

DRAFT



# CHARTER SCHOOLS ANNUAL REPORT

December 2019



*The Washington State Board of Education envisions an education system where students are engaged in personalized education pathways that prepare them for civic engagement, careers, postsecondary education, and lifelong learning.*

## **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.

Questions regarding this report should be directed 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
Charter Schools in Washington.....	6
Overview of the Academic Performance of Charter Schools .....	10
Section I - 2018-2019 Charter School Performance.....	10
Summary of Findings.....	11
Academic Performance of Charter School Students in Washington.....	12
Section II – Meeting the purposes of Washington’s Charter Schools Act.....	20
Areas for Improvement:.....	22
Funding Sufficiency for Charter Schools.....	22
Efficacy of the Funding for Charter School Authorizers.....	25
Section III - Recommended Changes to State Law or Policy.....	25
Appendix A: Detailed Performance Analysis.....	27
Part A: Academic Performance of the Charter Schools.....	27
Part B: Performance of Charter School Students and Similar TPS Students.....	38

## Executive Summary

Washington State's Charter School Act (RCW 28A.710) was enacted on April 3, 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<sup>1</sup>. A Washington charter public 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 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 third annual report, the data represent three 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 of the charter public schools serve higher percentages of students living in poverty, higher percentages of students with disabilities, higher percentages of students of color, but lower percentages of English Learners than the state average or than the home school districts.
2. Regarding the percentage of students meeting standard on the statewide assessments for the spring 2019 administration, the performance of the charter schools is mixed:

---

<sup>1</sup> An "At-risk student" is defined in statute as a student who has an academic or economic disadvantage that requires assistance or special services to succeed in educational programs. The term includes, but is not limited to, students who do not meet minimum standards of academic proficiency, students who are at risk of dropping out of high school, students in chronically low-performing schools, students with higher than average disciplinary sanctions, 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.

- a. Three charter schools posted results that were better than the home school<sup>3</sup> district on the English language arts (ELA), math, and science assessments.
  - b. Two charter schools posted results that were similar to the home school district on the ELA and math assessments.
  - c. Two charter schools posted results that were lower to the home school district on the ELA and math assessments.
  - d. Four charter schools posted mixed results in comparison to the performance of the home school district.
3. Information about the performance of charter schools on the Washington School Improvement Framework (WSIF) is limited and mixed, as only five schools earned a WSIF rating ranging from a low of 1.53 to a high of 8.35.
  4. Statewide, charter school students perform approximately the same as demographically and academically similar TPS students on the ELA assessment, but slightly higher than TPS students on the math and science assessments. In most cases the scale score differences are small.
  5. Statewide, the student growth percentiles posted by charter school students in ELA and math were slightly higher than the percentiles posted by TPS students.
  6. Two charter schools had reportable four year graduation rates, and the rates were similar to the state average.

### **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 12 charter public schools operating in Washington during the 2018-19 school year. Total charter public school enrollment increased to approximately 3,400 K-12 students in the 2018-19 school year, a 43 percent enrollment increase over 2017-18 school year.

During the 2018-19 school year, two new schools began operation enrolling a total of 294 students. At the close of the 2018-19 school year, three schools closed citing funding challenges which resulted in the withdrawal from Washington of the Green Dot charter management organization. Together, the closed schools (two Green Dot schools and the SOAR Academy) enrolled a total of 571 students in grades K-10 in the 2018-19 school year.

Additional developments in the fall of 2019 include the closure of Ashé Preparatory Academy after approximately one month in operation 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. That in turn impacted their enrollment.

---

<sup>3</sup> The home school district is defined as the district in which the charter school is physically located. In some cases charter schools draw students from multiple districts.

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 School District, which necessitates a transfer of their authorization contract from Spokane Public Schools to the Charter School Commission. The Board is expected to approve that transfer during the January 2020 meeting.

The key developments for each of the authorizers are listed below:

### **Charter School Commission**

- During the 2018-19 school year, ten CSC authorized charter schools were in operation.
- In June 2019 the CSC was notified of the voluntary closure of three charter schools and in October, the voluntary closure of a fourth charter school.
- Twelve organizations submitted Notices of Intent to apply for new charters, and seven applications to open new charter public schools were received. Three applications were deemed incomplete, and the other four new charter school applications were evaluated and approved by the Commission in May 2019 for operation in the 2020-21 school year.

### **Spokane Public Schools**

- During the 2018-19 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 of the 2018-19 school year.
- As described above Spokane International Academy has recently secured a new location outside the boundaries of Spokane School District and has applied to transfer its authorization contract to the Charter Schools Commission.
- One charter public school was approved in June 2019 for a fall 2020 opening in time for the 2020-21 school year.

## Introduction

In addition to this short introduction and appended materials, this report is divided in three main sections and each section addresses one of the three requirements specified in RCW 28A.710.250.

- 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.

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. In accordance with [RCW 28A.710.100\(4\)](#) and [WAC 180-19-210](#), the Washington Charter Schools Commission and Spokane Public Schools annual authorizer reports were submitted in a timely manner and include the status of the authorizer's charter school portfolio, the authorizer's strategic vision for chartering and progress toward achieving that vision, and the academic and financial performance of all operating charter schools under its jurisdiction, including the progress of the charter schools based on the authorizer's performance framework. Certain information from these two authorizer reports is incorporated into this SBE annual report. The charter school authorizer annual reports are posted [on SBE's website](#).

## Charter Schools in Washington

Washington State's Charter School Act ([RCW 28A.710](#)) was enacted on April 3, 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.

Also, 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, and
- Employ educators meeting the same certification requirements as traditional public school teachers, including background checks. Charter schools 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 changes from year to year (Table 1). It is not unusual for emerging charter schools to annually add one or two grade levels to be served to accommodate the grade promotion of continuing students, meaning that the grade levels served at each charter school may change from year to year. 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 2018-19 school year.

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

2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
			Ashé Prep*
Destiny	Destiny	Destiny	
Excel	Excel	Excel	
	Rainier Valley	Rainier Valley	Rainier Valley
		Impact Puget Sound	Impact Puget Sound
PRIDE Prep	PRIDE Prep	PRIDE Prep	PRIDE Prep
Rainier Prep	Rainier Prep	Rainier Prep	Rainier Prep
SOAR	SOAR	SOAR	
Spokane International	Spokane International	Spokane International	Spokane International
	Atlas	Atlas	Atlas
Olympus	Olympus	Olympus	Olympus
Sierra	Sierra	Sierra	Sierra
		Willow	Willow

\*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 12 charter public schools operating in Washington during the 2018-19 school year, (Table 1). Per



the Washington State Report Card, 3363 students attended one of the 12 Washington public charter schools in the 2018-19 school year (Table 2).

Table 2: shows the charter schools operating for the 2018-19 school year

School Name	Authorizer	Home District	Grades Served	Enrollment*
Green Dot Destiny	State Charter School Commission	Tacoma	6-8	162
Green Dot Excel	State Charter School Commission	Kent	7-10	189
Green Dot Rainier Valley Leadership Academy	State Charter School Commission	Seattle	6-7, 9	253
Impact   Puget Sound*	State Charter School Commission	Tukwila	K-1	180
PRIDE Prep	Spokane Public Schools	Spokane	6-10	498
Rainer Prep	State Charter School Commission	Highline	5-8	342
SOAR	State Charter School Commission	Tacoma	K-5	220
Spokane International Academy	Spokane Public Schools	Spokane	K-8	501
Summit Atlas	State Charter School Commission	Seattle	6-7 and 9-10	336
Summit Olympus	State Charter School Commission	Tacoma	9-12	194
Summit Sierra	State Charter School Commission	Seattle	9-12	374
Willow Public School*	State Charter School Commission	Walla Walla	6-8	114

\*Note: the 2018-19 school year was the first year of operation for Puget Sound Elementary and the Willow Public School. The home district is the school district in which the charter school is physically situated. Data 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 at-risk students<sup>4</sup>. At-risk students are defined in statute as a student who has an academic or economic disadvantage that requires assistance or special services to succeed in educational programs. The

<sup>4</sup> The "At risk" definition in statute connotes a defect in the person, and implies that certain student characteristics are defects. This stems from a deficit approach to people rather than the asset-based approach terminology consistent with the SBE characterization of these student groups. "Systemically underserved" may be more suitable verbiage. The SBE would recommend reconsidering the "at risk" language and would work collaboratively with the legislature, the Educational Opportunity Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee, the Charter School Commission, district charter authorizers, and the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction in an effort to identify better terminology to recommend the Legislature use to replace "at risk."

demographics of students enrolled in charter schools during the 2018-19 school year are presented in Table 3.

