spokane PS, and Tacoma SD) serve about 30,000 to 50,000 students. The comparisons would be more meaningful if the group sizes were similar.

- Charter schools most often enroll higher percentages of systemically marginalized students (e.g., from low-income households or who are students of color) than are enrolled in the traditional school districts. The most meaningful comparisons are made when the performance of like groups is the basis for the analysis.
- It is common for students enrolled in a charter school to come from more than one home school district. For example, students enrolled in Spokane International Academy may come from Spokane PS, Mead SD, and Central Valley SD, and in this case, the Spokane International performance is compared to the Mead SD because the charter school is physically situated within that school district.

Notwithstanding the limitations listed above and based on the spring 2023 statewide tests, many charter schools performed higher than or similar to the home school district on the content area tests administered in the spring 2023. Depending on the content area tested, some charter school performances were lower than the corresponding rate for the home school district, while some were higher than the home school district (Table 8 and Appendix B).

Table 8: summarizes the performance of charter schools in comparison to the home school district based on the spring 2023 statewide assessment administration.

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

There were no reportable assessment results for Impact Commencement Bay ES, Lumen High School, and the Why Not You Academy.

Washington School Improvement Framework (WSIF)

The OSPI released the winter 2024 WSIF to the public on March 19. The decile averages and the WSIF scores are limited and mixed, as only 10 of the 16 charter schools earned a WSIF rating. The current WSIF indicators are not sufficient to evaluate the academic performance of schools with small enrollments like Lumen High School and the Intergenerational High School. However,

the Every Student Succeeds Act requires all schools at a given level to be differentiated on the same criteria unless approved by the U.S. Department of Education. Spokane PS conducted national research of charter authorizers serving special populations to gather information about indicators that could be more informative. Spokane PS is working with Lumen to update the Lumen High School Academic Performance Framework reflecting the school's special population...

The average decile rating for the charter schools on each of the WSIF indicators is mostly similar to the state average (Table 9). However, the Other Academic Indicator decile (student growth percentiles) is higher for the charter schools (6.9 *vs.* 5.7) than the TPS, but the Graduation Rate decile for charter schools is lower (5.5 *vs*. 6.5) than the TPS.

Table 9: shows the winter 2024 WSIF school rating in decile points for the All Students group by indicator for the charter schools.

School Name	Prof. Decile	Other Academic Indicator Decile	Graduation Rate Decile	EL Progress Decile	SQSS Decile	Total Decile*
Catalyst Public School	6.5	5.0			5.0	5.6
Impact Puget Sound	7.0	9.0		8.0	6.0	8.0
Pinnacles Prep	4.5	7.0		2.0	4.0	3.1
PRIDE Prep School**	4.0	3.5	N.R.		4.3	N.R.
Rainier Prep	6.5	10.0		4.0	7.0	8.2
Rainier Valley Leadership Acad.	2.5	7.0	5.0		3.7	4.4
Spokane International Academy	7.0	6.0		5.0	7.3	6.5
Summit Atlas	6.5	8.0	7.0	4.0	5.3	6.7
Summit Olympus	7.0		5.0		5.3	4.9
Summit Sierra	6.0		8.0	3.0	5.0	6.7
Charter Schools (Average)	***5.8***	***6.9***	***6.3***	***4.7***	***5.3***	***6.0***
Washington Public Schools (Average)	***5.6***	***5.7***	***6.5***	***5.5***	***5.4***	***5.7***

*Note: the Total Decile is the final WSIF rating based on a weighted average of each of the individual decile ratings. **N.R.: a data discrepancy resulted in an erroneously low graduation rate decile for PRIDE Prep, so neither the graduation decile nor the total decile values are reported here. Charter schools not shown on this table did not have enough reportable data from which to compute a final WSIF score. Data from the OSPI Data Portal.

The WSIF data file provides final decile ratings for student groups if the minimum reporting requirements are met. The winter 2024 WSIF final decile ratings for student groups at the charter schools (Table 10) are limited and mixed. In summary, the average scores for the reportable student groups at charter schools were consistently higher than the state average.

Table 10: shows the winter 2024 WSIF school ratings (final total decile) for all reportable student groups for the charter schools earning a final decile rating*.

School Name	All Students	Native American or Alaskan Native	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latinx	Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	Limited English	Low-Income	Special Education
Catalyst Public Schools	5.6						7.4	2.7	-	4.9	3.9
Impact Puget Sound	8.0			7.3			7.9		5.7	6.6	
Pinnacles Prep	3.1				2.4		3.7			2.1	1.1
PRIDE Prep	N.R.			3.8	4.8		3.6			2.9	1.8
Rainier Prep	8.2		9.5	8.5	8.2		9.9	9.4	6.7	8.5	4.5
Rainier Valley Leadership Academy	4.4			4.3	4.3				3.3	3.9	3.4
Spokane International Academy	6.5		9.3	4.9	4.6		7.8	5.9		5.5	4.0
Summit Atlas	6.7			4.9	5.9		7.9	8.0	5.1	5.5	3.9
Summit Olympus	4.9			3.5	4.0		5.3			4.8	
Summit Sierra	6.7			5.6	5.5		7.8	7.2	5.7	5.1	5.1
Charter Schools (Average)	***6.0***	***N.D.***	***9.4***	***5.4***	***5.0***	***N.D.***	***6.8***	***6.6***	***5.3***	***5.0***	***3.5***
Washington Public Schools (Average)	***5.7***	***2.9***	***8.0***	***4.3***	***4.5***	***3.2***	***6.3***	***6.2***	***3.0***	***4.3***	***3.0***

Note: N.D. indicates No Data, as the decile was not reportable. Charter schools not shown on this table did not have enough reportable data from which to compute a final WSIF score. Data from the OSPI Data Portal.

Of the 16 charter schools in operation for the 2022-23 school year, 13 schools were identified for Foundational Supports under Washington's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Accountability Plan. The WSIF support levels for each charter school are shown below.

WSIF Support Tier Information
Catalyst Public School was identified as a Foundational Support school.
Impact | Commencement Bay was identified as a Foundational Support school.
Impact | Puget Sound was identified as a Foundational Support school.
Impact | Salish Sea was identified as a Foundational Support school.
Lumen High School was identified as a Support Tier Comprehensive Low Grad Opt Out Eligible school. The school was identified because of a low graduation rate (18.0 percent) for the combined graduation classes of 2021, 2022, and 2023. However, the class of 2021 graduation outcomes reported by PRIDE differs from the OPSI reporting. The reporting discrepancy is central to the low graduation rate
Pinnacles Prep was identified as a Support Tier 1: Targeted 1-2 school. The Low-Income and Special Education student groups performed below the threshold identification decile.
PRIDE Prep - School: Support Tier 3: Comprehensive Low Grad school. The school was identified on the 2023 because of a low graduation rate (40.6 percent) for the combined graduation classes of 2021, 2022, and 2023. Because the school was identified for Low Grad on the 2022 run, PRIDE Prep was further identified as a Support Tier 3: Comprehensive Plus school. However, the class of 2021 graduation outcomes reported by PRIDE differs from the OPSI reporting. The reporting discrepancy is central to the low graduation rate.
Pullman Community Montessori was identified as a Foundational Support school.
Rainier Prep was identified as a Foundational Support school.
Rainier Valley Leadership Academy was identified as a Foundational Support school.
Spokane International Academy was identified as a Foundational Support school.
Summit Atlas was identified as a Foundational Support school.
Summit Olympus was identified as a Foundational Support school.
Summit Sierra was identified as a Foundational Support school.
Why Not You Academy was identified as a Foundational Support school.
Whatcom IHS was identified as a Foundational Support school.

High School Graduation Results

Simply comparing the high school graduation rates of students enrolled in a charter school to graduation rates for students in the home school district or another traditional public school can be misleading. Because the students at charter schools are not exactly the same as their TPS peers because to their decision to enroll in an alternative educational experience, it is impossible to know whether differences in the high school graduation rates reflect the student differences or something about the charter school. In addition, it is not unusual for a student to enroll in a charter high school, be successful, and then to transfer to his or her traditional high school to walk in graduation with long-time childhood friends. In this case, the "credit" for graduation

goes to the final school of record and not to the school where the student was enrolled the longest.

Overall, the graduation rates for the All Students group for the charter schools are mostly higher than the home school districts and higher than the state rates (Table 11).

- Summit Olympus is within the Tacoma School District boundaries. The high school graduation rate for All Students for Summit Olympus is lower than the corresponding state graduation rates and is lower than the corresponding rate for the Tacoma school district.
- Summit Atlas is within the Seattle PS boundaries. The high school graduation rate for All Students is higher than the corresponding state graduation rate and similar to the corresponding rate for the Seattle PS.
- Summit Sierra is also within the Seattle PS boundaries. The high school graduation rate for All Students is higher than the corresponding state graduation rate and higher than the corresponding rate for the Seattle PS.
- PRIDE Prep is within the Spokane PS boundary. PRIDE Prep students' graduation rate for All Students is higher than the graduation rates for the state and for the Spokane PS.

Table 11: shows the official class of 2023 four-year graduation rates for reportable student groups for the charter schools, the home school districts, and Washington public schools.

	All Students	Native American or Alaskan Native	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latinx	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	English Learners	Low-income*	Special Education*
Summit Atlas	89.0	N.R.	N.R	>77	>70	N.R.	80.0	N.R.	N.R.	88.9	>76
Summit Sierra	96.0	N.R.	N.R	>83	>80	N.R.	>87	N.R.	>75	>90	>78
Seattle PS	***88.0***	***75.0***	***92.1***	***88.4***	***73.1***	***>88***	***90.8***	***92.9***	***67.8***	***84.0***	***73.9***
PRIDE Prep	93.0	N.R.	N.R	N.R.	70.7	N.R.	92.7	>78	N.R.	92.0	>87
Spokane PS	***90.5***	***85.7***	***>94***	***85.0***	***88.3***	***81.0***	***91.7***	***89.5***	***81.1***	***87.7***	***74.2***
Summit Olympus	78.6	N.R.	N.R	72.7	>72	N.R.	75.0	N.R.	N.R.	74.0	N.R.
Tacoma SD	***91.1***	***75.0***	***96.7***	***89.6***	***89.6***	***90.9***	***91.1***	***92.8***	***81.9***	***88.9***	***76.4***
Charter School Ave.	***84.5***	***N.R.***	***N.R.***	***91.8***	***83.7***	***N.R.***	***83.9***	***76.3***	***89.3***	***78.0***	***75.8***
Home District Ave.	***89.9***	***78.6***	***>94***	***87.7***	***83.7***	***>87***	***91.2***	***91.7***	***76.9***	***86.9***	***74.8***
Washington	***83.6***	***71.5***	***92.7***	***81.3***	***78.7***	***76.1***	***85.1***	***84.7***	***70.7***	***76.9***	***66.8***

*Note: N.R. means Not Reportable, as the data were suppressed to protect personal information or the student group was not represented in the graduation cohort for the school. Low-Income means the students qualifying for the Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRL) program. Special Education refers to students with a disability (SWD) who are receiving special educational services through an Individualized Educational Plan (IEP). English learners (ELs) are students receiving bilingual educational supports. Rates are from the Washington State Report Card.

See that many of the graduation rates for disaggregated student groups are subject to top-end suppression by the OSPI to protect the private information of students. Top-end suppression provides a minimum graduation rate but not the actual graduation rate, which makes it a challenge to compare the graduation rates of the disaggregated student groups at the charter schools to the corresponding rates for the home school district. In some cases, the suppressed or unsuppressed graduation rates for the disaggregated student groups are higher than the home school district and sometimes lower than the home school district. The results are best characterized as mixed.

Regular Attendance

On the measure of the percentage of students regularly attending school (fewer than two absences per month) for the 2022-23 school year, the average for the charter school LEAs is lower than the corresponding measures for the home school districts and the state (Table 12).

Table 12: shows the percentage of students who regularly attend school for the 2022-23 school year by race, ethnicity, and program participation status.

Regular Attendance	All Students	American Indian or Alaskan	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latinx	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	English Learners*	Low-Income*	Special Education*
Whatcom IHS	37.7	N.D.	N.D	N.D.	52.	N.D.	30.	N.D	N.D	35.	43.
Bellingham SD	***65.1***	***46.6***	***68.***	***64.5***	***56.0***	***66.7***	***67.9***	***64.7***	***57.0***	***54.9***	***54.9***
Catalyst Public Sch.	73.0	N.D.	>83	65.0	61.4	N.D.	75.6	74.5	N.D.	68.7	63.2
Bremerton SD	***60.9***	***41.5***	***69.9***	***53.5***	***58.8***	***53.8***	***59.8***	***51.4***	***63.6***	***56.5***	***56.5***
Rainier Prep	77.5	N.D.	78.3	80.7	74.4	N.D.	N.D.	58.8	78.3	74.0	58.3
Why Not You Academy	36.2	N.D.	N.D.	40.5	34.2	N.D.	<21	N.D.	53.6	37.5	55.6
Highline SD	***61.4***	***45.6***	***71.8***	***67.2***	***54.8***	***35.3***	***69.9***	***60.5***	***58.6***	***56.3***	***55.4***
Spokane International	80.5	N.D.	>90	80.0	71.1	N.D.	80.5	82.7	>88	73.0	74.4
Mead SD	***82,5***	***74.5***	***87.3***	***80.7***	***80.7***	***65.5***	***83.4***	***78.4***	***73.0***	***76.0***	***77.1***

Regular Attendance	All Students	American Indian or Alaskan	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latinx	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	English Learners*	Low-Income*	Special Education*
Pullman Comm. Montessori	43,8	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	29.4	N.D.	47.5	53.8	N.D.	15.0	26.1
Pullman SD	***75.4***	***63.6***	***87.1***	***85.1***	***63.5***	***82.4***	***76.3***	***77.1***	***82.7***	***63.2***	***67.1***
Impact Salish Sea	64.5	N.D.	75.6	63.2	56.3	N.D.	69.0	67.6	60.5	60.6	61.9
Rainier Valley	51.6	N.D.	72.7	48.5	58.6	N.D.	N.D.	50.0	83.3	52.8	51.4
Summit Atlas	47.4	N.D.	73.9	40.6	35.1	N.D.	55.1	44.3	44.2	41.7	43.7
Summit Sierra	59.2	N.D.	30.0	64.0	47.5	N.D.	68.8	40.6	56.3	50.0	64.9
Seattle PS	***74.8***	***53.5***	***82.0***	***63.1***	***62.2***	***50.0***	***80.8***	***75.6***	***67.9***	***61.1***	***66.4***
Lumen High School	10.0	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<16	N.D.	N.D.	8.8	<25
PRIDE Prep	51.7	N.D.	N.D.	46.2	54.0	N.D.	52.4	48.4	N.D.	46.0	46.3
Spokane PS	***71.3***	***60.1***	***83.1***	***72.4***	***64.2***	***50.5***	***74.4***	***64.7***	***65.1***	***64.1***	***63.6***
Impact Commence. Bay	59.9	N.D.	71.4.	71.3	51.7	N.D.	58.1	59.7	65.5	55.5	60.5
Summit Olympus	33.3	N.D.	N.D.	30.6	38.5	N.D.	31.6	40.0	40.0	32.4	26.1
Tacoma SD	***62.4***	***45.6***	***72.2***	***59.1***	***56.0***	***41.3***	***69.1***	***60.1***	***58.1***	***53.9***	***55.5***
Impact Puget Sound	67.2	N.D.	70.3	71.3	48.8	N.D.	74.2	70.8	67.7	67.2	72.1
Tukwila SD	***64.2***	***62.5***	***74.2***	***63.0***	***59.2***	***46.0***	***66.9***	***66.7***	***63.6***	***62.4***	***51.9***
Pinnacles Prep	64.6	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	67.2	N.D.	61.5	N.D.	84.2	65.2	61.3
Wenatchee SD	***64.6***	***64.1***	***75.9***	***72.1***	***60.0***	N.D.	***69.6***	***73.5***	***59.7***	***59.0***	***56.6***
Charter School Average	***54.3***	***N.D.***	***>72***	***58.5***	***52.1***	***N.D.***	***<53***	***57.6***	***61.2***	***49.0***	***<52***
Home District Average	***66.9***	***54.8***	***77.3***	***61.7***	***61.7***	***54.6***	***72.1***	***66.6***	***<66***	***60.9***	***60.9***
Washington	***69.7***	***51.5***	***81.6***	***68.2***	***63.2***	***48.1***	***72.5***	***68.1***	***63.9***	***61.0***	***61.7***

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

9th Grade On-Track

On the measure of the percentage of first-time 9th graders who are on-track (passed all of their classes) for the 2022-23 school year, the average for the charter school LEAs is higher than the corresponding measures for the home school districts and the state (Table 13).

Table 13: shows the percentage of first-time 9th graders who are on-track for the 2022-23 school year by race, ethnicity, and program participation status.

