



*Photo by Allison Shelley for American Education*

# Charter Schools Report 2019-2020



**Prepared by:  
The Washington State Board of Education**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

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

The SBE 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  
Andrew.Parr@K12.wa.us

**Contents**

- Executive Summary..... 3
  - Key Findings on the Academic Performance of Charter Schools ..... 3
  - Key Developments Charter Schools..... 4
- Introduction..... 6
  - Legislative Authority ..... 6
  - Charter Schools in Washington..... 7
  - Overview of the Performance of Charter Schools ..... 10
- Section I – Washington Charter School Performance ..... 13
  - Summary of Findings..... 14
  - Part A – Academic Performance of Charter Schools ..... 14
  - Part B – Academic Performance of Charter School Students and Similar TPS ..... 18
- Section II – Meeting the purposes of Washington’s Charter Schools Act ..... 28
  - Key Developments for Charter School Authorizers ..... 29
  - Areas for Improvement:..... 31
  - Funding Sufficiency for Charter Schools ..... 31
  - Efficacy of the Funding for Charter School Authorizers ..... 39
- Section III - Recommended Changes to State Law or Policy..... 40
- Appendix A: Detailed Performance Analysis..... 42
  - Part A: Academic Performance of the Charter Schools ..... 42
  - Part B: Performance of Charter School Students and Similar TPS Students..... 51

## Executive Summary

The Washington State's Charter School Act (RCW 28A.710) was enacted on April 3, 2016 for the primary purpose of allowing flexibility to innovate in areas such as scheduling, personnel, funding, and educational programs to improve student outcomes and academic achievement of "at-risk" student populations<sup>1</sup>. A Washington charter school is a public school that is not a common school: a public alternative to traditional common schools. The first public charter schools began operating in Washington in fall 2016. In collaboration with the Washington State Charter School Commission (CSC), the State Board of Education (SBE) issues an annual report to the Governor, the Legislature, and the public, in accordance with RCW 28A.710.250. While this is the fourth annual report, the data represent four or fewer years of results, with schools opening and closing, and significant changes in enrollment. As a result, trend data is limited so the findings and analysis presented here should be considered preliminary.

The information required to be included in the annual charter school report is as follows:

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

## Key Findings on the Academic Performance of Charter Schools

1. Most, but not all charter public schools continue to serve higher percentages of systemically marginalized students as described in the Washington Charter School Act as compared to the home school districts.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

2. Information about the performance of charter schools on the winter 2020 version of the Washington School Improvement Framework (WSIF) is limited and mixed. However and on average, the charter schools' WSIF score is a little higher than the state average.
3. Charter school students performed higher than the TPS student group on seven of the eight assessment and growth measures evaluated in this report.
4. Charter school students identifying as Hispanic/Latinx, students who are English learners, and students who qualify for FRL (low-income) consistently outperform their TPS matched peers.
5. Summit Olympus was the only charter school with a publicly reportable graduation rate, and this was lower than the home school district and the state rate.

### **Key Developments Charter Schools**

The Washington State Charter School Commission (CSC) and Spokane Public Schools continue as the only charter school authorizers in the state. The two entities oversaw 10 charter public schools operating in Washington during the 2019-20 school year. Total charter public school enrollment decreased to 3,165 K-12 students in the 2019-20 school year from approximately 3400 students enrolled in public charter schools for the 2018-19 school year.

During the 2019-20 school year, one new school (Ashé Preparatory Academy) began operation but closed shortly thereafter due to staffing and enrollment challenges. It is important to note that prior to opening, Ashé also experienced challenges finding a suitable space for the school and settled on a location outside the core community they intended to serve, affecting the school's enrollment. At the close of the 2018-19 school year, three schools closed citing funding challenges. Together, the closed schools (two Green Dot schools and the SOAR Academy) enrolled 571 students in grades K-10 in the 2018-19 school year.

Space availability was also a factor in another recent development, the decision of Spokane International Academy to relocate to a site outside the boundaries of the Spokane Public Schools (Spokane PS), which necessitated a transfer of their authorization contract from Spokane Public Schools to the Charter School Commission. The Board approved that transfer in 2020 effective for the 2020-21 school year.

The SBE requested legislation (HB1195) to extend the time in which to approve additional charter public schools. Per the bill summary prepared by the legislative staff, the timeframe for establishing up to 40 total charter schools is extended by five years to April 3, 2026 if HB1195 passes in current form.

The key developments for each of the authorizers include the following:

### **Charter School Commission**

- Seven CSC authorized charter schools were in operation for the entire 2019-20 school year.

- Four charter schools were approved to open in the fall 2020, but only Catalyst Public School and Impact | Salish Sea Elementary School opened for the new school year
- In June 2019 the CSC was notified of the voluntary closure of three charter schools (Green Dot Destiny, Green Dot Excel, and the SOAR Academy) and in October, the voluntary closure of a fourth charter school (Ashé Preparatory Academy).
- Provided all charter schools currently operating remain open and other approved charter schools open as planned, 16 charter schools will be in operation for the 2021-22 school year through CSC authorization.

### **Spokane Public Schools**

- During the 2019-20 school year, two Spokane PS authorized charter public schools were in operation. PRIDE Prep continues to grow and add a new grade level each year, while Spokane International Academy reached full capacity serving grades K-8.
- As described above, Spokane International Academy secured a new location outside the boundaries of Spokane PS. The SBE and CSC approved the transfer of the school's authorization contract to the Charter Schools Commission.
- In June 2019, the Spokane PS approved Lumen High School for a 2020-21 school year opening.

### **Recommendations**

- The SBE recommends extending, by five years to April 2026, the timeframe for establishing up to 40 total charter schools.
- The SBE recommends that a thorough review of the charter school rules and statutes be undertaken in advance of the 2022 legislative session for the purpose of updating language and clarifying processes contained in statute and rule.
- Closely examine statute and rule to explore for possible 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 SBE finds that charter schools face unique challenges with regard to funding due to lack of access to public funding for capital and lower appropriation per student due to a lack of access to equivalent state funding to make up for the fact that local funding is not available. The SBE recommends a close examination the sufficiency of charter school funding and approaches used in other states.

## Introduction

### Legislative Authority

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

The Charter School Commission and Spokane Public Schools submitted authorizer reports to the SBE in early February 2021 in compliance with RCW 28A.710. As specified in the authorizing legislation, the SBE used the authorizer reports and additional relevant data compiled by the SBE to complete this fourth annual report of the performance of the charter schools.

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

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

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

On March 20, 2020, the OSPI cancelled the spring 2020 summative statewide assessment administration after the [USED approved](#) the OSPI waiver request on March 27. The cancelled administrations include the Smarter Balanced assessments (SBAs), alternate assessment for students with significant cognitive challenges (WA-AIM), and the English language proficiency assessment (ELPA21). As a direct result of the cancellation of assessment administrations, the evaluation of the performance of the charter schools in this report differs in many respects to the evaluations presented in previous reports.

The SBE is directed in RCW 28A.710.250 to issue the annual report on the performance of the state's charter schools during the preceding year, meaning that this report is to elaborate on the academic performance of the charter schools operating during the 2019-20 school year. However, the physical closure of school buildings due to the COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent cancellation of the statewide assessment administration in the spring 2020 eliminates much of the educational data used for the required analysis. Changes to the required educational outcome data are as follows:

- No test score data is available for the 2019-20 school year,
- No growth model data is available for the 2019-20 school year, and
- The ability to generate a valid winter 2021 WSIF is in question.

Notwithstanding the data availability challenges, the SBE re-analyzed educational data from the 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 school years to create a new perspective of the academic performance of charter school students in comparison to demographically and academically similar non-charter school students.

## **Charter Schools in Washington**

Washington State's Charter School Act ([RCW 28A.710](#)) was enacted in 2013 updated in 2016. The primary purpose of Washington's Charter School Act is to allow flexibility to innovate in areas such as scheduling, personnel, funding, and educational programs to improve student outcomes and academic achievement of at-risk student populations. Washington charter public schools:

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

In addition, Washington charter public schools:

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



- Must comply with local, state, and federal health, safety, parents' rights, civil rights, Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and nondiscrimination laws applicable to school districts.

The charter schools in operation change from year to year (Table 1). Some emerging charter schools annually add one or two grade levels each year to accommodate the grade promotion of continuing students, meaning that the grade levels served at each charter school may also change from year to year. Throughout the text, some school names are shortened to increase the readability and to enhance the appearance of charts and tables. For example, Green Dot 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.

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

<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>
			Ashé Preparatory Academy*
Green Dot Destiny Middle School	Green Dot Destiny Middle School	Green Dot Destiny Middle School	
Green Dot Excel Middle School	Green Dot Excel Middle School	Green Dot Excel Middle School	
	Green Dot Rainier Valley Leadership Acad.	Green Dot Rainier Valley Leadership Acad.	Green Dot Rainier Valley Leadership Acad.
		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
SOAR Academy	SOAR Academy	SOAR Academy	
Spokane International Academy	Spokane International Academy	Spokane International Academy	Spokane International Academy
	Summit Atlas	Summit Atlas	Summit Atlas
Summit Olympus	Summit Olympus	Summit Olympus	Summit Olympus
Summit Sierra	Summit Sierra	Summit Sierra	Summit Sierra
		Willow Public School (Innovation)	Willow Public School (Innovation)

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

Together, the Washington Charter School Commission and Spokane Public Schools oversaw 10 charter public schools operating in Washington during the 2019-20 school year (Table 1). Per the Washington State Report Card, 3164 students attended one of the 10 Washington public charter schools in the 2019-20 school year (Table 2).

Table 2: shows some basic information for the charter schools operating for the 2019-20 school year.

School Name	Authorizer	Home District	Grades Served	Enrollment*
Ashé Preparatory Academy*	State Charter School Commission		K-2, 6	89
Green Dot Rainier Valley Leadership Academy	State Charter School Commission	Seattle	6-10	319
Impact   Puget Sound Elementary*	State Charter School Commission	Tukwila	K-2	285
PRIDE Prep School	Spokane Public Schools	Spokane	6-11	569
Rainer Prep	State Charter School Commission	Highline	5-8	350
Spokane International Academy	Spokane Public Schools	Spokane	K-8	436
Summit Atlas	State Charter School Commission	Seattle	6-11	539
Summit Olympus	State Charter School Commission	Tacoma	9-12	183
Summit Sierra	State Charter School Commission	Seattle	9-12	345
Willow Public School* Innovation Schools	State Charter School Commission	Walla Walla	6-8	49

\*Note: Ashé Preparatory Academy surrendered the school charter shortly after opening for several reasons discussed in the 2020 SCS Authorizer Report. The home district is the school district in which the charter school is physically situated. Enrollment data is from the Washington State Report Card.

RCW 28A.710 directs the CSC to authorize high quality charter public schools throughout the state, especially schools that are designed to expand opportunities for systemically marginalized (at-risk) students. Washington statute defines an at-risk (systemically marginalized) student as a student who has an academic or economic disadvantage that requires assistance or special services to succeed in educational programs. The demographics of students enrolled in charter schools (Table 3) during the 2019-20 school year vary considerably from school to school. Most of the charter public schools serve higher percentages of students qualifying for the Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRL) program, higher percentages of students with disabilities, higher percentages of students of color, but lower percentages of English Learners than the state average or the home school districts.

