A high-quality education system that prepares all students for college, career, and life.

Annual Report on Charter Schools: 2016-2017
December 1, 2017

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Questions regarding this report should be directed to the following SBE staff:

Ms. Kaaren Heikes, Director of Policy and Partnerships
Dr. Andrew Parr, Research Director

Table of Contents

Section I - Introduction

Washington's Charter School Act, Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 28.710 (ESSSB 6194, 2016) went into effect April 3, 2016. The 2016-2017 school year was the first full school year in which charter public schools operated in Washington State. Therefore, this is the State Board of Education's first annual report required by **RCW 28A.710.250(1)**: *By December 1st of each year beginning in the first year after there have been charter schools operating for a full school year, the (Washington) State Board of Education, in collaboration with the (Washington State Charter School) Commission, must issue a report on the performance of the state's charter schools during the preceding school year to the Governor, the Legislature, and the public.*

A charter school in Washington State is a public school that:

1. Is operated separately from the common school system, as a public alternative to traditional common schools;

2. Is a Washington nonprofit public benefit corporation that is nonsectarian and nonreligious with tax exempt status under section 501(c)(3) of the federal internal revenue code;

3. Has an approved charter school application that includes at least the 32 elements required by RCW 28A.710.130, approved by an "authorizer," which is either the Washington Charter School Commission or a school district approved by the State Board of Education;

4. Is governed by a charter school board according to the terms of a renewable, five-year charter contract executed with an approved authorizer; all charter school board members and Commission members must file annual personal financial affairs statements with the Public Disclosure Commission;

5. Is subject to the supervision of the superintendent of public instruction and the state board of education, including accountability measures, to the same extent as other public schools;

6. Is open to all children free of charge and by choice, regardless of a student's location of residence, with admission based only on age group, grade level, and school enrollment capacity;

7. Must provide a program of basic education that meets the goals in RCW 28A.150.210, including instruction in the essential academic learning requirements, and participate in the statewide student assessment system;

8. May offer any program or course of study that any other public school may offer, including one or more of grades kindergarten through twelve;

9. Is subject to the performance improvement goals adopted by the State Board of Education;

10. Is required to employ certificated instructional staff except in specific exceptional cases;

11. Functions as a local education agency under applicable federal laws and regulations and is responsible for meeting the requirements of local education agencies and public schools under those federal laws and regulations;

12. Must comply with local, state, and federal health, safety, parents' rights, civil rights, and nondiscrimination laws applicable to school districts;

13. Must comply with all state statutes and rules made applicable to the charter school in the school's charter contract, and are subject to the specific state statutes and rules identified in subsection (2) of this section. For the purpose of allowing flexibility to innovate in areas such as scheduling, personnel, funding, and educational programs to improve student outcomes and academic achievement, charter schools are not subject to, and are exempt from, all other state statutes and rules applicable to school districts and school district boards of directors. Except as provided otherwise by this chapter or a charter contract, charter schools are exempt from all school district policies;

14. Is required to adhere to generally accepted accounting principles and be subject to financial examinations and audits as determined by the state auditor, including annual audits for legal and fiscal compliance; comply with the open public meetings act and public records requirements, and provide an annual performance report.*

Two authorizers – the Charter School Commission and Spokane Public Schools authorized eight charter public schools operating in Washington during the 2016-17 school year.

Figure 1: 2016-2017 operating charter schools

School Name	Authorizer	Location	Grades Served	Enrollment
Green Dot Destiny	Charter School Commission	Tacoma	6-7	278
Green Dot Excel	Charter School Commission	Kent	6-8	157
Pride Prep	Spokane Public Schools	Spokane	6-8	232
Rainier Prep	Charter School Commission	Seattle	5-7	334
SOAR	Charter School Commission	Tacoma	K-1	180
Spokane International Academy	Spokane Public Schools	Spokane	K-2 and 6-7	252
Summit Olympus	Charter School Commission	Tacoma	9-10	167
Summit Sierra	Charter School Commission	Seattle	9-10	297

Charter public schools enrolled 1,897 Washington students K-12 in 2016-17, which is approximately 0.17 percent, or less than one-fifth of one percent, of the total 1,103,269 K-12 public school students enrolled in 2016-17.

* RCW 28A.710.010(5), 28A.710.010(3), 28A.710.020, 24.03.490, 28A.710.160, 28A.710.070, 28A.710.090. 28A.710.040, 28A.150.210, 28A.655.070, 28A.305.130, 28A.642, 28A.640, 28A.655.110, 28A.410.025.