9th Grade On-Track	All Students	American Indian or Alaskan	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latinx	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	English Learners*	Low-Income*	Special Education*
Whatcom IHS	75.0	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	>73	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.
Bellingham SD	***74.4***	***N.D.***	***87.2***	***66.7***	***59.9***	***N.D.***	***78.0***	***77.3***	***56.7***	***54.7***	***48.6***
Why Not You Academy	68.8	N.D.	N.D.	73.3	55.0	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	76.5	72.1	70.0
Highline SD	***64.3***	***N.D.***	***85.6***	***65.2***	***54.9***	***36.9***	***79.0***	***61.0***	***51.5***	***57.4***	***58.8***
Spokane International	66.7	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	76.9	N.D.	N.D.	60.0	N.D.
Mead SD	***81.3***	***N.D.***	***N.D.***	***N.D.***	***62.5***	***N.D.***	***82.9***	***83.1***	***58.8***	***66.2***	***59.4***
Rainier Valley	77.3	N.D.	N.D.	75.0	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	75.0	70.0
Summit Atlas	>96	N.D.	N.D.	>87	>77	N.D.	>89	>90	>73	>90	>75
Summit Sierra	>92	N.D.	N.D.	>75	N.F.	N.D.	>80	N.D.	N.D.	>81	>75
Seattle PS	***87.2***	***73.7***	***94.2***	***74.0***	***74.9***	***80.8***	***93.3***	***87.3***	***66.7***	***73.4***	***78.6***
Lumen High School	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.
PRIDE Prep	77.6	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	85.7	N.D.	N.D.	68.3	82.6
Spokane PS	***72.2***	***45.0***	***90.7***	***74.0***	***66.9***	***37.2***	***76.2***	***61.9***	***69.3***	***62.3***	***66.7***
Summit Olympus	86.2	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	>70	N.D.	N.D.	85.7	N.D.
Tacoma SD	***63.4***	***33.3***	***81.3***	***53.7***	***58.2***	***40.2***	***70.4***	***59.6***	***49.8***	***51.3***	***56.1***
Charter Schools (Average)	***>80***	***N.D.***	***N.D.***	***>78***	***>66***	***N.D.***	***>86***	***>90***	***>75***	***>76***	***>75***
Home Districts (Average)	***73.8***	***50.7***	***87.8***	***66.7***	***62.9***	***48.8***	***79.8***	***71.7***	***58.8***	***60.9***	***61.4***
Washington	***70.3***	***47.1***	***88.5***	***63.6***	***56.9***	***44.8***	***76.6***	***69.6***	***48.9***	***55.9***	***58.5***

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

Dual Credit

On the measure of the percentage of high school students completing a dual credit course for the 2022-23 school year, the average for the charter school LEAs is lower than the corresponding measures for the home school districts and the state (Table 14).

Table 14: shows the percentage of high school students completing a dual credit course for the 2022-23 school year by race, ethnicity, and program participation status.

Dual Credit	All Students	American Indian or Alaskan	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latinx	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	English Learners*	Low-Income*	Special Education*
Whatcom IHS	<4	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<20	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<10	N.D.
Bellingham SD	***81.2***	***61.1***	***87.3***	***72.4***	***74.3***	***70.0***	***83.2***	***80.9***	***69.1***	***72.7***	***57.9***
Why Not You Academy	<2	N.D.	N.D.	<4	<8	N.D.	<20	N.D.	<11.	<2	<11
Highline SD	***69.4***	***69.4***	***74.4***	***68.7***	***66.7***	***70.6***	***71.6***	***69.2***	***60.6***	***68.4***	***57.9***
Spokane International	>91	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	>86	N.D.	N.D.	>84.	N.D.
Mead SD	***42.8***	***22.2***	***50.0***	***36.8***	***36.8***	***19.6***	***43.7***	***42.5***	***18.6***	***35.2***	***14.1***
Rainier Valley	17.8	N.D.	N.D.	16.9	<21	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<27	16.1	<12
Summit Atlas	39.6	N.D.	N.D.	32.3	44.2	N.D.	42.0	34.5	41.2	35.0	47.1
Summit Sierra	56.3	N.D.	N.D.	57.5	69.2	N.D.	51.3	46.4	67.7	53.7	50.9
Seattle PS	***55.8***	***39.7***	***62.3***	***51.8***	***45.6***	***46.4***	***59.3***	***54.6***	***39.5***	***50.4***	***32.8***
Lumen High School	<7	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<15	N.D.	N.D.	<8	<21
PRIDE Prep	71.0	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	68.3	N.D.	68.7	80.5	N.D.	72.6	59.2
Spokane PS	***47.6***	***36.4***	***50.9***	***41.6***	***39.8***	***31.2***	***50.4***	***45.7***	***28.3***	***40.0***	***20.5***
Summit Olympus	77.6	N.D.	N.D.	82.4	80.8	N.D.	73.0	70.0	>70	73.0	72.7
Tacoma SD	***82.1***	***66.3***	***88.9***	***79.1***	***79.8***	***72.3***	***84.5***	***81.7***	***67.6***	***79.4***	***71.1***
Charter Schools (Average)	***<41***	***N.D.***	***N.D.***	***<39***	***<45***	***N.D.***	***>51***	***57.9***	***>43***	***>39***	***<39***
Home Districts (Average)	***63.2***	***49.2***	***69.0***	***58.4***	***57.2***	***51.7***	***65.5***	***62.4***	***47.3***	***57.7***	***42.4***
Washington	***64.5***	***45.7***	***80.7***	***65.7***	***59.9***	***60.9***	***64.6***	***65.4***	***52.7***	***58.0***	***45.2***

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

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

RCW 28A.710.250 requires us to compare the performance of charter school students with the performance of academically, ethnically, and economically comparable students in traditional public schools. We do this by matching a TPS student to a charter school student (1:1 matching) based on prior learning and other criteria, placing each in an independent group, and then completing a statistical analysis to identify differences in performance on traditional education outcomes. The matching criteria and statistical analysis are described in Appendix B.

In this analysis, it is important to note that not all charter school students can be matched with a TPS peer or "twin". This means that not all charter school students with valid test results are included in the comparison. In some cases, the unmatched student is high performing and in other cases low performing. Unmatched students may have excessive absences or may have excessive disciplinary events making them impossible to match. In addition, charter school students missing over 40 days of absences were excluded from the analysis due mainly to matching challenges. The comparison in performance is more meaningful when the students are closely matched on the preselected criteria. In this work, we closely matched students knowing that this will result in excluding more charter school students.

For the analyses that follow, the charter school group and the TPS group represent the aggregation of the charter schools open in the 2022-23 school year. In other words, all of the charter school students are combined into one large group to assess for differences in the groups' performance. The following discussion of student performance is based on the spring 2023 statewide testing. The results of the analyses are summarized below, while the statistics and other information on student matching and the statistical methodology are included in Appendix B.

Overview of Results for the All Students Group

Of the eight academic measures examined from the spring 2023 statewide tests, the charter school group performed different and higher than the TPS group on six of the measures. On the remaining measures, the charter school group performed similarly to the TPS group (Table 15 and Appendix B). The following results are evident:

- For the ELA and math scale scores, charter school students performed differently and higher than the TPS student group.
- For the percent meeting standard rates, charter school students performed differently and higher than the TPS group on the ELA and math percent meeting standard rates and similar to TPS group on the science percent meeting standard rates.
- The charter school students performed differently and higher than the TPS student group on the ELA and math student growth percentile measures.

Table 15: summarizes the performance of the charter school students compared to the performance of demographically and academically similar TPS group for the All Students group.

Academic Measure	Charter School Students Perform Different and Higher than TPS Students	Charter School Students Perform Similar to TPS Students	Charter School Students Perform Different and Lower than TPS Students
ELA Assessment	Average Scale Score, Percent Meeting Standard Rate, and Student Growth*		
Math Assessment	Average Scale Score, Percent Meeting Standard Rate, and Student Growth*		
Science Assessment		Average Scale Score and Percent Meeting Standard Rate	

*Note: The ELA, math, and science average scale scores reflect data from the spring administration of the 2022-23 school year. Student Growth refers to Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs) derived from the Washington Growth Model.

Overview of Results by Race/Ethnicity and Program Participation

The charter school student group performed as well or better than the TPS groups on all six of the measures analyzed here (Table 16). Charter school students identifying as Black African American, students who are English learners, and students who qualify for FRL (low-income) consistently outperform their TPS matched peers.

- **Native American and Alaskan Natives**: on all eight measures, the count of matched students with valid results was too small (less than 10) to report on.
- **Asian**: charter school attendees identifying as Asian performed higher than TPS students on math percent meeting standard and the median Math SGP measure, and similar to TPS students on the ELA measures, the other math measure, and the science measures.
- **Black or African American**: students identifying as Black at charter schools performed higher than TPS students on the ELA measures, higher on the math measures, and similar to TPS students on the science measures.
- **Hispanic or Latinx**: students at charter schools performed higher than the corresponding TPS group on the ELA SGP, higher on all three math measures, and similar to the TPS students on the science measures and the other two ELA measures.
- **White**: charter school students performed higher than the TPS students on the math SGP measure, and similar to TPS students on all of the other measures.
- **Two or More Races:** charter school students performed similarly to TPS students on all the measures.

- **Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander**: on all the measures, the count of matched students with valid results was too small (less than 20) to report on.
- **English Learners**: charter school students performed higher than the TPS group on all of the ELA and math measures, and similar to TPS students on the science measures.
- **Low-Income**: students at charter schools performed higher TPS students on all of the ELA and math measures, and similar to TPS students on the science measures.
- **Special Education**: charter school attendees receiving special education services performed higher than the TPS students on the ELA SGP measure, and similar to TPS students on all of the other measures.

Table 16: summary of group performance on ELA and math assessments by race/ethnicity and program participation by charter school enrollment.

Academic Measure	Charter School Students Perform Different and Higher than TPS Students	Charter School Students Perform Similar to TPS Students	Charter School Students Perform Different and Lower than TPS Students
ELA Assessment (Scale Score)	Black, *English Learners, and Low-Income*	Asian, Hispanic, White, Two or More Races, and *Special Education*	
ELA Proficiency (Percent Meeting Standard)	Black, *English Learners. and Low-Income*	Asian, Hispanic, White, Two or More Races, , *and Special Education*	
ELA Growth Student Growth Percentiles	Black, Hispanic, *English Learners. Low-Income, and Special Education*	Asian, White, and Two or More Races,	
Math Assessment (Scale Score)	Black, Hispanic, *English Learners, and Low-Income*	Asian, White, Two or More Races, and *Special Education*	
Math Proficiency (Percent Meeting Standard)	Asian, Black, Hispanic, *English Learners. and Low-Income*	White, Two or More Races*, and Special Education*	
Math Growth Student Growth Percentiles	Asian, Black, Hispanic, White, *English Learners, and Low-Income*	Two or More Races *and Special Education*	
Science Assessment (Scale Score)		Asian, Black, Hispanic, White, Two or More Races, *English Learners, Low-Income, and Special Education*	

Academic Measure	Charter School Students Perform Different and Higher than TPS Students	Charter School Students Perform Similar to TPS Students	Charter School Students Perform Different and Lower than TPS Students
Science Proficiency (Percent Meeting Standard)		Asian, Black, Hispanic, White, Two or More Races, *English Learners, Low-Income, and Special Education*	

For purposes here, Low-Income and FRL are interchangeable and means the students qualifying for the Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRL) program. Special Education refers to students with a disability (SWD) who are receiving special educational services through an Individualized Educational Plan (IEP). English learners (ELs) are students receiving bilingual educational supports. The Native American and Alaskan and the Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander student groups were too small to publicly report on.

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

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

The SBE approves school districts as charter school authorizers as described in RCW 28A.710.090. The Spokane PS is the only school district to file an application and then to be approved as a charter public school authorizer. All charter school authorizer applications must include:

- Vision for chartering,
- Plan to support that vision including budget information and commitment to quality authorizing,
- Draft application for charter schools to apply with the authorizer,
- Draft performance framework that would guide the establishment of a charter contract,
- Draft of the proposed renewals, revocation, and nonrenewal process,
- Statement of assurance that the authorizer is committed to meeting expectations of a charter authorizer and will engage in training with the state if provided or required, and
- Statement assuring public accountability and transparency for all authorizing practices, decisions, and expenditures.

The Washington State Charter School Commission (CSC) and Spokane PS are the only charter school authorizers in the state. Together, the Commission and Spokane PS oversaw 16 charter public schools operating in Washington during the 2022-23 school year. Per the Washington State Report Card, 4,805 students attended one of the 16 Washington public charter schools on the official count day for the 2022-23 school year (Table 2). The total charter school enrollment represents an increase of approximately 150 students from the 2021-22 school year and the

total charter school enrollment represents approximately 0.4 percent of all public school K-12 students.

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

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

The demographics of students enrolled in charter schools during the 2022-23 school year (Table 5) indicate that, for the most part, the Washington charter public schools serve systemically marginalized students at a rate higher than the home school districts.

Key Developments for Charter School Authorizers

Charter School Commission – Authorizer Developments

Fourteen CSC authorized charter public schools were in operation during the 2022-23 school year, which is the same number of schools operating for the 2021-22 school year. In the 2022-23 school year, the Commission's portfolio of 14 schools served approximately 4,250 students. All CSC-authorized charter schools were subject to strict oversight from the CSC and the OSPI. Impact Black River and Rooted School commenced operations for the 2023-24 school year. Other Commission activities regarding specific charter schools are described below.

Pullman Community Montessori

On March 15, 2024, the Charter School Commission held a special meeting to consider the revocation of the Pullman Community Montessori School charter contract. The Commission) voted to give notice to Pullman Community Montessori of the Commission's intention to revoke the school's charter contract. This is the first step in a process in which the school will have an opportunity to respond, and which may or may not ultimately result in revocation of the charter school contract. The Commission notified the school in writing of the determination and associated reasons for revocation. The school's Board of Directors will have 30 days to respond. A charter school that has fallen irreparably short of the commitments of the school's charter can result in charter revocation. A revoked charter without sufficient remedies can be terminated, resulting in the charter school closure

Whatcom Intergenerational High School

On October 26, 2023, the Commission reported that the State Auditor's Office had released its regular accountability audit reports for the 2021-22 school year. Specific to Whatcom Intergenerational High School, the State Auditor's Office found that:

1. The Board of Directors conducted business while Whatcom Intergenerational High School's nonprofit corporation was administratively dissolved by the Secretary of State.

   Commission Oversight Action: In its contracts with charter public schools, the Commission requires schools to immediately notify the Commission of any changes to its nonprofit corporation status. Failure to do so is a breach of contract. The Commission has added a requirement for schools to submit proof of active nonprofit status to the Commission annually.

2. Whatcom Intergenerational High School did not have adequate controls to ensure compliance with state procurement laws for public works.

   Commission Oversight Action: In September 2022, the Commission issued a Letter of Inquiry requiring the school to submit evidence of following its financial and procurement policies. As a result, the school conducted an investigation and implemented additional protocols to ensure adherence to all policies.

Summit Public Schools - Atlas

In March 2022, the State Auditor issued an accountability audit report with two findings identified for Summit Atlas for the 2019-20 school year. Because of the findings, the Commission approved a shorter term (two years instead of the typical five-year contract) and attached conditions to the contract. Since then, the Commission reported that Summit Atlas made significant strides in its organizational performance, including a determination by the State Auditor's Office that the findings concerning teacher certification in the 2021-22 school year have been fully resolved and corrected. Additional oversight by the Commission regarding the school's teacher credentialing practices found the new protocols to be sound in both design and implementation. The Commission approved Summit Atlas' renewal application for a three-year contract starting with the 2024-25 school year on October 12, 2023.

Catalyst Public School Expansion

In October 2023, the Commission approved (with conditions) the expansion of Catalyst Public Charter School from serving grades K-8 to serving grades K-12 after determining that the school met all Commission requirements. Catalyst plans to add a 9th grade in the fall 2024 and then add one grade per year until fully enrolled as a K-12 school. The expansion approval is contingent on the following:

- Demonstrating funding to the satisfaction of the Commission by March 31, 2024.
- Securing a facilities agreement with Olympic College and submitting it to the Commission by March 31, 2024.

- Submitting Board-approved updates/additions to school policies and/or student or employee handbooks to reflect the addition of high school students by July 1, 2024.
- A pre-opening site visit of the high school program and facilities is completed to the Commission's satisfaction by August 1, 2024.

Impact | Puget Sound Elementary School

In September 2022, the Commission posted materials related to Impact Puget Sound ES's contract renewal, and opened the public comment period. Additional materials were posted on a rolling basis until the Commission's renewal resolution vote. Parent and guardian comments regarding the delivery of special education services at Impact Puget Sound was investigated by the OSPI and addressed through a Corrective Action Plan (CAP). The Commission considered the community complaints and CAP from OSPI in making a renewal decision for Impact Puget Sound. The Commission approved Impact Puget Sound in February 2023 for a two-year renewal contract with conditions. On July 6, 2023, the OSPI closed the CAP as all requirements were met.

Rulemaking

In response to the enactment of HB 1744, the Charter School Commission filed a CR101 with the Code Reviser's Office in June 2023 indicating the Commission's intent to create new rules reflecting the addition of a complaint process consistent with HB 1744. To inform the new complaint process, the Commission conducted outreach to gather input on experiences with existing school complaint processes, gauge opinions, understand perceptions, and ask for guidance on resources that would be most helpful in resolving concerns about schools. In particular, the Commission sought feedback from those who might use the process and/or who might be most impacted by its use. The Commission engaged with school leaders, conducted a family focus group and survey, and engaged with the Office of the Education Ombuds, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction Offices of Special Education and of Civil Rights, the Puget Sound Educational Service District, and the Washington Student Achievement Council. The Commission sent draft rules to the SBE for review and comments. After a November 21, 2023 public hearing on the proposed rule changes, the Commission adopted the final rules on December 14, 2023.