Table 3: 2019-20 student demographics for charter schools, home school districts, and Washington.

	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latinx	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	English Learners	Low income*	Special Education*
Rainier Prep	0.0	6.3	40.0	42.6	0.0	4.9	6.3	22.0	78.6	11.1
<b>Highline SD</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>14.7</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>39.8</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>20.1</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>28.5</b>	<b>68.6</b>	<b>15.9</b>
Ashé Prep	1.1	0.0	79.8	7.9	0.0	0.0	11.2	ND	ND	ND
Summit Atlas	0.9	4.6	35.4	16.1	0.4	31.0	11.5	15.8	51.8	15.4
Rainier Valley	0.3	2.8	75.9	10.7	0.9	1.9	7.5	18.8	62.7	18.2
Summit Sierra	0.0	7.2	33.0	12.5	0.6	31.9	14.8	10.1	35.1	18.3
<b>Seattle PS</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>14.4</b>	<b>12.9</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>46.5</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>12.4</b>	<b>32.5</b>	<b>15.2</b>
PRIDE Prep	4.6	1.9	6.5	9.5	0.5	72.4	4.6	0.0	59.9	17.8
Spokane International	1.1	1.1	2.1	8.9	0.0	72.7	14.0	1.6	46.8	12.8
<b>Spokane PS</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>67.1</b>	<b>13.1</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>58.3</b>	<b>17.6</b>
Summit Olympus	2.2	2.2	21.3	24.0	5.5	26.8	18.0	6.0	76.5	25.1
<b>Tacoma SD</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>13.1</b>	<b>21.4</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>37.1</b>	<b>15.4</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>61.9</b>	<b>15.1</b>
Impact   Puget Sound	0.4	9.1	49.8	16.8	0.7	18.2	4.9	29.5	64.6	4.2
<b>Tukwila SD</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>26.5</b>	<b>21.3</b>	<b>29.6</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>34.8</b>	<b>74.7</b>	<b>12.0</b>
Willow	0.0	0.0	0.0	49.0	0.0	40.8	10.2	20.4	61.2	20.4
<b>Walla Walla PS</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>41.1</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>53.2</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>13.6</b>	<b>59.2</b>	<b>15.0</b>
<b>Washington</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>24.0</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>52.6</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>45.3</b>	<b>14.4</b>

Note: throughout the report, Low Income or 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. ND = No Data. 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 a great interest to academicians, educators, policymakers, and the public. Like traditional public school students, the academic achievement of charter school students varies considerably across the nation, from state to state, by school level, by presence and nature of a management organization, and results differ for specific student groups.

On average, the [evidence](#) from a myriad of studies indicates no difference in achievement on tests between students who attend a charter school and those who attend a TPS. Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO) is one of the most credible entities researching charter schools. In 2013, CREDO published the [National Charter School study](#) on the academic performance of students attending charter schools. Using CREDO's matched peers<sup>3</sup> methodology, the study found that students attending charter schools exhibit slightly higher levels of learning in reading and approximately the same level of learning in math as compared to their TPS peers. The 2019 report titled "[School Choice in the United States](#)" conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics found no measurable differences in the 2017 reading and math test scores between charter school and TPS students.

However, other evidence shows that urban charter schools serving systemically marginalized and low-income students following a "no excuses" philosophy have a demonstrable and positive impact on student outcomes. No excuses schools emphasize high academic and behavioral expectations, extended instructional time, and other prescribed educator practices. As did other studies of Boston, New York, and Denver charter schools, the CREDO 2013 study concluded that Black students, students in poverty, 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 yields significant and positive effects on educational outcomes.

In another important publication titled "[Urban Charter School Study: Report on 41 Regions](#)" by CREDO in 2015, the authors reported that Black and Hispanic/Latinx students, students in poverty, 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 Black students in poverty and Hispanic students in poverty posted much larger academic gains than their TPS peers.

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

---

<sup>3</sup> 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.

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

In January 2019, CREDO released the preliminary results of a study on [the Charter School Performance in the State of Washington](#) covering the 2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17 school years. While acknowledging the challenges of reporting on a small number of schools and their short history of school operations, the authors conclude that on average, charter school students in Washington experience annual growth in reading and math similar to the educational gains made by their matched peers who enroll in the TPS the charter school students would otherwise have attended. The CREDO authors characterized the performance of the charter schools as promising but not yet definitive.

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

The SBE delivered the third annual report on Washington charter schools to the Governor, the Legislature, and the public in January 2020. The report concluded that the performance of individual charter schools in comparison to the home district on statewide assessments varied, as some schools posted higher proficiency rates on the statewide assessments and others posted lower proficiency rates. Two charter schools reported adjusted cohort graduation rates and these were similar to or a little lower than the home district graduation rates. Likewise, the performance of charter schools on the Washington School Improvement Framework (WSIF) was limited and mixed, as only five of the 12 charter schools earned a WSIF rating and those ratings ranged from a low of 1.53 to a high of 8.35. The WSIF school ratings range from 1.0 to 10. A school rating of 1.53 is in the bottom one percent of school ratings and a school rating of 8.35 is a little below the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of WSIF school scores.

The SBE's third annual report also released the results of a rigorous evaluation showing that, as a group, charter school students posted scale scores similar to the scale scores achieved by demographically and academically similar TPS students on the ELA assessment, but higher scale scores than TPS students on the math and science assessments. The analysis yielded effect sizes showing that the effect associated with charter school enrollment was very small to very small. The student growth percentiles (SGPs) for charter school students were mostly similar to or higher than the TPS student group. The report characterized the findings as preliminary, as the analyses came from the assessment results of a relatively small number of students, from a small number of schools, operating for a small number of years.

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

## **Section I – Washington Charter School Performance**

This section of the annual report consists of two distinct parts in accordance to 28A.710.250 (2). Part A is comprised of analyses on the academic performance or achievement of students at charter schools compared to the home district and the state Part B comprises the comparison of the academic performance of students at charter schools to similar students in traditional public schools

This report elaborates on the performance of charter schools through data posted to the Washington State Report Card and other student results from the 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 school years. As was stated for the previous three charter school reports assessing the performance of charter schools and charter school students, the findings presented here are preliminary. Because the evaluation of the performance of charter schools in Washington is ongoing, it would be premature to make any judgement about the performance of the charter schools until multiple years of results (at least five years) are available.

When comparing the performance of the charter schools to their TPS counterparts, a couple of other challenges should be noted. First, most of the charter schools add one or two new grades each year. This means that schools must build curriculum, hire new teachers, and provide training each year to new teachers. This challenge is unique to the charter schools, as the 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.

Another limitation of this work centers on the fact that only 13 charter schools have been in operation over the most recent four-year period and only nine charter schools were in operation for the full 2019-20 school year. As explained earlier, there is scant educational data to report on for the most recent school year, and only 3000 to 4000 assessment records for charter school students over the three previous years. Recently approved charter schools will commence operations in the coming years and the overall enrollment of the charter schools will likely increase. The meaningfulness of the statistical analyses will increase with the larger student counts and additional schools.

## Summary of Findings

1. Information about the performance of charter schools on the winter 2020 version of the Washington School Improvement Framework (WSIF) is limited and mixed, as some schools earned higher scores while other schools earned lower scores. On average, the charter schools WSIF score is similar to or a little higher than the state average.
2. Two charter schools had reportable four-year adjusted cohort graduation rates for the class of 2020. The rate for one school was similar to the state average, but lower than the home school district. Data was suppressed for the other school.
3. Charter school students performed higher than TPS students do on seven of the eight assessment and growth measures evaluated in this report.
  - a. For the ELA and math assessments, charter school students perform higher than the TPS students do on average scale score and on the proficiency rate.
  - b. On the science assessments, charter school students perform higher than TPS students on average scale score and similar to TPS students on proficiency rate.
  - c. On the growth model SGPs, charter school students perform higher than the TPS students on the math SGP and ELA SGP measures.
4. Students identifying as Hispanic/Latinx, students who are English learners and students who qualify for FRL (low-income) opting for the charter school alternative consistently outperform their TPS peers.

## Part A – Academic Performance of Charter Schools

RCW 28A.710.250 directs the SBE to report on the performance of the state's charter schools during the preceding school year, and include a comparison of the performance of charter school students with the performance of academically, ethnically, and economically comparable groups of students in traditional public schools. This report is to elaborate on the academic performance of the charter schools operating during the 2019-20 school year.

The OSPI cancelled spring 2020 summative statewide assessment administration after the [ED approved](#) the OSPI waiver request on March 27. The cancelled administrations include the Smarter Balanced assessments (SBAs), alternate assessment for students with significant cognitive challenges (WA-AIM), and the English language proficiency assessment (ELPA21). The physical closure of school buildings due to the COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent cancellation of the statewide assessment administration in the spring 2020 eliminated much of the educational outcome data used for the required analysis.

- Neither the percent of students meeting standard on the statewide assessments nor the reporting of scale scores are reportable on the Washington State Report Card.
- The student growth percentiles are not available for the 2019-20 school year and cannot be computed for the 2020-21 school year following the adopted methodology.
- The generation of the 2020 WSIF is virtually possible!

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

### Washington School Improvement Framework

The OSPI published the first version of the Washington School Improvement Framework (WSIF) in the winter 2018 based on educational data from the 2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17 school years. For a variety of reasons, the majority of charter schools did not earn WSIF school ratings until the winter 2020 WSIF version. Last year’s report on the charter schools characterized the WSIF scores as limited and mixed, as only five schools earned a WSIF rating (Table 5).

Table 5: shows the winter 2020 WSIF school rating in decile points for the All Students group by indicator.

School Name	Prof. Decile	SGP Decile	Graduation Rate Decile	EL Progress Decile	SQSS Decile	Total Decile*
Green Dot Destiny*	2.00	2.50	N.D.	1.00	2.00	1.85
Green Dot Excel*	3.50	4.00	N.D.	1.00	2.00	3.25
Green Dot Rainier Valley	3.00	6.50	N.D.	1.00	3.33	4.40
Impact   Puget Sound ES*	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	10.00	5.00	N.D.
PRIDE Prep	5.00	3.00	N.D.	N.D.	2.67	3.55
Rainier Prep	7.50	10.00	N.D.	3.00	7.00	8.30
SOAR Academy*	2.00	1.50	N.D.	N.D.	2.00	1.45
Spokane International	8.00	6.00	N.D.	N.D.	9.00	6.95
Summit Atlas	6.50	9.50	N.D.	2.00	4.33	7.00
Summit Olympus	5.00	N.D.	5.00	N.D.	6.00	5.15
Summit Sierra	6.00	N.D.	6.00	2.00	5.67	6.65
Willow (Innovation)*	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.
<b>Charter Schools (Average)*</b>	<b>5.25</b>	<b>6.00</b>	<b>5.50</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>4.89</b>	<b>6.00</b>
<b>Washington Public Schools (Average)</b>	<b>5.97</b>	<b>5.61</b>	<b>5.84</b>	<b>5.60</b>	<b>5.22</b>	<b>5.69</b>

\*Note: N.D. means No Data, as a final decile could not be computed for a school due to too few reportable measures or the school having been open for less than two years. The winter 2020 WSIF is the



first year in which Willow and Puget Sound are included. Destiny, Excel, and SOAR surrendered their charters shortly after the 2018-19 school year ended and were excluded from the charter school averages.