Figure 2: Annual report contents

RCW 28A.710.250(2) Report Requirements	Status
The report must include a comparison of the performance of charter school students with the performance of academically, ethnically, and economically comparable groups of students in other public schools.	Since 2016-17 was the first full school year charter schools operated, only baseline assessment data are available for students in charter schools. SBE is utilizing 2016-17 Washington Report Card data and conducting analyses to compare this data with achievement data of comparable groups of students in other public schools during the same year. Consequently, performance data will show proficiency only. Starting next year when there is more than one data point, both proficiency and growth results based on Achievement Index data can and will be reported.
In addition, the annual report must include the state board of education's assessment of the successes, challenges, and areas for improvement in meeting the purposes of this chapter,	Each charter public school is required by law to obtain an annual independent financial audit. The audits for 2016-17 are not yet complete; projected completion date is February 2018. The State Auditor's Office is also conducting a performance audit of the charter public schools, and it is not yet complete; projected completion date for this report is April 2018. The absence of academic performance growth data and financial information from the audits makes it impossible to fairly assess the successes, challenges, and areas for improvement in meeting the purposes of the State's Charter School Act.
including the board's assessment of the sufficiency of funding for charter schools, the efficacy of the formula for authorizer funding,	The validity of the Charter Schools Act, including the manner of funding charter schools, is under review by the Washington State Supreme Court. The adequacy of K-12 funding is also under review by the Washington Supreme Court in a separate case. Decisions in both cases are expected before the end of the 2017-18 school year. The SBE believes that any assessment of funding for charter schools or charter authorizers is premature until the Court has issued decisions in these significant cases.
and any suggested changes in state law or policy necessary to strengthen the state's charter schools.	The paucity of data and information along with both current pertinent lawsuits obviate the SBE making any significant recommendations to state law or policy. SBE, through collaboration with the CSC, does recommend a few minor changes in state law to align with recently amended applicable laws, field practices and timing of pertinent data availability.

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.* The two current charter public school authorizers in the state, the Charter Schools Commission and Spokane Public Schools, submitted annual reports to the State Board of Education on November 1st in accordance with RCW 28A.710.100(4):

Each authorizer must submit an annual report to the state board of education, according to a timeline, content, and format specified by the board that includes:

(a) The authorizer's strategic vision for chartering and progress toward achieving that vision;

(b) 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;

(c) The status of the authorizer's charter school portfolio, identifying all charter schools in each of the following categories: (i) Approved but not yet open; (ii) operating; (iii) renewed; (iv) transferred; (v) revoked; (vi) not renewed; (vii) voluntarily closed; or (viii) never opened;

(d) The authorizer's operating costs and expenses detailed in annual audited financial statements that conform with generally accepted accounting principles; and

(e) The services purchased from the authorizer by the charter schools under its jurisdiction under RCW 28A.710.110, including an itemized accounting of the actual costs of these services.

Section II - Charter School 2016-2017 Performance

Figure 3 summarizes the 2016-17 student achievement on the statewide assessments for the charter schools compared to their "home district" performance. Only the 2016-17 student achievement data is addressed in this work, as 2016-17 was the first year the charter schools operated for a full school year. As such, the 2016-17 student achievement data should serve as a baseline year, or foundation upon which future comparisons should be made. The preliminary academic performance of the charter school students when compared with the school district in which the charter school is physically situated is: in four subject areas the performance is lower, in five subject areas the performance is similar, and in five subject areas the performance is higher.

The achievement data presented here should not be used to make any definitive judgements about school performance. Judgements about the performance of all schools, including the charter schools, should be based on results included in the School Achievement Index (Index) that follows a set of predetermined business rules designed to ensure that the performance of schools is described in a valid, reliable, and fair manner. The version of the Index that includes the 2016-17 achievement data will be published in winter 2018.

Figure 3: Summary of charter school performance compared to the performance of the school district in which the charter school is physically situated.

School	Grades Served 2016-17	2016-17 Achievement (District Comparison*)		
		ELA	Math	Science
Green Dot Destiny	6-7	Lower	Lower	nd
Green Dot Excel	6-8	Lower	Similar	Lower
Pride Prep	6-8	Similar	Similar	Higher
Rainier Prep	5-7	Higher	Higher	Higher
SOAR	K-1	nd	nd	nd
Spokane Intl. Acad.	K-2 & 6-7	Higher	Similar	nd
Summit Olympus	9-10	nd	nd	nd
Summit Sierra	9-10	nd	nd	Similar
*Note: the District Comparison indicates whether the all students group for the school performed higher, lower, or similar to the school district in which the school is physically situated. The performance was deemed to be similar if the difference was ±5 percentage points. No data = nd, indicates not tested, uncertain, unknown, or suppressed Biology EOC results.				

For each of the charter schools in operation for the 2016-17 school year an image of the school demographics from the Washington Report Card is provided. The achievement data represented in the following charts were taken from the Washington Report Card in late October and early November 2017. While the Report Card provides the best publicly available school achievement data prior to the publication of the Washington Achievement Index (planned for the winter 2018), the results displayed do not paint a complete picture of student achievement for a school. Growth model data in combination with achievement data provides a

more complete picture of the school's impact on student learning. The OSPI anticipates publically releasing the 2016-17 growth model data in February 2018.

The Washington Report Card shows all of the assessment results for each school, including records for students enrolling mid-year and even those shortly before testing. This means that some of the student results may be attributed to a school even when a student may have been enrolled at the school for only weeks. For school accountability, the federal regulations require that the state apply a continuously enrolled (CE) filter to include in a school analysis; only those students who meet certain enrollment criteria. The Washington Report Card does not apply this CE filter.