Charter School Financial Performance

The Commission was unable to report on the operational charter public school's financial performance for the 2022-23 school year because the OSPI had not yet completed and made available school financial analyses and the State Auditor's Office (SAO) had not yet completed the required accountability audits. The Commission can report on the 2021-22 school year financial performance for charter public schools. The Commission will be releasing the 2022-2023 financial performance reports for all schools once the independent financial audit reports have been received and analyzed.

In the spring of 2021, the Commission adopted an updated Financial Performance Framework. The 2021-2022 school year is the first year the updated framework was implemented. This

update includes an "Approaching Standard "rating. Additionally, for increased clarity in reporting, Enrollment Variance, which is an informational-only near-term indicator, no longer receives a rating, instead the enrollment variance is reported in percentages. The enrollment variance indicates whether the school is meeting its enrollment projections. A school that does not meet its enrollment targets may not be able to meet its budgeted expenses. As enrollment is a key driver of revenue, variance is important to track as an indicator of sufficiency of revenues generated to fund ongoing operations. It is the Spokane PS policy to report and rate enrollment variance. In order to meet standard, Spokane charter schools must post an enrollment variance of 95 percent or higher, which neither did.

Of the 14 CSC charter schools open in 2022-23, 11 met standard on all financial performance measures (Table 17). The two Spokane charter schools met standard on all of the financial performance measures, except for enrollment variance.

Table 17: shows information for charter schools from the Financial Performance Framework provided by the Washington Charter School Commission (CSC) and the Spokane Charter School Authority (CSA).

Charter School (Authorizer)	1.a. Current Ratio	1.b. Unrestricted Days of Cash	1.c. Debt Default	2.a. Total Margin Ratio	2.b. Debt to Asset Ratio	2.c. Cash Flow	Enrollment Variance (%)
Catalyst Public Charter School (CSC)	M	M	M	M	M	M	97
Impact Commencement Bay (CSC)	M	M	M	M	M	NA	103
Impact Puget Sound (CSC)	M	M	M	M	M	M	101
Impact Salish Sea (CSC)	M	M	M	M	M	M	101
Lumen High School (Spokane CSA)	M	M	M	M	M	M	76
PRIDE Prep (Spokane CSA)	M	M	M	M	M	M	90
Pullman Community Montessori (CSC)	M	A	M	D	D	M	77
Pinnacles Prep (CSC)	M	M	M	M	M	NA	88
Rainier Prep (CSC)	M	M	M	M	M	M	99
Rainier Valley (CSC)	M	M	M	M	A	M	100
Spokane International (CSC)	M	M	M	M	M	M	96
Summit Atlas (CSC)	M	M	M	M	A	M	81
Summit Olympus (CSC)	M	M	M	M	M	M	80
Summit Sierra (CSC)	M	M	M	M	M	M	80
Whatcom HIS (CSC)	M	M	M	M	M	NA	80
Why Not You (CSC)	M	M	M	M	M	NA	96

Notes: M means Met Standard; A means Approaches Standard, D means Did Not Meet Standard, NA means Not Applicable.

Spokane Public Schools – Authorizer Developments

During the 2022-23 school year, two district-authorized charter schools (PRIDE Prep and Lumen High School) were in operation. These schools were subject to oversight from the Spokane PS and the OSPI. Spokane PS strengthened their understanding of quality charter authorizing by participating in professional development trainings, and by partnering with NACSA and the Washington Charter Schools Association (WA Charters) to create a collaborative spirit with charter operators.

PRIDE Prep Charter School

PRIDE Prep served over 500 students in the 6th through 12th grades in the 2022-23 school year. PRIDE Prep serves secondary students following a comprehensive school model with project based learning and International Baccalaureate programming. 2022-23 was the second year of Pride Schools' conditional renewal due, in part, to academic performance falling in the bottom quartile of schools on the Washington School Improvement Framework.

During the 2022-23 school year, Spokane PS provided teacher professional development focused on reading and math intervention, coupled with the addition of Lexia Powerup and Dreambox adaptive online tools for reading and math intervention and acceleration. Positive academic growth on NWEA Measure of Academic Progress (MAP) assessment data for the year translated to increases in the percentage of students meeting standard on the statewide assessments in the spring 2022 and spring 2023 administrations. Pride has now fully implemented MAP assessment, including student goal setting and interim assessments for struggling students.

Pride continued to work towards aligning budget to enrollment and met financial performance indicators with the assistance of federal ESSER funding. Corrective action plans and increased monitoring continued throughout 2022-23, which was their second year of a three-year conditional renewal. Pride has taken specific steps to address conditional renewal areas of concern and has worked with the SPS charter authorizer staff to improve in all areas. Pride Schools is applying for renewal during the 2023-24 school year.

Lumen High School

Lumen High School commenced operations for the 2020-21 school year under partial COVID-related pandemic closures but delivered in-person instruction for the full 2021-22 school year. Lumen High School has created strong community partnerships in support of their mission to offer educational pathways for teen parents leading to high school graduation, positive parenting, and future life success. Lumen continues to support social and emotional learning strategies with therapeutic supports to keep students engaged and attending school.

- The school staff implemented a tiered intervention system of support to improve attendance, which yielded positive results.
- In addition to Early Childhood Education classes, students participate in internships and are assisted in pursuing post-secondary opportunities. Lumen has a social worker who

supports student's needs and refers vulnerable students to counseling and other services.
- Lumen's small schools funding and grant awards continue to support a solid financial performance.

Lumen High School enrolled 36 students in grades 9 through 12 for the fall 2022 count day, which was lower than anticipated. Lumen students comprise a special population of teen mothers and fathers. Students at Lumen HS test well below grade level. About one third test 5-6 years below grade level and about one third testing 2-3 years below grade level. The students at Lumen have the added responsibility of giving birth and raising a child. Lumen's enrollment is too small for many of the current Charter School Academic Performance Framework accountability measures, making assessing academic performance a challenge.

With Lumen up for renewal during the 2024-25 school, Spokane PS began discussions with Lumen in the spring of 2023 on reevaluating how to best measure academic performance framework effectiveness considering the very high needs student population they are serving. To provide additional measures, the school has fully implemented NWEA Measure of Academic Progress (MAP) assessment and SPS provided technical assistance to train teachers in how to use MAP data to better measure and monitor student academic growth. MAPs is now a student entrance requirement and Lumen HS will continue to work with SPS to examine additional ways to measure academic performance framework indicators.

Funding Sufficiency for Charter Schools

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

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

Charter schools face four unique funding challenges.

- **Startup funding**: because funding is provided to charter schools based on enrollment, there are substantial front-end costs that must be addressed through other sources (e.g.,

private philanthropy, local fundraising, federal grants, or some combination of these sources). This makes it challenging for schools to start-up, particularly as schools move from the planning phase to implementation, finding and outfitting a space, and hiring staff.

- **Capital funding**: charter schools do not have access to local bonds or state capital funds typically used to finance the purchase of land and school construction. As a result, charter schools generally acquire leased space paid for through their operating budget. Per WA Charters and the CSC and because of the way charter school funds are allotted, charter schools spend a substantial portion of their basic education allocation on facilities, which results in a reduction of the monies available to support teaching and learning.
- **Authorizer oversight fee**: Charter schools receive an allocation through the OSPI based on average, full-time, student enrollment and the prototypical school funding model. For the purposes of the funding allotment, each charter public school is a local education agency. The state funding allotment, and any private funds received by the school must cover both capital and all operating costs. A portion of the per pupil funding allotment (three percent for both the CSC and Spokane PS authorizers) is also provided to the authorizer for specified oversight purposes outlined in RCW 28A.710.100.
- **Timing of apportionment payments:** Another concern Spokane PS identified after their 2019 annual report relates to disbursement policies rather than sufficiency. A challenge stems from the fact that apportionment is paid out unevenly across the 12 months. School districts receive a lower amount from the state in November and May because they receive tax levy dollars in those months, but charter public schools do not receive levy funds. This creates a significant cash flow challenge for charter school LEAs. These disparate payment percentages can result in a charter school LEA appearing to fail to meet financial performance indicators in those two months, where they would otherwise meet the indicators if the apportionment payment percentages were the same across all months.

Summary of Findings on Revenues and Expenditures

As was noted in the authorizer reports, these findings are based on the 2021-22 school year because the 2022-23 fiscal information had not yet been made publicly available on the OSPI website at the time of this writing. We include details on the revenues and expenditures in Appendix C.

- In the 2021-22 school year, per student revenue for nearly all of the charter schools is approximately $1,000 to $4,700 lower than the home district when the Other revenues (gifts, grants, donations, and support from foundations) are excluded.
- After charter school outliers were eliminated, the charter school LEAs per student average expenditure was similar to the home school district average expenditure

(approximately $19,144 *vs*. $19,029). However, the categorical spending by the charter school LEAs and home school districts are considerably different.

- The charter school LEA Administration expenditures are more than double the home school districts (approximately $4,900 *vs.* $2,400 per student).
- The charter school LEA per student expenditures attributed to Maintenance and Operations are more than double that of the home school districts ($3,200 *vs.* $1,600).
- The charter school LEA per student expenditures attributed to Teaching are substantially lower than the Teaching costs for the home school district (approximately $9,400 *vs.* $13,600).

SBE Review of Revenues

The SBE examined the 2021-22 revenues and expenditures reported on the OSPI Student Apportionment and Fiscal Services (SAFS) website for the charter LEAs and the home school districts. The most up to date version of the allocation of state funding to support the instructional program of basic education is described in RCW 28A.150.260. The basic education allocation or allotment is a dollar amount derived from the prototypical school model based on school district full time enrollment by grade level and distributed to school districts each month throughout the year. To obtain a clearer picture of school funding and in a deviation from prior years, this review includes all revenues coming from state, local and other sources, and revenue contributions from federal sources.

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

For this analysis, revenues are described as coming from State sources, Local sources, Federal, or Outside sources. State revenues are subdivided into General Purpose Apportionment or Special Purpose revenue (Table 18). The State General Purpose Apportionment revenue represents the sum the basic apportionment, and add-ins for special education and for local effort assistance. The State Special Purpose revenue represents the sum of monies for special education services, learning assistance, bilingual education, highly capable services, food services, transportation operations, and other line items. In 2021-22, some school districts received additional state funding (e.g. infant special education funds, institutional, child-care funding, pilot program funding, funding from other state agencies, and other assigned state monies) that the charter schools did not receive.

Summary of Revenue

- The state apportionment is similar for the charter school LEAs and the home school districts, typically ranging from approximately $11K to $15K per student.
- Approximately 43 to 83 percent of the total per student revenue for school districts and charter school LEAs come from the State General Purpose and the State Special Purpose Apportionment.
- On average, 16 to 18 percent of the total revenues come from federal sources, and there is little difference between the charter school LEAs and the home school districts on this measure.
- Approximately 13 percent of the total per student revenue for the charter school LEAs comes from Other sources and Local sources but less than two percent for the home school districts.
- When charter school grant monies are excluded from the total federal funds, charter schools and the home districts receive approximately $2,000 to $4,000 per student and there is little difference between the two groups.

Table 18: summary of the 2021-22 per pupil revenues for school district and charter school LEAs. Dollar amounts shown are the average for home school districts and charter school LEAs.

Group	Total State Revenue $/Pupil	Total Local* Revenue $/Pupil	Total Federal Revenue $/Pupil	Other* Revenue $/Pupil	Total Revenue Includes Other* $/Pupil	Total Revenue Excludes Other* $/Pupil
Charter School LEAs (Average)	13,710	346	3,785	3,439	20,707	17,574
Home School Districts (Average)	13,082	2,685	3,009	366	19,006	18,865
Washington	12,749	2,368	2444	299	17,859	17,859

Note: data for Whatcom IHS, Why Not You Academy, Lumen HS, and Rainier Valley Leadership are not included in this table because they are outliers. *Note: total Local revenue amount excludes Other revenues (Source Category 2500 - Gifts, Grants and Donations), and Foundation support (Source Category 8200 – Other Financial Revenues). Values shown here are numeric averages, not weighted averages.

Review of Expenditures

Charter school LEA and school district expenditures are broken out into the categories of expenses attributed to Administration, Teaching, Maintenance and Operations, School Food Service, Student Transportation, and Other expenses (Table 19).

Administration expenditures include costs attributed to the board of directors, superintendent's office, business office, human resources, public relations, supervision of instruction, school principal's office, and supervision of food services, transportation, and maintenance and operations. The home school districts expend approximately $2,400 (12 percent of the total) per student on administration, while the charter school LEAs expend approximately $4,900 per student (26 percent of the per student total) on administration. Lumen High School posted the

highest administration expenses (approximately $16,100 per student), which was identified as an outlier and was excluded from the calculation of averages.

The Teaching expenditures include a wide range of activities attributed to instruction, which include but are not limited to learning resources, guidance and counseling, student health services, classroom instruction, extracurricular activities, professional learning, and curriculum. The charter school LEAs reported teaching expenditures far less than the home school districts (approximately $9,400 vs. $13,600) per student. Many of the charter school LEAs spent less per student on teaching and instruction expenditures than the home school district.

The Maintenance and Operations expenditure category includes activities such as grounds maintenance, operations of buildings, building maintenance, cost of utilities, and costs attributed to building and property security. On average, the charter school LEAs spend approximately $3,200 per student, as compared to $1,600 per student for the home school districts. The home school districts spend approximately 8.2 percent of total expenditures on Maintenance and Operations, while the charter school LEAs rate was 16.8 percent of the total per student expenditures.

Total Expenditures

In the 2021-22 school year, the charter school LEAs expended approximately $19,144 per student (Table 23), which is similar to the home school districts expenditure of approximately $19,029. Charter school LEA per student costs attributed to Administration are more than double that of the home school districts ($4,898 vs. $2,364). The charter school LEA per student costs attributed to Teaching are far less than the costs for the home school district ($9,430 vs. $13,569). The charter school LEA per student costs attributed to Maintenance and Operations are more than double that of the home school districts ($3,208 vs. $1,565). The expenditures related to Food Service and Student Transportation expenses for charter school LEAs ($893 total) and home school districts ($983 total) are similar.

Table 19: summary of the 2021-22 per pupil expenditures for home school district and charter school LEAs. Dollar amounts are the average for home school districts and charter school LEAs.

Group	Total Admin $/Pupil	Total Teaching $/Pupil	Maintenance Operations $/Pupil	School Food Service $/Pupil	Student Transport. $/Pupil	Other $/Pupil	Total $/Pupil
Charter School LEAs (Average)	4,898	9,430	3,208	709	523	370	19,144
Home School Districts (Average)	2,364	13,569	1,565	549	557	426	19,029
Washington	2,221	12,583	1,459	506	673	407	17,850

Note: data for Whatcom IHS, Why Not You Academy, Lumen HS, and Rainier Valley Leadership are not included in this table because they were identified as outliers. Values shown here are numeric averages, not weighted averages.

Equitable Funding of Charter Schools

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

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

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

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

Efficacy of the Funding for Charter School Authorizers

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

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

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

Section IV - Recommended Changes to State Law or Policy

Earlier in the 2022-23 school year, the SBE opened WAC 180-19 to develop proposed rules addressing changes needed to implement legislation that passed in the 2023 Legislative session. ESHB 1744 made various changes to provisions governing the administration and oversight of charter schools, including new and modified duties for charter schools, charter school boards, charter school authorizers, the charter school commission, and the Board that requires changes to the current rules (Table 20). In addition, the Board, in consultation with the authorizers, has identified a few other issues in the rules that are either confusing or add administrative burden that the agencies would like to address during this revision.

A hearing on the proposed rules was held on December 11, 2023. Public testimony and written comment were not received on the proposed rules, and no issues have been identified that require changes to the proposed rules for chapter 180-19 WAC (Table 20). The Board adopted the final rules on February 15, 2024.

Table 20: shows the adopted changes to WAC 180-19 and other comments.

Change	Comments
Added definitions to 180-19-010 to incorporate definitions from the statute, move definitions from other sections, and clarify terms.	The current rules lack a number of definitions included in the statute and some critical terms are undefined. The current rules include definitions that are consolidated in the definition section of the draft proposed rules.
180-19-030 - Submission of authorizer application. Replaced dates with a time frame, added language for renewal applications, and moved language regarding the content of the application to a new section. Changes to the content section improve clarity and ensure provisions in RCW are addressed in the rule.	Certain dates are included in the rules that are not required in statute and add potential barriers in the application process for new authorizers. In addition, the current rules are silent on the renewal process for authorizers.
180-19-035 - New Section - Content of authorizer application.	Breaks out the content of the authorizer application into its own section for greater clarity and to remove duplication (previously included in 180-19-030).
180-19-040 - Evaluation and approval or denial of authorizer applications. Where appropriate dates are replaced with time frames, definitions are moved to 180-19-010.	The specified dates are not required in statute and create potential barriers for approval of new authorizers.
180-19-060 - Authorizer oversight fee. Language is clarified, the date by which rates are determined is moved earlier to align with timelines of the OSPI fiscal system, and duplicative language regarding annual report content is removed.	Current language is confusing, and the timing of decisions does not align with the current Board meeting schedule and is later than needed to ensure the fiscal systems are set up to adjust to a change in the fee.
180-19-210 - Annual report by authorizer. Date by which a template must be available is set earlier	The timing of reporting is problematic and may need to be addressed further at another time. The Board's annual report requires certain information

Change	Comments
and content requirements for district authorizers and commission are clarified.	from the authorizers, which drives the reporting timeline. However, data needed by both authorizers and the Board is not available when needed to meet the timelines.
180-19-220 - Oversight of Authorizers; 180-19-230 Updates to address requirements of HB 1744	As noted above ESHB 1744 requires SBE to oversee certain activities of the Charter School Commission as it relates to their role as an authorizer. Changes in these sections address this oversight and the requirement for special review and reporting as needed.
180-19-230 - Oversight of district authorizers - Special Review; 180-19-250 - Oversight of authorizers—Revocation of authorizing contract, and 180-19-260 - Authorizer Oversight - Transfer of Charter Contract. Changes to clarify applicability only to district authorizers and to add language from 1744 regarding high percentage of school closures.	"Authorizer" is defined in RCW and in WAC to refer to both district authorizers approved by the Board and the Charter School Commission. In current rule, these sections only apply to district authorizers, so clarification is added to include the commission where appropriate.