Two charter schools were unrated due to having been in operation for only one year, the 2018-19 school year. The remaining ten charter schools reported on in the winter 2020 WSIF earned a school rating, ranging from a low of 1.45 to a high of 8.30 decile points. Destiny, Excel, and SOAR ceased operations shortly after the 2018-19 school year, and after excluding those schools, the average WSIF school rating (final decile) for the charter schools is 6.0, just a little higher than the state average of 5.7. The average decile rating for the charter schools on each of the WSIF indicators is mostly just a little lower than the state average.

The WSIF data file created by the OSPI provides final decile ratings for student groups if the minimum reporting requirements are met. The winter 2020 WSIF final decile ratings for student groups at the charter schools (Table 6) are limited and mixed. For each of the student groups for which a final decile could be computed, the charter school average score was approximately 0.75 to 2.00 decile points higher than the state average.

Table 6: shows the winter 2020 WSIF school ratings (final decile) for all reportable student groups for the charter schools earning a final decile rating\*.

School Name	All Students	Native American	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Pacific Islander	White	Two or More	Limited English	Low Income	Special Education
Green Dot Destiny*	1.95	N.D.	N.D.	1.05	1.05	1.40	3.05	1.95	1.55	1.55	1.00
Green Dot Excel*	3.25	N.D.	8.25	2.35	2.50	N.D.	4.90	2.85	3.75	2.35	N.D.
PRIDE Prep	3.55	N.D.	N.D.	2.15	N.D.	N.D.	3.55	6.05	N.D.	2.70	1.80
Rainier Prep	8.30	N.D.	9.90	8.25	8.70	N.D.	9.25	9.45	6.10	8.60	3.85
Rainier Valley	4.40	N.D.	N.D.	4.15	4.35	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	3.55	4.15	3.75
Spokane International	6.95	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	5.05	N.D.	6.40	6.00	N.D.	5.50	3.65
SOAR Academy*	1.45	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.
Summit Atlas	7.00	N.D.	N.D.	6.15	6.90	N.D.	8.75	7.45	N.D.	6.50	5.15
Summit Olympus	5.15	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	4.30	N.D.
Summit Sierra	6.65	N.D.	N.D.	6.45	N.D.	N.D.	6.90	N.D.	N.D.	5.45	N.D.
<b>Charter School (Average)*</b>	<b>6.00</b>	<b>N.D.</b>	<b>9.90</b>	<b>5.43</b>	<b>6.25</b>	<b>N.D.</b>	<b>6.97</b>	<b>7.24</b>	<b>4.83</b>	<b>5.31</b>	<b>3.64</b>
<b>Washington Public Schools (Average)</b>	<b>5.69</b>	<b>2.98</b>	<b>7.88</b>	<b>4.11</b>	<b>4.64</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>6.24</b>	<b>5.91</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>4.38</b>	<b>2.89</b>

\*Note: N.D. means No Data, as a final decile is not computed for a school for various reasons including too few reportable measures or the school having been open for less than two years. Destiny and Excel surrendered their charters shortly after the 2018-19 school year ended and are not included in the charter school averages.

## High School Graduation Results

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

The 2019-20 school year was only the second year in which charter public schools served 12<sup>th</sup> graders (Table 7) and posted an official four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (ACGR).

- Summit Olympus is within the Tacoma School District boundaries. The high school graduation rates of the reportable student groups are mostly similar to or a little lower than the corresponding state graduation rates but lower than the corresponding rates for the Tacoma School District.
- The four-year graduation data for Summit Sierra was incorrectly uploaded to the OSPI. At the time of this writing, Summit Sierra is working with OSPI to determine how and whether or not the correct graduation data will be displayed on the Washington State Report Card. The incorrect data is currently suppressed.

Table 7: shows the four-year graduation rates for reportable student groups for the charter schools, the home school districts, and Washington.

<b>Class of 2020 Four-year Graduation Rate</b>	<b>Summit Olympus</b>	<b>Tacoma SD</b>	<b>Summit Sierra</b>	<b>Seattle PS</b>	<b>Washington</b>
All Students	75.0	89.9	N.D.	85.8	82.9
American Indian / Alaskan Native	N.D.	81.3	N.D.	N.D.	69.8
Asian	N.D.	94.3	N.D.	85.5	91.1
Black / African American	N.D.	90.2	N.D.	79.9	76.3
Hispanic / Latinx	84.6	88.2	N.D.	74.3	77.7
Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	N.D.	88.9	N.D.	N.D.	77.3
White	54.5	89.5	N.D.	90.7	84.7
Two or More Races	63.6	89.7	N.D.	90.1	83.9
Limited English	N.D.	84.5	N.D.	66.6	68.4
Low-Income	71.4	87.0	N.D.	78.2	75.1
Students with a Disability	66.7	68.0	N.D.	64.2	64.5
Female	73.9	93.6	N.D.	89.7	86.0
Male	75.0	86.3	N.D.	82.0	80.0

\*Note: N.D. means No Data, as the data were suppressed to protect personal information or the student group was not represented in the graduation cohort for the school. From the Washington State Report Card.

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

### **Methodology**

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

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

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

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

- Differences in educator quality or effectiveness,
- Differences in educational materials, technology, and other facilities of the school,

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

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

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

### **Changes in Reporting from Previous Years**

The analysis of the performance of charter school students in comparison to TPS students presented in this report differs substantially from that presented in the first three versions of the annual charter school report. The bulk of the changes were necessary because of the cancellation of the spring 2020 statewide assessment administration. Student matching for the 2017 and 2018 school years was updated to make the year-to-year reporting more consistent. The major differences are as follows:

- The charter school and TPS group comparisons used in the 2017 and 2018 reports did not match students based on prior year performance. To be consistent with the 2019 report, the student pairs for 2016-17 and 2017-18 were “re-matched” based on the wide range of student characteristics (Appendix A) and prior performance on ELA and math assessments.
- This report presents the results for each of the three most recent assessment administrations (2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19) to assess performance patterns, and the results of the aggregation of those three years to evaluate group performance differences.
- The results presented in this report are for the charter schools open for the 2019-20 school year, meaning that the results for students enrolled at Destiny, Excel, and SOAR are not included in the analyses.

## Results

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

A **similar** performance describes group means that do **not differ statistically**. The data tables that follow include a row showing the mean difference as a positive or negative value. More often than not, a mean difference exists, but the analyses 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 (\*\*).

### Overview of Results

For the analyses that follow, the charter school group and the TPS groups represent the aggregation of the charter schools open in the 2019-20 school year. In other words, all of the charter school students are combined into one large group to assess for differences in the groups' performance, and those students are all from the charter schools in operation for the entire 2019-20 school year.

Of the eight academic measures examined, charter school group performed different and higher than TPS group on seven of the measures. On the remaining measure, the charter school group performed similarly to the TPS group (Table 8). The following results are evident:

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

Table 8: summarizes the performance of the charter school students compared to the performance of demographically and academically similar TPS group aggregated over multiple school years.

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

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

### **English Language Arts (ELA) Results**

On the three-year aggregation of statewide ELA assessment results, the charter school students group performed statistically higher than the TPS student group (Table 9). However, the effect sizes for each of the measures indicate a negligible or very small effect associated with attendance at a charter school.

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

Table 9: summary of the differences for the ELA measures from the spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019 statewide assessments for 3<sup>rd</sup> to 10 grade students based on charter school enrollment.

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

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

### Mathematics Results

On the three-year aggregation of statewide math assessment results, the charter school students group performed statistically higher than the TPS student group (Table 10). The effect sizes for each of the measures indicate a negligible or very small effect associated with attendance at a charter school.

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

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

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

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

### Science Results

On the two-year aggregation of statewide science assessment results, the charter school students group performed statistically higher than the TPS student group on the scale score measure, and similar to the TPS group on the proficiency rate measure (Table 11). The effect sizes for each of the measures indicate a negligible or very small effect associated with attendance at a charter school.

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

- The science proficiency rate for the charter school students group is similar to the corresponding rate for TPS group (49.9 vs. 46.3).

Table 11: summary of the differences for the science measures from the spring 2018 and spring 2019 statewide assessments based on charter school enrollment.

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

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

### Overview of Results by Race/Ethnicity and Program Participation

In aggregating the educational outcome data over a three-year period, group sizes increase sufficiently to report on and to be more meaningful. With only one exception, the charter school students performed as well or better than the TPS groups on all the measures (Table 12). Charter school students identifying as Hispanic/Latinx, students who are English learners, and students who qualify for FRL (low-income) consistently outperform their TPS matched peers.

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



- **Low-Income:** students at charter schools performed higher than the corresponding TPS group on all of the measures.
- **Special Education:** charter school attendees receiving special education services perform similarly to the corresponding TPS group on all measures, except for the average, math, scale score, which was higher than the TPS group.

Table 12: summary of group performance on ELA and math assessments and SGPs by race/ethnicity and program participation by charter school enrollment.

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

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

### **Results by Race/Ethnicity**

On the Smarter Balanced ELA assessment scale score (aggregated over the 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 school years), the Native American/Alaskan Native, Asian, Black/African American, White, and Two or More Races student groups at charter schools yielded group means students that were similar to the corresponding group means of the TPS students (Table 13). The Hispanic/Latinx students at the charter schools posted scale scores different and higher than the average scale score for the TPS students. The effect sizes indicate a very small effect is associated with attendance at a charter school.

Table 13: ELA scale score differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) of statewide assessments for 3<sup>rd</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> grade students by race/ethnicity and based on charter school enrollment.

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

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

Aggregated over the 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 school years, the Native American/Alaskan Native, Black/African American, White, and Two or More Races student groups at charter schools posted ELA SGP medians similar to the corresponding medians for the TPS students (Table 14). The Asian and Hispanic/Latinx groups at charter schools posted ELA SGP medians different and higher than the TPS student groups. The effect sizes indicate a small effect is associated with attendance at a charter school.

Table 14: ELA SGP differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) for 4<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> grade students by race/ethnicity and based on charter school enrollment.

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

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

For the three most recent years of statewide math assessments, the Native American, Asian, White, and Two or More Races groups of charter school students posted average scale scores similar to the corresponding TPS student groups (Table 15). The Black and Hispanic/Latinx student groups in charter school students posted different and higher scale scores than the TPS student groups. The effect sizes indicate a small to very small effect is associated with attendance at a charter school.

Table 15: math scale score differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) of statewide assessments for 3<sup>rd</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> grade students by race/ethnicity and based on charter school enrollment.