- It is evident that the Washington charter public schools are, for the most part, serving “at-risk” students at a rate higher than the home school district (SD) and the state.
- Most of the charter public schools serve higher percentages of students living in poverty, 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: 2018-19 student demographics for charter schools, home school districts, and Washington.

	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	English Learners	Low income	Special Education
Rainier Prep	0.3	7.3	40.4	36.8	0.9	7.0	7.6	38.6	75.4	13.5
<b>Highline SD</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>38.9</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>20.9</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>28.8</b>	<b>69.0</b>	<b>16.8</b>
Excel	1.1	4.8	39.7	12.2	1.6	28.6	12.2	10.1	65.1	20.6
<b>Kent SD</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>19.8</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>32.9</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>20.8</b>	<b>53.1</b>	<b>12.1</b>
Atlas	0.9	3.9	34.2	15.2	0.3	33.9	11.6	14.3	54.8	18.8
Rainier Valley	0.4	2.8	75.9	9.5	0.0	6.3	5.1	21.3	75.1	16.6
Sierra	0.0	8.8	34.5	11.0	0.3	31.3	14.2	8.3	40.4	17.1
<b>Seattle PS</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>14.5</b>	<b>12.3</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>46.8</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>33.7</b>	<b>16.8</b>
PRIDE Prep	7.0	2.8	12.9	2.0	1.0	73.7	0.6	0.6	54.6	17.1
SIA	1.0	1.6	2.4	11.0	0.0	70.3	13.8	2.0	43.9	13.8
<b>Spokane PS</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>67.2</b>	<b>13.7</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>58.2</b>	<b>18.4</b>
Destiny	1.2	1.2	29.6	17.9	3.1	32.1	14.8	9.3	85.8	19.8
Olympus	1.5	2.1	22.7	32.5	1.5	23.7	16.0	7.7	68.6	22.7
SOAR	0.5	0.5	27.7	19.1	5.5	22.7	24.1	4.1	50.9	17.3
<b>Tacoma SD</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>20.9</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>38.3</b>	<b>13.6</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>61.6</b>	<b>15.9</b>
Impact-Puget Sound	0.0	7.2	51.7	17.2	0.0	18.3	5.6	40.6	71.7	4.4
<b>Tukwila SD</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>27.2</b>	<b>20.4</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>33.6</b>	<b>75.6</b>	<b>13.0</b>
Willow	0.0	0.9	0.0	43.9	0.0	52.6	2.6	14.9	49.1	14.9
<b>Walla Walla SD</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>40.6</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>53.8</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>58.4</b>	<b>15.6</b>
<b>Washington</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>7.7</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>23.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>54.4</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>42.4</b>	<b>14.1</b>

Note: from the Washington State Report Card.

## **Overview of the Academic Performance of Charter Schools**

Drawing broad conclusions about the academic achievement of charter school students across the nation is challenging, as results vary from state to state, by school level, by presence and nature of a management organization, and results differ for specific student groups. The 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. The highlights of the study include the following:

- Students attending charter schools exhibit the equivalent of eight additional days of learning in reading and the same days of learning in math per year compared to their TPS peers.
- Black students, students in poverty, and English Learners appear to benefit from attending charter schools.
- Like TPS, charter school quality is uneven across the states and across schools.

In January 2019, CREDO released the 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. The authors rightfully acknowledge that the study might be judged to be premature, given the small number of schools and the short history of school operations. Nonetheless, 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<sup>5</sup> who enroll in the TPS the charter school students would otherwise have attended.

Also in January 2019, SBE delivered a 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.

### **Section I - 2018-2019 Charter School Performance**

This section of the annual report on charter schools provides a comparison of the performance of charter school students with the average results for the home district and the state (Part A), and with the performance of academically, ethnically, and economically comparable groups of students in other public schools (Part B), in accordance with RCW 28A.710.250(2). Put another

---

<sup>5</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.

way, the state law requires that the charter school performance be conducted through two distinct analyses:

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. The charter school student performance data (percentage of students meeting standard on the statewide assessments) is presented in summary tables with accompanying descriptive text in Appendix A.

Part B comprises the comparison of the academic performance of students at charter schools to similar students in traditional public schools (TPS). This analysis required the construction of a control group from which to make the comparison of student groups (Appendix A). The charter school student performance data compared to results from similar TPS students are presented in summary tables with accompanying descriptive text.

The findings presented here upon should be considered preliminary, as this is only the SBE's third annual report assessing the performance of charter schools and charter school students. Also, the SBE has requested staff to conduct additional analyses which may be included in future reports. The SBE requests include but are not limited to the following analyses:

- Performance on the early learning assessment (Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developmental Skills) by charter school students and similar students,
- Differences in performance based on gender,
- Differences in performance based on race/ethnicity and subethnicity,
- Differences in performance based on program participation, and
- Comparison of performance to the school the charter school student came from.

This report elaborates on the performance of charter schools through data posted to the Washington State Report Card and other student results from the 2018-19 school year only. Because the SBE is expected to conduct additional analyses subsequent to issuing this report it would be premature to make any judgement about the performance of the charter schools until multiple years of results (five years) are available.

Another limitation of this work centers on the fact that only twelve charter schools are reported upon here and the results for approximately 1600 charter school students are included in this initial analysis. Additional charter schools are expected to be authorized in the coming years and the overall enrollment of the charter schools is expected to increase. The meaningfulness of the statistical analyses would be enhanced with the larger student counts and additional schools.

### **Summary of Findings**

1. Regarding the percentage of students meeting standard on the statewide assessments on the spring 2019 administration, the performance of the charter schools is mixed:

- a. Three charter schools posted results that were better than the home school district on the ELA, math, and science assessments.
  - b. Two charter schools posted results that were similar to the home school district on the ELA and math assessments.
  - c. Two charter schools posted results that were lower than the home school district on the ELA and math assessments.
  - d. Four charter schools posted mixed results in comparison to the performance of the home school district.
2. Information about the performance of charter schools on the WSIF is 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.
  3. Statewide, charter school students perform approximately the same as demographically and academically similar TPS students on the ELA assessment, but higher than TPS students on the math and science assessments. The effect sizes indicate that the differences are very small to small.
  4. At every grade level in ELA, charter school students post scale scores similar to TPS students, while math scores for charter school students are higher for the 5<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grades and similar for the other grade levels. The differences are very small to small for the most part.
  5. Statewide, the student growth percentiles posted by charter school students were higher than the percentiles posted by TPS students for five of 10 measures and similar to TPS students on four of 10 measures.
  6. Two charter schools had a reportable four year adjusted cohort graduation rate and both rates were similar to the state average, and one posted rates lower than the home school district while another posted rates similar to the home school district.

## **Academic Performance of Charter School Students in Washington**

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

RCW 28A.710.250(2) requires that the charter school performance include an analysis of the academic performance or achievement of students at charter schools compared to students in the home district and the state. The overall results and findings from the data analyses and data compilations from the Washington State Report Card are best characterized as mixed. Some of the charter schools performed higher, some performed similarly, and some performed lower than the home school district on the ELA, math, or science assessments (Table 4). The academic performance of all charter schools, home districts, and the state are tabulated in Appendix A.

Table 4: identifies the charter schools whose students perform generally similar to, better than, or lower than the home school district.

Measure	Charter Schools with a Performance Better than the Home School District	Charter Schools with a Performance Similar to the Home School District	Charter Schools with a Performance Lower than the Home School District
ELA	Rainier Prep Spokane International Olympus	Destiny* PRIDE Prep Atlas	Excel* Rainier Valley SOAR* Sierra Willow
Math	Rainier Prep Spokane International Olympus	Destiny* Excel* Rainier Valley Atlas Sierra	PRIDE Prep SOAR* Willow
Science*	Rainier Prep Spokane International	Destiny* Excel* PRIDE Prep Olympus Sierra	
Four Year ACGR*		Sierra	Olympus

\*Notes: no science assessment results are available for Rainier Valley, Atlas, SOAR, and Willow because of serving non-tested grades or data being suppressed to protect student privacy. No results for Impact Puget Sound because the school served only non-tested grades (K-1) in 2018-19. ACGR = Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate. Destiny, Excel, and SOAR surrendered their charters shortly after the 2018-19 school year ended.

The winter 2019 Washington School Improvement Framework (WSIF) scores for the charter schools and the state averages are presented in Table 5. The WSIF ratings for the charter schools are best characterized as limited and mixed.

- Five charter public schools earned a WSIF rating ranging from a low of 1.53 to a high of 8.35 decile points.
- Five charter schools were not rated due to having been in operation for only one year, the 2017-18 school year.
- Two charter schools were not open in 2017-18, the latest year included in the winter 2019 WSIF.