The Washington Charter School Commission provided specific recommendations in the 2022-23 Authorizer Report to improve the Charter School Act.

Washington State Charter School Commission Recommendations
Amend the Charter School Act (RCW 28A.710) to allow more time for charter schools to be established in Washington. • Families are looking for more public school options that serve the unique educational needs of their children. • There is increased local interest by communities to establish charter public schools to serve students often the furthest from educational justice.
Allow charter public schools access to public funding streams that traditional schools currently receive. • Charter public schools do not have access to local levy funds or the state's School Construction Assistance Program (SCAP), which leads to inequities that hurt charter public school students.
Ongoing funding is needed to fulfill the requirements of ESHB 1744, which passed during the 2023 legislative session. • Additional funding is necessary to implement the Commission's new complaint process and to provide the level of technical assistance directed by the Legislature.
Create a path to add tribal compact and charter public schools to the list of entities that may receive basic education waivers from the Superintendent of Public Education and the State Board of Education.

Washington State Charter School Commission Recommendations
Explore solutions for meeting the Commission's administrative needs, to streamline operations and increase efficiencies. • The Charter School Act (RCW 28A.710) establishes the Charter School Commission as an independent state agency with administrative services provided by OSPI. Since the passage of the Charter School Act, additional solutions are available to independent state agencies to receive administrative support and services.

The Spokane PS provided specific recommendations in their 2022-23 Authorizer Report to improve the Charter School Act.

Spokane Charter School Authorizer Recommendations
28A.710.110(4): Increase the flexibility in the allowable use of the authorizer fee to enable the authorizer to assist the charter schools in areas of mutual benefit to both the authorizer and the school.
The timing of school district apportionment has lower payments in the months that levy dollars are received by traditional districts. Given charter schools do not receive levy dollars this creates cash flow challenges in those months. We would recommend evaluation and adjustment of the payment schedule and adjust the payment schedule to address cash flow challenges.
Both charters SPS authorizes previously reported their facilities lease as an operating lease. With the introduction of GASB 87, each charter school was required to capitalize their operating lease. This has greatly increased the long-term debt reported by each charter school. SPS recommends additional funding for school facility construction or acquisition, as this would greatly assist with charter school fiscal stability.
Small charter schools (like Lumen High School) often have no WISF scores due to an insufficient number of students, leading to a sizable portion of the current Academic Performance Framework that is not applicable. The National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA), the source of the current frameworks, recommends that authorizers prioritize disaggregated student growth and mission-specific goals, especially those that focus on student accelerated growth and wellness in their academic framework measures of school quality.

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

Authorizing Additional Charter Schools

Since the enactment of the 2016 Charter School Act, new charter schools opened in each school year and the total charter school total enrollment increased each year. In addition,

approximately 1,200 students are on waiting lists to enroll in the charter schools currently operating. This is good evidence that parents and guardians continue to seek out alternatives to traditional public schools to find the best educational fit for their children. The Charter School Act allowed for the authorization of up to 40 schools within the first five years of the Act. After some charter schools closed in the previous years, 16 charter schools operated in the 2021-22 school year. The count of operating charter schools is well below the cap of 40 schools authorized in statute.

During the 2021 and 2022 legislative sessions, legislation was introduced that would have extended the timeframe for establishing up to 40 total charter schools by another five years but the bills were unsuccessful. No bills were introduced in the 2023 or 2024 legislative sessions that would extend or reopen the authorization window. No additional charter schools will be approved or authorized unless the Legislature and the Governor pass and approve legislation to do so.

> **RECOMMENDATION 1: The SBE and charter school authorizers recommend that the window for authorization be extended to allow additional charter schools to operate in Washington.**

Equitable Funding of Charter Schools

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

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

> **RECOMMENDATION 2: The SBE and charter school authorizers recommend a close examination of the sufficiency of charter school funding and approaches used in other states in order to bring about equitable educational funding for Washington's schools.**

Authorizer Oversight Fees and Usage

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

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

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

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

Other Recommendations and Other Ongoing Work

In response to the enactment of HB 1744, the SBE filed the CR 101 with the Code Reviser's Office in May 2023 indicating the Board's intent to review and update the charter school rules (WAC 180-19). The Board, in consultation with the authorizers, has identified a number of issues in rule that are either confusing or add administrative burden that the agency would like to address during this revision. The SBE conducted a public hearing on the draft proposed rules on December 11, 2023. The Board adopted the final rules on February 15, 2024.

The timing of school district apportionment includes lower payments in the months that levy dollars are received by traditional districts. Given charter schools do not receive levy dollars this creates cash flow challenges in those months. The SBE and Spokane PS would recommend evaluation and adjustment of the payment schedule to address cash flow challenges.

Appendix A: Charter Management Organizations

Overview

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

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

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

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

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

In 2012, Mathematica published a report titled *Evaluating the Effectiveness of Charter Management Organizations (CMOs)*, which was conducted with the CRPE. The evaluation found that many CMOs have a significant positive impact on students' academic achievement, as

captured by test scores, while others have significant negative impacts. Each CMO's impact on test scores is often consistent across schools, suggesting some degree of uniformity. In addition, some, but not all, CMOs substantially boost students' chances of graduating from high school and enrolling in postsecondary education.

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

Charter Management Organizations with a Washington Presence

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

For the fiscal year ending August 2019, Impact's IRS Form 990 reported contributions, gifts, and grants totaling approximately $1.99M, of which $522K was indicated to be government grants and approximately $1.47M to be other grants or contributions. In 2019 and 2020, Impact | Puget Sound Elementary was awarded a total of $425K from the Louis Calder Foundation to support grade level growth and to pilot a transitional kindergarten program. In October 2020, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation committed approximately $125K to Impact Public Schools Washington for providing support for professional development partnerships in Washington. In July 2020, Impact | Salish Sea was awarded a $1.30M grant from the Washington Charter School Association. In September 2020, Impact | Commencement Bay was awarded a $1.50M grant from the Washington Charter School Association.

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

The pedagogy employed at Summit schools, dubbed "Summit Learning," is a personalized, project-based learning (PBL) curriculum that puts students "in charge" of their own learning. Courses are built around projects done at students' own paces instead of traditional coursework modules, and teachers focus their energy on tutoring individual students.

Projects are the foundation of the academic experience and give students hands-on experience with real-world scenarios they will encounter after graduation, like collaborating with a team,

interpreting data, and presenting a persuasive argument. In the classroom, teachers teach cognitive skills and content through real-world projects and help students apply their knowledge to the world around them.

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

Appendix B: Analysis of the Academic Performance of Charter Schools

Part A: Academic Performance of the Charter Schools

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

There were no reportable assessment results on the Washington State Report Card for Impact Commencement Bay ES, Impact Salish Sea ES, Lumen High School, and the Why Not You Academy.

Table B1: shows the percentage of students meeting standard on the spring 2023 SBA and WCAS assessments for Catalyst Public School and the home school district.

Student Group Grades 3-8	Catalyst PS ELA	Catalyst PS Math	Catalyst PS Science	Bremerton SD ELA	Bremerton SD Math	Bremerton SD Science
All Students	**48.8**	**45.1**	**51.0**	**32.2**	**24.7**	**31.7**
Native American or Alaskan	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.
Asian	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	58.3	49.1	62.2
Black or African American	28.6	19.0	N.D.	<22	<22	<11
Hispanic or Latinx	35.1	32.4	N.D.	17.4	13.7	16.5
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<30	<30	<30
White	57.4	55.4	60.0	41.8	33.9	45.8
Two or More Races	35.5	35.5	N.D.	33.4	<26	20.2
English Learners	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<10	<12	<10
Low-Income	40.8	36.8	37.0	25.3	19.0	25.3
Students with Disabilities	23.4	21.3	<21	<9	<11	<10

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

Table B2: shows the percentage of students meeting standard on the spring 2023 SBA and WCAS assessments for Impact Puget Sound and the home school district.

Student Group Grades 3-5	Impact PS ELA	Impact PS Math	Impact PS Science	Tukwila SD ELA	Tukwila SD Math	Tukwila SD Science
All Students	**53.0**	**51.7**	**48.8**	**26.5**	**24.5**	**26.3**
Native American or Alaskan	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.
Asian	69.6	56.5	N.D.	34.6	37.6	38.8
Black or African American	44.3	47.8	<17	23.7	<12	13.3
Hispanic or Latinx	46.7	40.0	N.D.	19.8	19.1	16.9
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<16	<25	<27.
White	71.9	75.0	N.D.	29.0	<32	33.3
Two or More Races	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<43	<36.	50.0
English Learners	39.5	44.7	N.D.	14.4	16.3	8.4.
Low-Income	44.3	45.5	30.0	22.3	19.9	23.2
Students with Disabilities	<19	25.0	N.D.	<12	<11	10.3

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

Table B3: shows the percentage of students meeting standard on the spring 2023 SBA and WCAS assessments for Impact Salish Sea and the home school district.

Student Group Grades K-3	Impact Salish Sea ELA	Impact Salish Sea Math	Impact Salish Sea Science	Seattle PS ELA	Seattle PS Math	Seattle PS Science
All Students	**37.5**	**41.7**	N.D	**61.6**	**62.9**	**N.D.**
Native American or Alaskan	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	42.9.	35.7	N.D.
Asian	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	63.1	70.7	N.D.
Black or African American	44.3	47.8	N.D.	26.6	26.5	N.D.
Hispanic or Latinx	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	41.4	43.6	N.D.
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<30	<25	N.D.
White	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	73.3	75.8	N.D.
Two or More Races	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	70.0	70.0	N.D.
English Learners	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	31.0	39.2	N.D.
Low-Income	36.8	42.1	N.D	33.4	35.1	N.D.
Students with Disabilities	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	38.6	39.2	N.D.

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

Table B4: shows the percentage of students meeting standard on the spring 2023 SBA and WCAS assessments for Lumen High School and the home school district.

Student Group Grades 9-12	Lumen ELA	Lumen Math	Lumen Science	Spokane PS ELA	Spokane PS Math	Spokane PS Science
All Students	**N.D.**	**N.D.**	**<20**	**57.7**	**24.0**	**32.7**
Native American or Alaskan	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	20.8	<12	<11
Asian	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	54.0	30.0	41.8
Black or African American	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	27.3	<4	<5
Hispanic or Latinx	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	46.4	15.9	24.0
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	8.6	<5	<7%
White	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	64.9	28.3	38.0
Two or More Races	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	55.1	21.3	24.9
English Learners	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	7.0	5.2	4.7
Low-Income	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	43.8	13.5	21.8
Students with Disabilities	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	12.1	<1	7.4

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

Table B5: shows the percentage of students meeting standard on the spring 2023 SBA and WCAS assessments for Pinnacles Prep and the home school district.

Student Group Grades 6-8	Pinnacles Prep ELA	Pinnacles Prep Math	Pinnacles Prep Science	Wenatchee SD ELA	Wenatchee SD Math	Wenatchee SD Science
All Students	**42.5**	**28.7**	**31.1**	**41.1**	**25.1**	37.1.
Native American or Alaskan	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.
Asian	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	50.0	60.0	N.D.
Black or African American	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.
Hispanic or Latinx	30.6	14.5	<18	27.7	13.5	21.8
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.
White	50.0	36.7	42.3	58.1	39.7	56.0
Two or More Races	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	50.1	<35	41.7
English Learners	<16	<16	N.D.	4.4	<3	<3
Low-Income	30.7	15.9	15.4	30.0	16.0	25.2
Students with Disabilities	<9%	<9%	<27	7.2	<4	11.3

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

Table B6: shows the percentage of students meeting standard on the spring 2023 SBA and WCAS assessments for PRIDE Prep and the home school district.

Student Group Grades 6-12	PRIDE Prep ELA	PRIDE Prep Math	PRIDE Prep Science	Spokane PS ELA	Spokane PS Math	Spokane PS Science
All Students	**54.6**	**25.0**	**38.1**	**47.6**	**29.7**	**34.0**
Native American or Alaskan	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<29	<15	<23
Asian	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	51.3	42.0	44.8
Black or African American	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	28.4	<14	<12
Hispanic or Latinx	51.0	19.6	25.9	37.3	19.5	23.9
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<8	<6	<6
White	56.8	27.6	46.6	53.9	35.0	39.8
Two or More Races	51.7	20.7	26.7	39.7	22.8	23.8
English Learners	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<2	<5	<3
Low-Income	48.3	16.7	34.8	34.1	18.0	22.1
Students with Disabilities	16.7	<5%	21.9	11,4	<7	7.9

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

Table B7: shows the percentage of students meeting standard on the spring 2023 SBA and WCAS assessments for Pullman Community Montessori and the home school district.

Student Group Grade 3-6	Pullman Montessori ELA	Pullman Montessori Math	Pullman Montessori Science	Pullman SD ELA	Pullman SD Math	Pullman SD Science
All Students	**30.0**	**30.0**	**63.6**	**62.7**	**61.0**	**67.8**
Native American or Alaskan	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.
Asian	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	>73	>73	>70
Black or African American	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.
Hispanic or Latinx	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	43.5	42.9	N.D.
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.
White	41.2	29.4	N.D.	66.2	64.7	77.9
Two or More Races	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	>60	>62	>75
English Learners	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<39	>31	41.7
Low-Income	<27	<27	N.D.	46.2	40.4	22.4
Students with Disabilities	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	28.7	27.1	30.3

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

Table B8: shows the percentage of students meeting standard on the spring 2023 SBA and WCAS assessments for Rainier Prep and the home school district.

Student Group Grades 5-8	Rainier Prep ELA	Rainier Prep Math	Rainier Prep Science	Highline SD ELA	Highline SD Math	Highline SD Science
All Students	**60.6**	**50.3**	**39.5**	**29.9**	**18.3**	**30.2**
Native American or Alaskan	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<30.	<30	<30
Asian	59.1	69.6	N.D.	42.4	32.5	41.3
Black or African American	64.0	49.7	39.3	27.4	12.8	21.0
Hispanic or Latinx	54.0	48.3	38.5	18.7	8.7	17.9
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<13	<8	<8
White	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	50.6	37.0	59.0
Two or More Races	56.3	4348	N.D.	34.2	19.8	35.8
English Learners	33.0	25.0	13.3	5.5	<4	7.0
Low-Income	57.6	46.8	45.5	24.1	12.7	23.0
Students with Disabilities	<13	<13	<23	9.1	6.6	11.6

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

Table B9: shows the percentage of students meeting standard on the spring 2023 SBA and WCAS assessments for Rainier Valley Leadership Academy and the home school district.

Student Group Grades 6-12	Rainier Valley ELA	Rainier Valley Math	Rainier Valley Science	Seattle PS ELA	Seattle PS Math	Seattle PS Science
All Students	**27.2**	**10.9**	**18.6**	**63.6**	**48.0**	**40.4**
Native American or Alaskan	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<49	<29	29.7
Asian	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	70.9	57.0	40.0
Black or African American	19.6	7.1	10.3	27.9	11.5	10.9
Hispanic or Latinx	35.3	<18	N.D.	40.7	24.2	24.3
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<25	<19	,18
White	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	78.9	63.1	52.8
Two or More Races	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	68.7	54.8	47.4
English Learners	<30	<30	N.D.	11.4	8.7	4.9
Low-Income	23.3	6.8	16.2	37.7	21.6	20.1
Students with Disabilities	<19	<19	<25	32.5	21.1	21.2

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

Table B10: shows the percentage of students meeting standard on the spring 2023 SBA and WCAS assessments for Spokane International Academy and the home school district.

Student Group K-12	SIA ELA	SIA Math	SIA Science	Mead SD ELA	Mead SD Math	Mead SD Science
All Students	**55.8**	**49.4**	**53.9**	**61.9**	**50.7**	**49.8**
Native American or Alaskan	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	38.3	21.3	30.8
Asian	66.7	66.7	60.0	66.3	63.2	58.3
Black or African American	42.1	36.8	N.D.	39.4	20.0	26.1
Hispanic or Latinx	53.7	46.3	65.0	54.9	38.9	40.9
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	22.0	13.6	<13
White	57.4	50.6	53.9	63.9	53.2	51.7
Two or More Races	53.6	48.2	53.3	57.4	44.5	45.7
English Learners	<23	38.5	N.D.	15.3	10.4	11.5
Low-Income	48.1	41.6	45.2	46.5	34.0	35.8
Students with Disabilities	22.0	18.0	<19	23.7	18.2	19.3

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

Table B11: shows the percentage of students meeting standard on the spring 2023 SBA and WCAS assessments for Summit Atlas and the home school district.