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

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

Regarding the math SGPs aggregated over the three most recent years, all of the charter school race/ethnicity student groups (except for the White student group) posted math SGP medians that were different and higher than the TPS SGP medians (Table 16). Most of the effect sizes indicate a small to very small effect is associated with attendance at a charter school, but for Hispanic/Latinx students a medium effect size is associated with attendance at a charter school.

Table 16: math SGP differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) for 4<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> grade students by race/ethnicity and based on charter school enrollment.

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

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

### **Results by Program Participation**

Students receiving special education services at charter schools posted an average scale score similar to that for special education students at the TPS. However, both the English learner student group and the students qualifying for the FRL program at charter schools yielded average ELA scale scores that were different and higher than the corresponding scale scores for the TPS students (Table 17). The effect sizes indicate a very small effect is associated with attendance at a charter school.

Table 17: ELA scale score differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) of statewide assessments for 3<sup>rd</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> grade students by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

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

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

The English learner and special education students attending charter schools posted ELA SGP medians similar to those posted for TPS students (Table 18). Students qualifying for FRL program (Low-Income) posted a higher ELA SGP median than the TPS students. However, the effect size associated with charter school attendance on ELA SGP median is very small.

Table 18: ELA SGP differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) for 4<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> grade students by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

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

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

The charter school students participating in English learner, low-income, or special education programs posted average scale scores in math different and higher than the scale scores for the TPS students in corresponding groups (Table 19). However, the effect sizes are small to very small.

Table 19: math scale score differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) of statewide assessments for 3<sup>rd</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> grade students by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

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

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

On the math SGPs, the special education students at charter schools posted a median math SGP that was similar to that for similar TPS students (Table 20). The charter school English learners and low-income students groups posted median math SGPs different and higher than the median math SGPs for the TPS students. The effect size associated with charter school attendance is small to very small.

Table 20: math SGP differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) for 4<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> grade students by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

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

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

## **Section II – Meeting the purposes of Washington’s Charter Schools Act**

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

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

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

The Washington State Charter School Commission (CSC) and Spokane PS are the only charter school authorizers in the state. Together, the Washington Charter School Commission and Spokane PS oversaw ten charter public schools operating in Washington during the 2019-20 school year, a decrease of two schools compared to the 2018-19 school year. One of the ten

charter schools closed in October 2019, meaning that nine charter schools were in operation for the entire 2019-20 school year. Per the Washington State Report Card, 3,164 students attended one of the 10 Washington public charter schools in the 2019-20 school year (Table 2). The total charter school enrollment represents a decrease of approximately 200 students from the 2018-19 school year and the total charter school enrollment represents approximately 0.28 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 2019-20 school year (Table 3) indicate that, for the most part, the Washington charter public schools serve systemically marginalized students at a rate higher than the home school district.

## **Key Developments for Charter School Authorizers**

### **Charter School Commission – Authorizer Developments**

Eight CSC authorized charter public schools were in operation during the 2019-20 school year, which represents a decrease of two schools from the 2018-19 school year. One charter school voluntarily closed in October 2019, meaning that seven CSC authorized schools operated for the full 2019-20 school year.

The CSC issued the new Charter School Application in September 2019. The CSC received nine Notices of Intent to apply from organizations throughout the state on December 2, 2019. In March 2019, the CSC received seven applications to open new charter public schools. Of the seven applications, three were incomplete, and not reviewed. At a regularly scheduled June 25, 2020 CSC meeting, the CSC approved four new charter school applications.

The previously approved charter schools completed the planning and development necessary to initiate operations in the 2020-21 school year. Two schools opened for the 2020-21 school year (Catalyst Public School and Salish Sea Elementary School) and two schools delayed opening to

the 2021-22 school year. Provided all charter schools currently operating remain open and other approved charter schools open as planned, 16 charter schools will be in operation for the 2021-22 school year through CSC authorization.

### **Spokane Public Schools – Authorizer Developments**

Two Spokane PS authorized charter schools completed their fourth year of operation in the 2019-20 school year. The two schools were subject to oversight from the district and the OSPI. Spokane PS approved the application of a new charter high school.

Pride Prep continues to grow and add a new grade level each year and will reach full capacity in the 2020-21 school year. Pride Prep continued to have challenges meeting financial performance indicators. Corrective action plans and increased monitoring continued throughout 2019-20. Pride Prep has taken specific steps toward addressing areas of concern and are currently working closely with the Spokane PS to improve areas of academic and financial concern. Because of the school's academic performance falling in the bottom quartile of schools on the WSIF, Pride Prep did not meet the Washington State academic performance requirements in 2018-2019. Pride Prep was notified in their Renewal Report (issued May 1, 2020) of their ineligibility for renewal status under RCW 28A.710.200 (2), unless they were able to demonstrate exceptional circumstances that the Authorizer finds justifiable. Pride Prep did submit a response to demonstrate exceptional circumstances on June 15, 2020, as well as a renewal application on July 1, 2020.

Spokane International Academy reached full capacity serving grades K-8 as of the 2018-19 school year. During the 2019-20 school year, Spokane International made significant improvement in meeting financial performance indicators. Spokane International secured a new school building for the 2020-21 school year outside the Spokane PS boundaries, which necessitated the transfer of the charter school contract to the CSC to serve as the authorizer.

Spokane PS approved the application of Lumen High School in June 2019. Lumen High School staff and founders completed the planning and development necessary to commence operations for the 2020-21 school year. Lumen High School is in downtown Spokane and serves pregnant and parenting teens in Spokane and the surrounding community. Lumen High School expects to enroll up to 60 students in grades 9 through 12 for the 2020-21 school year and intends to serve 120 students at capacity.

### **Other Highlights and Challenges**

- In September 2019, the Washington State Charter Schools Association (WA Charters) received a [\\$20M competitive federal grant](#) through the Charter School Program Grants to State Entities grant program. WA Charters will sub-grant the \$20 million to support new and expanding public charter schools in Washington over a five-year period. The

Washington State Charter Schools Association is a statewide nonprofit that advocates for and supports high-quality charter public schools that meet the needs of systemically underserved students.

- Charter public schools continue to serve a higher share of many of the systemically marginalized student groups prioritized in law, particularly students with Individualized Educational Plans (IEPs) and students from low-income households.
- Charter public school authorizers continue to implement comprehensive academic, financial, and organizational frameworks and protocols for high levels of charter public school accountability. This system allows for swift interventions and corrective action in instances of charter school non-compliance with their performance-based charter contract.

### **Areas for Improvement:**

See Section III for potential law and policy changes.

### **Funding Sufficiency for Charter Schools**

In recent years, the legislature acted to increase state funding for education and eliminate school district reliance on local levy funds for basic education. The legislature intends that state funding for charter schools be distributed equitably with state funding provided for other public schools (RCW 28A.710.280(1)), but RCW 28A.710.030(3) does not entitle public charter schools to receive local levy funds. Charter schools receive state funding as specified through the prototypical school funding model on the same basis as traditional school districts. While the equitable funding of charter schools is the intent of the legislature, the charter public schools are not entitled to any local levy funds, nor do the schools have access to facilities or capital bonds, as do traditional public schools.

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

- **Startup funding:** because funding is provided to charter public schools based on enrollment, there are substantial front-end costs that must be addressed through other sources (e.g., private philanthropy, local fundraising, federal grants, or some combination of these sources). This makes it challenging for schools to start-up, particularly as schools move from the planning phase to implementation, finding and outfitting a space, and hiring staff.
- **Capital funding:** public charter schools do not have access to local bonds or state capital funds typically used to finance the purchase of land and school construction. As a result, charter public schools generally acquire leased space paid for through their operating budget. Per the WA Charters and the CDC and because of the manner in which charter school funds are allotted, charter schools spend a substantial portion of their basic education allocation on facilities, which results in a reduction of the monies available to support teaching and learning.



- **Operating budget:** Charter public schools receive an allotment through the OSPI based on student enrollment and the prototypical school funding model. For the purposes of the funding allotment, each charter public school is a local education agency. The state funding allotment, and any private funds received by the school must cover both capital and all operating costs. A portion of the per pupil funding allotment (3 percent for the CSC and 4 percent for Spokane PS) is also provided to the authorizer for specified oversight purposes outlined in RCW [28A.710.100](#). The amount transferred to the authorizer is three or four percent of the state allotment based on a formula adopted by SBE.
- **Another concern:** identified by Spokane PS subsequent to their 2019 annual report relates to disbursement policies rather than sufficiency. A challenge stems from the fact that apportionment is paid out unevenly across the 12 months. School districts receive a lower amount from the state in November and May because they receive tax levy dollars in those months, but charter public schools do not receive levy funds. This creates a significant cash flow challenge for charter school LEAs. These disparate payment percentages can result in a charter school LEA appearing to fail to meet financial performance indicators in those two months, where they would otherwise meet the indicators if the apportionment payment percentages were the same across all months.

### **Summary of Findings on Revenues and Expenditures**

- In the 2018-19 school year, per student revenue for nearly all of the charter schools is approximately \$2,000 to \$6,000 lower than the home district when the Outside revenues (gifts, grants, donations, and support from foundations) are excluded.
- The charter school LEAs per student expenditure was nearly identical to the home school district expenditure (approximately \$15,300 vs. \$15,450). However, the manner in which expenditures are attributed is considerably different.
  - The charter school LEA Administration costs are nearly double that of the home school districts (\$3,603 vs. \$1,872 per student).
  - The charter school LEA per student costs attributed to Maintenance and Operations are nearly double that of the home school districts (\$2,175 vs. \$1,124).
  - The charter school LEA per student costs attributed to Teaching are substantially lower than the Teaching costs for the home school district (\$7,882 vs. \$11,182).
- Charter school LEAs spent approximately eight to 17 percent of total revenues on the combination of charter authorizer fee (three or four percent) and an additional (five to 12 percent for schools with charter management organization fee agreements).

## SBE Review of Revenues

The SBE examined the 2018-19 revenues and expenditures reported on the OSPI Student Apportionment and Fiscal Services (SAFS) website for the charter LEAs and the home school districts (Table 21). 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.

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

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

Please be aware that 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.

For this analysis, revenues are derived from State sources, Local sources, or Outside sources. State revenues are subdivided into General Purpose Apportionment or Special Purpose revenue (Table 21). 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 2018-19, some school districts received additional state funding (e.g. infant special education funds, institutional, child-care funding, pilot program funding, funding

from other state agencies, and other assigned state monies) that the charter schools did not receive.

- Across the state, approximately 80 percent of the total per student revenue for a school district comes from the State General Purpose and the State Special Purpose Apportionment, while 71 percent of the total per student revenue for the charter school LEAs comes from the State General and Special Purpose Apportionments.
- The state apportionment is similar for the charter school LEAs and the home school districts, ranging from approximately \$10K to \$17K per student. Regarding the total State revenue (per student average), the apportionment of four charter school LEAs are similar to the home school district, five charter school LEAs are lower than the home school district, and three charter school LEAs are higher than the home school district.

Table 21: summary of revenues (expressed as per pupil dollars) for the 2018-19 school year for the charter school LEAs and the home school districts.