The WSIF data file provides final decile ratings for student groups, provided that the minimum reporting requirements are met. Those final decile ratings are presented in Table 6. Again, the results for the charter public schools are best characterized as limited and mixed.

Table 5: shows the winter 2019 WSIF school rating in decile points for the All Students group by indicator.

School Name	Prof. Decile	SGP Decile	Grad. Rate Decile	EL Progress Decile	SQSS Decile	Total Decile*
Green Dot Destiny*	1.50	1.50			2.00	1.53
Green Dot Excel*	4.50	4.50		1.00	2.00	4.20
Green Dot Rainier Valley	2.00	6.50			5.00	
PRIDE Prep	4.50	3.00			2.30	3.42
Rainier Prep	7.50	10.00		1.00	6.00	8.35
SOAR*	1.50				1.00	
Spokane International	7.50	5.00			7.00	6.10
Summit Atlas	7.00	10.00			4.30	
Summit Olympus	4.00				6.00	
Summit Sierra	6.00				5.70	
<b>Washington Public Schools</b>	<b>5.87</b>	<b>5.63</b>	<b>5.64</b>	<b>3.87</b>	<b>5.29</b>	<b>5.79</b>

\*Note: 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. The winter 2020 WSIF is the first year in which Willow and Puget Sound will be included. Destiny, Excel, and SOAR surrendered their charters shortly after the 2018-19 school year ended.

Table 6: shows the winter 2019 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 Races	Limited English	Low Income	Special Education
Green Dot Destiny	1.53			1.53	1.25	1.68	1.88	1.93	1.28	1.25	1.28
Green Dot Excel	4.20			2.20			6.93	3.98	2.35	2.40	2.85
Pride Prep	3.42	5.2		2.12			3.83	6.13		2.80	3.73
Rainier Prep	8.35		9.95	8.50	8.60		8.40	9.60	5.78	8.60	4.60
SIA	6.10				6.08		5.75	6.58		5.68	2.15
<b>Washington Public Schools</b>	<b>5.79</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>8.12</b>	<b>4.34</b>	<b>4.89</b>	<b>3.88</b>	<b>6.43</b>	<b>6.18</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>4.63</b>	<b>3.12</b>

\*Note: 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.

The 2018-19 school year was the first in which charter public schools served 12<sup>th</sup> graders and posted an official four year adjusted cohort graduation rate (ACGR). However, it should be noted that Summit Olympus (Olympus) and Summit Sierra (Sierra) first opened for the 2017-18 school

year, which means that the graduating class would have attended Sierra or Olympus for only two years at most and at least two years at another high school.

Olympus is physically situated in the Tacoma School District. The four year ACGR results are presented in Table 7.

- For all reportable student groups, the graduation rate for Olympus is approximately 10 to 17 percentage points lower than the rate for the corresponding Tacoma school district group.
- The graduation rate for the All Students group at Olympus was approximately six percentage points lower than the state graduation rate.
- The White student group and the FRL (Low Income) student group at Olympus graduated at a rate similar to the state average for the corresponding student groups.
- The Black student group posted a graduation rate a little higher than and the Hispanic student group posted a graduation rate a little lower than the state average for the corresponding groups.

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 2019 Four Year Graduation Rate</b>	<b>Olympus</b>	<b>Tacoma SD</b>	<b>Sierra</b>	<b>Seattle PS</b>	<b>Washington</b>
All Students	75.0	89.8	84.3	82.9	80.9
American Indian / Alaskan Native	--	> 90.0	--	62.1	61.7
Asian	--	92.6	82.2	85.4	90.4
Black / African American	76.2	89.6	> 91.0	77.1	73.6
Hispanic / Latino	72.2	89.4	72.7	68.7	75.7
Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	--	80.8	--	57.1	74.4
White	81.3	91.0	78.6	89.2	82.8
Two or More Races	--	81.7	83.3	82.1	81.2
Limited English	--	86.3	83.3	61.7	62.4
Low-Income	72.1	85.8	87.9	73.3	72.2
Students with a Disability	--	71.1	--	57.9	62.1
Female	79.4	91.4	88.2	86.7	84.0
Male	72.2	88.1	80.4	79.2	78.1

\*Note: "--" means the data were suppressed to protect personally identifying information or the student group was not represented in the graduation cohort for the school. From the Washington State Report Card.

Sierra is physically situated in Seattle, so the school's rates are compared to the rates for the Seattle Public Schools. The four year ACGR results for Sierra are presented in Table 7.



- The graduation rate for the All Students group at Sierra is similar to the Seattle PS rate and a little higher than the state graduation rate.
- The Asian and White student groups at Sierra graduated at rates lower than the Seattle PS and lower than the state.
- The Black, FRL (Low Income), and English Learner student groups at Sierra graduated at rates higher than the Seattle PS and higher than the state.
- The Hispanic and Two or More races groups posted graduation rates similar to the corresponding groups for the Seattle PS and the state.

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

### **Design of the Analysis**

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 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 considered evidence of but not proof that attending a traditional public school versus a charter school results in a different performance on an educational outcome. However, it should be noted that differences in performance could be attributable 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
- Differences in the curriculum delivered and the learning opportunities provided to students, and
- Differences in the number of exclusionary discipline events and number of days missed by the students.

In the design, a control group was created following a student-by-student matching process to be as identical as possible to the comparison 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”) and the group means are then compared using the Independent Sample *t*-Test. The effect size of the difference is reported as Cohen’s *d*.

- The comparison 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 comparison group members have

valid results for the Washington Comprehensive Assessment of Science (WCAS) in the grade levels which are tested.

- A control group comprised of demographically and academically similar students enrolled in traditional public schools (TPS) was created through a one-by-one matching process described in Appendix A. TPS students in the control group usually, but not always, are enrolled in the home district in which the charter school is physically situated.

Statewide, charter school students perform approximately the same as similar TPS students on the ELA assessment, but higher than TPS students on the math and science assessments. The students at charter schools posted average student growth percentiles higher than the average student growth percentiles (SGPs) posted by TPS students for both ELA and math (Table 8). When the SGP medians are analyzed, the charter school students perform approximately the same as similar TPS students on the ELA SGPs, but higher than TPS students on the math SGPs.

Table 8: summarizes the performance of charter school students compared to the performance of demographically and academically similar TPS students.

<b>Academic Measure</b>	<b>Charter School Students Perform Higher than TPS Students</b>	<b>Charter School Students Perform Similar to TPS Students</b>	<b>Charter School Students Perform Lower than TPS Students</b>
ELA (Average Scale Score)		X	
Math (Average Scale Score)	X		
Science (Average Scale Score)	X		
ELA (Mean SGP)*	X		
Math (Mean SGP)*	X		
ELA (Median SGP)*		X	
Math (Median SGP)*	X		

\*Note: the student growth percentiles (SGP) are computed only for students in the 4<sup>th</sup> through the 8<sup>th</sup> grade with valid Smarter Balanced assessment results from the spring 2018 and spring 2019 assessment administrations. SGPs are not computed for science.

## Results

For the analyses that follow, the comparison and control 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. The results are summarized in Table 9. Both the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade results and the 10<sup>th</sup> grade results are included in the table below, notwithstanding the use of a different matching protocol.

On the statewide ELA assessment, the comparison group (charter school students) perform no differently than the control group (TPS students). On the math and science assessments, the average scale score for the comparison group was a little higher than the average scale score for the control group. The findings are detailed as follows:

- The performance on the ELA assessment for the charter school students was similar to the performance of the TPS students.
- On the math assessment, the mean scale score for the comparison group (charter school students) was different and approximately 8.1 scale score points higher than the mean scale score for the TPS control group.
- The mean scale score for the comparison group (charter school students) was different and approximately 14.4 scale score points higher than the mean scale score for the control group (TPS students) on the science assessment.

For the math and science assessments, the mean scale score differences are statistically different but the differences are small or very small. Results are characterized as “practically significant” when the difference is medium or large. For the analyses below and for each of the content areas, the effect size described in Appendix A (Cohen’s *d*) is less than 0.20 which indicates little or no effect. In other words, the difference in group performance is statistically significant but the differences are very small to small.

Table 9: Scale score differences from spring 2019 statewide assessments based on charter school enrollment.

Assessment	Number of Students in each Group (N)	Mean Scale Score Comparison Group Charter Students	Mean Scale Score Control Group TPS Students	Mean Scale Score Difference*
ELA	1614	2551.1	2545.4	-5.69
Math**	1591	2534.2	2526.1	-8.06
Science**	468	692.7	678.2	-14.44

\*Note: the mean difference is reported as the value for the non-charter school group minus the value for the charter school group. A negative mean difference indicates that the mean scale score for the comparison group (charter school students) was higher than the mean scale score for the control group (non-charter school students). A positive mean difference indicates that the mean scale score for the comparison group (charter school students) was lower than the mean scale score for the control group (non-charter school students).