Student Group Grades 6-12	Summit Atlas ELA	Summit Atlas Math	Summit Atlas Science	Seattle PS ELA	Seattle PS Math	Seattle PS Science
All Students	**56.5**	**41.9**	**39.2**	**63.6**	**48.0**	**40.4**
Native American or Alaskan	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<49	<29	29.7
Asian	50.0	75.0	N.D.	70.9	57.0	40.0
Black or African American	35.6	17.8	25.0	27.9	11.5	10.9
Hispanic or Latinx	51.3	28.2	25.0	40.7	24.2	24.3
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<25	<19	,18
White	64.4	55.1	57.6	78.9	63.1	52.8
Two or More Races	71.7	47.2	27.3	68.7	54.8	47.4
English Learners	23.9	15.2	<23	11.4	8.7	4.9
Low-Income	46.5	23.6	24.6	37.7	21.6	20.1
Students with Disabilities	35.1	19.3	<10	32.5	21.1	21.2

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

Table B12: shows the percentage of students meeting standard on the spring 2023 SBA and WCAS assessments for Summit Olympus and the home school district.

Student Group Grades 9-12	Summit Olympus ELA	Summit Olympus Math	Summit Olympus Science	Tacoma SD ELA	Tacoma SD Math	Tacoma SD Science
All Students	**57.1**	**17.1**	**52.4**	**51.1**	**17.2**	**31.6**
Native American or Alaskan	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	<25	<25	22.2
Asian	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	64.6	27.6	32.1
Black or African American	N.D	N.D	N.D,	32.8	4.7	16.3
Hispanic or Latinx	60.0	<20	46.2	39.7	7.5	24.3
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	16.4	<5	10.7
White	N.D.	N.D.	>77	66.1	29.1	43.4
Two or More Races	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	49.0	12.5	33.3
English Learners	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	14.0	4.0	4.4
Low-Income	54.5	<14	50.0	41.1	10.1	22.1
Students with Disabilities	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	11.7	<1	7.2

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

Table B13: shows the percentage of students meeting standard on the spring 2023 SBA and WCAS assessments for Summit Sierra and the home school district.

Student Group Grades 9-12	Summit Sierra ELA	Summit Sierra Math	Summit Sierra Science	Seattle PS ELA	Seattle PS Math	Seattle PS Science
All Students	**60.3**	**25.4**	**42.2**	**68.8**	**42.7**	**27.4**
Native American or Alaskan	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	52.6	26.3	27.8
Asian	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	77.6	49.9	30.3
Black or African American	27.8	<17	16.7	37.3	7.3	7.5
Hispanic or Latinx	N.D.	N.D.	33.3	45.8	18.8	17.8
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	25.0	<11	<14
White	84.6	42.3	77.8	83.9	58.6	34.9
Two or More Races	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	70.8	49.0	30.5
English Learners	N.D.	N.D.	<27	13.9	5.0	2.1
Low-Income	27.3	<14	23.1	45.7	18.0	15.0
Students with Disabilities	46.7	<20	28.6	35.9	14.2	12.5

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

Table B14: shows the percentage of students meeting standard on the spring 2023 SBA and WCAS assessments for Whatcom Intergenerational High School and the home school district.

Student Group Grade 8-12	Whatcom IHS ELA	Whatcom IHS Math	Whatcom IHS Science	Bellingham SD ELA	Bellingham SD Math	Bellingham SD Science
All Students	34.8	13.0	<13	**62.2**	**30.1**	**39.5**
Native American or Alaskan	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.
Asian	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	58.1	39.5	40.0
Black or African American	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	53.3	<20	26.7.
Hispanic or Latinx	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	41.6	15.3	17.4
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.
White	38.5	23.1	<23	68.6	36.4	44.4
Two or More Races	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	64.9	37.7	52.2
English Learners	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	10.9	7.3	<7
Low-Income	40.0	<30.	<20	45.9	20.0	25.1
Students with Disabilities	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	24.3	<3	18.9

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

Limitations

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

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

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

Methodology

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

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

> It is important to note that these findings are **non-causal** because the design does not include randomized group assignment and does not consider other confounding factors. It would be misleading to report that attending a charter school **causes** or **results** in a higher or lower performance on educational outcomes. For this reason, we use non-causal terminology (e.g., associated, related, and correlated) to describe the result that attending a charter school is **associated** with a higher or lower performance on educational outcomes.

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

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

- Differences in the curriculum delivered and the learning opportunities provided to students.

In the design used here, we created a comparison group following a student-by-student matching process to be as identical as possible to the treatment group of charter school students. In such a design, each charter school student is matched to or paired with a demographically and academically similar TPS student ("TPS twin"), followed by the evaluation of group means using the Independent Samples *t*-Test or the Mann-Whitney *U*-Test.

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

In the results, the performance of the groups is described as different or similar. It is important to understand that differences in the performance between two groups typically exist, may appear to be quite large, and yet, be characterized as similar. In other cases, scores can appear to be similar, the difference between the groups' averages may be quite small and indicative of a different performance. The nature or the distribution of the data or scores for smaller *vs*. larger groups explains this paradox.

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

Data Sources and Data Processing

The Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) Office of School Information provided the SBE with separate de-identified student enrollment, assessment, absence, exclusionary discipline, and other data files for the 2022-23, school year to complete the required analyses. The assessment files provided by the OSPI contained results for the Washington Access to Instruction and Measurement (WA-AIM) and the statewide Smarter Balanced assessments. A very small percentage of students at charter schools participated in the WA-AIM, the assessment for selected students with severe disabilities. The WA-AIM differs greatly from the SBA and WA-AIM scores vary considerably based on disability type, Because of this, the SBE made the decision to exclude the WA-AIM results from the analyses presented

here. The findings in Part B come solely from the SBA ELA and math and the WCAS science assessments for the charter school and TPS student groups. Group mean differences were evaluated using the Independent Samples *t*-Test and Mann-Whitney *U*-Test. The group differences are reported as follows.

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

While it is important to report on the statistical significance of group means in work of this nature, it is at least equally important to quantify the magnitude of the effect associated with the treatment or experimental variable (Table B15). When reporting on *t*-test results, Cohen's *d* is a standardized measure of effect size, which provides context regarding the magnitude of the difference between group means. For the Independent Samples *t*-test, Cohen's *d* is the mean difference between the two groups, divided by the pooled standard deviation. Results are characterized as "practically significant" when the difference is medium or large.

Table B15: describes the effect size (Cohen's *d)* provides additional context as to the practical significance or meaningfulness of an experimental treatment.

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

A student growth percentile (SGP) is a derived percentile value or rank, and when aggregated, SGPs are reported as a median value, which usually differs from the mean (average) value. Group differences in SGP medians were evaluated through the Mann-Whitney *U*-Test of medians. The effect size (*r*) provides additional context regarding the magnitude of the difference between group medians (Table B16). For the Mann-Whitney *U*-test, the effect size (*r*) is computed as $r = Z/\sqrt{N}$, where *Z* is the test statistic.

Table B16: describes the effect size (r) and provides additional context as to the practical significance or meaningfulness of an experimental treatment.

Effect Size (*r*) From	Effect Size (*r*) To	Description of Effect Size from the Experimental Variable
	≤ 0.10	Effect from the treatment is trivial, negligible, or very small
0.10	< 0.30	Effect of the treatment is small.
0.30	< 0.50	Effect of the treatment is medium.
≥ 0.50		Effect of the treatment is large.

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

In addition to the average scale score by group, the scale score mean difference provides a meaningful measure of charter school, student performance in comparison to the TPS student performance. The mean difference is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school group.

- A negative mean difference indicates that the mean scale score for the treatment group (charter school students) was higher than the mean scale score for the comparison group (TPS students).
- A positive mean difference indicates that the mean scale score for the treatment group (charter school students) was lower than the mean scale score for the comparison group (TPS students).

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

Design and Statistical Methods

The overarching idea of the design is to create two groups differing only by charter school enrollment status and then to analyze the performance of the groups on the assessments. Any difference in performance may then be associated to attending a traditional public school versus a charter school. However, differences in performance can also be attributed to other factors not considered here, some of which include the following:

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

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

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

Exact matching criteria included grade level, gender, federal race and ethnicity coding, Free and Reduced Price Lunch program (FRL) status, English Learner (EL) status, and special education (SWD) status (Table B17). The matching criteria included prior year SBA scale scores in ELA and math in the 4th through 8th grades. To be matched or paired, the ELA or math scores could not differ by more than 25 scale score points, which is relatively small as typical SBA scores range from approximately 2300 to 2800.

Other matching criteria considered in the protocol included Section 504 status, the aggregated number of absences during the school year, the number of exclusionary discipline events, the number of days out of school related to exclusionary disciplinary events, and the language spoken at home. In the matching process, each student's home district was considered and used as matching criteria. As examples, a student at a Spokane charter school was matched to a

similar student in a Spokane TPS, and a student at a Tacoma charter school was matched to a similar student in a Tacoma TPS and each would have scored approximately the same on the ELA and math assessments in the prior year. To achieve more matches, some matched TPS students attended school in a different, but nearby school district.

Table B17: shows the matching criteria used in creating the control group of TPS students.

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

*Note: The number of days out of school is the sum of days absent and days related to exclusionary discipline events.

Unfortunately, not all charter school students could be matched or paired based on exactly the same criteria (Table A14) but most are matched or paired on similar criteria. For purposes here, four distinct groups result when the matching criteria are applied to the charter school enrollees.

- The largest group is 4th to 8th grade students matched on demographics and prior assessment results.
- Because the 3rd grade is the first year of statewide testing, students do not have previous assessment results from which to establish academic peers.
- Because 9th graders are not assessed, academic peers for the 10th graders could not be established based on the spring 2020 8th grade assessment results because the administration was cancelled due to the COVID pandemic.
- Science testing occurs every three years (5th, 8th, and 11th grades) which is not conducive to establishing academic peers based on prior science assessment results.

Table B18 and Table B19 show that the demographic characteristics of the comparison group (TPS students) are identical to the demographic characteristics of the treatment group (charter school students). Table A16 shows that the attendance patterns for each group is essentially the

same and that the comparison and treatment groups are academically similar as indicated by the average prior ELA and math scores.

Table B18: Race and ethnicity composition of the comparison and treatment student groups for the 3rd through 10th grade students addressed in this analysis.

Student Group*	Native Amer. (%)	Asian (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	White (%)	Pacific Islander (%)	Two or More (%)
Comparison Group (TPS Students)	0.2	4.5	25.2	18.7	41.9	0.4	9.2
Treatment Group (Charter School Students)	0.2	4.5	25.2	18.7	41.9	0.4	9.2

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

Table B19: Program participation, attendance, and prior score patterns for the comparison and treatment groups for the 3rd through 10th grader students addressed in this analysis.

Student Group	FRL (%)	EL (%)	SWD (%)	Section 504 (%)	Days Out of School* (M)	Average Prior ELA Score	Average Prior Math Score
Comparison Group (TPS Students)	61.2	13.0	10.7	4.3	15.9	2504.89	2496.65
Treatment Group (Charter School Students)	61.2	13.0	10.7	4.3	16.0	2504.93	2497.36

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

A number of charter school students with valid SBA results could not be matched with a TPS student due to an unusual number of days out of school in combination with other matching criteria. In addition, some matches were impossible to make as the required coding (e.g. race/ethnicity or FRL status) was not included in the various data files. For the comparison group, approximately 96 percent of the students were enrolled at the school for at least 150 days, while the corresponding measure for the treatment group was approximately 96 percent. Student results were included in this comparison regardless of the continuously enrolled status like the Washington State Report Card reporting.

Data and Findings from the Statistical Analyses

Statistics and Results for the Peer Analyses

Summary Statistics for ELA for All Students

On the spring 2023 statewide ELA assessment results, the charter school student group performed statistically higher than the TPS student group (Table B20). However, the effect sizes for each of the measures indicate a negligible or very small effect associated with attendance at a charter school.

- The charter school student group posted a different and higher average scale score than the TPS student group (2537 vs. 2524).
- The percent meeting standard on the ELA assessments for the charter school group was different and higher than the TPS group rate (57.7 vs. 52.7 percent).
- The charter school student group posted a different and higher median ELA SGP score than the TPS student group (59.0 vs. 49.0).

Table B20: summary of the differences for the ELA measures from the spring 2023, statewide assessments for students based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Assessments	Scale Score**	Percent Meeting Standard**	Student Growth Percentiles**
TPS Group	2523.9	52.7	49.0
Charter School Group	2536.8	57.7	59.0

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

Summary Statistics for Mathematics for All Students

On the spring 2023 statewide math assessment results, the charter school students group performed statistically higher than the TPS student group on the three measures (Table B21). The effect sizes for each of the measures indicate a negligible or very small effect associated with attendance at a charter school.

- The charter school students group posted an average scale score different and approximately 17 scale score points higher than the TPS student group (2521 vs. 2504).
- The percent meeting standard for the charter school student group is different and higher than the corresponding rate for the TPS group (46 vs. 39).
- The charter school students group posted a different and higher math SGP median score than the TPS student group (61 vs. 50).

Table B21: summary of the differences for the math measures from the spring 2023 statewide assessments for students based on charter school enrollment.

Math Assessments	Scale Score**	Percent Meeting Standard**	Student Growth Percentiles**
TPS Group	2504.0	38.6	50.0
Charter School Group	2521.4	45.6	61.0

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

Summary Statistics for Science for All Students

On the spring 2023 statewide science assessment results, the charter school students group performed similar to the TPS student group on the scale score measure, and similar to the TPS group on the percent meeting standard measure (Table B22). The effect sizes for both measures indicate a negligible or very small effect associated with charter school attendance.

- The group means derived from the science scale scores are similar with the charter school student group posting an average scale score approximately 8.5 scale score points higher (689 vs. 681). The effect sizes indicate a negligible to very small effect associated with attendance at a charter school.
- The science percent meeting standard for the charter school student group is similar to the corresponding rate for the TPS group (48.6 vs. 46.9).

Table B22: summary of the differences for the science measures from the spring 2023 statewide assessments for students based on charter school enrollment.

Science Assessment	Scale Score	Percent Proficient
TPS Group	680.8	46.9
Charter School Group	689.3	48.6

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

Detailed Statistics for the All Students Group for All Measures

Overall, the charter school student group performed better than the TPS student group on six of the eight measures, and similar to the TPS group on the two remaining measures. However, the effect sizes for each of the measures are less than 0.20, indicating a negligible or very small effect associated with attendance at a charter school (Table B23).

Table B23: summary statistics for the spring 2023 statewide assessments for students based on charter school enrollment.

Assessment	ELA** Scale Score	ELA** Percent Meeting Std.	ELA** Student Growth	Math** Scale Score	Math** Percent Meeting Std.	Math** Student Growth	Science Scale Score	Science Percent Meeting Std.
TPS Group (SD)	2523.9 (147.02)	52.7 (49.9)	49.0	2504.0 (140.60)	38.6 (48.7)	50.0	680.8 (71.17)	45.9 (50.0)
CS Group (SD)	2536.8 (113.07)	57.7 (49.4)	59.0	2521.4 (108.60)	45.6 (49.8)	61.0	689.3 (71.01)	49.6 (50.0)
Mean (Median) Difference*	-12.901	-4.9	(-10.0)	-17.461	-7.0	(-11.0)	-8.410	-1.7
T (Z)	-2.754	-2.784	(5.098)	-3.816	-3.987	(7.079)	-1.714	-0.483
P	0.006**	0.005**	<0.001**	<0.001**	<0.001**	<0.001**	0.087	0.629
Cohen's d (*r*)	0.10	0.10	(0.11)	0.14	0.14	(0.16)	0.12	0.03
Number of students in each group	1567	1567	1049	1507	1507	988	420	420

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

Summary Statistics for ELA by Race/Ethnicity

On the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment scale score, the Asian, Hispanic or Latinx, White, and Two or More Races student groups at charter schools yielded group means students that were similar to the corresponding group means of the TPS students (Table B24). The Black or African American students and Hispanic or Latinx students at the charter schools posted scale scores different and higher than the average scale score for the corresponding TPS students. The effect sizes indicate a very small effect is associated with attendance at a charter school.

Table B24: ELA scale score on the spring 2023 statewide assessments students by race/ethnicity and based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Scale Score	Asian	Black**	Hispanic	White	Two or More Races
TPS Group Mean Scale Score	2538.6	2490.5	2497.8	2550.2	2539.5
Charter School Group Mean Scale Score	2546,1	2516.6	2520.7	2553.8	2542.5

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

On the spring 2023 statewide ELA assessment, Asian, Hispanic or Latinx, White, and Two or More Races student groups at charter schools posted ELA percent meeting standard means similar to the corresponding means for the TPS students (Table B25). The Black or African American student group at charter schools posted an ELA percent meeting standard rate different and higher than the TPS student group. The effect sizes indicate a small effect is associated with attendance at a charter school.