District (LEA) Name	Total State Revenue \$/Pupil	Total Local* Revenue \$/Pupil	Outside** Revenue \$/Pupil	Total Revenue Includes Outside** \$/Pupil	Total Revenue Excludes Outside** \$/Pupil
Rainier Prep	11,254	97	1,554	12,905	11,351
<b>Highline SD</b>	<b>12,427</b>	<b>2,943</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>15,425</b>	<b>15,370</b>
Excel	17,436	161	1,572	19,169	17,596
<b>Kent SD</b>	<b>11,675</b>	<b>2,200</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13,890</b>	<b>13,875</b>
Summit Sierra	10,390	88	3,515	13,993	10,478
Summit Atlas	12,590	65	3,948	16,604	12,655
Rainier Valley	13,786	90	4,646	18,523	13,876
<b>Seattle PS</b>	<b>11,949</b>	<b>4,484</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>16,635</b>	<b>16,432</b>
PRIDE Prep	10,893	275	1,076	12,245	11,169
Spokane International	10,221	224	1,347	11,792	10,445
<b>Spokane PS</b>	<b>11,514</b>	<b>1,927</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>13,465</b>	<b>13,441</b>
Destiny	12,224	1,246	8,086	21,555	13,469
Summit Olympus	12,414	65	7,198	19,676	12,478
Soar	12,613	133	2,497	15,242	12,745
<b>Tacoma SD</b>	<b>12,064</b>	<b>2,664</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>14,777</b>	<b>14,727</b>
Impact PS	13,247	149	971	14,367	13,396
<b>Tukwila SD</b>	<b>12,312</b>	<b>3,209</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>15,527</b>	<b>15,521</b>
Willow	10,108	2,838	2,860	15,806	12,946
<b>Walla Walla SD</b>	<b>11,048</b>	<b>1,588</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>12,688</b>	<b>12,636</b>

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

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

- Across the state, approximately 13 percent of the total per student revenue for a school district comes from the Local Tax, Local Non-Tax, and Other categories. Less than one percent of the total per student revenue for a charter school LEA comes from the Local Tax, Local Non-Tax, and Other categories (after excluding Destiny and Willow as outliers).
- The average student support from the Local and Other revenue source is approximately \$2,700 for the home school districts and is approximately \$135 for the charter school LEAs (after excluding Destiny and Willow as outliers).

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, as advised by the CSC. 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 or building improvements).

- Across the state, approximately \$43 (0.25 percent of the total) per student revenue for a school district comes from Outside sources.
- For the charter school LEAs, approximately \$2860 (16 percent on the total) per student revenue comes from Outside sources.

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

### **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 (Table 22). The charter school LEAs received an average revenue of approximately \$12,700 per student, while the home school districts yield an average of approximately \$14,600. Per student, revenue for most of the charter schools is approximately \$2,000 to \$6,000 lower than the home district after excluding the Outside revenues.

Table 22: summary of the 2018-19 per pupil revenues for school district and charter school LEAs. Dollar amounts shown are the average for home school districts and charter school LEAs.

District (LEA) Name	Total State Revenue \$/Pupil	Total Local* Revenue \$/Pupil	Outside** Revenue \$/Pupil	Total Revenue Includes Outside** \$/Pupil	Total Revenue Excludes Outside** \$/Pupil
Charter School LEAs	12,265	135	3,273	15,990	12,717
Home School Districts	11,855	2,716	58	14,629	14,572

Note: the Total Local Revenue for charter school LEAs does not include the data for Destiny and Excel, which were identified as outliers.

### 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 23).

Administration expenditures include costs attributed to the board of directors, superintendent’s office, business office, human resources, public relations, supervision of instruction, school principal’s office, and supervision of food services, transportation, and maintenance and operations. The home school districts expend approximately \$1,875 (12 percent of the total) per student on administration, while the charter school LEAs expend approximately \$3,600 per student (24 percent of the per student total) on administration. The Green Dot schools and Summit schools yielded some of the highest administration expenses (approximately \$4,000 to \$6,200 per student), which were two to three times greater than the home school districts.

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 \$7,900 vs. \$11,200) per student. All of the charter school LEAs (except for Excel, which spent \$1,400 more) spent approximately \$2,000 to \$4,500 per student less than the home school district.

The Maintenance and Operations expenditure category includes activities such as grounds maintenance, operations of buildings, building maintenance, cost of utilities, and costs attributed to building and property security. On average, the charter school LEAs spend nearly two times the amount (approximately \$2,175 vs. \$1,124) per student as the home school districts. The home school districts spend approximately 7.3 percent of total expenditures on Maintenance and Operations, while the charter school LEAs rate was 14.2 percent of the total per student expenditures.

Table 23: summary of expenditures (expressed as per pupil dollars) for the 2018-19 school year for the charter school LEAs and the home school districts.

District (LEA) Name	Admin. \$/Pupil	Teaching \$/Pupil	Maintenance Operations \$/Pupil	School Food Service \$/Pupil	Student Transport. \$/Pupil	Other \$/Pupil	Total \$/Pupil
Rainier Prep	2,680	7,270	496	391	689	261	11,786
<b>Highline SD</b>	<b>1,945</b>	<b>11,699</b>	<b>1,092</b>	<b>437</b>	<b>345</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>15,902</b>
Excel	3,812	11,234	2,682	600	1,277	567	20,171
<b>Kent SD</b>	<b>1,614</b>	<b>9,783</b>	<b>779</b>	<b>354</b>	<b>409</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>13,341</b>
Summit Sierra	3,938	7,694	2,145	135	596	351	14,860
Summit Atlas	4,449	8,078	3,184	364	668	490	17,232
Rainier Valley	5,975	9,358	2,645	714	1,262	342	20,296
<b>Seattle PS</b>	<b>2,073</b>	<b>12,076</b>	<b>1,264</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>692</b>	<b>398</b>	<b>16,753</b>
PRIDE Prep	1,719	6,624	1,629	448	822	626	11,868
Spokane Intl.	1,654	7,523	1,181	324	578	159	11,417
<b>Spokane PS</b>	<b>1,485</b>	<b>10,814</b>	<b>1,089</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>511</b>	<b>14,780</b>
Destiny	6,261	9,745	4,790	724	1,555	268	23,343
Summit Olympus	5,717	8,663	3,564	342	167	1,156	19,609
Soar	4,369	7,765	1,469	969	1,009	225	15,808
<b>Tacoma SD</b>	<b>2,096</b>	<b>11,177</b>	<b>1,243</b>	<b>417</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>332</b>	<b>15,725</b>
Impact PS	3,233	6,724	2,839	1,019	616	482	14,913
<b>Tukwila SD</b>	<b>2,300</b>	<b>11,407</b>	<b>1,121</b>	<b>619</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>407</b>	<b>16,178</b>
Willow	6,405	6,300	3,629	1,074	63	310	17,782
<b>Walla Walla SD</b>	<b>1,588</b>	<b>9,496</b>	<b>1,129</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>547</b>	<b>13,543</b>

Note: school district and LEA expenditures exceed the revenues shown on Table 21 because the revenue amounts do not include federal funds and cash on hand at the start of the school year.

The School Food Service expenditure category includes the cost of school food and food service operations. The home school districts spent approximately \$370 (2.4 percent of the total) per student on School Food Service, which is similar to the state average of \$360 (2.5 percent of the total) per student. The charter school LEAs spent a little more on school food service \$490 (3.2 percent of the total) per student. Three charter school LEAs reported Food Service expenditures of approximately \$1,000 (6.0 to 6.8 percent of the total) per student.

The Student Transportation expenditure category includes costs attributed to transportation operations, maintenance, and insurance. The charter school LEAs spent an average of approximately \$760 (5.0 percent of the total) per student on transportation, while the home school districts spent approximately \$490 (3.2 percent of the total) per student on transportation. Four charter school LEAs each spent \$1,000 to \$1,500 (6.2 to 6.7 percent of the total) per student on transportation.

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

principal, debt service, and public activities. Most of the charter school LEAs spend approximately \$200 to \$600 (1.2 to 2.8 percent of the total) per student expenditures and the home school districts spend approximately the same amount per student. One charter school LEA attributed approximately \$1,150 (5.9 percent of the total) per student to these Other expenditures.

### Total Expenditures

In the 2018-19 school year, the charter school LEAs expended approximately \$15,300 per student (Table 24), which compares favorably to the home school districts expenditure of approximately \$15,450. Charter school LEA per student costs attributed to Administration are nearly double that of the home school districts (\$3,603 vs. \$1,872). The charter school LEA per student costs attributed to Teaching are far less than the costs for the home school district (\$7,882 vs. \$11,182). The charter school LEA per student costs attributed to Maintenance and Operations are much higher than the home school districts (\$2,175 vs. \$1,124). The expenditures related to Food Service, Student Transportation, and Other expenses for charter school LEAs and home school districts are individually similar, but in combination (\$1,676 vs. \$1,276), the charter school LEAs are somewhat higher.

Table 24: summary of the 2018-19 per pupil expenditures for home school district and charter school LEAs. Dollar amounts shown are the average for home school districts and charter school LEAs.

District (LEA) Name	Admin \$/Pupil	Teaching \$/Pupil	Maintenance Operations \$/Pupil	School Food Service \$/Pupil	Student Transport. \$/Pupil	Other \$/Pupil	Total \$/Pupil
Charter School LEAs	3,603	7,882	2,175	493	762	421	15,300
Home School Districts	1,872	11,182	1,124	372	492	412	15,450

Charter school LEAs must budget for an expenditure not applicable to the traditional public school districts, the authorizer oversight fee. In the 2018-19 school year and as provided for in RCW 28A.710.110, the CSC collected three percent of the state funds allocated to the charter schools under the CSC authority, while the Spokane Public School collected four percent of the state funds allocated to the two charter schools under the Spokane’s authority. The authorizer must use the oversight fee exclusively for fulfilling the authorizer’s duties specified in statute, which include but are not limited to the following:

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

Another expense incurred by many charter schools is a fee paid to the charter management organization (CMO) for a wide range of services and support. For a variety of reasons, charter

school founders choose to engage with CMOs for start-up and operational support. CMOs often provide back office functions for charter schools to take advantage of economies of scale, but some also provide a wider range of services (e.g., hiring, professional development, data analysis, public relations and advocacy). CMOs differ from the vendors that schools may contract with for specific services, primarily because CMOs have considerable influence over the instructional design and operations of their affiliated charter schools.

In the 2018-19 school year, seven of the charter schools authorized by the CSC were contractually engaged with CMOs. The seven charter schools paid approximately \$3.13 million to their respective CMOs in the approximate amounts.