In a manner similar to the analysis above and as derived from the statewide ELA and math assessments, the comparison group (charter school students) performed differently and higher than the control group (TPS students) on the ELA SGPs and the math SGPs (Table 10). The charter school students made on average more than one year of academic growth in ELA and math, while the non-charter school (TPS) students made approximately one year of academic growth in ELA and math. The findings are as follows:

- The ELA SGPs for the charter school students were different and higher than the ELA SGPs of the TPS students. The mean SGP for the comparison group was approximately 3.0 percentile points higher than the TPS students, meaning that the charter school students demonstrated greater academic growth than similar TPS students.
- On the math SGP calculations, the mean SGP for the comparison group (charter school students) was approximately 3.1 percentile points higher than the control group (TPS students). The means differed with the comparison group posting higher SGP, meaning that the charter school students demonstrated greater academic growth than similar TPS students.

For the ELA and math SGPs, the mean SGP differences are statistically different but the differences are very small to small. For the ELA and math SGPs, the effect size is less than 0.20 which indicates little or no effect. In other words, the differences between the group means are statistically significant but are not practically significant.

Table 10: shows the ELA and math growth model data (statistical means) for the control and comparison groups.

Assessment	Number of Students in each Group* (N)	Mean SGP Comparison Group Charter Students	Mean SGP Control Group TPS Students	Mean SGP Difference
ELA**	1352/1361	53.1	50.1	-3.02
Math**	1337/1321	52.4	49.4	-3.07

The mean difference is reported as the value for the non-charter school group minus the value for the charter school group. A negative mean difference indicates that the mean scale score for the comparison group (charter school students) was higher than the mean scale score for the control group (non-charter school students). A positive mean difference indicates that the mean scale score for the comparison group (charter school students) was lower than the mean scale score for the control group (non-charter school students). \*Note: shows the number of student records for the control/comparison group. \*\*Note: the double asterisk denotes the assessments where the group performances were statistically different.

A student growth percentile (SGP) is a derived percentile value or rank, and when aggregated, SGPs are often but not always reported as a median value, which usually differs from the mean (average) value. An evaluation of the medians shows that the comparison group (charter school students) performed similar to the control group (TPS students) on the ELA SGPs and better than the control group (TPS students) on the math SGP measure (Table 11). The findings are as follows:

- The ELA SGP median for the charter school students was similar to the ELA SGP median for the TPS students.
- On the math SGP analysis, the median SGP for the comparison group (charter school students) was approximately 5.0 percentile points higher than the control group (TPS students). The medians differed with the comparison group posting a higher median

SGP, meaning that the charter school students demonstrated greater academic growth than similar TPS students. The effect size indicates that the difference is very small.

- The charter school students made on average more than one year of academic growth in ELA and math (median SGPs greater than 50), while the non-charter school (TPS) students made approximately one year of academic growth (median SGP of 50) in ELA and math.

Table 11: shows the ELA and math growth model data (statistical medians) for the control and comparison groups.

Assessment	Number of Students in each Group* (N)	Median SGP Comparison Group Charter Students	Median SGP Control Group TPS Students	Median SGP Difference
ELA	1352/1361	54.0	50.0	-4.00
Math**	1337/1321	55.0	50.0	-5.00

The mean difference is reported as the value for the non-charter school group minus the value for the charter school group. A negative mean difference indicates that the mean scale score for the comparison group (charter school students) was higher than the mean scale score for the control group (non-charter school students). A positive mean difference indicates that the mean scale score for the comparison group (charter school students) was lower than the mean scale score for the control group (non-charter school students). \*Note: shows the number of student records for the control/comparison group. \*\*Note: the double asterisk denotes the assessments where the group performances were statistically different.

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

28A.710.250 directs 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 Public Schools is the only local educational authority (LEA) to file an application and 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 Public Schools continue as the only charter school authorizers in the state. Together, the Washington Charter School Commission and Spokane Public Schools oversaw 12 charter public schools operating in Washington during the 2018-19 school year, an increase of two schools compared to the 2017-18 school year. Per the Washington State Report Card, 3,363 students attended one of the 12 Washington public charter schools in the 2018-19 school year (Table 2). The total charter school enrollment represents an increase of approximately 1,000 students from the 2017-18 school year and the total charter school enrollment represents approximately 0.30 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 students”. At-risk students are defined in statute as a student who has an academic or economic disadvantage that requires assistance or special services to succeed in educational programs. The term includes, but is not limited to:

- Students who do not meet minimum standards of academic proficiency,
- Students who are at risk of dropping out of high school,
- Students in chronically low-performing schools, students with higher than average disciplinary sanctions,
- 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.

The demographics of students enrolled in charter schools during the 2018-19 school year are presented in Table 3. It is evident that the Washington charter public schools are, for the most part, serving at-risk students at a rate higher than the home school district.

The key developments for each of the authorizers during the 2018-18 school year are listed below:

#### Charter School Commission – Authorizer Developments

- During the 2018-19 school year, ten CSC authorized charter public schools were in operation, which represents an increase of two schools from the 2017-18 school year.
- In June 2019 the CSC was notified of the voluntary closure of three charter schools and in October, the voluntary closure of a fourth charter school.
- Twelve organizations submitted Notices of Intent to Apply for new charters, and seven applications to open new charter public schools were received. Three applications were

deemed incomplete, and the other four new charter school applications were evaluated and approved by the Commission in May 2019 for operation in the 2020-21 school year.

#### Spokane Public Schools – Authorizer Developments

- During the 2018-19 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 of the 2018-19 school year.
- One charter public school was approved in June 2019 for a fall 2020 opening in time for the 2020-21 school year.

#### Other Highlights and Challenges

- The Washington State Charter Schools Association (WA Charters) was awarded a [\\$20M competitive federal grant](#) to support new and expanding public charter schools in Washington.
- Charter public schools are serving a higher share of many of the student groups prioritized in law, particularly students with IEPs and students in low-income families.
- Charter public school authorizers implemented 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**

The legislature has acted in recent years to increase state funding and eliminate district's 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. While state K-12 funding may be distributed equitably to charter public schools, 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 public charter schools based on enrollment there are substantial front-end costs that must be addressed through other sources, such as 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 schools generally acquire leased space paid for through their operating budget.
- Operation budget: Charter public schools receive an allotment through OSPI based on student enrollments. For the purposes of funding allotment each charter public school is treated as a local education agency and receives funding equivalent to the amounts allotted through basic education. However, since charter public schools are not “common schools” the funding is provided from an account other than the state general fund. In addition, charter public schools are prohibited from receiving local levy funding or state level equalization funding. The state funding allotment, and any private funds received by the school must cover both capital and operating costs. A portion of the per-pupil funding allotment is also provided to the authorizer for specific oversight purposes outlined in RCW [28A.710.100](#). The amount transferred to the authorizer ranges from three to four percent based on a formula adopted by the SBE.
- Another concern identified by Spokane Public Schools subsequent to their annual report relates to disbursement policies rather than sufficiency. A challenge stems from the fact that apportionment is not paid out evenly across the 12 months. 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 public schools. These payment percentages can result in a charter public school 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 even across all months.

The CSC contends that the current regulatory structure creates a funding gap in which public charter schools receive less public funding than traditional public schools, resulting in a system in which funding for charter public schools is both insufficient and inequitable. In June 2019, the Commission adopted an educational equity policy driving the Commission’s commitment to advocate for equitable funding for all charter public schools at the state and philanthropic levels.

- The CSC contends that the current funding model, in which students in charter public schools receive significantly lower total public funding than students in non-charter public schools represents a substantial inequity, making sustainability a challenge. In the annual authorizer report (p. 44-46), the CSC provides an analysis enumerating the



disparate funding of charter schools. The charter school's inability to access local levy revenue poses a significant obstacle not faced by traditional public schools.