Table B25: shows the ELA percent meeting standard rate differences on the spring 2023 statewide assessment administration by race/ethnicity and based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Percent Meeting Standard	Asian	Black**	Hispanic	White	Two Or More Races
TPS Group Percent Meeting Standard	52.9	41.1	41.6	62.7	61.5
Charter School Group Percent Meeting Standard	64,3	50.0	50,3	63.9	62.9

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

On the spring 2023 statewide ELA assessment, Black or African American and Hispanic or Latinx student groups at charter schools posted an ELA median SGP different and higher than the TPS student group. Asian, White, and Two or More Races student groups at charter schools posted ELA median SGPs similar to the corresponding medians for the TPS students (Table B26). The effect sizes indicate a small effect is associated with attendance at a charter school.

Table B26: shows the ELA median student growth percentile (SGP) differences on the spring 2023 statewide assessment administration by race/ethnicity and based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Student Growth Percentiles	Asian	Black**	Hispanic**	White	Two Or More Races
TPS Group Median SGP	61.0	48.0	45.0	50.5	52.0
Charter School Group Median SGP	61.5	68.0	63.5	54.0	48.0

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

Detailed Statistics for ELA by Race/Ethnicity

Table B27: summary statistics for the ELA scale score differences on the spring 2023 statewide assessments for students by race/ethnicity and charter school enrollment.

ELA Scale Score	Asian	Black**	Hispanic	White	Two or More Races
TPS Mean SS (Standard Deviation)	2538.6 (101.917)	2490.5 (121.487)	2497.8 (175.504)	2550.2 (151.578)	2539.5 (119.806)
CS Mean SS (Standard Deviation)	2546.1 (94,381)	2516.6 (117.312)	2520.7 (113.532)	2553.8 (109.736)	2542.5 (114.206)

ELA Scale Score	Asian	Black**	Hispanic	White	Two or More Races
Mean Difference*	-7.486	-26.084	-22.824	-3.613	-2.993
T	-0.451	-3.066	-1.871	-0.494	-0.216
P	0.653	0.002	0.062	0.622	0.829
Cohen's *d*	0.08	0.22	0.15	0.03	0.03
Number of students in each group	70	394	293	654	143

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

Table B28: ELA percent meeting standard rate differences and statistics on the spring 2023 statewide assessments for students by race/ethnicity and based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Percent Meeting Standard	Asian	Black**	Hispanic	White	Two Or More Races
TPS Group Percent Meeting Standard (SD)	52.9 (50.3)	41.1 (49.3)	41.6 (49.4)	62.7 (48.4)	61.5 (48.8)
CS Group Percent Meeting Standard (SD)	64.3 (48.3)	50.0 (50.1)	50.3 (50.1)	63.9 (48.1)	62.9 (48.5)
Mean Difference*	-11.4	-8.9	-8.7	-1.2	-1.4
T	-1.372	-2.510	-1.954	-0.459	-0.243
P	0.173	0.012**	0.051	0.647	0.808
Cohen's *d*	0.23	0.18	0.15	0.03	0.03
Number of students in each group*	70	394	293	654	143

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

Table B29: ELA median growth percentile (SGP) differences and statistics on the spring 2023 statewide assessments for students by race/ethnicity and based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Student Growth Percentiles	Asian	Black**	Hispanic**	White	Two Or More Races
TPS Group Median SGP	61.0	48.0	45.0	50.5	52.0
CS Group Median SGP	61.5	68.0	63.5	54.0	48.0
Median Difference*	-0.5	-20.0	-17.5	-3.5	4.0
Z	0.166	5.433	3.944	0.780	-0.81
P	0.868	<0.001**	<0.001**	0.839	0.857
Effect Size *(r)*	0.02	0.24	0.20	0.03	0.01
Number of students in each group*	52	257	198	443	95

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

Summary Statistics for ELA by Program Participation

Students receiving special education services at charter schools posted an average scale score similar to that for special education students at the TPS. However, both the English learner student group and the students qualifying for the FRL program at charter schools yielded average ELA scale scores that were different and higher than the corresponding scale scores for the TPS students (Table B30). The effect sizes indicate a very small effect is associated with attendance at a charter school.

Table B30: ELA scale score differences on the spring 2023 statewide assessments for students by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Scale Score	English Learners**	Low-Income**	Special Education
TPS Group Mean Scale Score	2426.3	2501.2	2429.4
Charter School Group Mean Scale Score	2456.6	2515.2	2467.6

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

The English learner and low-income students attending charter schools posted ELA percent meeting standards means higher those posted for TPS students (Table B31). Students receiving special education services at charter schools posted ELA percent meeting standard means similar to those posted for TPS students. However, the effect sizes associated with charter school attendance on the measures is very small.

Table B31: ELA percent meeting standard rate differences on the spring 2023 statewide assessments for students by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Percent Meeting Standard	English Learners**	Low-Income**	Special Education
TPS Group Percent Meeting Standard	14.4	43.3	22.6
Charter School Group Percent Meeting Standard	26.8	50.1	21.0

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

Students receiving special education services at charter schools posted and ELA median SGP similar to those posted for TPS students. The English learner and low-income students attending charter schools posted ELA median SGPs higher those posted for TPS students (Table B32). The effect sizes associated with charter school attendance on the measures are very small.

Table B32: shows the ELA median student growth percentile (SGP) differences on the spring 2023 statewide assessment administration by race/ethnicity and based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Student Growth Percentiles	English Learners**	Low-Income**	Special Education
TPS Group Median SGP	38.0	45.0	33.0
Charter School Group Median SGP	60.0	61.0	52.0

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

Detailed Statistics for ELA by Program Participation

Table B33: ELA scale score differences from the spring 2023 statewide assessments for students by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Scale Score	English Learners**	Low-Income**	Special Education
TPS Mean SS (Standard Deviation)	2426.3 (86.813)	2501.2 (115.666)	2429.4 (281.345)
CS Mean SS (Standard Deviation)	2456.6 (93.014)	2515.2 (112.254)	2467.6 (111.035)
Mean Difference*	-30.264	-14.027	-38.236
T	-3.391	-2.699	-1.634
P	<0.001**	0.007**	0.103
Cohen's *d*	0.34	0.12	0.18
Number of students in each group	201	955	167

*Note: the mean difference in scale score (SS) points is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative mean difference indicates that the mean ELA scale score for the

charter school group was higher than the mean scale score for the TPS student group. **Note: the double asterisk denotes the school years where the group performances were statistically different.

Table B34: ELA percent meeting standard rate differences from the spring 2023 statewide assessments for students by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Percent Meeting Standard	English Learners**	Low-Income**	Special Education
TPS Group Percent Meeting Standard (SD)	14.4 35.2)	43.3 (49.6)	22.6 (42.0)
CS Group Percent Meeting Standard (SD)	26.8 (44.3)	50.1 (50.0)	21.0 (40.8)
Mean Difference*	-12.4	-6.8	1.6
T	-3.086	-2.940	0.367
P	0.002**	0.003**	0.714
Cohen's *d*	0.31	0.14	0.04
Number of students in each group*	201	955	167

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

Table B35: ELA student growth percentile median differences and statistics on the spring 2023 statewide assessments for students by race/ethnicity and based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Student Growth Percentiles	English Learners**	Low-Income**	Special Education
TPS Group Median SGP	38.0	45.0	34.0
CS Group Median SGP	60.0	60.0	52.0
Median Difference*	-22.0	-15.0	-18.0
Z	4.300	5.750	2.867
P	<0.001**	<0.001**	0.004**
Effect Size *(r)*	0.25	0.16	0.24
Number of students in each group*	144	629	88

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

Detailed Statistics for ELA by Grade Level

Table B36: spring 2023 ELA scale score differences on the statewide assessments for students by grade level and based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Scale Score	3rd Grade	4th Grade	5th Grade	6th Grade	7th Grade	8th Grade**	10th Grade
TPS Group Mean SS (SD)	2408.6 (172027)	2476.1 (96.099)	2519.8 (98.965)	2504.5 (101.570)	2564.3 (94.950)	2562.3 (100.111)	2605.1 (196.776)
CS Group Mean SS (SD)	2425.1 (96420)	2479.0 (89.519)	2533.3 (91.136)	2519.3 (82.733)	2573.3 (92.834)	2593.2 (94.166)	2607.0 (108.532)
Mean Difference*	-16.504	-2.909	-13.546	-14.806	-9.070	-30.917	-1.865
T	-1.309	-0.275	-1.285	-1.776	-1.097	-3.412	-0.3135
P	0.220	0.784	0..200	0.076	0.273	<0.001**	0.893
Cohen's *d*	0.12	0.03	0.14	0.16	0.10	0.32	0.01
Number of students in each group	244	154	163	247	258	230	266

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

Table B37: shows the ELA percent meeting standard rate differences on the spring 2023 statewide assessments for students by grade level and based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Percent Meeting Standard	3rd Grade	4th Grade	5th Grade	6th Grade	7th Grade	8th Grade**	10th Grade
TPS Group Percent Meeting Standard (SD)	43.0 (49.6)	57.8 (49.6)	55.8 (49.8)	42.1 (49.5)	55.8 (49.8)	48.7 (50.1)	67.3 (47.0)
CS Group Percent Meeting Standard (SD)	48,6 (50.1)	55.2 (49.9)	63.8 (48.2)	47.0 (50.0)	63.2 (48.3)	61.7 (48.7)	65.0 (47.8)
Mean Difference*	-5.5	-2.6	-8.0	-4.9	-7.4	-13.0	2.3
T	-1.229	0.458	-1.469	-1.085	-1.705	-2.831	0.549
P	0.220	0.647	0.143	0.278	0.089	0.005**	0.583
Cohen's *d*	0.11	0.05	0.15	0.10	0.15	0.26	0.05
Number of students in each group	244	154	163	247	258	230	266

*Note: the mean difference in ELA percent meeting standard rate is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative mean difference indicates that the mean percent meeting standard rate for the charter school group was higher than the mean percent meeting standard

rate for the TPS group. The positive mean difference indicates that the mean rate for the charter school group was lower than the mean rate for the TPS student group **Note: the double asterisk denotes the grades where the group performances were statistically different.

Table B38: shows the ELA median student growth percentile differences on the spring 2023 statewide assessments for students by grade level and based on charter school enrollment.

ELA Student Growth Percentiles	3rd Grade	4th Grade	5th Grade	6th Grade*	7th Grade	8th Grade**	10th Grade
TPS Group Median SGP	N.D.	53.0	58.0	45.0	49.0	47.0	N.D.
CS Group Median SGP	N.D.	51.0	62.0	55.0	57.5	68.5	N.D.
Median Difference*	N.D.	2.0	-4.0	-10.0	-8.5	-21.5	N.D.
Z	N.D.	-0.228	1.159	2.795	1.750	5.186	N.D.
P	N.D.	0.820	0.246	0.005**	0.080	<0.001**	N.D.
Effect Size (*r*)	N.D.	0.01	0.06	0.13	0.08	.24	N.D.
Number of students in each group	N.D.	153	163	246	258	229	N.D.

*Note: the median difference is the median value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative median difference indicates that the median for the charter school students was higher than the median for the TPS group. **Note: the double asterisk denotes where the group performances were statistically different. Student growth percentiles are not calculated for 3rd and 10th grade students.

Summary Statistics for Math by Race/Ethnicity

On the spring 2023 statewide math assessments, the Asian, White, and Two or More Races groups of charter school students posted average scale scores similar to the TPS student groups (Table B39). The Black or African American and Hispanic or Latinx student groups in charter schools posted different and higher scale scores than the TPS student group. The effect sizes indicate a small to very small effect associated with attendance at a charter school.

Table B39: math scale score differences on the spring 2023 statewide assessments for students by race/ethnicity and based on charter school enrollment.

Math Scale Score	Asian	Black**	Hispanic*	White	Two or More Races
TPS Group Mean Scale Score	2523.8	2466.5	2477.7	2531.6	2519.7
Charter School Group Mean Scale Score	2549.0	2495.2	2504.1	2539.9	2530.0

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

Regarding the math percent meeting standard rates, the Black or African American and Hispanic or Latinx student groups posted math mean rates that were different and higher than the TPS group rates (Table B40). Asian, White, and the Two or More student groups at charter schools posted percent meeting standard rates similar to the TPS student group. The effect sizes indicate a small to very small effect associated with attendance at a charter school.

Table B40: math percent meeting standard rate differences on the spring 2023 statewide assessments by race/ethnicity and based on charter school enrollment.

Math Percent Meeting Standard	Asian**	Black**	Hispanic*	White	Two or More Races
TPS Group Percent Meeting Standard (SD)	47.0	23.6	28.0	50.5	41.4
Charter School Group Percent Meeting Standard (SD)	65.2	38.0	36.4	51.9	46.6

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

Table B41: shows the math median student growth percentile differences on the spring 2023 statewide assessment administration by race/ethnicity and based on charter school enrollment.

Math Student Growth Percentiles	Asian**	Black**	Hispanic*	White**	Two Or More Races
TPS Group Median SGP	66.0	45.0	41.0	52.0	50.0
Charter School Group Median SGP	77.5	66.5	59.0	59.0	51.0

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

Detailed Statistics for Math by Race/Ethnicity

Table B42: math scale score differences on the spring 2023 statewide assessments for students by race/ethnicity and charter school enrollment.

Math Scale Score	Asian	Black**	Hispanic**	White	Two or More Races
TPS Group Mean Scale Score (SD)	2523.8 (105.857)	2466.5 (104.956)	2477.7 (173.491)	2531.6 (145.851)	2519.7 (108.445)
CS Group Mean Scale Score (SD)	2549.0 (104.878)	2495.2 (112.214)	2504.1 (106.745)	2539.9 (104.056	2530.0 (107.799)

Math Scale Score	Asian	Black**	Hispanic**	White	Two or More Races
Mean Difference*	-25.182	-28.754	-26.337	-8.258	-10.331
T	-1.373	-3.631	-2.162	-1.169	-0.779
P	0.172	< 0.001**	0.031**	0.243	0.437
Cohen's *d*	0.24	0.27	0.18	0.07	0.10
Number of students in each group	66	376	279	643	133

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

Table B43: math percent meeting standard on the spring 2023 statewide assessments by race/ethnicity and based on charter school enrollment.

Math Percent Meeting Standard	Asian**	Black**	Hispanic*	White	Two or More Races
TPS Group Percent Meeting Standard (SD)	47.0 (50.3)	23.6 (42.5)	28.0 (45.0)	50.5 (50.0)	41.4 (49.4)
CS Group Percent Meeting Standard (SD)	65.2 (48.0)	38.0 (48.6)	36.4 (48.2)	51.9 (50.0)	46.6 (50.1)
Mean Difference*	-18.2	-14.4	-8.4	-1.4	-5.2
T	-2.124	-4.333	-2.149	-0.530	-0.863
P	0.036**	<0.001**	0.032**	0.596	0.389
Cohen's *d*	0.37	0.32	0.18	0.03	0.11
Number of students in each group*	66	376	279	643	133

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

Table B44: math student growth percentiles differences and statistics on the spring 2023 statewide assessments for students by race/ethnicity and based on charter school enrollment.

Math Student Growth Percentiles	Asian**	Black**	Hispanic*	White**	Two Or More Races
TPS Group Median SGP	66.0	45.0	41.0	52.0	50.0
CS Group Median SGP	77.5	66.5	59.0	59.0	51.0
Median Difference*	-11.5	-21.5	-18.0	-7.0	1.0
Z	2.224	6.035	3.641	2.981	0.598
P	0.739	<0.001**	<0.001**	0.003**	0.550
Effect Size (*r*)	0.026**	0.28	0.19	0.10	0.05
Number of students in each group*	48	240	183	430	85

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

Summary Statistics for Math by Program Participation

On the math scale score measure, the special education students at charter schools posted a mean scale score that was similar to that for similar TPS students (Table B45). The charter school English learners and low-income students groups posted mean scale scores different and higher than the corresponding scale scores for the TPS students. The effect size associated with charter school attendance is small to very small.

Table B45: math scale score differences on the spring 2023 statewide assessments for students by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

Math Scale Score	English Learners**	Low-Income**	Special Education
TPS Group Mean Scale Score	2425.5	2479.3	2412.8
Charter School Group Mean Scale Score	2458.0	2500.1	2442.8

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

On the math percent meeting standard rate, the special education students and English learner students at charter schools posted rates that were similar to that for similar TPS students (Table B46). The charter school low-income students groups posted a mean percent meeting standard rate different and higher than that for the TPS students. The effect size associated with charter school attendance is small to very small.

Table B46: math proficiency rate differences on the spring 2023 statewide assessments for students by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

Math Percent Meeting Standard	English Learners**	Low-Income**	Special Education
TPS Group Percent Meeting Standard	12.3	28.8	20.2
Charter School Group Percent Meeting Standard	24.9	37.6	16.9

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

Table B47: shows the math median student growth percentile (SGP) differences on the spring 2023 statewide assessment administration by race/ethnicity and based on charter school enrollment.