- To Summit Schools CMO, \$1,900,000
  - Summit Atlas \$706,000
  - Summit Olympus \$504,000
  - Summit Sierra \$690,000
- To Green Dot Schools CMO, \$778,000
  - Green Dot Destiny \$150,500
  - Green Dot Excel \$364,500
  - Green Dot Rainier Valley \$263,000
- To Impact Schools CMO, \$447,000 (Impact | Puget Sound Elementary)

In a [report on CMOs](#) by the Center for Reinventing Public Education (CRPE), charter schools are challenged as they receive fewer dollars per pupil than the home school districts, and yet, they must pay for their school buildings, purchase business services and support staff, and recruit teaching staff and students. The CMO model generates the benefits of the economies of scale, collaborative opportunities, and support structures in an autonomous and entrepreneurial environment. If the charter schools were supported in a manner more like TPSs, the \$3.13 million dollars transferred to CMOs in 2018-19 might have remained in Washington school districts in exchange for providing the needed supports and services.

### **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, with a sliding scale based on number of schools authorized, not to exceed four percent of each charter school's annual funding ([WAC 180-19-060](#)). The fee structure stipulates that an authorizer of 10 or more schools would be set at three percent of the state operating funding allocation for each authorized school. The rate is set at four percent of the state operating funding allocation for an authorizer of fewer than ten schools.

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.

### **Section III - Recommended Changes to State Law or Policy**

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

- **Streamline authorizer application:** The final rules eliminate the requirement for a notice of intent from districts seeking to become authorizers. In addition, there are minor revisions to the authorizer application requirements including elimination of job descriptions and resumes for staff working on authorization (a requirement for the district to describe staff resources devoted to charter authorizing and oversight is maintained).
- **Transition to a performance based authorizer fee structure:** The current fee structure relies upon the number of schools authorized regardless of enrollment. However, the state funding allotment uses student enrollment. The proposed change would transition to a performance based model that takes in to account the needs identified by the authorizer, charter school enrollment, financial stability, performance challenges, and other situations as identified by the authorizer or the Board.
- **Changes to reporting dates:** With the passage of HB 2853 (2020), the deadline for the Board's annual report was moved from December 1 to March 1, each year. This change provides more time for authorizers to review student data and provide their reports to the Board. The final rule now aligns with the state law adopted in the 2020 legislative session.
- **Other changes:** In addition to those changes described above, the final rules clean up language and update information (such as a change in the agency email address).

This year, legislation (HB 1195 and companion bill SB 5443) was introduced to extend the timeframe for establishing charter schools by five more years, to April 3, 2026. At the time of this report, the Legislature is still in session. However, the bill did not advance out of committee before the policy deadline, so the bill is unlikely to move forward.

The SBE anticipates a thorough review of the charter school rules and statutes in advance of the 2022 legislative session for the purpose of updating language and clarifying processes contained in statute and rule.

The SBE finds that charter schools face unique challenges with regard to funding due to lack of access to public funding for capital and lower appropriation per student due to a lack of access to equivalent state funding to make up for the fact that local funding is not available. The SBE

recommends a close examination the sufficiency of charter school funding and approaches used in other states.

In an effort to provide additional information that would assist the SBE regarding RCW 28A.710.250 (2), the Commission provided the following information regarding changes to RCW 28A.710 that would strengthen the state’s charter public schools.

<b>Charter School Commission Recommendations</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Continue to explore the sufficiency of charter public school funding in combination with an authorizer’s oversight fee. The oversight fee is a tax that only charter public school must pay and this increases the inequity of public funding between charter public schools and traditional public schools.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Clarify that a charter public school administrator can directly file complaints regarding certificated staff for immorality, violation of written contract, unprofessional conduct, intemperance, or crime against the law of the state directly to the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. Currently, charter public school administrator must file the complaint with their local Educational Service District who is then tasked with making the formal complaint to OSPI. Clarification of RCW 28A.410.090 (1) (a) and (b) are required to make this change.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Consider updating RCW 28A.300.750 (e) (i) and (ii) to include charter public authorizers. This would make it clear that charter public schools may seek a waiver from the State Board of Education regarding graduation requirements while respecting the role the authorizer plays in a charter public schools’ existence.</li></ul>

The Spokane PS provided additional information regarding potential changes to RCW 28A.710 that the Spokane PS believes would strengthen the state’s charter schools and authorizing practices.

<b>Spokane Public Schools Recommendations</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The timing of school district apportionment has lower payments made in the months that levy dollars are received by traditional districts. Given charter schools do not receive levy dollars this creates cash flow challenges in those months. We would recommend evaluation of the payment schedule and make an adjustment to the payment schedule.</li></ul>

## **Appendix A: Detailed Performance Analysis**

### **Part A: Academic Performance of the Charter Schools**

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

The SBE is directed in RCW 28A.710.250 to issue the annual report on the performance of the state's charter schools during the preceding year, meaning that this report is to elaborate on the academic performance and educational outcomes for the charter schools operating during the 2019-20 school year. However, the closure of schools due to the COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent cancellation of the statewide assessment administration in the spring 2020 eliminates much of the educational data used for the required analysis. Changes to the required educational data is as follows:

- No test score data is available for the 2019-20 school year,
- No growth model data is available for the 2019-20 school year, and
- The ability to generate and the validity of a winter 2021 WSIF is in question.

Because it is impossible to issue the annual report describing the performance of the state's charter schools for the 2019-20 school year, this part of the report will include the results of the most recent assessment administration, that which occurred in the spring 2019.

### **Limitations**

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

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

## Fast Facts: Green Dot Rainier Valley Leadership Academy

- Rainier Valley served 319 students in the 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup>, and 10<sup>th</sup> grades in the 2019-20 school year.
- Approximately 76 percent of Rainier Valley’s students identify as Black, which is more than five times the rate of the Seattle PS and much higher than the state rate. Rainier Valley’s FRL rate (63 percent) is double the Seattle PS FRL rate and approximately 17 percentage points higher than the state FRL rate.

For the 2018-19 school year, the following assessment results from Figure A3 are noteworthy:

- For ELA proficiency, the reportable student groups at Rainier Valley generally perform lower than the corresponding groups for the Seattle PS and the state. The Black student group performs similar to the Seattle PS and a little lower than the state.
- For math proficiency, the performance of the reportable student groups at Rainier Valley is mixed. The All Students group performs lower than the Seattle PS and the state, while the Black and Hispanic student groups perform higher than the Seattle PS and the state. However, students identifying with Two or More Races performed lower than the Seattle PS and the state.
- Rainier Valley does not serve a grade level in which the science assessment is administered.

Figure A3: compares the academic performance of Green Dot Rainier Valley to the Seattle public schools and Washington.

ELA Proficiency Rates (SBA)	Rainier Valley (6-7)	Seattle PS (6-7)	Washington (6-7)
All Students	35.2	70.0	58.8
Native American		50.3	28.1
Asian	--	73.9	78.6
Black	34.7	35.9	39.6
Hispanic	39.1	49.5	41.7
Pacific Islander		29.0	36.1
White	--	83.8	66.2
Two or More Races	27.3	73.7	61.7
Limited English	< 8.0	12.0	9.5
Low-Income	33.3	44.4	42.4
Special Education	< 9.0	32.2	16.9

Math Proficiency Rates (SBA)	Rainier Valley (6-7)	Seattle PS (6-7)	Washington (6-7)
All Students	37.7	62.4	47.8
Native American		39.7	19.5
Asian	--	71.4	74.3
Black	36.7	25.3	25.9
Hispanic	47.8	40.3	30.1
Pacific Islander		29.0	23.6
White	--	75.4	54.9
Two or More Races	45.5	64.9	49.3
Limited English	13.2	14.5	9.1
Low-Income	34.7	35.7	30.5
Special Education	12.1	26.1	11.7

\*Note: the “--” shows where the data were suppressed to protect personally identifying information.

### Fast Facts: Rainier Prep

- Rainier Prep served 350 students in the 5<sup>th</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grades in the 2019-20 school year.
- Approximately 40 percent of Rainier Prep’s students identify as Black, which is triple the rate of the Highline SD and much higher than the state rate. Rainier Prep’s FRL rate (79 percent) is higher than the Highline SD FRL rate and approximately 33 percentage points higher than the state FRL rate.

For the 2018-19 school year, the following assessment results from Figure A4 are noteworthy:

- For ELA proficiency, all of the reportable student groups (except for the students with a disability group) at Rainier Prep perform at least 10 percentage points higher than the corresponding groups for the Highline SD and most groups perform approximately 10 to 20 percentage points higher than the corresponding measure for the state.
- For math proficiency, the performance of all of the reportable student groups at Rainier Prep is approximately 25 to 40 percentage points higher than the corresponding measures for groups from the Highline SD and substantially higher than the state rates.
- For science, Rainier Prep student groups outperform the corresponding groups for the Highline SD by approximately 10 to 25 percentage points and approximately five to ten percentage points higher than the state. Black and Hispanic student groups notably outperform the district and the state.

Figure A4: compares the academic performance of Rainier Prep to the Highline school district and Washington.

ELA Proficiency Rates (SBA)	Rainier Prep (5-8)	Highline SD (5-8)	Washington (5-8)
<b>All Students</b>	60.8	48.5	59.0
Native American		27.3	29.1
Asian	76.0	63.7	78.4
Black	55.9	42.7	40.3
Hispanic	54.1	37.8	41.9
Pacific Islander	--	31.6	35.3
White	86.4	64.8	66.3
Two or More Races	76.9	57.8	62.1
Limited English	39.7	10.5	10.2
Low-Income	56.6	41.1	42.6
Special Education	12.8	11.8	18.0

Math Proficiency Rates (SBA)	Rainier Prep (5-8)	Highline SD (5-8)	Washington (5-8)
<b>All Students</b>	61.8	33.8	47.4
Native American		< 10.0	20.2
Asian	> 90.0	54.0	73.7
Black	53.8	25.2	25.9
Hispanic	56.6	21.1	29.9
Pacific Islander	--	17.5	24.0
White	81.1	52.6	54.4
Two or More Races	80.8	41.7	48.7
Limited English	41.8	6.7	9.7
Low-Income	58.3	26.2	30.3
Special Education	15.4	7.9	12.4

Science Proficiency Rates (WCAS)	Rainier Prep (5-8)	Highline SD (5-8)	Washington (5-8)
<b>All Students</b>	55.1	37.3	52.4
Native American		36.4	24.9
Asian	78.6	51.7	71.2
Black	45.3	24.3	29.5
Hispanic	53.4	26.0	32.2
Pacific Islander	--	17.4	22.7
White	69.2	59.6	61.6
Two or More Races	60.0	46.7	55.0
Limited English	32.8	6.5	8.1
Low-Income	51.8	28.7	34.8
Special Education	14.8	10.0	19.0

\*Note: the “--” shows where the data were suppressed to protect personally identifying information.

### Fast Facts: PRIDE Prep

- PRIDE Prep served 569 students in the 6<sup>th</sup> through 11<sup>th</sup> grades in the 2019-20 school year.
- The student demographics for PRIDE Prep are remarkably similar to the demographics for the Spokane PS. PRIDE Prep serves a higher percent of White students and has a higher FRL rate than the state.

