Evaluation of the Public Charter Schools Program: Year One Evaluation Report

APPENDICES

APPENDICES
TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES
TABLE OF CONTENTS (concluded)

CHAPTER 1 APPENDICES

Appendix A

OVERVIEW OF STATE CHARTER SCHOOL ACTIVITY

- In Exhibit A-1, an overview of selected characteristics of each state with charter school legislation is presented. It includes the year when each state's first charter law was passed, the number of charters granted in each state as of September 30, 1999, and the number of schools opened as of that date. The total number of charter schools opened as of September 30, 1999, was 1,692 (see Exhibit 1-3 in the introduction). Exhibit A-1 also summarizes the types of entity permitted to award charters, the types of charter school permitted (e.g., newly created, public conversion), and the number of charters granted by type of school. The last column of the exhibit displays the years the state has received PCSP grants from the U.S. Department of Education.

- In addition to growing rapidly, the charter school movement takes different forms in different states. There is also variation within states. Exhibit A-1 reflects some of this variation, especially in the footnotes. For example, the number of charters granted frequently reflects charters that have been revoked or altered in some other way. If a state has not received a PCSP grant (e.g., Mississippi), that fact is indicated in the PCSP column. Some of the information in this exhibit is discussed and analyzed in more detail in other sections of the report (the PCSP, for example, and the types of agencies that grant charters).

Exhibit A-1
OVERVIEW OF STATE CHARTER SCHOOL ACTIVITY

State	Law Passed	Charters Granted in State (as of 9/30/99)	Charter Schools Opened in State (as of 9/30/99)	Category of Entity Eligible to Award Charters[1]	Types of Charter School Permitted/ Number of Charters Granted, by Type	Years of PCSP Funding
Alaska	1995	20[2]	18	Multiple entities with interdependence	Newly created (19) Public conversions (1)[3]	1996-1998 1999-2001
Arizona	1994	273	273[4]	Multiple entities, independent of each other	Newly created Public conversions Private conversions[5]	1995-1997
Arkansas	1995	0	0	Multiple entities with interdependence	Newly created Public conversions	1999-2001
California	1992	255	238	Multiple entities with interdependence	Newly created (170) Public conversions (85)	1995-1997 1998-2000
Colorado	1993	70	68	Locals	Newly created (70)[6]	1995-1997 1998-2000
Connecticut	1996	18	16	Multiple entities, independent of each other	Newly created (18) Public conversions	1996-1998 1999-2001
Delaware	1995	17	5	Multiple entities, independent of each other	Newly created (17) Public conversions	1997-1999
District of Columbia	1996	29[7]	27	Multiple entities, independent of each other	Newly created (22) Public conversions Private conversions (5)	1996-1998 1999-2001
Florida	1996	125	110	Multiple entities, independent of each other	Newly created (123) Public conversions (2)[8]	1996-1998 1999-2001
Georgia	1993	36[9]	32	Multiple entities with interdependence	Newly created (9) Public conversions (27)	1996-1998 1999-2001
Hawaii	1994	2	2	State	Public conversions (2)	1999-2001
Idaho	1998	8	8	Locals	Newly created (8) Public conversions	1999-2001
Illinois	1996	18	17	Multiple entities with interdependence	Newly created (18) Public conversions	1996-1998 1999-2001
Kansas	1994	15	15	Locals	Newly created (10) Public conversions (5)[10]	1996-1998
Louisiana	1995	24	17	Multiple entities, independent of each other	Newly created (22) Public conversions (2)	1995-1997 1998-2000
Massachusetts	1993	43	39	Multiple entities with interdependence	Newly created (37) Public conversions (6)	1995-1997 1998-2000
Michigan	1993	177	175	Multiple entities, independent of each other	Newly created (177)[11]	1995-1997 1998-2000
Minnesota	1991	61	54	Multiple entities with interdependence	Newly created (55) Public conversions (2) Private conversions Other (4)	1995-1997 1998-2000

Exhibit A-1
OVERVIEW OF STATE CHARTER SCHOOL ACTIVITY (continued)