The ESSA Report Card workgroup recommended that the ESSA Accountability Workgroup adopt a minimum n-size of twenty (20) students for reporting school performance data in the Achievement Index. Using three years of combined data, 20 is the minimum number to be included in accountability. This approach is more inclusive than the previous approach used on Washington's State Report Card. This means the outcomes for more students will be included in determining which schools need the most support. In part, the minimum n-size was supported because it was deemed to result in statistically reliable and valid results. In other words, reporting on 20 students provides more meaningful information as compared to reporting on ten students. Because the achievement results are reported here as a percentage of students, the reader should carefully consider the statistical nuances of comparing the results of 10 students to the results of 2000 students.

The Washington Report Card suppresses assessment results when fewer than 10 records are present to prevent the disclosure of student personal identifying information (PII). Results are suppressed for any of several reasons, the most common occurring when a student group at a grade level has fewer than 10 records. The following list provides important information about the reporting of charter school achievement information in this report.
- Blank cells for a student group at a school means that there were no reportable results for that student group. Non-reportable results are most often due to no records or too few records, but there are other instances in which results may be suppressed.
- Where school district-level data is suppressed, the cells are noted with "supp."
- Student groups identified with an asterisk (*) indicate the circumstance where records are reportable for at least one grade level but not all assessed grade levels.
- Where grade-level results are suppressed at a school, the corresponding school district value for the same reportable grades are shown. In other words, when only the sixth grade results are reported for the school, only the sixth grade results are shown for the district.

As stated in this report's introductory section, RCW 28A.710.250(2) stipulates that this report "must include a comparison of the performance of charter school students with the performance of academically, ethically, and economically comparable groups of students in other public schools." Comparing the academic achievement of the students at a charter school to a nearly identical public school in the local school district would be ideal, but is a very

difficult task to accomplish. In order to develop an assessment of charter school academic performance, the methodology and analyses reported upon here include a comparison of the charter school achievement to the achievement of the school district in which the charter school is physically located. When interpreting the difference in achievement on the performance table for each charter school, the following applies:
- A positive value means the charter school outperformed the district.
- A negative value means the charter school performed lower than the district.

Washington computes student academic growth in English language arts (ELA) and math using the Washington Growth Model, which follows the Student Growth Percentile (SGP) growth model developed by Dr. Damian Betebenner of the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessments. School and subgroup SGPs are annually reported on the OSPI K-12 Data Analytics webpage. Aggregated SGPs for a school or student group are generated from student level data and are reported as group medians. As such, it impossible to aggregate grade level medians to group medians without averaging medians, which adds unnecessary complexity to this work. The 2017 SGPs are not yet publicly available on the OSPI website.

Preliminary SGPs for 2017 are briefly discussed but are reported by grade level on the OSPI website rather than aggregating to the school level. As such, only a general statement can be made about the range of values for the separate grade levels for each school.

Student growth percentiles are normative measures of student academic growth from one year to the next and require assessment records for the two most recent years in order to calculate. Because of this requirement, the number of SGP records for any given group is typically less than the number of records for (achievement) proficiency measures. Like any measure, smaller group sizes tend to exhibit greater year to year variance, and because of this, it is not wholly appropriate to compare the SGPs for a smaller school to an entire district. SGPs range from one to 99 and, when describing the performance of a group, the terminology that follows will be used.
- A median SGP of 67 or greater is considered high growth.
- A median SGP of 34 to 66 is considered typical growth.
- A median SGP or 33 or less is considered low growth.

In summary, the information on school achievement presented here is the best publicly reported data available from the Washington Report Card. The information on student academic growth comes primarily from the Index, which is the best publicly reported data available, and is augmented with general descriptors for 2017 preliminary SGPs not yet publicly available. The conclusions drawn from this data about school achievement and academic growth should be framed in an understanding of data suppression to preserve student PII, the statistical nuances of small group analyses, and comparing vastly different sized groups. Finally, every attempt has been made to use all available data from a variety of sources to best characterize the academic performance of the charter schools.

Green Dot Destiny MS (6-7)

Green Dot Destiny Middle School (MS) is physically situated within the Tacoma School District (SD) boundary. For the 2016-17 school year, Green Dot Destiny MS served approximately 250 sixth and seventh grade students. Approximately 80 percent of the students qualify for the Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRL) program and approximately 20 percent qualify for special education, both of which are higher than the state and Tacoma SD averages. Per the Washington Report Card more than three fourths of the students are non-white, which is far greater than the state and Tacoma SD averages.

Student Demographics		
Enrollment		
October 2016 Student Count		270
May 2017 Student Count		247
Gender (October 2016)		
Male	139	51.5%
Female	131	48.5%
Race/Ethnicity (October 2016)		
Hispanic / Latino of any race(s)	69	25.6%
American Indian / Alaskan Native	7	2.6%
Asian	5	1.9%
Black / African American	73	27.0%
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	11	4.1%
White	60	22.2%
Two or More Races	45	16.7%
Special Programs		
Free or Reduced-Price Meals (May 2017)	199	80.6%
Special Education (May 2017)	51	20.6%
Transitional Bilingual (May 2017)	10	4.0%
Migrant (May 2017)	0	0.0%
Section 504 (May 2017)	4	1.6%
Foster Care (May 2017)	N<10	
Other Information (more info)		
Unexcused Absence Rate (2016-17)	1,618	3.7%

Overall, the academic performance of the all students group at Green Dot Destiny (GDD) is lower than the performance of the Tacoma SD sixth and seventh graders (Figure 4). On the 2017 assessments, approximately 27.7 percent of GDD students met standard on the ELA assessment and 17.6 percent on the math assessment. These rates are 18 to 20 percentage points lower than the Tacoma SD average.