For 2018-19, the following assessment results from Figure A5 are noteworthy:

- For ELA proficiency, the results for the student groups at PRIDE Prep are mixed as some groups (e.g. Native American, Low-Income, and Special Education) outperform the district and state a little, while other groups (e.g. Black and White) perform a little lower than the Spokane PS and the state.
- For math proficiency, the results for the student groups at PRIDE Prep are mixed. The Native American student group outperforms the district and state, while other groups (e.g. Asian and White) perform substantially lower than the district and state. The Black student group performs a little better than the Spokane PS but lower than the state.
- For science, the performance of the student groups at PRIDE Prep is mixed as some groups (e.g. Students with a Disability and Low-Income) outperform the district and state, while the All Students group performs a little lower than the Spokane PS and the state. The Black student group performs higher than the Spokane PS and similar to the state.

Figure A5: compares the academic performance of PRIDE Prep to the Spokane public schools and Washington.

ELA Proficiency Rates (SBA)	PRIDE Prep (6-10)	Spokane PS (6-10)	Washington (6-10)
<b>All Students</b>	<b>57.0</b>	<b>58.8</b>	<b>61.3</b>
Native American	37.5	33.1	33.5
Asian	70.0	63.0	79.8
Black	31.7	36.1	42.3
Hispanic	--	47.8	44.6
Pacific Islander	--	17.8	37.2
White	61.9	65.1	68.4
Two or More Races	--	50.1	63.7
Limited English	--	9.4	11.5
Low-Income	49.3	45.3	44.9
Special Education	24.6	15.9	17.7

Math Proficiency Rates (SBA)	PRIDE Prep (6-10)	Spokane PS (6-10)	Washington (6-10)
<b>All Students</b>	<b>30.2</b>	<b>41.2</b>	<b>45.4</b>
Native American	20.8	11.4	18.6
Asian	20.0	51.2	72.3
Black	19.5	18.0	23.6
Hispanic	--	29.2	27.5
Pacific Islander	--	< 10.0	21.2
White	34.0	47.3	52.1
Two or More Races	--	32.6	46.3
Limited English	--	< 5.0	8.7
Low-Income	24.2	27.3	27.8
Special Education	8.8	7.4	9.6

Science Proficiency Rates (WCAS)	PRIDE Prep (8)	Spokane PS (8)	Washington (8)
<b>All Students</b>	<b>45.1</b>	<b>50.1</b>	<b>51.6</b>
Native American	--	< 10.0	23.8
Asian	--	55.6	71.3
Black	28.6	24.1	28.9
Hispanic	--	38.8	31.6
Pacific Islander	--	6.3	21.9
White	56.9	57.8	60.4
Two or More Races	--	38.0	53.1
Limited English	--	6.3	8.1
Low-Income	41.1	36.9	33.9
Special Education	27.3	14.3	15.6

\*Note: the "--" shows where the data were suppressed to protect personally identifying information.

## Fast Facts: Spokane International Academy

- Spokane International Academy (SIA) served 436 students in kindergarten through 8<sup>th</sup> grades in the 2019-20 school year.
- Approximately 73 percent of SIA's students identify as White, which is a little higher than the Spokane PS and higher than the state rate. SIA's FRL rate (47 percent) is approximately 11.5 percentage points lower than the Spokane PS FRL rate and similar to the state FRL rate.

For the 2018-19 school year, the following assessment results from Figure A6 are noteworthy:

- For ELA proficiency, the reportable student groups at SIA perform uniformly higher than the corresponding groups for the Spokane PS and higher than the corresponding measure for the state.
- For math proficiency, the performance of reportable student groups at SIA is mostly higher than the corresponding measures for groups from the Spokane PS and are mostly similar to the corresponding rates for the state. However, the performance of the students with a disability is a little lower than the Spokane PS and the state.
- For science, the reportable SIA student groups mostly outperform the corresponding groups for both the Spokane PS and the state.

Figure A6: compares the academic performance of Spokane International Academy to the Spokane public schools and Washington.

ELA Proficiency Rates (SBA)	SIA (K-8)	Spokane (K-8)	Washington (K-8)
<b>All Students</b>	<b>72.5</b>	<b>54.5</b>	<b>58.0</b>
Native American	--	27.4	28.4
Asian	--	53.7	76.9
Black	--	32.1	40.0
Hispanic	61.5	41.9	40.7
Pacific Islander		15.9	34.6
White	76.7	61.0	65.5
Two or More Races	64.3	45.9	61.1
Limited English	--	8.4	12.3
Low-Income	60.3	41.6	41.7
Special Education	30.0	18.8	20.3

Math Proficiency Rates (SBA)	SIA (K-8)	Spokane (K-8)	Washington (K-8)
<b>All Students</b>	<b>50.6</b>	<b>46.5</b>	<b>50.3</b>
Native American	--	24.6	23.3
Asian	--	54.8	75.0
Black	--	22.4	29.3
Hispanic	39.5	34.0	32.9
Pacific Islander		< 10.0	27.5
White	54.3	52.8	57.3
Two or More Races	47.6	37.7	51.8
Limited English	--	< 10.0	14.1
Low-Income	41.4	33.5	33.6
Special Education	12.0	14.4	16.9

Science Proficiency Rates (WCAS)	SIA (5, 8)	Spokane (5, 8)	Washington (5, 8)
<b>All Students</b>	<b>59.8</b>	<b>50.3</b>	<b>52.4</b>
Native American	--	14.3	24.9
Asian	--	48.1	71.2
Black	--	24.6	29.5
Hispanic	50.0	36.2	32.2
Pacific Islander		8.3	22.7
White	60.3	57.2	61.6
Two or More Races	61.5	41.8	55.0
Limited English	--	6.9	8.1
Low-Income	48.9	38.0	34.8
Special Education	28.6	17.3	19.0

\*Note: the "--" shows where the data were suppressed to protect personally identifying information.

### Fast Facts: Summit Atlas

- Summit Atlas served 539 students in the 6<sup>th</sup> through the 11<sup>th</sup> grades in the 2019-20 school year.
- Approximately 35 percent of Atlas' students identify as Black, which is more than double the rate of Seattle PS and much higher than the state rate. Atlas' FRL rate (52 percent) is 20 percentage points higher than Seattle PS FRL rate and approximately seven percentage points higher than the state FRL rate.

For the 2018-19 school year, the following assessment results from Figure A8 are noteworthy:

- For ELA proficiency, the performance of the reportable student groups at Atlas is mixed, as some groups (e.g. Hispanic and English learners) perform higher than the corresponding groups for Seattle PS and the state while some groups (e.g. Black) perform similar to or lower than Seattle PS and or the state.
- For math proficiency, the performance of reportable student groups at Atlas is mostly mixed as most groups outperform the state rates. Some student groups perform lower than the Seattle PS (e.g. White and Two or More Races), while some groups (e.g. Black and Hispanic) perform at a higher level.
- In the 2018-19 school year, Atlas did not serve a grade level, which is assessed in science; hence, there are no reportable results.

Figure A8: compares the academic performance of Summit Atlas to the Seattle public schools and Washington.

ELA Proficiency Rates (SBA)	Atlas (6-7 & 9-10)	Seattle PS (6-7 & 9-10)	Washington (6-7 & 9-10)
<b>All Students</b>	<b>58.3</b>	<b>71.9</b>	<b>62.4</b>
Native American	--	52.4	34.9
Asian	--	76.3	80.4
Black	41.4	39.6	43.5
Hispanic	60.5	52.1	45.8
Pacific Islander	--	24.9	38.8
White	75.0	84.7	69.5
Two or More Races	53.3	74.6	64.8
Limited English	23.3	13.9	12.0
Low-Income	45.1	47.3	46.0
Special Education	33.3	32.5	18.7

Math Proficiency Rates (SBA)	Atlas (6-7 & 9-10)	Seattle PS (6-7 & 9-10)	Washington (6-7 & 9-10)
<b>All Students</b>	<b>51.2</b>	<b>58.7</b>	<b>45.2</b>
Native American	--	35.2	18.8
Asian	--	69.8	72.0
Black	39.1	22.3	23.6
Hispanic	47.4	35.6	27.2
Pacific Islander	--	26.7	21.1
White	63.6	71.4	52.0
Two or More Races	53.3	60.4	46.4
Limited English	16.7	13.3	8.4
Low-Income	36.8	32.9	27.6
Special Education	21.4	20.8	9.7

\*Note: the "--" shows where the data were suppressed to protect personally identifying information.



### Fast Facts: Summit Olympus

- Summit Olympus served 183 students in the 9<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grades in the 2019-20 school year.
- At Olympus, the percentage of students who identify as Black and those receiving special education services are higher than the Tacoma SD and higher than the state rate. Olympus' FRL rate (77 percent) is approximately 15 percentage points higher than the Tacoma SD FRL rate and more than 30 percentage points higher than the state FRL rate.

For the 2018-19 school year, the following assessment results from Figure A9 are noteworthy:

- For ELA proficiency, the student groups at Olympus perform 15 to 20 percentage points higher than the groups for the Tacoma SD and up to 12 percentage points higher than the state.
- For math proficiency, the performance of reportable student groups at Olympus is 10 to 15 percentage points higher than the corresponding measures for groups from the Tacoma SD and up to 13 percentage points higher than the corresponding state rate.
- For science, Olympus student groups perform as well as or better than the corresponding groups for both the Tacoma SD and the state. The Hispanic student group performed approximately six percentage points higher than the state.

Figure A9: compares the academic performance of Summit Olympus to the Tacoma school district and Washington.

ELA Proficiency Rates (SBA)	Olympus (9-12)	Tacoma SD (9-12)	Washington (9-12)
<b>All Students</b>	<b>73.7</b>	<b>55.5</b>	<b>69.7</b>
Native American		47.4	48.4
Asian	--	68.2	83.9
Black	--	39.9	51.4
Hispanic	--	41.0	54.0
Pacific Islander	--	17.4	44.1
White	85.7	67.5	76.2
Two or More Races	--	54.5	71.2
Limited English	--	13.9	16.9
Low-Income	65.4	42.6	53.4
Special Education	--	10.3	22.5

Math Proficiency Rates (SBA)	Olympus (9-12)	Tacoma SD (9-12)	Washington (9-12)
<b>All Students</b>	<b>42.1</b>	<b>27.3</b>	<b>40.2</b>
Native American		21.1	17.5
Asian	--	48.4	67.5
Black	--	11.1	19.1
Hispanic	--	15.3	21.5
Pacific Islander	--	10.9	16.2
White	57.1	35.1	46.3
Two or More Races	--	24.0	40.7
Limited English	--	7.5	7.0
Low-Income	34.6	16.7	21.8
Special Education	--	2.1	5.6

Science Proficiency Rates (WCAS)	Olympus (11)	Tacoma SD (11)	Washington (11)
<b>All Students</b>	<b>36.4</b>	<b>38.0</b>	<b>34.5</b>
Native American	--	15.0	21.9
Asian	--	46.2	43.1
Black	--	18.6	15.3
Hispanic	28.6	28.0	22.7
Pacific Islander	--	10.4	16.3
White	--	51.1	39.9
Two or More Races	45.5	32.3	35.6
Limited English	--	7.1	5.1
Low-Income	28.0	27.3	25.0
Special Education	14.3	10.8	10.7

\*Note: the "--" shows where the data were suppressed to protect personally identifying information.