- The CSC authorizer report (p. 45) includes an analysis of the other support (local fundraising, grants, and gifts) beyond other support provided by the state and federal government. While the charter schools receive substantial resources in the category of other support, the additional resources do not fully offset the funding inequities brought about through the lack of access to local levy revenue.
- Lack of access to capital funding for Washington charter public schools exacerbates the funding challenges. In the 2018-19 school year, charter public schools spent an average of 10 to 15 percent of their state apportionment revenue on facilities; and

Three charter public schools voluntarily closed in June after the 2018-19 school year ended and another charter public school voluntarily closed shortly after the 2019-20 school year began. In response to a letter from the SBE to the CSC in October requesting additional information on the closures of the four charter public schools and that the information on the closures be included in the Charter School Commission's annual authorizer report. The requested information is contained in the CSC's authorizer report and is summarized below:

- SOAR Academy (SOAR) in Tacoma experienced financial challenges from the onset of operations and was unable to overcome the financial obstacles. The CSC contends that SOAR "...served significant numbers of systemically underserved students who required expensive supports and given charter public schools inability to access in accessing local levy revenue, SOAR was reliant on private funding to offset these costs." Over much of the 2018-19 school year, SOAR's board of directors sought and met with several management teams to lead the school, but the meetings did not culminate in the identification of a new management team. In combination, the expense burdens and the lack of a suitable management team further added to SOAR's challenges.
- Green Dot Public School Washington State voluntarily surrendered the charter contracts for Destiny Middle School in Tacoma and Excel Middle School in Kent. The CSC was in the process of issuing Corrective Action to the two Green Dot schools "...regarding the low academic performance at Destiny and Excel..." Per the Commission's authorizer report, under enrollment, significant long-term debt obligations, and Green Dot's inability to control costs led to the voluntary surrendering of the school contracts.
- Ashé Preparatory Academy (Ashé) Directors surrendered their charter contract in October 2019 after operating for approximately one month into the 2019-20 school year. The school faced facility, staffing, and leadership challenges that when coupled with under enrollment, were insurmountable. The Commission's report includes additional information on the circumstances surrounding the school's closure.

### **Efficacy of the Funding for Charter School Authorizers**

In accordance with RCW 28A.710.110, SBE has, through rule-making, 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 the purpose of fulfilling its charter school authorizing duties (under RCW 28A.710.100). The Spokane Public Schools 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**

The Board has identified two areas where changes to WAC may be warranted:

- The Board will propose revisions to the rules outlining the application process for districts to become a charter school authorizer. The current rules include steps that go beyond the requirements in statute. The additional steps in rule extend the timeline for districts to become authorizers and add unnecessary complexity to the process. Revised rules could streamline and shorten the process while maintaining the integrity of the application process.
- The Board is responsible for establishing the authorizer fee structure. Spokane Public Schools has asked for greater flexibility in the use of fees. The Board agrees with the need for greater flexibility and finds that the revision would likely require statutory change. However, in reviewing the request SBE staff also noted that that the fee structure is not necessarily aligned to workload. The Board will explore alternatives to the current formula to better align with the cost drivers associated with authorization.

In addition, the Board also recommends that OSPI review disbursement policies for charter public schools to address cash flow issues associated with uneven distribution of funds through the year.

Finally, the Board notes additional recommendations raised in the authorizer reports shown in the tables below. In general these recommendations would be improvements to the law. For example, timing of the annual report is an issue given the timeline for availability of data and would allow more time for the Board to respond to the authorizer reports. Both Spokane Public Schools and the CSC identify an issue with the statutory language in RCW 28A.710.050 (3). The language in statute refers to the commission where, given the context, it should refer to the "authorizer". The Board supports the recommendation to revise the language if the legislation opening this section of law is offered.

The Charter School Commission has identified a number of recommended statutory changes it would like to see for the purpose of strengthening the state's charter schools.

- 28A.710.050(3): Change, "approved by the commission" to "approved by the authorizer," which
- 28A.710.070(8): Change, "The commission shall reside within the office of the superintendent of
- Add 28A.710.070(10) to read as follows, "The executive director may employ members, who
- 28A.710.250(1): Change, "By December 1st of each year" to "By March 1st of each year" a later
- Amend WAC 180-19-210(1) to change "no later than November 1st of each year" to later date

Spokane Public Schools has also identified, in its annual report to SBE, potential changes to RCW 28A.710 that the district believes would strengthen the state's charter schools and authorizing practices.

- 28A.710.050(3): Change, "approved by the commission" to "approved by the authorizer," which
- 28A.710.100(4)(b): In "The academic and financial performance of all operating charter schools,"
- 28A.710.250(1): Change "By December 1st of each year" to a later date to enable the authorizer
- 28A.710.110(4): Increase the flexibility in the allowable use of the authorizer fee to enable the

## Appendix A: Detailed Performance Analysis

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

Figure A1: compares the academic performance of Green Dot Destiny to the Tacoma school district and Washington.

#### Fast Facts: Green Dot Destiny

Charter contract surrendered in June 2019

- Destiny served 162 students in the 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> grades in the 2018-19 school year.
- Approximately 30 percent of the Destiny’s students identify as Black which is more than double the rate of the Tacoma SD and seven times the state rate. The Destiny FRL rate (86 percent) is double the state FRL rate and approximately 24 percentage points higher than the Tacoma SD.
- Since the 2016-17 school year, nearly all reportable student groups improved in ELA, math, and science proficiency rates.

For the 2018-19 school year, the following assessment results from Figure A1 are noteworthy:

- For ELA proficiency, reportable student groups at Destiny perform similar to the corresponding groups for the Tacoma SD, but lower than the rate for the corresponding state rate.
- For math proficiency, reportable student groups at Destiny perform a little lower than the corresponding groups for the Tacoma SD and the corresponding state rate.
- The science results are mixed as some student groups (e.g. Hispanic) at Destiny outperform the Tacoma SD and the state, while other groups (e.g. White) at Destiny perform lower than the district and the state.

ELA Proficiency Rates (SBA)	Destiny (6-8)	Tacoma SD (6-8)	Washington (6-8)
<b>All Students</b>	37.2	47.9	58.5
Native American	--	33.6	28.5
Asian	--	63.4	78.4
Black	33.3	29.8	39.2
Hispanic	37.0	38.5	41.4
Pacific Islander	--	26.1	34.9
White	35.3	60.0	65.8
Two or More Races	41.7	46.9	61.2
Limited English	< 10.0	7.4	9.6
Low-Income	37.1	36.8	42.0
Special Education	< 10.0	9.0	16.1

Math Proficiency Rates (SBA)	Destiny (6-8)	Tacoma SD (6-8)	Washington (6-8)
<b>All Students</b>	28.0	32.6	47.1
Native American	--	< 10.0	19.0
Asian	--	52.2	73.8
Black	21.9	14.1	25.1
Hispanic	22.2	23.5	29.5
Pacific Islander	--	15.5	22.9
White	28.0	45.2	54.1
Two or More Races	37.5	25.4	48.2
Limited English	< 10.0	6.2	9.3
Low-Income	26.1	21.9	29.7
Special Education	< 10.0	4.0	10.9

Science Proficiency Rates (WCAS)	Destiny (8)	Tacoma SD (8)	Washington (8)
<b>All Students</b>	33.3	41.2	51.6
Native American	--	29.6	23.8
Asian	--	59.2	71.3
Black	23.1	21.1	28.9
Hispanic	37.5	31.4	31.6
Pacific Islander	--	16.7	21.9
White	26.9	55.0	60.4
Two or More Races	54.5	40.5	53.1
Limited English	--	11.3	8.1
Low-Income	33.3	29.9	33.9
Special Education	< 10.0	5.8	15.6

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

**Fast Facts: Green Dot Excel**

Charter contract surrendered in June 2019

- Excel MS served 189 students in the 7<sup>th</sup> through 10<sup>th</sup> grades in the 2018-19 school year.
- Approximately 40 percent of Excel’s students identify as Black which is more than triple the rate of the Kent SD and nearly 10 times the state rate. Excel’s FRL rate (65 percent) is higher than the district FRL rate and approximately 23 percentage points higher than the state FRL rate.
- Since the 2016-17 school year, the changes in ELA and math proficiency rates are mixed as some groups made gains while other groups posted declines. All reportable groups posted solid gains on the science assessment.

For the 2018-19 school year, the following assessment results from Figure A2 are noteworthy:

- For ELA proficiency, the Black student group at Excel performs similarly to the corresponding groups for the Kent SD and the state, but the other student groups generally perform lower than the Kent SD and the state.
- For math proficiency, most student groups at Excel MS perform similar to or a little lower than the corresponding groups for the Kent SD and the state rates.
- The science results are mixed as some student groups (e.g. Black) at Excel outperform the Kent SD and the state, while other groups (e.g. White) perform lower.

Figure A2: compares the academic performance of Green Dot Excel to the Kent school district and Washington.