- At GDD, 23 percent of Black students met standard on the ELA assessment and 11.5 percent on the math assessment. These rates are 7 to 10 percentage points lower than the Tacoma SD average for Black students.
- Approximately 25.4 percent of Hispanic students met standard on the ELA assessment and 13.4 percent on the math assessment. These rates are 10 to 11 percentage points lower than the Tacoma SD average for Hispanic students.
- At GDD, 32.1 percent of White students met standard on the ELA assessment and 30.2 percent on the math assessment. These rates are 19 to 25 percentage points lower than the Tacoma SD average for White students.
- The performance of students identifying as Two or More Races is a little lower than the Tacoma SD but is based on only 13 students.
- Students at GDD receiving special education services perform at a rate approximately 4 percentage points lower than the Tacoma SD average.
- Green Dot Destiny serves a high percentage of students qualifying for FRL and these student perform about 9 percentage points lower than the Tacoma SD average in both ELA and math.

Figure 5: Shows the percentage of students at Green Dot Destiny MS meeting standard on the 2017 ELA and math Smarter Balanced assessments by student group.

	Green Dot Destiny		Tacoma SD		Difference[+]	
	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math
All Students	27.7	17.6	45.9	37.4	-18.1	-19.7
Asian	**	**	60.2	56.2	--	--
Native American	**	**	28.6	18.6	--	--
Black	23.0	11.5	30.0	21.2	-7.0	-9.7
Hispanic	25.4	13.4	34.9	24.1	-9.5	-10.7
Pacific Islander	**	**	31.0	22.6	--	--
White	32.1	30.2	56.8	48.8	-24.7	-18.6
Two or More*	30.8	23.1	38.4	26.1	-7.6	-3.0
Limited English	**	**	8.8	6.6	--	--
Special Education	5.8	1.9	10.3	5.9	-4.5	-3.9
Low Income	25.8	17.0	34.6	25.9	-8.8	-8.9

[+]Difference = Performance of Green Dot Destiny minus the performance of Tacoma SD for the corresponding grade levels for the reportable student groups shown in percentage points. *Note: values do not reflect all grade levels for the school, only those grade levels with reportable results. **Note: cells denoted with a double asterisk (**) indicate the presence of students in this group but with results suppressed to protect PII.

Overall, the academic growth of the students at Green Dot Destiny in 2017 does not appear to be particularly strong. When the all students group is considered, the academic growth for ELA was lower than typical while the math SGPs will likely be close to typical.

- In 2017, the academic growth for the Black, White, and Two or More Races student groups was mostly lower than in 2016 and will likely fall in the lower than typical growth category.
- The academic growth for Hispanic students in 2017 is low for ELA and typical for math
- The academic growth for FRL-qualifying students appears to be low for ELA and typical for math.
- The academic growth for students receiving special education services is typical for math but was reportable for only one grade level. The ELA result was not reportable.

Green Dot Excel MS (6-8)

The Green Dot Excel MS is physically situated within the Kent SD boundaries. The Green Dot Excel MS served approximately 150 sixth, seventh, and eighth grade students in the 2016-17 school year. The percentage of students qualifying for FRL (47 percent), special education (13 percent) and bilingual education (13 percent) are close to the state and Kent school district averages.

Approximately two-thirds of the students are non-white, which is higher than the state average and similar to the district rate. Green Dot Excel (GDE) MS is physically situated within the Kent SD boundaries. Overall, the GDE students meet standard on the

Student Demographics		
Enrollment		
October 2016 Student Count		187
May 2017 Student Count		158
Gender (October 2016)		
Male	108	57.8%
Female	79	42.2%
Race/Ethnicity (October 2016)		
Hispanic / Latino of any race(s)	17	9.1%
Asian	16	8.6%
Black / African American	58	31.0%
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	2	1.1%
White	67	35.8%
Two or More Races	27	14.4%
Special Programs		
Free or Reduced-Price Meals (May 2017)	74	46.8%
Special Education (May 2017)	21	13.3%
Transitional Bilingual (May 2017)	20	12.7%
Migrant (May 2017)	0	0.0%
Section 504 (May 2017)	10	6.3%
Foster Care (May 2017)	N<10	
Other Information (more info)		
Unexcused Absence Rate (2016-17)	826	2.5%

ELA assessment (47 percent) and the math assessment (44.7 percent) lower than the Kent SD average (Figure 6). The GDE ELA performance is approximately 11 percentage points lower and the math 4 percentage points lower that the corresponding measures for Kent SD.

