Archived Information PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

Goal: To support the creation of a large number of high-quality charter schools and evaluate their effects.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Public Charter Schools Program objectives support Objective 1.6 of the Department's Strategic Plan (greater public school choice will be available to all students and families). Public Charter Schools Program objectives seek to expand the number and variety of options available for families. The program also strives to improve the quality and accountability of those options, while working to increase positive impacts on the public school system. The program goal is to increase the numbers of charter schools and ensure that these schools have adequate flexibility, are held accountable for reaching high standards, and are open to all students.

FY 2000—\$145,000,000

FY 2001—\$175,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: ENCOURAGE THE DEVELOPMENT OF A LARGE NUMBER OF HIGH-QUALITY CHARTER SCHOOLS THAT ARE FREE FROM STATE OR LOCAL RULES THAT INHIBIT FLEXIBLE OPERATION, ARE HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR ENABLING STUDENTS TO REACH CHALLENGING STATE PERFORMANCE STANDARDS, AND ARE OPEN TO ALL STUDENTS.

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	40 states will have charter school	legislation	DANDS, AND ARE OF ENTO ARE STODENIS.
Indicator 1	Targets and Perform		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of states with charter school legislation (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico)			Status: Positive move toward 2000 target.	Source: State Educational Agencies SEA; state legislatures.
Year Actual Performance Performance Targets			Explanation: There has been a positive trend	Frequency: Quarterly.
1994–95:	12	Terrormance Targets	toward meeting this objective, which was set by	Next Update: Summer 2000.
1995–96:	19		the president of the United States. The number	The second secon
1996–97:	27		of states (including the District of Columbia and	Validation Procedure: Data supplied by
1997–98:	31		Puerto Rico) with charter school legislation has	State Educational Agencies SEAs and state
1998–99:	38	Continuous Improvement	risen from 12 in 1994 to 38 in 1999.	legislatures. Data validated by ED staff and
1999–00:	30	40	-	corroborated by information from other
2000–01:		42	-	sources.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: There is variation in the definition of state charter school legislation, which leads to uneven implementation.
Indicator 1	.2 Charter operations: By 20	02, there will be at least 3,000 cha	rter schools in operation around the Nation.	
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of ch	arter schools in operation		Status: Positive movement toward 2002 target.	Source: State legislatures, SEAs.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Frequency: Annually.
1994–95:	100		Explanation: There has been a positive trend	Next Update: Summer 2000.
1995–96:	255		toward meeting this objective, which was set by	Wild B I B C C II
1996–97:	428		the President of the United States. The number	Validation Procedure: Data verified by the
1997–98:	790		of charter schools in operation has dramatically	U.S. Dept. of Education data quality
1998–99:	1,100		increased from 100 in 1994 to 1,700 in 1999.	attestation process and ED Standards for
1999-00:	1,700	2,060		Evaluating Program Performance Indicators.
2000–01:		2,667		
2001–02:		3,000		

	Targets and Perfo	ormance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Differences in the definition of charter schools (i.e., some states count multiple sites as single charters, while others count them as multiple charters) cause variability in the counts State Educational Agencies SEAs. There is sometimes disagreement about numbers of charter schools in operation among the agencies that do the counting.
Indicator			of start-up funds is a major obstacle to implem	
	Targets and Perfo	ormance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	e of first-year charter schools repo implementation	rting start-up funding as a major	Status: Positive move toward 2001 target.	Source: National Study of Charter Schools (2000); National Evaluation of the Public
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Explanation: Between 1996 and 1999, fewer	Charter School Program (2001, 2002).
1996:	59%		charter schools reported start-up funding as a major barrier to implementation. During that	Frequency: Periodically. Next Update: Second-year report of the
1997:	55%		time span, funding to the Public Charter School	National Evaluation, December 2001.
1998:	51%		Program has increased, suggesting a possible	Trational Evaluation, December 2001.
1999:	39%	Continuing decrease	correlation. A specific numerical target was set	Validation Procedure: Internal review
2000:		Continuing decrease	in 2001 and not 2000, because we will not have	procedures of an experienced data collection
2001:		30%	data on this indicator in 2000.	agency.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Continuity problems as a result of data collection under multiple studies. In fact, the survey that is responsible for school-level data in 1999–2000, the Schools and Staffing Survey, will not be capturing this data. Therefore, there will be no data for this indicator until December 2001. After the National Evaluation is completed in 2002, it will be difficult to collect this data.