ELA Proficiency Rates (SBA)	Excel (7-10)	Kent SD (7-10)	Washington (7-10)
<b>All Students</b>	42.9	59.0	62.8
Native American	--	--	36.0
Asian	--	73.0	80.6
Black	43.5	42.3	43.8
Hispanic	35.7	44.1	46.4
Pacific Islander	--	41.9	38.3
White	48.4	67.3	69.7
Two or More Races	45.5	63.1	64.9
Limited English	< 10.0	14.5	12.4
Low-Income	34.7	45.4	46.3
Special Education	16.7	12.3	18.1

Math Proficiency Rates (SBA)	Excel (7-10)	Kent SD (7-10)	Washington (7-10)
<b>All Students</b>	30.6	42.1	44.9
Native American	--	--	19.1
Asian	--	59.8	71.7
Black	22.2	21.1	22.7
Hispanic	28.6	22.8	26.9
Pacific Islander	--	17.9	20.9
White	35.5	53.5	51.6
Two or More Races	45.5	45.6	45.4
Limited English	< 10.0	8.4	8.6
Low-Income	19.7	26.3	27.0
Special Education	16.7	7.5	8.8

Science Proficiency Rates (WCAS)	Excel (8)	Kent SD (8)	Washington (8)
<b>All Students</b>	42.0	45.1	51.6
Native American	--	--	23.8
Asian	--	62.5	71.3
Black	33.3	26.8	28.9
Hispanic	--	29.3	31.6
Pacific Islander		9.1	21.9
White	50.0	54.6	60.4
Two or More Races	--	48.3	53.1
Limited English	--	7.6	8.1
Low-Income	34.4	30.8	33.9
Special Education	--	14.3	15.6

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

**Fast Facts: Green Dot Rainier Valley Leadership Academy**

- Rainier Valley served 253 students in the 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 9<sup>th</sup> grades in the 2018-19 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 (75 percent) is more double the Seattle PS FRL rate and approximately 33 percentage points higher than the state FRL rate.
- Since the 2017-18 school year, the changes in ELA are best described as slightly improving or unchanged, while the math proficiency rates are mixed as some groups made small gains while other groups posted small declines and others were largely unchanged.
- Rainier Valley does not serve a grade level in which the science assessment is administered.

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.
- For math proficiency, the performance of reportable student groups at Rainier Valley is mixed as some groups perform similar to or a little lower than the corresponding groups while some groups perform higher than the Seattle PS and the state.

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 342 students in the 5<sup>th</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grades in the 2018-19 school year.
- Approximately 40 percent of Rainier Prep’s students identify as Black which is triple the rate of the Highline SD and nearly ten times higher than the state rate. Rainier Prep’s FRL rate (75 percent) is a little higher than the Highline SD FRL rate and approximately 33 percentage points higher than the state FRL rate.
- Since the 2016-17 school year, the changes in ELA, math, and science proficiency rates for Rainier Prep student groups are best described as slightly improving or unchanged.

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

- For ELA proficiency, the reportable student groups at Rainier Prep perform uniformly higher than the corresponding groups for the Highline SD and similar to or better than the corresponding measure for the state.
- For math proficiency, the performance of reportable student groups at Rainier Prep is substantially better than the corresponding measures for groups from the Highline SD and the state.
- For science, Rainier Prep student groups outperform the corresponding groups for both the Highline SD 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 498 students in the 6<sup>th</sup> through 10<sup>th</sup> grades in the 2018-19 school year.
- Approximately 13 percent of PRIDE Prep’s students identify as Black which is four times the rate of the Spokane PS and approximately 74 percent White students which is a little higher than the Spokane PS. PRIDE Prep’s FRL rate (55 percent) is a little lower than the Spokane PS FRL rate and 13 percentage points higher than the state FRL rate.
- Since the 2016-17 school year, the ELA and science proficiency rates are slightly improved, while the math proficiency rates for PRIDE Prep student groups mostly declined.

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) outperform the district and state, while other groups (e.g. White) perform lower than the Spokane PS and the state.
- For math proficiency, the results for the student groups at PRIDE Prep are mixed as some groups (e.g. Native American) outperform the district and state, while other groups (e.g. Asian and White) perform lower than the district and state.
- For science, the performance of the student groups at PRIDE Prep is mixed as some groups (e.g. Students with a Disability) outperform the district and state, while other groups perform lower than the Spokane PS and 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)
All Students	57.0	58.8	61.3
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)
All Students	30.2	41.2	45.4
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)
All Students	45.1	50.1	51.6
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 501 students in kindergarten through 8<sup>th</sup> grades in the 2018-19 school year.
- Approximately 70 percent of SIA’s students identify as White which is similar to the Spokane PS and higher than the state rate. SIA’s FRL rate (44 percent) is 14 percentage points lower than the Spokane PS FRL rate and comparable to the state FRL rate.
- Since the 2016-17 school year, the ELA proficiency rates are mostly unchanged or slightly lower, while the math and science proficiency rates for SIA’s student groups are best described as declining.

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 better than the corresponding measure for the state.
- For math proficiency, the performance of reportable student groups at SIA is mostly similar to or better than the corresponding measures for groups from 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: SOAR Academy**

Charter contract surrendered in June 2019

- SOAR Academy served 220 students in kindergarten through the 5<sup>th</sup> grade in the 2018-19 school year.
- Approximately 28 percent of SOAR’s students identify as Black which is double the rate of the Tacoma SD and much higher than the state rate. SOAR’s FRL rate (51 percent) is approximately 10 percentage points lower than the Tacoma SD FRL rate and approximately nine percentage points higher than the state FRL rate.
- Since the 2016-17 school year, the changes in ELA and math proficiency rates for SOAR student groups are mostly improved. SOAR did not have reportable results for science for the 2018-19 school year.

For the 2018-19 school year, the following assessment results from Figure A7 are noteworthy:

- For ELA proficiency, the reportable student groups at SOAR perform uniformly and substantially lower than the corresponding groups for the Tacoma SD and the corresponding measure for the state.
- For math proficiency, the performance of reportable student groups at SOAR is uniformly and substantially lower than the corresponding measures for groups from the Tacoma SD and the state.
- All of the results for science were suppressed to protect student privacy.

Figure A7: compares the academic performance of SOAR to the Tacoma school district and Washington.

ELA Proficiency Rates (SBA)	SOAR (K-5)	Tacoma SD (K-5)	Washington (K-5)
<b>All Students</b>	<b>26.2</b>	<b>55.3</b>	<b>57.6</b>
Native American	--	39.7	28.2
Asian		58.6	75.4
Black	14.3	39.0	40.7
Hispanic	--	46.2	40.0
Pacific Islander	--	33.5	34.4
White	23.1	67.4	65.2
Two or More Races	30.0	56.0	60.9
Limited English	--	19.8	14.9
Low-Income	14.3	46.0	41.4
Special Education	< 10.0	18.3	24.6

Math Proficiency Rates (SBA)	SOAR (K-5)	Tacoma SD (K-5)	Washington (K-5)
<b>All Students</b>	<b>27.7</b>	<b>47.3</b>	<b>53.4</b>
Native American		31.5	27.6
Asian		56.9	76.1
Black	14.3	29.8	33.5
Hispanic	--	36.1	36.2
Pacific Islander	--	26.9	32.1
White	30.8	61.2	60.6
Two or More Races	35.0	44.5	55.4
Limited English	--	21.4	18.9
Low-Income	20.0	37.3	37.4
Special Education	18.2	17.2	23.0

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

**Fast Facts: Summit Atlas**

- Summit Atlas served 336 students in the 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup>, and 10<sup>th</sup> grades in the 2018-19 school year.
- Approximately 34 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 (54 percent) is 20 percentage points higher than Seattle PS FRL rate and approximately 12 percentage points higher than the state FRL rate.
- Since the 2016-17 school year, the changes in ELA and math proficiency rates for Atlas are mixed as some student groups are posting while other groups are posting declines or are unchanged.

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) perform higher than the corresponding groups for Seattle PS and the state while some groups 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 but perform lower than the Seattle PS.
- Atlas does 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 194 students in the 9<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grades in the 2018-19 school year.
- Approximately 23 percent of Olympus’ students identify as Black and 33 percent identify as Hispanic, both of which are approximately 10 to 12 percentage points higher than the Tacoma SD and higher than the state rate. Olympus’ FRL rate (69 percent) is seven percentage points higher than the Tacoma SD FRL rate and 27 percentage points higher than the state FRL rate.
- Since the 2016-17 school year, the reportable student groups are posting improvements in the ELA and math proficiency rates, but declines on the science assessment.

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

- For ELA proficiency, the student groups at Olympus perform uniformly higher than the groups for the Tacoma SD and the state.
- For math proficiency, the performance of reportable student groups at Olympus is substantially better than the corresponding measures for groups from the Tacoma SD and similar to or better 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.