- GDE students identifying as Black met standard on the ELA assessment (46.5 percent), which is approximately 15 percentage points higher than the Kent SD. On the math assessment, the GDE rate (37.2 percent) is approximately 15 percentage points greater than the Kent SD.
- White students at GDE perform 22.5 percentage points lower on the ELA and 13 percentage points lower on the math assessment than the Kent SD average.
- The performance of students at GDE identifying with Two or More Races is mixed but the group performance is based on only 11 students.
- The performance of students with a disability is mixed but the group performance is based on only 11 students.
- Students qualifying for FRL at GDE perform approximately 3.4 percentage points higher on the ELA and 13.2 percentage points better on the math than the Kent SD.
- On the 8th grade science statewide assessment, GDE students who identify as Black or who qualify for FRL outperformed the corresponding groups for the Kent SD. However, the all students group (8th grade) for the Kent SD outperformed GDE by about 14 percentage points.

Figure 7: Shows the percentage of students at Green Got Excel MS meeting standard on the 2017 ELA and math Smarter Balanced assessments by student group.

	Green Dot Excel		Kent SD		Difference[+]	
	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math
All Students	47.0	44.7	57.8	48.8	-10.8	-4.2
Asian	**	**	71.9	65.9	--	--
Native American	--	--	supp	supp	--	--
Black*	46.5	37.2	31.7	22.3	14.8	14.9
Hispanic	**	**	43.9	32.0	--	--
Pacific Islander	**	**	supp	supp	--	--
White*	44.7	47.1	67.2	59.9	-22.5	-12.8
Two or More*	36.4	45.5	60.5	40.5	-24.1	5.0
Limited English	**	**	10.8	10.9	--	--
Special Education*	9.1	18.2	11.2	8.2	-2.1	10.0
Low Income	46.0	45.1	42.6	31.9	3.4	13.2
[+]Difference = Performance of Green Dot Excel minus the performance of Kent SD for the corresponding grade levels for the reportable student groups shown in percentage points. *Note: values do not reflect all grade levels for the school, only those grade levels with reportable results. **Note: cells denoted with a double asterisk (**) indicate the presence of students in this group but with results suppressed to protect PII.						

Overall, the academic growth of the students at GDE in 2017 data appears to be considerably lower than the previous year but still in the typical range. For the all students group in 2017, the school median SGPs will likely be less than 50 for both ELA and math but both are expected to be in the range of typical growth. For Black students, the academic growth appears to fall in the typical range for ELA and the low range for math. For White students, the SGPs for ELA and math will likely land in the typical range. For students qualifying for FRL, the SGPs for ELA and math will likely fall in the typical range.

Pride Prep MS (6-8)

Pride Prep is physically situated within Spokane Public Schools' (PS) boundaries. Per the Washington Report Card, Pride Prep MS served approximately 235 sixth, seventh, and eighth grade students in the 2016-17 school year. Approximately 53 percent of the students qualify for the Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRL) program and approximately 18 percent qualify for special education, both of which are a little higher than the state average and similar to the Spokane PS average.

Not only are the Pride Prep student demographics reflective of the Spokane PS, the students' performance on the ELA assessment (53.5 percent meeting standard) and math assessment (40.7 percent meeting standard) are comparable to the Spokane PS averages (Figure 8).

- Students identifying as White at Pride Prep performed on the ELA assessment approximately 3.5 percentage points lower than the Spokane PS average and approximately 7.1 percentage points lower than the Spokane SD on the math assessment.
- At Pride Prep in 2017, 41.7 percent of students who are not White met standard on the ELA assessment and 32.8 percent met standard on the math assessment. These rates are approximately 16 and 11 percentage points lower (for ELA and math, respectively) than the rates for White students.

Student Demographics		
Enrollment		
October 2016 Student Count		242
May 2017 Student Count		232
Gender (October 2016)		
Male	143	59.1%
Female	99	40.9%
Race/Ethnicity (October 2016)		
Hispanic / Latino of any race(s)	10	4.1%
American Indian / Alaskan Native	9	3.7%
Asian	2	0.8%
Black / African American	22	9.1%
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	1	0.4%
White	176	72.7%
Two or More Races	22	9.1%
Special Programs		
Free or Reduced-Price Meals (May 2017)	122	52.6%
Special Education (May 2017)	42	18.1%
Transitional Bilingual (May 2017)	0	0.0%
Migrant (May 2017)	0	0.0%
Section 504 (May 2017)	7	3.0%
Foster Care (May 2017)	N<10	

- Students qualifying for FRL and participating in special education perform a little better than the Spokane PS averages on the ELA and math assessments.
- On the 8th grade science assessment, the Pride Prep all students group performs approximately 9.5 percentage points better than the Spokane PS. All of the reportable student groups (White = 83.3 percent, SWD = 54.5 percent, and FRL = 75.6 percent) perform higher than the Spokane PS.

Figure 9: Shows the percentage of students at Pride Prep MS meeting standard on the 2017 ELA and math Smarter Balanced assessments by student group.