Indicator 2.1 Equity—impact of charters on educational opportunity: Nationally, students in charter schools will have similar demographic characteristics					
students in all public schools.					

	2.1 Equity—ir n all public sch	-	rs on education	al opportunity: Na	tionally, students in charter schools will have	e similar demographic characteristics as
Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of students, out of total student enrollment, for each demographic characteristic for both charter schools and all public schools in states with charter schools that year					Status: Percent Minority: No 1999 data available. Unable to judge whether progress toward target is likely.	Source: National Study of Charter Schools (1997, 1998, 1999, and 2000); Schools and Staffing Survey (1999); Evaluation of the
Percent Min	iority				Free or Reduced-Price Lunch Eligibility: No	Public Charter Schools Program (2000, 2001, and 2002).
Year Actual Performance		Performance Targets		1999 data available, but progress toward target	Frequency: Periodically.	
	Charter	All Public*	Charter	All Public* (see limitations)	is likely.	Next Update: 2001.
1997:	48.2%	41.3%			Students with Disabilities: No 1999 data	Validation Procedure: Internal review
1998	51.8%	41%			available, but progress toward target is likely.	procedures of an experienced data collection
1999:	No data a	vailable yet	Continuo	is closing of gap		agency.
2000:			45%	41% (est'd.)	Explanation: The target is to have the	
2001:			Continuou	is closing of gap	percentage of charter school students (with one	Limitations of Data and Planned
Free or Red	Free or Reduced-price Lunch Eligibility				of the three characteristics) similar to that of	Improvements: The number of charter schools,
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		students in all public schools.	students in charters, and states with charter schools increase each year.
	Charter	All Public*	Charter	All Public*	Percent Minority: The percentage of minority	schools increase each year.
1997:	36.7%	37.6%			students in charter schools has risen from 48	* Note: Because data collection for all public
1998:	38.7%	37.3%			percent in 1997 to 52 percent in 1998; in all	schools lags behind data collection for charter
1999:	No data a	vailable yet	Continuo	is closing of gap	public schools, minority students have	schools, comparison data for all public schools
2000:			37.3%	37.3% (est'd.)	remained at about 41 percent. It is difficult to	are for a school year 1 to 3 years prior to the
2001:			Continuou	is closing of gap	judge whether the target will be met, because	year for charter schools. There is also wide
Students Wi	th Disabilities				the percentage of minority students in charter schools is variable and seems to be affected by	variation between states in charter and all public schools, as well as variation and
Year		erformance	Performance Targets		the growth of charter schools within states.	potential concentration of students in individual
	Charter	All Public*	Charter	All Public*	the growth of charter schools within states.	charter schools. The Department hopes to
1997:	8.3%	11.2%			Free or Reduced-Price Lunch Eligibility: In	update this indicator to better reflect the
1998:	8.4%	11.3%			1998, charter schools served a similar but	complexities of this issue in the field, after the
1999:	No data a	vailable yet	Continuous closing of gap		slightly higher percentage of students eligible	publication of a forthcoming study examining
2000:			10%	11.3% (est'd.)	for free or reduced-price lunch, as compared	equity issues in charter schools.
2001:			Continuou	is closing of gap	with all public schools (39 percent versus 37 percent).	
					Students with Disabilities: In both 1997 and 1998, charter schools enrolled a slightly lower proportion of students with disabilities than all public schools in the charter states (8 percent versus 11 percent).	

Indicator 2	Indicator 2.2 Impact on student performance: Increasing numbers of charter schools will show improved student outcomes.				
	Targets and Perfo	rmance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Status: Unable to judge.	Source: National Study of Charter Schools	
1997	No data available			(2000); National Evaluation of the Public	
1998	No data available		Explanation: The first national-level study on	Charter Schools Program (2001, 2002).	
1999:	No data available	No specific target set	student achievement in charter schools will be	Frequency: Periodically.	
2000:		Continuing increase	released in spring 2000.	Next Update: 2000.	
2001:		Continuing increase		Validation Procedure: N/A.	
				Limitations of Data and Planned	
				Improvements: N/A (because there are no	
				data).	