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 374 students in the 9<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grades in the 2018-19 school year.
- Approximately 34 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 (40 percent) is six percentage points higher than Seattle PS FRL rate and comparable to the state FRL rate.
- Since the 2016-17 school year, the proficiency rates for ELA and science are mostly declining, while the proficiency rates for math are mixed as some groups (e.g. Black) are improving and others are declining.

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

- For ELA proficiency, the student groups at Sierra perform mostly lower than the corresponding groups for Seattle PS, but the Limited English and Students with a Disability groups outperform the Seattle PS and the state.
- For math proficiency, the performance of student groups at Sierra is mixed as the groups perform similar to, better than, or lower than the corresponding measures for groups for the Seattle PS and or the state.
- For science, Sierra student groups perform lower than the groups for both the Seattle PS and the state, except for the White student group which performs higher than both.

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 114 students in the 6<sup>th</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grades in the 2018-19 school year.
- Approximately 44 percent of Willow’s students identify as Hispanic which is similar to the Walla Walla SD rate and nearly double the state rate. Willow’s FRL rate (49 percent) is lower than the Walla Walla SD FRL rate (58 percent) and approximately six percentage points higher than the state FRL rate.
- Willow Public School opened in the 2018-19 school year, meaning that a performance baseline has just recently been set making any type of trend analysis impossible.

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

- For ELA proficiency, the reportable student groups at Willow mostly perform lower than the corresponding groups for the Walla Walla SD and the state.
- For math proficiency, student groups at Willow mostly perform 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 of the small number of students assessed in science, all 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**

- Impact Puget Sound served 180 students in kindergarten and the 1<sup>st</sup> grades in the 2018-19 school year. No assessment results are available.

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

### Data Sources and Data Processing

Between late September and mid-December, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) Office of School Information provided SBE with separate de-identified student enrollment, assessment, absence, and student growth percentile files for the 2018-19 school year to complete the required analyses. The assessment file 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. Because the WA-AIM differs greatly from the SBA and because WA-AIM scores vary considerably based on disability type, SBE made the decision to exclude the WA-AIM results from the analyses presented here. The findings in Part B are derived solely from the SBA ELA and math and the WCAS science assessments for the charter school and TPS student groups. Group differences were evaluated using the Independent Samples *t*-Test and the group differences are reported as follows.

- A statistically similar performance between groups is where a *t*-test of the group means resulted in a value of  $p > 0.050$ . In this case, the null hypothesis of no difference between the means cannot be rejected. **In other words, the researcher must conclude that the means do not differ and the performance is statistically similar.**
- A statistically different performance between groups is where a *t*-test of the group means resulted in a value of  $p \leq 0.050$ . In this case, the null hypothesis of no difference between the means is rejected. **The researcher concludes that the means differ and the performance is described as 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 of 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 sample *t*-test, Cohen's *d* is determined by calculating the mean difference between the two groups, and then dividing the result by the pooled standard deviation.

Results are characterized as "practically significant" when the difference is medium or large. For many of the analyses reported upon here, the effect size (Cohen's *d*) is less than 0.20 which indicates negligible effect. In other words, the difference between the group means is statistically significant but of little or no practical significance in a real life situation.

Table A12: shows how the effect size (Cohen's  $d$ ) is described for the purpose of providing additional context as to the practical significance or meaningfulness of an experimental treatment.

Cohen's $d$ From	Cohen's $d$ To	Description of Effect Size from the Experimental Variable
	$\leq 0.20$	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.
$\geq 0.80$		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 necessary to evaluate for scale score differences by grade level.

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

The Independent Sample  $t$ -Test was conducted to determine whether the comparison group (charter school students) performed differently than the control group (TPS students) on the statewide ELA, math, and science assessments. For the analyses in Part B, the comparison and control 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 attributed to attending a traditional public school versus a charter school. However, it must be noted that 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 control group was created following a student-by-student matching process to be as identical as possible to the comparison 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 comparison 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 comparison group members, also have valid results for the Washington Comprehensive Assessment of Science (WCAS) in the grade levels which are tested.
- A control 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. 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 2018-19 school year, and the language spoken at home. In the matching process, each student's home district was considered and used as a 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 control group matched student attended school in a different, but nearby school district.

Unfortunately, not all charter school students can 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 a previous result 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.
- Science is assessed 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 science results.

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

Matching Criteria	3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade Students	4 <sup>th</sup> to 8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Students	10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Students	11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Students*
Grade	Yes, exact	Yes, exact	Yes, exact	Yes, exact
Gender	Yes, exact	Yes, exact	Yes, exact	Yes, exact
Race/Ethnicity	Yes, exact	Yes, exact	Yes, exact	Yes, exact
Low Income (FRL) Status	Yes, exact	Yes, exact	Yes, exact	Yes, exact
English Learner (EL) Status	Yes, exact	Yes, exact	Yes, exact	Yes, exact
Special Education (SWD) Status	Yes, exact	Yes, exact	Yes, exact	Yes, exact
Previous Assessment Results	No	Yes, prior year (+/- 25 points)	Yes, two yrs. prior (+/- 25 points)	No
Cumulative Days Absent	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 11<sup>th</sup> grade matching criteria are for the science assessment results only.

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

Table A14: Race and ethnicity composition of the student groups in the 2018-19 school year for the 3<sup>rd</sup> through 10<sup>th</sup> graders addressed in this analysis.

Student Group	Students in Group (N)	Native Amer. (%)	Asian (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	White (%)	Pacific Islander (%)	Two or More (%)
Control Group (TPS Students)	1614	1.2	3.3	25.5	17.1	41.9	0.9	9.5
Comparison Group (CS Students)	1614	1.2	3.3	25.5	17.1	41.9	0.9	9.5

Table A15: Program participation, attendance, and exclusionary discipline patterns for the study groups and Washington for the 2018-19 school year.

Student Group	Students in Group (N)	FRL (%)	EL (%)	SWD (%)	Section 504 (%)	Days Absent* (M)	Average Prior ELA Score	Average Prior Math Score
Control Group (TPS Students)	1381	60.4	11.8	13.7	3.8	11.9	2514.6	2512.0
Comparison Group (CS Students)	1381	60.4	11.8	13.7	3.4	12.0	2514.4	2512.5

\*Note: the days absent variable was computed 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 due to unusual absence patterns. Also, 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 control and comparison groups, more than 95 percent of the students were continuously enrolled for the academic year, and student results were included in this comparison regardless of the continuously enrolled status, in a similar manner in which results are reported on the Washington State Report Card.

## Grade Level Findings by Content Area

### Performance by Scale Score

For the seven grades in which analyses on the ELA assessment were conducted, the comparison group (charter school students) performed statistically similar to the control group (TPS students) at all grade levels (Table A16).

Table A16: spring 2019 ELA scale score differences based on charter school enrollment.

Assessment	Number of Students in each Group (N)	Mean Scale Score Comparison Group Charter Students	Mean Scale Score Control Group TPS Students	Mean Scale Score Difference*
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade	79	2443.9	2435.7	-8.19
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade	59	2479.8	2502.3	22.46
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	101	2523.1	2503.4	-19.64
6 <sup>th</sup> Grade	418	2522.2	2524.8	2.57
7 <sup>th</sup> Grade	481	2562.0	2557.1	-4.58
8 <sup>th</sup> Grade	302	2576.3	2564.2	-12.11
10 <sup>th</sup> Grade	174	2635.4	2617.6	-17.93

\*Note: the mean difference is reported as the value for the TPS student group minus the value for the charter school group. A negative mean difference indicates that the mean scale score for the comparison group (charter school students) was higher than the mean scale score for the TPS control group. A

positive mean difference indicates that the mean scale score for the comparison group (charter school students) was lower than the mean scale score for the TPS control group.

For the seven grades in which analyses on the math assessment were conducted, the comparison group (charter school students) performed statistically similar to the control group in most grade levels (Table A17). The results are described in more detail below.

- On the math assessment, the comparison group (charter school students) performed statistically similar to the control group (TPS students) at all grade levels except for the 5<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grades.
- On the 5<sup>th</sup> grade math assessment, the mean scale score for the comparison group (2523.7) was statistically different and higher than the mean scale score for the control group (2496.3). The mean scale score difference was approximately 27 scale score points.
- On the 10<sup>th</sup> grade math assessment, the mean scale score for the comparison group (2589.0) was statistically different and higher than the mean scale score for the control group (2554.8). The mean scale score difference was approximately 34 scale score points.

For the 5<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grade math assessments, the mean scale score differences are statistically different and the differences are small. Results are “practically significant” when the difference is large enough to be meaningful in real life. For the 5<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grade analyses, the effect size (Cohen’s *d*) is approximately 0.30 which indicates a small effect. In other words, statistically significant and practically significant, but the effect of charter school enrollment is small.