	Pride Prep		Spokane PS		Difference[+]	
	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math
All Students	53.5	40.7	55.5	44.9	-2.0	-4.2
Asian	**	**	59.3	53.0	--	--
Native American	**	**	32.6	22.9	--	--
Black	**	**	27.1	21.3	--	--
Hispanic	**	**	45.5	32.0	--	--
Pacific Islander	**	**	17.8	11.1	--	--
White	57.6	43.5	61.1	50.6	-3.5	-7.1
Two or More	**	**	47.9	37.1	--	--
Limited English	--	--	8.7	6.6	--	--
Special Education	15.0	29.3	13.7	11.2	1.3	18.1
Low Income	45.9	37.7	42.2	31.7	3.7	6.0

[+]Difference = Performance of Pride Prep minus the performance of Spokane PS for the corresponding grade levels for the reportable student groups shown in percentage points. *Note: values do not reflect all grade levels for the school, only those grade levels with reportable results. **Note: cells denoted with a double asterisk (**) indicate the presence of students in this group but with results suppressed to protect PII.

In a general sense, the academic growth in 2017 for the all students group at Pride Prep appears to be in the typical range for both ELA and math. The growth data for the students who are White and for those who qualify for FRL are similar to the measures for the all students group. Students participating in special education will likely post SGPs in the typical range for ELA and high growth for math.

Rainier Prep MS (5-7)

Rainier Prep MS is physically situated within the Highline SD boundaries. In the 2016-17 school year, Rainier Prep served approximately 250 fifth, sixth, and seventh grade students per the Washington Report Card. Nearly 80 percent of the students qualify for FRL and 23 percent participate in bilingual education, the FRL rate is higher than both the state and district average. More than 93 percent of the students are non-white, which is far greater than the state rate and greater than the Highline SD rate.

Overall, the students at Rainier Prep are performing at an academic level higher than the Highline SD in which the

Student Demographics		
Enrollment		
October 2016 Student Count		251
May 2017 Student Count		242
Gender (October 2016)		
Male	129	51.4%
Female	122	48.6%
Race/Ethnicity (October 2016)		
Hispanic / Latino of any race(s)	104	41.4%
American Indian / Alaskan Native	1	0.4%
Asian	27	10.8%
Black / African American	81	32.3%
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	2	0.8%
White	16	6.4%
Two or More Races	20	8.0%
Special Programs		
Free or Reduced-Price Meals (May 2017)	191	78.9%
Special Education (May 2017)	23	9.5%
Transitional Bilingual (May 2017)	56	23.1%
Migrant (May 2017)	0	0.0%
Section 504 (May 2017)	4	1.7%
Foster Care (May 2017)	N<10	
Other Information (more info)		
Unexcused Absence Rate (2016-17)	861	2.1%

charter school is situated (Figure 10). For all students, Rainier Prep had 58 percent of students meeting standard on the ELA assessment and 62.1 percent meeting standard on the math assessment. Rainier Prep students outperformed the Highline SD averages by 11.5 percentage points in ELA and 24.5 percentage points in math.

- Of the students who identify as Black at Rainier Prep, 53.5 percent met standard on the ELA and 64.8 percent met standard on the math assessment. These rates are 15.8 (ELA) and 36.8 (math) percentage points better than the Highline SD.
- Students qualifying for FRL met standard at rates of 54.4 percent in ELA and 57.5 percent in math, which are 16 and 28 percentage points (respectively) better than the Highline SD.
- Asian and Hispanic students outperformed the corresponding Highline SD averages by 17 to 26 percentage points, but some grades were not reportable, thereby reducing group sizes which makes comparisons a little more difficult.
- White students at Rainier Prep met standard on the ELA (-12.2 percentage points) and math (-14.4 percentage points) assessments at rates lower than the Highline SD.
- Even though some grade level results were suppressed to protect PII, students at Rainier Prep participating in bilingual education or special education outperformed the Highline

SD on corresponding measures by a few percentage points in ELA and 11 to 12 percentage points in math.

- On the 5th grade science assessment, Rainier Prep students outperformed corresponding Highline SD groups by approximately five to seven percentage points.

Figure 11: Shows the percentage of students at Rainier Prep meeting standard on the 2017 ELA and math Smarter Balanced assessments by student group.

	Rainier Prep		Highline SD		Difference+	
	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math
All Students	58.0	62.1	46.5	37.6	11.5	24.5
Asian*	80.0	80.0	63.3	58.1	16.7	21.9
Native American	**	**	26.8	25.3	--	--
Black	53.5	64.8	37.8	28.0	15.8	36.8
Hispanic*	57.9	55.3	37.3	29.5	20.6	25.8
Pacific Islander	**	**	30.8	24.1	--	--
White*	51.7	39.7	64.0	54.1	-12.2	-14.4
Two or More	**	**	52.9	40.0	--	--
Limited English*	13.8	20.0	10.4	8.7	3.4	11.3
Special Education*	13.3	20.0	9.0	8.1	4.3	11.9
Low Income	54.4	57.5	38.4	29.7	16.0	27.8

+Difference = Performance of Rainier Prep minus the performance of Highline SD for the corresponding grade levels for the reportable student groups shown in percentage points. *Note: values do not reflect all grade levels for the school, only those grade levels with reportable results. **Note: cells denoted with a double asterisk (**) indicate the presence of students in this group but with results suppressed to protect PII.