Math Student Growth Percentiles	English Learners**	Low-Income**	Special Education
TPS Group Median SGP	35.5	45.5	40.0
Charter School Group Median SGP	58.0	60.0	50.0

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

Detailed Statistics for Math by Program Participation

Table B48: shows the math scale score differences on the spring 2023 statewide assessments for students by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

Math Scale Score	English Learners**	Low-Income**	Special Education
TPS Group Mean Scale Score (SD)	2425.5 (87.690)	2479.3 (105.286)	2412.8 (281.057)
CS Group Mean Scale Score (SD)	2458.0 (92.328)	2500.1 (105.381)	2442.8 (114.075)
Mean Difference*	-32.508	-20.837	-30.009
T	-3.662	-4.215	-1.253
P	<0.001**	< 0.001**	0.211
Cohen's *d*	0.36	0.20	0.14
Number of students in each group	203	907	160

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

Table B49: shoes the math percent meeting standard on the spring 2023 statewide assessment by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

Math Percent Meeting Standard	English Learners**	Low-Income**	Special Education
TPS Group Percent Meeting Standard (SD)	12.3 (32.9)	28.8 (45.3)	20.2 (40.3)
CS Group Percent Meeting Standard (SD)	24.9 (43.3)	37.6 (48.5)	16.9 (37.6)
Mean Difference*	-12.6	-8.8	3.3
T	-3.319	-3.984	0.777
P	<0.001**	<0.001**	0.438
Cohen's *d*	0.33	0.20	0.09
Number of students in each group*	203	907	160

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

Table B50: shows the math student growth percentile median differences and statistics on the spring 2023 statewide assessments for students by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

Math Student Growth Percentiles	English Learners**	Low-Income**	Special Education
TPS Group Median SGP	35.5	45.5	40.0
CS Group Median SGP	58.0	60.0	50.0
Median Difference*	-22.5	-14.5	-10.0
Z	-3.847	6.489	1.211
P	<0.001**	<0.001**	0.226
Effect Size *(r)*	0.22	0.19	0.09
Number of students in each group*	147	581	85

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

Detailed Statistics for Math by Grade Level

Table B51: shows the math scale score differences from spring 2023 statewide assessments by grade and based on charter school enrollment.

Math Scale Score	3rd Grade	4th Grade	5th Grade	6th Grade	7th Grade	8th Grade**	10th Grade
TPS Group Mean Scale Score (SD)	2420.5 (172.542)	2482.9 (77.895)	2502.4 (86.906)	2511.1 (101.279)	2539.4 (107.228)	2523.9 (106.556)	2538.3 (196.043)
CS Group Mean Scale Score (SD)	2436.0 (94.237)	3496.0 (76.546)	2519.1 (91.495)	2528.1 (93.767)	2553.7 (99821)	2560.4 (113.178)	2545.8 (119.711)
Mean Difference*	-15.471	-13.042	-16.747	-17.013	-14.341	-39.476	-7.442
T	-1.231	-1.433	-1.744	-1.886	-1.535	-3.674	-0.531
P	0.219	0.153	0.082	0.099	0.125	<0.001**	0.595
Cohen's *d*	0.11	0.17	0.20	0.17	0.14	0.36	0.01
Number of students in each group	244	144	154	234	246	212	269

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

Table B52: shows the math percent meeting standard rate differences from the spring 2023 statewide assessments by grade level and based on charter school enrollment.

Math Percent Meeting Standard	3rd Grade	4th Grade	5th Grade	6th Grade	7th Grade	8th Grade**	10th Grade
TPS Group Percent Meeting Standard (SD)	48.0 (50.1)	54.2 (50.0)	42.2 (49.6)	31.2 (46.4)	45.1 (49.9)	27.1 (44.6)	29.7 (45.8)
CS Group Percent Meeting Standard (SD)	53.5 (50.0)	62.5 (48.6)	52.6 (50.1)	38.5 (48.8)	50.0 (50.1)	43.4 (49.7)	29.4 (45.6)
Mean Difference*	-5.5	-8.3	-10.4	-7.3	-4.9	-16.3	0.3
T	-1.220	-1.434	-1.830	-1.651	-1.082	-3.564	0.094
P	0.223	0.153	0.068	0.099	0.280	<0.001**	0.925
Cohen's *d*	0.11	0.11	0.21	0.15	0.10	0.35	0.01
Number of students in each group	244	144	154	234	246	212	269

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

Table B53: shows the math student growth percentile median differences on the spring 2023 statewide assessments for students by grade level and based on charter school enrollment.

Math Student Growth Percentiles	3rd Grade	4th Grade**	5th Grade**	6th Grade**	7th Grade**	8th Grade**	10th Grade
TPS Group Median SGP	N.D.	47.0	54.5	46.0	52.5	45.0	N.D.
CS Group Median SGP	N.D.	58.0	64.0	58.0	59.0	67.5	N.D.
Median Difference*	N.D.	-11.0	-9.5	-12.0	-6.5	-22.5	N.D.
Z	N.D.	2.448	2.488	2.627	2.359	5.777	N.D.
P	N.D.	0.014**	0.013**	0.009**	0.018**	<0.001**	N.D.
Effect Size (*r*)	N.D.	0.14	0.14	0.12	0.11	0.28	N.D.
Number of students in each group	N.D.	143	154	233	246	212	N.D.

*Note: the median difference is the median value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative median difference indicates that the median for the charter school students was higher than the median for the TPS group. **Note: the double asterisk denotes where the group performances were statistically different. Student growth percentiles are not calculated to 3rd and 10th grade students.

Detailed Statistics for Science for All Students

Table B54: shows the science mean differences from spring 2023 statewide assessments for students based on charter school enrollment.

Science Assessment	Scale Score	Percent Meeting Standard
TPS Group Mean (SD)	681.0 (71.389)	47.2 (50.0)
CS Group Mean (SD)	688.9 (70.662)	48.6 (50.0)
Mean Difference*	-7.904	-1.4
T	-1.624	-0.411
P	0.105	0.681

Science Assessment	Scale Score	Percent Meeting Standard
Cohen's *d*	0.11	0.03
Number of students in each group	426	426

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

Detailed Statistics for Science by Race/Ethnicity

Table B55: shows the science mean scale score differences from spring 2023 statewide assessments for students based on race/ethnicity by charter school enrollment.

Science Scale Score	Asian	Black or African Amer.	Hispanic or Latinx	White	Two or More Races
TPS Mean SS (SD)	696.5 (83.057)	654.8 (67.733)	664.4 (63.391)	701.1 (70.269)	700.9 (68.996)
CS Mean SS (SD)	691.4 (59.482)	667.1 (66.731)	673.4 (68.589)	711.0 (67.219)	690.9 (81.611)
Mean Difference*	5.105	-12.336	-9.074	-9.924	10.059
T	0.218	-1.342	-0.947	-1.331	0.549
P	0.829	0.181	0.345	0.184	0.585
Cohen's *d*	0.07	0.18	0.14	0.14	0.13
Number of students in each group	19	107	95	170	34

*Note: the mean difference in science scale score is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative mean difference indicates that the mean science scale score for the charter school students was higher than the mean science scale score for the TPS group. The positive mean difference indicates that the mean science scale score for the charter school students was lower than the mean science scale score for the TPS group.

Table B56: shows the science percent meeting standard rate differences from spring 2023 statewide assessments for students based on race/ethnicity by charter school enrollment.

Science Percent Meeting Standard	Asian	Black or African Amer.	Hispanic or Latinx	White	Two or More Races
TPS Group Percent Meeting Standard (SD)	57.9 (50.7)	30.8 (46.8)	38.9 (49.0)	58.8 (49.4)	58.8 (50.0)
CS Group Percent Meeting Standard (SD)	47.4 (51.3)	34.6 (48.1)	40.0 (49.2)	62.9 (48.4)	47.1 (50.7)
Mean Difference*	10.5	-3.8	-1.1	-4.1	11.7

Science Percent Meeting Standard	Asian	Black or African Amer.	Hispanic or Latinx	White	Two or More Races
T	0.635	-0.581	0.149	-0.776	0.964
P	0.529	0.562	0.883	0.438	0.338
Cohen's *d*	0.21	0.08	0.02	0.08	0.23
Number of students in each group	19	107	95	170	34

*Note: the mean difference in percent meeting standard is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative mean difference indicates that the mean science percent meeting standard rate for the charter school students was higher than the mean science percent meeting standard rate for the TPS group. The positive mean difference indicates that the mean science percent meeting standard rate for the charter school students was higher than the mean science percent meeting standard rate for the TPS group.

Detailed Statistics for Science by Program Participation

Table B57: shows the science mean scale score differences from spring 2023 statewide assessments for students based on program participation and charter school enrollment.

Science Scale Score	English Learners**	Low-Income	Special Education
TPS Group Mean SS (SD)	614.4 (60.007)	660.1 (66.964)	615.5 (63.663)
CS Group Mean SS (SD)	633.9 (51.733)	669.6 (65.399)	626.4 (59.912)
Mean Difference*	-19.491	-9.591	-10867
T	-2.005	-1.633	-0.834
P	0.047**	0.103	0.407
Cohen's *d*	0.35	0.15	0.18
Number of students in each group	66	254	45

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

Table B58: shows the science percent meeting standard rate differences from spring 2023 statewide assessments for students based on program participation and charter school enrollment.

Science Percent Meeting Standard	English Learners	Low-Income	Special Education
TPS Proficiency Rate (SD)	9.0 (28.8)	32.7 (47.0)	15.6 (36.7)
CS Proficiency Rate (SD)	13.6 (34.6)	37.0 (48.4)	13.3 (34.4)
Mean Difference*	-4.6	-4.3	2.3

Science Percent Meeting Standard	English Learners	Low-Income	Special Education
T	-0.849	-1.023	0.297
P	0.397	0.307	0.767
Cohen's *d*	0.15	0.09	0.06
Number of students in each group*	66	254	45

*Note: the mean difference in percent meeting standard is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative mean difference indicates that the mean science percent meeting standard rate for the charter school students was higher than the mean science percent meeting standard rate for the TPS group. The positive mean difference indicates that the mean science percent meeting standard rate for the charter school students was higher than the mean science percent meeting standard rate for the TPS group.

Statistics for Science by Grade Level

Table B59: shows the science mean scale score differences from spring 2022 statewide assessments for 5th, 8th, and 11th grade students based on charter school enrollment.

Science Scale Score	5th Grade	8th Grade	11th Grade*
TPS Group Mean SS (SD)	692.3 (69.195)	672.9 (71.983)	N.D.
CS Group Mean SS (SD)	702.1 (67.022)	679.4 (71.805)	N.D.
Mean Difference*	-9.882	-6.484	N.D.
T	-1.369	-1.004	N.D.
P	0.172	0.316	N.D.
Cohen's *d*	0.15	0.09	N.D.
Number of students in each group	178	248	N.D.

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

Table B60: Science percent meeting standard rate differences from spring 2022 statewide assessments for 5th, 8th, and 11th grade students based on charter school enrollment.

Science Percent Meeting Standard	5th Grade	8th Grade	11th Grade
TPS Group Percent Meeting Standard (SD)	53.4 (50.0)	42.7 (49.6)	N.D.
CS Group Percent Meeting Standard	59.0 (49.3)	41.1 (49.3)	N.D.

Science Percent Meeting Standard	5th Grade	8th Grade	11th Grade
(SD)			
Mean Difference*	-5.6	1.6	N.D.
T	-1.067	0.363	N.D.
P	0.172	0.717	N.D.
Cohen's *d*	0.11	0.03	N.D.
Number of students in each group	178	248	N.D.

*Note: the mean difference in science scale score is the value for the TPS group minus the value for the charter school (CS) group. The negative mean difference indicates that the mean science scale score for the charter school students was higher than the mean science scale score for the TPS group. The positive mean difference indicates that the mean percent meeting standard rate in science for the charter school students was higher than the corresponding rate for the TPS group. The data file provided to the author was not conducive to matching 11th grade students.

Appendix C: Charter School Revenues and Expenditures

SBE Review of Revenues

The SBE examined the 2021-22 revenues and expenditures reported on the OSPI Student Apportionment and Fiscal Services (SAFS) website for the charter LEAs and the home school districts. The most up to date version of the allocation of state funding to support the instructional program of basic education is described in RCW 28A.150.260. The basic education allocation or allotment is a dollar amount derived from the prototypical school model based on school district full time enrollment by grade level, and distributed to school districts each month throughout the year. To obtain a clearer picture of school funding and in a deviation from prior years, this review includes all revenues coming from state, local and other sources, and revenue contributions from federal sources.

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

The OSPI publication titled *Organization and Financing of Washington's Public Schools* provides an overview of the manner in which K-12 public schooling is funded. The document describes the changes to how school districts were funded for school staff salaries in the 2017 and 2018 legislative sessions by the Washington Legislature. Most importantly, the document explains how the Legislature discontinued the "staff mix" factor after the 2017–18 school year and no

longer provides funding to each school district for teacher salary and benefits tied to the teachers' education level and certificated years of experience.

For this analysis, revenues are described as coming from State sources, Local sources, Federal, or Outside sources. State revenues are subdivided into General Purpose Apportionment or Special Purpose revenue (Table 18). The State General Purpose Apportionment revenue represents the sum the basic apportionment, and add-ins for special education and for local effort assistance. The State Special Purpose revenue represents the sum of monies for special education services, learning assistance, bilingual education, highly capable services, food services, transportation operations, and other line items. In 2021-22, some school districts received additional state funding (e.g. infant special education funds, institutional, child-care funding, pilot program funding, funding from other state agencies, and other assigned state monies) that the charter schools did not receive.

Information on Outlier Schools

The financial information for several charter schools highlights an unusual pattern of revenues and expenditures. In particular, these schools were awarded grants or other foundation supports, which greatly increased revenues and inflated per student revenues and expenditures. These schools are best characterized as outliers, which distort the overall pattern of charter school revenues and expenditures. As outliers, these schools are omitted from the overall discussion, but are included on the data tables for completeness.

Whatcom Intergenerational High School: first year of operation was 2021-22 school year with an average full-time enrollment of approximately 49 students. The school received small secondary school apportionment enhancements to ensure that the school can provide appropriate staffing for each of the subjects and grades necessary. In addition, the school received a federal charter school (start-up?) grant of nearly $420K (approximately $8,500 per student). In addition, the school received approximately $115K from private foundations, an amount equivalent to approximately $2,300 per student. Whatcom IHS is an outlier due to the small school apportionment enhancements and the large start-up grant money the school receives, so is not included in the charter school-home school district comparisons.

Lumen High School: 2021-22 was the first full year of in-person instruction after the COVID pandemic-related physical closure of school buildings. The average full-time enrollment was approximately 35 students. Lumen received small secondary school apportionment enhancements to ensure that the school can provide appropriate staffing for each of the subjects and grades necessary. In addition, the school received a federal charter school (start-up?) grant of nearly $340K (approximately $9,600 per student). In addition, the school received approximately $273K from private foundations and an additional $195K from gifts and non-tax local support, an amount equivalent to approximately $5,500 per student. Lumen HS is an outlier due to the small school apportionment enhancements and the large start-up grant and other monies the school receives, so is not included in the charter school-home school district comparisons.

Why Not You Charter: began operations in the 2021-22 school year. With an average full-time enrollment of 99 high school students, the school received an enhanced apportionment. The school received approximately $120 K in local gifts and donations, $375K from a federal charter school grant, and a $1.0M private foundation grant. These monies increase revenue by more than $12K per student. Why Not You charter school is an outlier due to the small secondary school enhancement apportionment and the large start-up grant and other monies the school receives. The school is not included in the charter school-home school district comparisons.

Rainier Valley Leadership Academy: the school received two substantial grants in the 2021-22 school year. The $1.0M federal grant and $960K private foundation award resulted in additional school year revenue of $12,500 per student. The school is an outlier due to the grant and other monies the school received and is not included in the charter school-home school district comparisons.

Summary of Revenue

- The state apportionment is similar for the charter school LEAs and the home school districts, typically ranging from approximately $11K to $15K per student.
- Approximately 43 to 83 percent of the total per student revenue for school districts and charter school LEAs come from the State General Purpose and the State Special Purpose Apportionment.
- On average, 16 to 18 percent of the total revenues come from federal sources, and there is little difference between the charter school LEAs and the home school districts on this measure.
- Approximately 13 percent of the total per student revenue for the charter school LEAs comes from other Other sources and Local sources but less than two percent for the home school districts.
- When charter school grant monies are excluded from the total federal funds, charter schools and the home districts receive approximately $2,000 to $4,000 per student and there is little difference between the two groups.

Table C1: summary of the 2021-22 per pupil revenues for school district and charter school LEAs. Dollar amounts shown are the average for home school districts and charter school LEAs.

Group	Total State Revenue $/Pupil	Total Local* Revenue $/Pupil	Total Federal Revenue $/Pupil	Other* Revenue $/Pupil	Total Revenue Includes Other* $/Pupil	Total Revenue Excludes Other* $/Pupil
Charter School LEAs (Average)	13,710	346	3,785	3,439	20,707	17,574
Home School Districts (Average)	13,082	2,685	3,009	366	19,006	18,865
Washington	12,749	2,368	2444	299	17,859	17,859

Note: data for Whatcom IHS, Why Not You Academy, Lumen HS, and Rainier Valley Leadership are not included in this table because they are outliers. *Note: total Local revenue amount excludes Other revenues (Source Category 2500 - Gifts, Grants and Donations), and Foundation support (Source Category 8200 – Other Financial Revenues). Values shown here are numeric averages, not weighted averages.