### Fast Facts: Summit Sierra

- Summit Sierra served 345 students in the 9<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grades in the 2019-20 school year.
- Approximately 33 percent of Sierra’s students identify as Black, which is more than double the rate of Seattle PS and much higher than the state rate. Sierra’s FRL rate (35 percent) is just a little higher than Seattle PS FRL rate and approximately ten percentage points lower the state FRL rate.

For the 2018-19 school year, the following assessment results from Figure A10 are noteworthy:

- For ELA proficiency, the performance for Sierra is mixed. Black, students identifying with Two or More Races, and low-income students performed five to 24 percentage points lower than the Seattle PS. However, English learners and students receiving special education services at Sierra perform substantially higher than the corresponding groups for Seattle PS.
- For math, the performance Black, English learners, and students receiving special education services at Sierra perform up to 30 percentage points higher than the Seattle PS, but the low-income student group performs seven percentage point lower than the Seattle PS. Sierra performs similar to or higher than the state.
- For science, Sierra students perform mostly lower than the groups for the Seattle PS and the state, except for the White student group, which performed 20 to 35 percentage points higher than both did.

Figure A10: compares the academic performance of Summit Sierra to the Seattle public schools and Washington.

ELA Proficiency Rates (SBA)	Sierra (9-12)	Seattle PS (9-12)	Washington (9-12)
<b>All Students</b>	<b>60.2</b>	<b>75.7</b>	<b>69.7</b>
Native American		56.5	48.4
Asian	--	81.0	83.9
Black	38.2	47.1	51.4
Hispanic	--	57.4	54.0
Pacific Islander		16.7	44.1
White	82.4	88.0	76.2
Two or More Races	52.9	76.5	71.2
Limited English	36.4	17.7	16.9
Low-Income	48.6	53.3	53.4
Special Education	55.0	33.0	22.5

Math Proficiency Rates (SBA)	Sierra (9-12)	Seattle PS (9-12)	Washington (9-12)
<b>All Students</b>	<b>43.9</b>	<b>51.3</b>	<b>40.2</b>
Native American		26.1	17.5
Asian	--	66.5	67.5
Black	20.6	16.3	19.1
Hispanic	--	26.2	21.5
Pacific Islander		22.2	16.2
White	64.7	63.5	46.3
Two or More Races	41.2	51.5	40.7
Limited English	27.3	11.0	7.0
Low-Income	20.0	27.3	21.8
Special Education	35.0	10.2	5.6

Science Proficiency Rates (SBA)	Sierra (9-12)	Seattle PS (9-12)	Washington (9-12)
<b>All Students</b>	<b>25.9</b>	<b>24.6</b>	<b>34.5</b>
Native American		8.3	21.9
Asian	--	36.3	43.1
Black	< 8.0	11.9	15.3
Hispanic	--	15.2	22.7
Pacific Islander		15.4	16.3
White	61.9	27.3	39.9
Two or More Races	18.2	25.9	35.6
Limited English	--	4.9	5.1
Low-Income	< 8.0	18.9	25.0
Special Education	< 10.0	6.9	10.7

\*Note: the “--” shows where the data were suppressed to protect personally identifying information.

**Fast Facts: Willow Public School**

- Willow Public School (Innovations School) served 49 students in the 6<sup>th</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grades in the 2019-20 school year.
- Approximately 49 percent of Willow’s students identify as Hispanic, which is eight percentage points higher than the Walla Walla SD rate and double the state rate. Willow’s FRL rate (61 percent) is similar to the Walla Walla SD FRL rate and 16 percentage points higher than the state FRL rate.

For the 2018-19 school year, the following assessment results from Figure A11 are noteworthy:

- For ELA proficiency, the reportable student groups at Willow performed much lower than the corresponding groups for the Walla Walla SD and the state.
- For math proficiency, student groups at Willow performed significantly lower than the corresponding groups for the Walla Walla SD and the state.
- For science, Willow served a very small number of 8<sup>th</sup> graders in 2018-19. As a result, all of the results for the science assessment were suppressed to protect student privacy.

Figure A11: compares the academic performance of Willow public school to the Walla Walla public schools and Washington.

ELA Proficiency Rates (SBA)	Willow (6-8)	Walla Walla SD (6-8)	Washington (6-8)
All Students	17.1	50.5	58.5
Native American	--	--	28.5
Asian	--	--	78.4
Black	--	--	39.2
Hispanic	10.8	33.9	41.4
Pacific Islander		--	34.9
White	25.8	64.0	65.8
Two or More Races	--	40.3	61.2
Limited English	< 10.0	< 10.0	9.6
Low-Income	12.5	33.5	42.0
Special Education	< 10.0	< 10.0	16.1

Math Proficiency Rates (SBA)	Willow (6-8)	Walla Walla SD (6-8)	Washington (6-8)
All Students	7.9	38.6	47.1
Native American	--	--	19.0
Asian	--	--	73.8
Black	--	--	25.1
Hispanic	< 8.0	21.8	29.5
Pacific Islander		--	22.9
White	16.1	51.3	54.1
Two or More Races	--	32.5	48.2
Limited English	< 10.0	< 10.0	9.3
Low-Income	< 8.0	21.6	29.7
Special Education	< 10.0	< 10.0	10.9

\*Note: the “--” shows where the data were suppressed to protect personally identifying information.

**Fast Fact: Impact | Puget Sound Elementary**

- Impact Puget Sound served 285 students in kindergarten and the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> grades in the 2019-20 school year. No assessment results are available.

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

### Data Sources and Data Processing

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

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

While it is important to report on the statistical significance of group means in work of this nature, it is at least equally important to quantify the magnitude of the effect associated with the treatment or experimental variable (Table A12). When reporting on *t*-test results, Cohen's *d* is a standardized measure of effect size, which provides additional context regarding the magnitude of the difference between group means. For the Independent Samples *t*-test, Cohen's *d* is the mean difference between the two groups, divided the result by the pooled standard deviation. Results are characterized as "practically significant" when the difference is medium or large.

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

materials describing the [Washington growth model](#) for the public and school staff, which are available on the OSPI website.

Table A12: describes the effect size (Cohen’s *d*) provides additional context as to the practical significance or meaningfulness of an experimental treatment.

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

A student growth percentile (SGP) is a derived percentile value or rank, and when aggregated, SGPs are reported as a median value, which usually differs from the mean (average) value. Group differences in SGP medians and measures not meeting the parametric assumptions were evaluated through the Mann-Whitney *U* Test of medians. Eta squared is the measure of effect size providing additional context regarding the magnitude of the difference between group medians (Table A13). For the Mann-Whitney *U*-test, the eta squared effect size is  $Z^2/(N-1)$ .

Table A13: describes the effect size (eta squared) and provides additional context as to the practical significance or meaningfulness of an experimental treatment.

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

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

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

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

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

### **Design and Statistical Methods**

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

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

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

- The treatment group is comprised of students enrolled in charter schools with valid scores for either or both of the Smarter Balanced (SBA) English language arts (ELA) and mathematics assessments. Most, but not all of the treatment group members, also have valid results for the Washington Comprehensive Assessment of Science (WCAS) in the grade levels, which are tested.

- A comparison group comprised of demographically and academically similar students enrolled in traditional public schools (TPS) was created through a one-by-one matching process.

Exact matching criteria included grade level, gender, federal race and ethnicity coding, Free and Reduced Price Lunch program (FRL) status, English Learner (EL) status, and special education (SWD) status (Figure A14). The matching criteria included prior year SBA scale scores in ELA and math. In order to be matched or paired, the ELA or math scores could not differ by more than 25 scale score points, which is relatively small as typical SBA scores range from approximately 2200 to 2600. Other matching criteria considered in the protocol included Section 504 status, the aggregated number of absences during the school year, the number of exclusionary discipline events, the number of days out of school related to exclusionary disciplinary events, and the language spoken at home. In the matching process, each student’s home district was considered and used as matching criteria. As examples, a student at a Spokane charter school was matched to a similar student in a Spokane TPS, and a student at a Tacoma charter school was matched to a similar student in a Tacoma TPS and each would have scored approximately the same on the ELA and math assessments in the prior year. In some instances, the matched TPS student attended school in a different, but nearby school district.

Figure A14: shows the matching criteria used in creating the control group of TPS students.

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

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

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

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

Table A15 and Table A16 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 A15: Race and ethnicity composition of the comparison and treatment student groups for the 3<sup>rd</sup> through 10<sup>th</sup> grade students addressed in this analysis.

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

Table A16: Program participation, attendance, and prior score patterns for the comparison and treatment groups for the 3<sup>rd</sup> through 10<sup>th</sup> grader students addressed in this analysis.

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

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



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

## Data from the Statistical Analyses

### ELA Tables

Table A17: ELA scale score differences from spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019 statewide assessments for 3<sup>rd</sup> to 10 grade students based on charter school enrollment.

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

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

Table A18: ELA scale score differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) of statewide assessments for 3<sup>rd</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> grade students by grade level and based on charter school enrollment.

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

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

Table A19: ELA proficiency rate differences from spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019 statewide assessments for 3<sup>rd</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> grade students based on charter school enrollment.

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

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

Table A20: ELA score differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) of statewide assessments for 3<sup>rd</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> grade students by race/ethnicity and charter school enrollment.

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

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

Table A21: ELA scale score differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) of statewide assessments for 3<sup>rd</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> grade students by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

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

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

Table A22: ELA student growth percentile median differences from spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019 statewide assessments for 4<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> grade students based on charter school enrollment.

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

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

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

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

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

Table A24: ELA SGP differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) for 4<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> grade students by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

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

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

### Math Tables

Table A25: Math scale score differences from spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019 statewide assessments for 3<sup>rd</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> grade students based on charter school enrollment.

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

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

Table A26: Math scale score differences from spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019 statewide assessments by grade and based on charter school enrollment.

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

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

Table A27: math, proficiency rate, differences from spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019 statewide assessments for 3<sup>rd</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> grade students based on charter school enrollment.

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

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

Table A28: math score differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) of statewide assessments for 3<sup>rd</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> grades by race/ethnicity and charter school enrollment.

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

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

Table A29: math scale score differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) of statewide assessments for 3<sup>rd</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> grade students by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

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

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

Table A30: math student growth percentile median differences from spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019 statewide assessments for 4<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> grade students based on charter school enrollment.

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

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

Table A31: math SGP differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) for 4<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> grade students by race/ethnicity and based on charter school enrollment.

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

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



Table A32: math SGP differences aggregated over three years (spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019) for 4<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> grade students by program participation and based on charter school enrollment.

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

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

### Science Tables

Table A33: Science scale score differences from spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019 statewide assessments based on charter school enrollment.

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

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

Table A34: Science proficiency rate differences from spring 2017, spring 2018, and spring 2019 statewide assessments based on charter school enrollment.

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

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

Table A35: Science scale score differences from spring 2018 and spring 2019 statewide assessments for 5<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, and 11<sup>th</sup> grade students based on charter school enrollment.

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

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