Rainier Prep's SGPs from 2017 for the all students group appear to remain solidly at the high side of typical growth for ELA and math. The academic growth for students identifying as Black appears to be in the typical range for both ELA and math. The academic growth for Hispanic students appears to be high for both ELA and math. For students qualifying for FRL, the growth in ELA is typical and growth for math. The SGPs in ELA and math for English language learners will likely fall in the typical range.

Spokane International Academy (K-2 and 6-7)

The Spokane International Academy (SIA) is physically situated within Spokane Public Schools (PS). Per the Washington Report Card, SIA served approximately 250 kindergarten, first, second, sixth, and seventh grade students in the 2016-17 school year. Approximately 42 percent of the students qualified for FRL which is close to the state average and lower than Spokane PS average. The SIA served students in special education (8.7 percent and bilingual education (1.6 percent) at rates lower than Spokane PS averages.

The SIA students met standard on statewide assessments at rates of 72.7 percent and 56.4 percent on the ELA and math assessments, respectively. The ELA rate of meeting standard is nearly 18 percentage points better than Spokane PS (Figure 12).

- Approximately 68.0 percent of White students at the SIA met standard on the ELA assessment and 57.3 percent met standard on the math assessment. These rates are 7.7 (ELA) and 4.6 (math) percentage points better than Spokane PS averages.

Student Demographics		
Enrollment		
October 2016 Student Count		263
May 2017 Student Count		252
Gender (October 2016)		
Male	112	42.6%
Female	151	57.4%
Race/Ethnicity (October 2016)		
Hispanic / Latino of any race(s)	29	11.0%
American Indian / Alaskan Native	3	1.1%
Asian	4	1.5%
Black / African American	8	3.0%
White	186	70.7%
Two or More Races	33	12.5%
Special Programs		
Free or Reduced-Price Meals (May 2017)	105	41.7%
Special Education (May 2017)	22	8.7%
Transitional Bilingual (May 2017)	4	1.6%
Migrant (May 2017)	0	0.0%
Section 504 (May 2017)	6	2.4%
Foster Care (May 2017)	N<10	

- Because of the required suppression, little can be stated about the academic performance of other race/ethnicity student groups. Students who are non-White met standard on the ELA assessment at a rate of 82.9 percent and on the math assessment at a rate of 54.3 percent. The percentage of non-White students meeting standard on the ELA assessment is approximately 15 percentage points better than the corresponding rate for White students.
- With some grade level results suppressed, the SIA students who qualify for special education and those who identify with Two or More Races outperformed Spokane PS by mostly substantial margins. After suppression both group sizes for SIA are very small.
- Students qualifying for FRL met standard on the ELA at a rate of 67.4 percent and a rate of 52.2 percent on the math assessment. These rates are approximately 25.2 and 18.5 percentage points better than Spokane PS on the ELA and math assessments, respectively.

Figure 13: Shows the percentage of students at Spokane International Academy meeting standard on the 2017 ELA and math Smarter Balanced assessments by student group.

	Spokane Int. Acad.		Spokane PS		Difference[+]	
	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math
All Students	72.7	56.4	54.8	56.4	17.9	0.0
Asian	**		54.8	51.2	--	--
Native American	--	--	24.7	18.7	--	--
Black	**	**	22.9	20.4	--	--
Hispanic	**	**	46.6	34.6	--	--
Pacific Islander	--	--	21.1	14.2	--	--
White	68.0	57.3	60.3	52.8	7.7	4.6
Two or More*	70.0	60.0	47.0	34.5	23.0	25.5
Limited English	**	**	10.7	7.5	--	--
Special Education*	33.3	8.3	14.2	8.1	19.1	0.2
Low Income	67.4	52.2	42.2	33.7	25.2	18.5
[+]Difference = Performance of SIA minus the performance of Spokane PS for the corresponding grade levels for the reportable student groups shown in percentage points. *Note: values do not reflect all grade levels for the school, only those grade levels with reportable results. **Note: cells denoted with a double asterisk (**) indicate the presence of students in this group but with results suppressed to protect PII.						

The 2017 aggregated SGPs for the students at Spokane International Academy indicate fairly good academic growth. For the all students group, the growth appears to be typical for both ELA and math. The SGPs for the White students is a little lower than the all students but solidly in the typical range. Students qualifying for FRL also posted SGPs in the typical range.

Summit Olympus (9-10)

During the 2016-17 school year, Summit Olympus served approximately 120 students in the 9th and 10th grades. The Summit Olympus charter school is physically situated within the Tacoma SD boundary. Summit Olympus serves a higher percentage of students identifying as Hispanic than the home school district and a lower percentage of White students than the Tacoma SD (Figure 14). Summit Olympus serves a slightly lower percentage of students qualifying for FRL and about the same percentage of students in special education and bilingual education than the Tacoma SD on the comparable measures.

Student Demographics		
Enrollment		
October 2016 Student Count		134
May 2017 Student Count		116
Gender (October 2016)		
Male	68	50.7%
Female	66	49.3%
Race/Ethnicity (October 2016)		
Hispanic / Latino of any race(s)	37	27.6%
American Indian / Alaskan Native	3	2.2%
Asian	6	4.5%
Black / African American	26	19.4%
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	3	2.2%
White	42	31.3%
Two or More Races	17	12.7%
Special Programs		
Free or Reduced-Price Meals (May 2017)	75	64.7%
Special Education (May 2017)	18	15.5%
Transitional Bilingual (May 2017)	10	8.6%
Migrant (May 2017)	0	0.0%
Section 504 (May 2017)	0	0.0%
Foster Care (May 2017)	N<10	

The Biology EOC assessment results are suppressed because the percentage of students meeting standard is less than five percent.