Table C2: summary of revenues (expressed as per pupil dollars) for the 2021-22 school year for the charter school LEAs and the home school districts.

District (LEA) Name	Total State Revenue $/Pupil	Total Local* Revenue $/Pupil	Total Federal Revenue $/Pupil	Other* Revenue $/Pupil	Total Revenue Includes Other* $/Pupil	Total Revenue Excludes Outside* $/Pupil
Whatcom HIS**	31,120	624	11,658	2,321	45,723	42,778
Bellingham SD	***12,280***	***2,953***	***2,138***	***189***	***17,560***	***17,371***
Catalyst	13,559	0	2,115	653	16,327	15,674
Bremerton SD	***13,783***	***3,120***	***3,071***	***78***	***20,052***	***19,974***
Rainier Prep	13,558	1,907	2,895	236	18,596	16,453
Why Not You**	20,048	1,587	8,153	10,282	40,069	28,200
Highline SD	***14,104***	***3,199***	***2,859***	***989***	***21,151***	***20,162***
Spokane International	15,227	82	2,542	1,263	19,113	17,768
Mead SD	***11,841***	***1,556***	***1,527***	***50***	***14,974***	***14,924***
Pullman Community Montessori	12,503	128	6,821	3,887	23,338	19,323
Pullman SD	***11,108***	***2,134***	***2,235***	***0***	***15,478***	***15,478***
Impact Salish Sea	14,647	52	4,247	0	18,945	18,893
Rainier Valley**	19,804	211	6,609	6,121	32,745	26,412
Summit Atlas	14,915	86	3,373	1,270	19,644	18,288
Summit Sierra	13,756	159	2,569	1,430	17,914	16,325
Seattle PS	***13,219***	***3,764***	***2,569***	***1,515***	***21,067***	***21,067***
Lumen HS**	42,272	8,055	13,549	7,722	71,598	55,821
PRIDE Prep	13,448	164	2,816	13,517	29,945	16,264
Spokane PS	***12,425***	***2,286***	***3,674***	***156***	***18,540***	***18,385***
Impact Comm. Bay	13,409	944	5,011	0	19,364	19,364
Summit Olympus	13,850	179	2,797	5,095	21,922	16,648
Tacoma SD	***12,839***	***3,010***	***2,922***	***347***	***19,119***	***19,119***
Impact Puget Sound	14,752	29	3,418	0	18,198	18,170
Tukwila SD	***14,220***	***3,241***	***4,795***	***108***	***22,364***	***22,364***
Pinnacles Prep	10,901	421	6,820	7,042	25,183	17,721
Wenatchee SD	***12,957***	***1,855***	***3,433***	***54***	***18,310***	***18,310***
State Total	***12,749***	***2,368***	***2,444***	***299***	***17,859***	***17,859***

*Note: total Local revenue amount excludes Other revenues (Source Category 2500 - Gifts, Grants and Donations), and support from Foundations (Source Category 8200 – Other Financial Revenues). **Note: the large per pupil dollar amount for Whatcom IHS, Lumen HS, Why Not You Academy, and Rainier Valley

results from the combination of low enrollment, state enhancements for small secondary schools, and significant revenue from Other sources described immediately above. These outlier schools are not included in the charter school-home school district comparisons.

Local and Other revenues are divided into Local Property Tax, Local Non-Tax, and Other revenue categories by the OSPI. The Local Property Tax is just that, with small contributions from sale of property and timber excise tax. The Local Non-Tax is a broad category, in which the revenue is the sum of miscellaneous tuition/fees, childcare tuition/fees, sales of good/services, school food sales, and the grouping of gifts, grants, and donations. The Other revenue is a catchall that includes monies from other governmental agencies, equipment sales, money transfers, and monies from private foundations. For this analysis, the grouping of gifts, grants, and donations and monies from private foundations is broken out as a separate revenue source (Other Revenues) and described in the next section.

- Across the state, approximately 10 to 15 percent of the total per student revenue for a school district comes from the Local Tax and Local Non-Tax, categories. An average of one percent of the total per student revenue for a charter school LEA comes from the Local Tax and Local Non-Tax categories
- The average student support from the Local and Other revenue source is approximately $2,800 for the home school districts and is approximately $240 for the charter LEAs

Funding of School Staff

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

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

Certificated instructional staff (CIS) unit salary allocations are calculated by multiplying the statewide salary allocation rate for CIS ($68,937 for 2021-22) times the school district's regionalization factor for that school year. Beginning in the 2019–20 school year, a 0.04 experience factor was added for school districts with above-average education and experience for their certificated instructional staff.

School districts and charter schools are provided with a predetermined amount of revenue for each staffing unit but may actually staff a school differently. For example, the prototypical school

model might allocate $690K for 10 classroom teachers ($68,937 x 10) and the school might choose to employ 12 teachers with lesser experience at an average salary of $50K per year for a total expense of $600K. It would be acceptable to do this and use the remaining $90K for other expenses such as facilities costs. School districts and charter schools are afforded considerable latitude in how they spend their allocations, which can create substantial salary disparities between charter schools and the home school districts (Table C3).

- With a couple of exceptions, the average total salary for charter school instructional staff is approximately $3,000 to $41,000 lower than the salary allocation from the state.
- The average total salary for charter school instructional staff is approximately $15,000 to $61,000 lower than the average total salary paid by the home school district.

Table C3: shows the 2021-22 instructional staff salary allocation, average salary and differences by charter school and home school district.

Organization	Salary Allocation Includes RA 2022	Average Total Salary 2022	Allocation vs. Salary Difference* 2022	Charter/Home District Difference* 2022
Whatcom IHS	$75,870	$70,523	-$5,347	-$27,586
Bellingham SD	***$75,870***	***$98,109***	***$22,239***	
Catalyst	$81,346	$53,305	-$28,041	-$42,254
Bremerton SD	***$81,346***	***$95,559***	***$14,213***	
Rainier Prep	$79,750	$75,738	-$4,012	-$18,167
Why Not You	81,346	$72,422	-$8,946	-$21,483
Highline SD	***$81,346***	***$93,905***	***$12,559***	
Spokane International	$70,964	$58,690	-$12,274	-$34,374
Mead SD	***$70,964***	***$93,064***	***$22,100***	
Pullman Comm. Montessori	$68,937	$55,727	-$13,210	-$19,645
Pullman SD	***$68,937***	***$75,372***	***$6,435***	
Impact Salish Sea	$81,346	$40,846	-$40,500	-$55,502
Rainier Valley	$81,346	$64,282	-$17,064	-$32,066
Summit Atlas	$81,346	$81,188	-$158	-$15,160
Summit Sierra	$81,346	$75,395	-$5,951	-$20,953
Seattle PS	***$81,346***	***$96,348***	***$15,002***	
Lumen HS	$71,694	$67,905	-$3,789	-$22,666
PRIDE Prep	$71,694	$66,381	-$5,313	-$24,190
Spokane PS	***$71,694***	***$90,571***	***$18,877***	
Impact Commence. Bay	$77,209	$46,276	-$30,993	-$56,117

Organization	Salary Allocation Includes RA 2022	Average Total Salary 2022	Allocation vs. Salary Difference* 2022	Charter/Home District Difference* 2022
Summit Olympus	$77,209	$79,588	$2,379	-$22,775
Tacoma SD	***$77,209***	***$102,363***	***$25,154***	
Impact Puget Sound	$81,346	$40,129	-$41,217	-$61,517
Tukwila SD	***$81,346***	***$101,646***	***$20,300***	
Pinnacles Prep	$71,694	$68,604	-$3,090	-$19,009
Wenatchee SD	***$71,694***	***$87,613***	***$15,919***	

Note: RA is the Regionalization Adjustment, which is the same for the home school district and the charter school LEA. The Allocation vs. Salary Difference is computed as the Average Total Salary minus the Salary Allocation for 2022. A negative value means the Average Total Salary was lower than the Salary Allocation. A positive value means the Average Total Salary was greater than the Salary Allocation. The Charter/Home District Difference is computed as the charter school Average Total Salary minus the home school district Average Total Salary for 2022. A negative difference means that the Average Total Salary for the charter school was lower than the Average Total Salary for the home school district. Modified from the OSPI Personnel Summary Reports.

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

Outside revenues includes monies from gifts, grants, and donations (source category = 2500) and private foundations (source category = 8200). This Outside revenue source is examined separately, an approach endorsed by the CSC in previous charter school reports. While the Outside revenues can be substantial for some charter schools, the revenue source is most often awarded for a limited period and designated for a specific purpose (e.g. start-up costs, school expansion, or building improvements). For example, the Washington Charter School Association (CSA) was awarded nearly $20M through the federal Charter Schools Program Grant. Most of the monies will be sub-granted to schools for supporting the opening of new charter schools and expanding existing high-quality charter schools. Beginning in July 2020, the CSA awarded grants totaling $1.25M to $1.5M to 10 charter schools opening or expanding school operations. These types of grants can increase revenues and expenditures by more than $3000 per student per year but are limited in scope and duration.

- Across the state, approximately $366 per student revenue for a school district comes from Outside sources.
- For the charter school LEAs and for the 2021-22 school year and excluding outliers, an average of approximately $3,439 per student revenue comes from Outside sources.

Total Revenue (Excluding Outside Revenue)

This category includes State and Local revenue, while excluding Outside (gifts, grants, and donations (source category = 2500) and Private Foundations (source category = 8200)) revenues. After excluding outliers, the charter school LEAs received an average revenue of

approximately $17,574 per student, while the home school districts yielded an average of approximately $18,865. Per student revenue for most of the charter schools is approximately $500 to $4,000 lower than the home district after excluding the Outside revenues.

SBE Review of Expenditures

Charter school LEA and school district expenditures are broken out into the categories of expenses attributed to Administration, Teaching, Maintenance and Operations, School Food Service, Student Transportation, and Other expenses (Table C4).

Administration expenditures include costs attributed to the board of directors, superintendent's office, business office, human resources, public relations, supervision of instruction, school principal's office, and supervision of food services, transportation, and maintenance and operations. The home school districts expend approximately $2,400 (12 percent of the total) per student on administration, while the charter school LEAs expend approximately $4,900 per student (26 percent of the per student total) on administration. Lumen High School posted the highest administration expenses (approximately $16,100 per student), which was identified as an outlier and was excluded from the calculation of averages.

The Teaching expenditures include a wide range of activities attributed to instruction, which include but are not limited to learning resources, guidance and counseling, student health services, classroom instruction, extracurricular activities, professional learning, and curriculum. The charter school LEAs reported teaching expenditures far less than the home school districts (approximately $9,400 vs. $13,600) per student. Many of the charter school LEAs spent less per student on teaching and instruction expenditures than the home school district.

The Maintenance and Operations expenditure category includes activities such as grounds maintenance, operations of buildings, building maintenance, cost of utilities, and costs attributed to building and property security. On average, the charter school LEAs spend approximately $3,200 per student, as compared to $1,600 per student for the home school districts. The home school districts spend approximately 8.2 percent of total expenditures on Maintenance and Operations, while the charter school LEAs rate was 16.8 percent of the total per student expenditures.

Table C4: summary of expenditures (expressed as per pupil dollars) for the 2021-22 school year for the charter school LEAs and the home school districts.

District (LEA) Name	Total Admin. $/Pupil	Total Teaching $/Pupil	Maint. Operations $/Pupil	School Food Service $/Pupil	Student Transport. $/Pupil	Other $/Pupil	Total $/Pupil
Whatcom IHS*	14,933	19,411	11,396	973	13,222	3,941	50,921
Bellingham SD	***2,413***	***12,769***	***1,399***	***552***	***446***	***161***	***17,741***
Catalyst	3,724	9,106	617	1,123	711	510	15,790
Bremerton SD	***2,577***	***14,153***	***1,578***	***639***	***491***	***628***	***20,066***
Rainier Prep	3,381	10,334	1,174	843	1,125	91	16,947

District (LEA) Name	Total Admin. $/Pupil	Total Teaching $/Pupil	Maint. Operations $/Pupil	School Food Service $/Pupil	Student Transport. $/Pupil	Other $/Pupil	Total $/Pupil
Why Not You*	9,261	13,615	8,325	558	533	4,117	35,410
Highline SD	***2,783***	***15,228***	***1,459***	***478***	***478***	***323***	***20,749***
Spokane Intl.	2,582	8,603	3,638	817	602	290	16,531
Mead SD	***1,558***	***10,852***	***1,324***	***464***	***623***	***308***	***15,129***
Pullman Comm. Montessori	6,754	12,307	2,930	1,040	2	1,459	24,492
Pullman SD	***2,071***	***10,475***	***1,532***	***451***	***577***	***386***	***15,493***
Impact Salish Sea	5,336	7,290	1,899	844	373	479	15,821
Rainier Valley*	10,724	15,584	1,358	604	688	3,787	32,745
Summit Atlas	5,255	11,081	1,898	287	803	18	19,342
Summit Sierra	5,152	10,152	1,880	208	242	20	17,655
Seattle PS	***2,774***	***14,820***	***1,809***	***410***	***966***	***498***	***21,277***
Lumen HS*	16,522	28,756	6,423	656	577	9,516	62,429
PRIDE Prep	2,304	7,462	15,487	445	1,160	288	27,146
Spokane PS	***1,716***	***13,522***	***1,316***	***604***	***385***	***484***	***18,028***
Impact Comm. Bay	4,678	8,319	1,815	1,010	728	102	16,652
Summit Olympus	7,463	10,478	2,920	459	163	36	21,518
Tacoma SD	***2,784***	***13,229***	***1,825***	***681***	***631***	***438***	***19,587***
Impact Puget Sound	5,001	7,404	1,861	793	263	87	15,409
Tukwila SD	***2,962***	***16,585***	***2,011***	***722***	***478***	***473***	***23,231***
Pinnacles Prep	7,123	10,622	2,380	640	109	1,555	22,429
Wenatchee SD	***2,054***	***13,258***	***1,226***	***487***	***380***	***298***	***17,703***
State total	***2,221***	***12,583***	***1,459***	***506***	***673***	***407***	***17,850***

Note: school district and LEA expenditures exceed the revenues shown on Table 21 because the revenue amounts do not include cash on hand at the start of the school year. *Additional note: the large per pupil dollar amount for Whatcom IHS, Lumen HS, Why Not You Academy, and Rainier Valley results from the combination of low enrollment, state enhancements for small secondary schools, and significant revenue from Other sources described above. These outlier schools are not included in the charter school-home school district comparisons.

The School Food Service expenditure category includes the cost of school food and food service operations. The home school districts spent approximately $550 (2.9 percent of the total) per student on School Food Service, which is similar to the state average of $700 (3.7 percent of the total) per student. The charter school LEAs spent a little more on school food service $509 (3.4 percent of the total) per student.

The Student Transportation expenditure category includes costs attributed to transportation operations, maintenance, and insurance. Every charter school reported expenditures attributed to student transportation operations. However, the type of student transportation and extent to

which each charter school provided student transportation were not clear after searching charter school websites. The charter school LEAs spent an average of approximately $523 (1.0 percent of the total) per student on transportation, while the home school districts spent approximately $557 (2.9 percent of the total) per student on transportation.

The catchall category of Other expenditures include but is not limited to costs attributed to certain insurance, information systems, printing, warehousing/distribution, motor pool, interest, principal, debt service, and public activities. Most of the charter school LEAs spent an average of approximately $370 (1.9 percent of the total) per student expenditures and the home school districts spend an average of approximately $426 per student representing 2.2 percent of the total per student expenditures.

Total Expenditures

In the 2021-22 school year, the charter school LEAs expended approximately $19,144 per student (Table C5), which is similar to the home school districts expenditure of approximately $19,029. Charter school LEA per student costs attributed to Administration are more than double that of the home school districts ($4,898 vs. $2,364). The charter school LEA per student costs attributed to Teaching are far less than the costs for the home school district ($9,430 vs. $13,569). The charter school LEA per student costs attributed to Maintenance and Operations are more than double that of the home school districts ($3,208 vs. $1,565). The expenditures related to Food Service, Student Transportation, and Other expenses for charter school LEAs ($893 total) and home school districts ($983 total) are similar.

Table C5: summary of the 2021-22 per pupil expenditures for home school district and charter school LEAs. Dollar amounts are the average for home school districts and charter school LEAs. **To be updated.**

Group	Total Admin $/Pupil	Total Teaching $/Pupil	Maintenance Operations $/Pupil	School Food Service $/Pupil	Student Transport. $/Pupil	Other $/Pupil	Total $/Pupil
Charter School LEAs (Average)	4,898	9,430	3,208	709	523	370	19,144
Home School Districts (Average)	2,364	13,569	1,565	549	557	426	19,029
Washington	2,221	12,583	1,459	506	673	407	17,850

Note: data for Whatcom IHS, Why Not You Academy, Lumen HS, and Rainier Valley Leadership are not included in this table because they were identified as outliers. Values shown here are numeric averages, not weighted averages.

Charter school LEAs must budget for an expenditure not applicable to the traditional public school districts, the authorizer oversight fee. In the 2021-22 school year and as provided for in RCW 28A.710.110, the charter school authorizers collected three percent of the state funds allocated to the charter schools under the CSC authority and Spokane Public Schools. The

authorizer must use the oversight fee exclusively for fulfilling the authorizer's duties specified in statute, which include but are not limited to the following:

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

Equitable Funding of Charter Schools

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

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

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

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