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Providing support and technical assistance for state and regional information and outreach meetings.
- Supporting a charter school Web site, including interactive forums and a national registry of charter schools, to provide information on common issues.
- Providing information about model charters and chartering processes for chartering agencies through documents and meetings.
- In order to discuss lessons learned about equity, performance accountability, effective management, leadership and partnerships, and cross-fertilization to nonchartered schools, the program is convening national conferences for Federal charter school grantees and others.
- Supporting studies of issues associated with charter schools, such as serving students with disabilities, assessment and accountability, fairness and equity, and school finance.
- Collecting and disseminating information on charter school models that promote student achievement and innovation in the public school system and support the development of networks among charter schools.
- Meeting with universities, museums, organizations that educate disadvantaged children, and others with the capacity to help charter schools in order to encourage their support in sponsoring and providing technical assistance to charter schools and potential developers of charter schools.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- In order to fuel more cooperation among charter schools and other public schools, the program is initiating dissemination grant opportunities for states and schools.
- ❖ Initiating a comprehensive needs assessment to direct future national activities—including focus groups with charter schools, charter developers, and charter authorizing agencies—in addition to convening federally funded researchers and demonstration projects.
- To increase accountability, the program is supporting networking and sharing of practices among chartering entities, recognizing that they influence the quality, accountability and equity in the charter school movement through their decisions.
- Publishing regulations regarding Federal formula funds that charter schools are eligible to receive.
- ❖ In order to see how to better administer grants, the Planning and Evaluation Service is conducting a program evaluation.
- To improve the way that states administer charter school programs, the program is supporting a series of regional workshops hosted by State Educational Agencies.
- In order to learn more about equity in charter schools, the program will sponsor a study on this issue.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- To ensure that all Federal agencies reflect the Department's support for charter schools, the Public Charter Schools Program incorporates other agencies into the national charter school conferences and other events. Agencies represented include the Department of Justice, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Department of Agriculture.
- To ensure charter schools comply with civil rights obligations, the Public Charter Schools Program has collaborated with the Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, as well as the Department of Education's Office of General Council and Office for Civil Rights to draft guidance addressing civil rights issues.
- To ensure that charter schools receiving Federal funds operate as nonprofit organizations, and that nonprofit charter schools are not unduly burdened, the Public Charter Schools Program has worked with the Internal Revenue Service to streamline the examination of charter school applications by the Internal Revenue Service.
- To ensure that eligible charter schools can participate in school nutrition programs, the Public Charter Schools Program has worked with the U.S. Department of Agriculture to provide guidance and staff support.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Variations in state charter school laws and in procedures and oversight processes make it difficult to ensure quality in educational programs and complicate efforts to increase the quantity of charter schools.
- Some authorizing agencies fail to implement charter school oversight and accountability initiatives in ways that match program goals (e.g., they may not have adequate rigor in the review process, or may not ensure later accountability for performance).
- Public Charter Schools Program funds constitute a small proportion of total funding for charter schools.
- Other obstacles, in addition to the lack of start-up funds, hamper expansion and success in charters (e.g., lack of facilities, inadequate planning time, and organizational and governance challenges).

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

Indicator 1.6 on educational approaches was adjusted to reflect student outcomes more generally (new Indicator 2.2).

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicators 1.3 and 1.4 replaced by new Indicator 1.3: The former Indicators 1.3 and 1.4 were created to take into account the changes to the Public Charter Schools Program under the Charter School Expansion Act of 1998. The old indicators were intended to reflect the flexibility and accountability that the amendments to the act were designed to support. Technical aspects of the grant competition made these indicators meaningless, as all participating states were required to comply with the areas measured. The revised Indicator 1.3 reduces the complexity of the indicators, captures the primary objective of the program, and can be accurately gauged.
- Objective 2 adjusted: Last year's Objective 2 read: "Evaluate the effects of charter schools, including identifying the most effective strategies to improve quality and innovation in the public school system." It now reads: "Identify, evaluate, and disseminate the effects of charter schools." The new language better reflects the 1998 reauthorized school legislation.
- Indicators 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 have been adjusted: These indicators are basically the same in substance but have been reworded and strengthened. Instead of indicators that state, "Studies will show," the new indicators focus on the performance of charter schools. While the purpose of the Public Charter Schools Program is not to impact charter school outcomes per se, the program does need to identify, evaluate, and disseminate the effects of charter schools (Objective 2).

Dropped

Indicator 2.3 dropped: To truly determine the impact of charter schools on the public school system, one would need to get data from traditional public schools. The Public Charter Schools Program is dropping this indicator until future data sources can better inform an indicator like this one.

New

❖ Indicator 1.3 is new this year. It replaces last year's Indicators 1.3 and 1.4.