Summit Sierra (9-10)

During the 2016-17 school year, Summit Sierra served approximately 200 students in the 9th and 10th grades. Summit Sierra is physically situated with the Seattle Public Schools boundary. Summit Sierra serves a lower percentage of Hispanic and White students and a higher percentage of Black students than the Seattle Public Schools. Summit Sierra also serves a higher percentage of students qualifying for FRL and lower percentages of students in special education and bilingual education than Seattle Public Schools (Figure 15).

Student Demographics		
Enrollment		
October 2016 Student Count		190
May 2017 Student Count		189
Gender (October 2016)		
Male	91	47.9%
Female	99	52.1%
Race/Ethnicity (October 2016)		
Hispanic / Latino of any race(s)	12	6.3%
American Indian / Alaskan Native	3	1.6%
Asian	27	14.2%
Black / African American	81	42.6%
White	46	24.2%
Two or More Races	21	11.1%
Special Programs		
Free or Reduced-Price Meals (May 2017)	89	47.1%
Special Education (May 2017)	22	11.6%
Transitional Bilingual (May 2017)	8	4.2%
Migrant (May 2017)	0	0.0%
Section 504 (May 2017)	0	0.0%
Foster Care (May 2017)	N<10	

The Biology EOC assessment results indicate that approximately 76 percent of the 10th grade students met standard when prior passing scores are included. The percentage of 10th graders meeting standard on the Biology EOC is similar to the performance of the Seattle Public Schools and a little better than the state average.

SOAR Academy (K-2)

In the 2016-17 school year, SOAR Academy served young children in kindergarten, the 1st, and 2nd grades. The SOAR Academy is physically situated within the Tacoma School District boundary. The SOAR Academy serves more non-White students than the Tacoma SD; most notably, much higher percentages of Black students and students identifying with Two or More races. The SOAR Academy serves a higher percentage of students qualifying for FRL and lower percentages of students in special education and bilingual education than the Tacoma School District (Figure 16).

Student Demographics		
Enrollment		
October 2016 Student Count		143
May 2017 Student Count		131
Gender (October 2016)		
Male	64	44.8%
Female	79	55.2%
Race/Ethnicity (October 2016)		
Hispanic / Latino of any race(s)	17	11.9%
American Indian / Alaskan Native	1	0.7%
Black / African American	55	38.5%
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	3	2.1%
White	25	17.5%
Two or More Races	42	29.4%
Special Programs		
Free or Reduced-Price Meals (May 2017)	101	77.1%
Special Education (May 2017)	14	10.7%
Transitional Bilingual (May 2017)	6	4.6%
Migrant (May 2017)	0	0.0%
Section 504 (May 2017)	0	0.0%
Foster Care (May 2017)	N<10	

The state does not require academic assessments in these grades. There are no results on the Report Card for the SOAR Academy for the Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developmental Skills (WaKIDS), which would be the only available assessment of skills for the school.

Section III - Recommended changes to state law or policy

Due to the dearth of information and the current pertinent lawsuits, SBE does not recommend any significant changes to state law or policy. SBE, through collaboration with the CSC, does recommend a few minor changes in state law to align with recently amended applicable laws, field practices and timing of pertinent data availability:

1. 28A.710.050(3): Change approval (of an admission policy) "by the commission" to "by the authorizer."

2. 28A.710.100(4)(b): In "The academic and financial performance of all operating charter schools," insert "organizational," which will better align this statute to the "board performance and stewardship" in 28A.710.170(2)(h) and create consistency with NACSA's Principles & Standards (required in this section).

3. 28A.710.250(1): Change annual report dates – from November 1st (authorizers' reports to SBE) and December 1st (SBE's report to the Governor and Legislature) – to later dates that allow authorizers and the SBE to access and utilize financial and academic performance data, and enables SBE to incorporate them into one comprehensive annual charter schools report that addresses all information required by RCW 28A.710.250(2).

Section IV – Next Steps

SBE looks forward to obtaining the information and data not yet available, so as to conduct a comprehensive analysis of Washington's charter schools' performance in the state's first year with operating charter schools. SBE anticipates having all such information and data in-hand and analyzed by May, 2018.

SBE will continue to develop and refine its methodology for future reports. In future annual reports, SBE anticipates having thorough information and data related to the performance of the state's charter schools and other factors related to the implementation of Washington's Charter School Act. Comprehensive academic, organizational, financial, and other performance information and data will allow SBE to provide the Governor, the Legislature and the public at large its "*assessment of the successes, challenges, and areas for improvement in meeting the purposes of this chapter, including the board's assessment of the sufficiency of funding for charter schools, the efficacy of the formula for authorizer funding, and any suggested changes in state law or policy necessary to strengthen the state's charter schools*" (RCW 28A.710.250).