Table A17: spring 2019 math scale score differences based on charter school enrollment.

Assessment	Number of Students in each Group (N)	Mean Scale Score Comparison Group Charter Students	Mean Scale Score Control Group TPS Students	Mean Scale Score Difference*
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade	79	2435.4	2444.8	9.43
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade	63	2470.7	2481.3	10.67
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade**	115	2523.7	2496.3	-27.41
6 <sup>th</sup> Grade	413	2518.2	2525.5	7.36
7 <sup>th</sup> Grade	462	2548.4	2540.0	-8.43
8 <sup>th</sup> Grade	289	2547.1	2531.8	-15.28
10 <sup>th</sup> Grade**	170	2589.0	2554.8	-34.22

\*Note: the mean difference is reported as the value for the TPS student group minus the value for the charter school group. A negative mean difference indicates that the mean scale score for the comparison group (charter school students) was higher than the mean scale score for the TPS control group. A positive mean difference indicates that the mean scale score for the comparison group (charter school students) was lower than the mean scale score for the TPS control group. \*\*Note: the double asterisk denotes the assessments and grades where the group performances were statistically different.

On the science assessments, the comparison group (charter school students) scored similar to the control group (TPS students) in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade and substantially higher than the control group in the 8<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> grade (Table A18). Additional details are provided below.

- On the 5<sup>th</sup> grade science assessment, the average scale score for the comparison group was higher than the control group, but the scores were statistically similar
- On the 8<sup>th</sup> grade science assessment, the average scale score for the comparison group was statistically higher than the control group,
- The comparison group (672.7 scale score) performed statistically similar to the control group (665.4 scale score) on the 11<sup>th</sup> grade science assessment. The mean difference was -7.33 scale score points with the charter school student group scoring higher.

For the 8<sup>th</sup> grade science assessment, the mean scale score difference is statistically significant but the difference is very small. For the 8<sup>th</sup> grade science assessment, the effect size (Cohen's *d*) is less than 0.20 which indicates a very small effect. In other words, statistically significant but not practically significant.

Table A18: Science scale score differences from the spring 2019 assessment administration based on charter school enrollment.

Assessment	Number of Students in Each Group (N)	Mean Scale Score Comparison Group Charter Students	Mean Scale Score Control Group TPS Students	Mean Scale Score Difference*
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	101	702.0	687.3	-14.69
8 <sup>th</sup> Grade**	301	693.3	678.0	-15.28
11 <sup>th</sup> Grade	67	672.7	665.4	-7.33

\*Note: the mean difference is reported as the value for the TPS student group minus the value for the charter school group. A negative mean difference indicates that the mean scale score for the comparison group (charter school students) was higher than the mean scale score for the control group. \*\*Note: the double asterisk denotes the assessments and grades where the group performances were statistically different.

### Performance on Student Growth Percentiles

Washington uses the student growth percentiles (SGPs) growth model 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 computed for students in the 4<sup>th</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grades. The OSPI created materials describing the [Washington growth model](#) are posted on their website.

The Independent Sample *t*-Test was conducted to determine whether the comparison group (charter school students) performed differently than the control group (TPS students) on the measure of student growth percentiles (SGPs). Statewide, charter school students posted student growth percentiles similar to or higher than the TPS students in all grades for both ELA and math, except for the measure of the 4<sup>th</sup> grade ELA SGP (Table A19).

- On the ELA SGPs, the comparison group (charter school students) performed similarly to the control group (TPS students) for the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> grades.
  - On the 4<sup>th</sup> grade ELA SGP measure, the TPS students performed differently and approximately 5.1 percentile points better than the charter school students.
  - On the 5<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade ELA SGP measures, the charter school students performed differently and approximately 7.8 to 9.3 percentile points better than the TPS students.
- On the math SGPs, the comparison group (charter school students) performed similarly to or higher than the control group (TPS students) at all grade levels. On the 5<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> grade math SGP measures, the charter school students performed differently and approximately 4.8 to 14.4 percentile points better than the TPS students.

For the 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> grade ELA SGPs, the mean SGP differences are statistically different and the differences are small. The effect sizes (Cohen’s *d*) are approximately 0.30 to 0.40 which indicates a small effect. In other words, statistically significant and practically significant but a small effect from charter school enrollment.

For the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade math SGPs, the mean SGP differences are statistically different. The effect sizes (Cohen’s *d*) are less than 0.20 which indicates little or a very small effect. In other words, statistically significant and but not practically significant. For the 5<sup>th</sup> grade math SGPs, the effect size is approximately 0.50 which indicates a small to medium effect from charter school enrollment.

Table A19: shows the ELA and math growth model mean (average) data for the groups by grade level.

Assessment	Number of Students in each Group* (N)	Mean SGP Comparison Group Charter Students	Mean SGP Control Group TPS Students	Mean SGP Difference
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA**	59/59	45.9	56.2	10.27
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA**	101/99	59.7	50.4	-9.25
6 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA	418/416	51.0	51.6	0.59
7 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA	481/478	52.3	48.9	-3.44
8 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA**	302/300	56.6	48.8	-7.89
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math	63/63	46.0	52.5	6.51
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math **	114/104	65.1	50.7	-14.38
6 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math	412/410	51.1	52.8	1.70
7 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math**	459/458	53.4	48.6	-4.77
8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math**	289/286	49.5	44.3	-5.18

The mean difference is reported as the value for the non-charter school group minus the value for the charter school group. A negative mean difference indicates that the mean SGP for the comparison group (charter school students) was higher than the mean SGP for the control group (non-charter school students). A positive mean difference indicates that the mean SGP for the comparison group (charter school students) was lower than the mean SGP for the control group (non-charter school students).\*Note: shows the number of student records for the control/comparison group. \*\*Note: the double asterisk denotes the assessments where the group performances were statistically different.

A student growth percentile (SGP) is a derived percentile value or rank, and when aggregated, SGPs are often but not always reported as a median value, which usually differs from the mean (average) value. An evaluation of the medians shows that the comparison group (charter school students) performed similar to or better than the control group (TPS students) on the ELA and math SGPs at all grade levels (Table A20). The findings are as follows:

- The ELA SGP medians for the charter school students (comparison group) was similar to the ELA SGP medians for the TPS students for the 4<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, and 7<sup>th</sup> grades.
- In the 5<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades, the median values for the charter school students was 15 and 12 percentile points higher than the corresponding value for the TPS students.
- The math SGP medians for the charter school students (comparison group) was similar to the math SGP medians for the TPS students for the 4<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> grades.
- In the 5<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> grades, the median values for the charter school students was five to 19 percentile points higher than the corresponding value for the TPS students.

For the 5<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade ELA SGP analyses, an effect size (eta squared) of 0.027 and 0.019 indicate that the experimental variable (enrollment in a charter school) explains approximately two to three percent of the variance found in the ELA SGPs. This represents a very small effect from charter school enrollment.

For the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade math SGP analyses, an effect size (eta squared) of 0.007 and 0.008 indicate that the experimental variable (enrollment in a charter school) explains less than one percent of the variance found in the math SGPs. This represents a very small effect from charter school enrollment. For the 5<sup>th</sup> grade math SGP analysis, an effect size of 0.118 indicates that the experimental variable (enrollment in a charter school) explains approximately 11.8 percent of the variance found in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade math SGPs. This represents a small to medium effect from charter school enrollment.

Table A20: shows the ELA and math growth model data (medians) for the control and comparison groups by grade level.

Assessment	Number of Students in each Group* (N)	Median SGP Comparison Group Charter Students	Median SGP Control Group TPS Students	Median SGP Difference
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA	59/59	40.0	58.0	18.00
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA**	101/99	64.0	49.0	-15.00
6 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA	418/416	51.0	52.5	1.50
7 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA	481/478	51.5	50.0	-1.50
8 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA**	302/300	61.0	49.0	-12.00
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math	63/63	43.0	58.0	15.00
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math **	114/104	73.0	53.5	-19.50
6 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math	412/410	54.0	53.5	-0.50
7 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math**	459/458	57.0	45.0	-12.00
8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math**	289/286	48.0	43.0	-5.00

DRAFT

The median difference is reported as the value for the non-charter school group minus the value for the charter school group. A negative median difference indicates that the median SGP for the comparison group (charter school students) was higher than the median SGP for the control group (non-charter school students). A positive mean difference indicates that the median SGP for the comparison group (charter school students) was lower than the median SGP for the control group (non-charter school students). \*Note: shows the number of student records for the control group/comparison group. \*\*Note: the double asterisk denotes the assessments and grades where the group performances were statistically different. The results are derived from the Mann Whitney Independent Sample *U* Test of Medians.

DRAFT