State	Law Passed	Charters Granted in State (as of 9/30/99)	Charter Schools Opened in State (as of 9/30/99)	Category of Entity Eligible to Award Charters[1]	Types of Charter School Permitted/ Number of Charters Granted, by Type	Years of PCSP Funding
Mississippi	1997	1	1	Multiple entities with interdependence	Public conversions (1)	No state grant
Missouri	1998	16	15	Multiple entities with interdependence	Newly created (10) Public conversions (1)[12] Private conversions (5)	1998-2000
Nevada	1997	5	5	Locals	Newly created (5) Public conversions Private conversions	No state grant
New Hampshire	1995	5	0	State	Newly created (5) Public conversions	No state grant
New Jersey	1996	47	47	State	Newly created (47) Public conversions	1996-1998 1999-2001
New Mexico	1993	6	3	Locals	Newly created (1) Public conversions (4) Private conversions (1)	No state grant
New York	1998	5	5	Multiple entities with interdependence	Newly created (3) Public conversions (2)	1999-2001
North Carolina	1996	96	82	Multiple entities with interdependence	Newly created (80) Public conversions (1) Private conversions (15)	1996-1998 1999-2001
Ohio	1997	69	57	Multiple entities, independent of each other	Newly created (68) Public conversions (1)	1998-2000
Oklahoma	1999	0	0	Locals	Newly created Public conversions	1999-2001
Oregon	1999	0[13]	0	Locals	Newly created Public conversions Alternative education program conversions	1995-1997 1999-2001
Pennsylvania	1997	52	46[14]	Locals	Newly created (46) Public conversions (0) Private conversions (3) Other – preexisting educational organizations (3)[15]	1997-1999
Puerto Rico	1993	79	79[16]	Multiple entities, independent of each other	Public conversions (79)	1996-1998 1999-2001
Rhode Island	1995	4	2	State	Newly created (3) Public conversions (1)	1998-2000
South Carolina	1996	12[17]	9	Locals	Newly created (10) Public conversions Other (2)	1997-1999
Texas	1996	193[18]	173	Multiple entities, independent of each other	Newly created (144) Public conversions (7) Private conversions (42)	1995-1997 1998-2000
Utah	1998	8	6	State	Newly created (6) Public conversions (1)[19] Other (1)[20]	1999-2001

Exhibit A-1
OVERVIEW OF STATE CHARTER SCHOOL ACTIVITY (concluded)

State	Law Passed	Charters Granted in State (as of 9/30/99)	Charter Schools Opened in State (as of 9/30/99)	Category of Entity Eligible to Award Charters[1]	Types of Charter School Permitted/ Number of Charters Granted, by Type	Years of PCSP Funding
Virginia	1998	0	0	Locals	Newly created Public conversions	1999-2001
Wisconsin	1993	48	48	Multiple entities, independent of each other	Newly created (45) Public conversions (3)	1996-1998 1999-2001
Wyoming	1995	0	0	Local	Newly created Public conversions	No state grant
Total		1,837	1,692			

Sources: Information in table compiled from SRI data collection and legislative analyses; consultation with Eric Hirsch of the National Conference of State Legislatures; the US Charter Schools Web site (http://www.uscharterschools.org/); and the Committee for Education Reform's Charter School Legislation: State-by-State Analyses.

Footnotes:

[1]See Appendix N for further detail on charter school authorizers.

[2]Includes one charter that never opened and one that has been closed for lack of enrollment

[3]Types of school permitted not specified in law.

[4]Arizona reported that 334 schools were open as of 9/30/99, although many of these are multiple school sites operating under single charters.

[5]Numbers of each type of charter school not provided by survey respondent, as figures haven't incorporated into database.

[6]Colorado law technically has no provision for conversions, so schools had to close and reopen as "newly created" charter schools. Two of these were formerly public schools, and one was formerly a private school.

[7]Two of these charters were later revoked, so respondent did not provide data on them

[8]Although no private conversions are allowed in Florida, some former private schools have dissolved and "enrobed" as public schools.

[9]One stayed as a school but is no longer a charter. This charter school was a public conversion.

[10]Types of school permitted not specified in law.

[11]Under Michigan law, all charter schools become "new." Twenty-three of these charter schools in the state are former private schools that became chartered.

[12]Law stipulates that a maximum of 5% of school buildings currently in use may be converted (does not apply to vacant buildings or buildings not used for instructional purposes).

[13]Twenty-two schools opened under a prior school reform law; many of these schools received PCSP funds. Under the 1999 charter law, no charter schools have yet been opened.

[14]One charter school in Pennsylvania closed pending a court order at time of interview. The school in question was not counted in the number of charter schools open, but was counted in the number of charters granted in the state.

[15]Although the state respondent provided information on the number of conversions from private schools and other pre-existing educational organizations, Pennsylvania's charter law provides only for the creation of new schools and public conversions.

[16]Respondent answered 81, reflecting that 2 additional schools would be opened a week after the survey was conducted.

[17]This includes "full" charters granted, not those granted "conditional" charters that didn't later become full charters.

[18]Estimated; SEA was not directly involved in collecting this information.

[19]Conversion is part of an existing public school.

[20]Tribally operated alternative school.

Appendix B

FUTURE DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

This appendix presents information on data collection activities scheduled for future rounds of SRI International's evaluation of the Public Charter Schools Program. Exhibit B-1 shows the remaining data collection activities and other sources of information for the SRI evaluation. It also shows a basic timeline for these activities. Below the exhibit, the remaining data sources are described in full. Sampling for future data collection activities is described in the second section. The appendix concludes with an table that shows where each research question was addressed in the Year 1 report and how future data collection activities will address them.

Exhibit B-1
REMAINING DATA COLLECTION ACTIVITIES

Data Source	Data Collection in 1999-2000	In 2000 OMB Submission	Data Collection in 2000-2001	Data Collection in 2001-2002
Telephone survey of state coordinators	X	X		X
Telephone survey of charter school authorizers	X	X	X	X
Telephone survey of non-state PCSP grantees	X	X		X
Telephone survey of charter schools		X	X	
Site visits	X (Fall-Winter 2000)	X	X	X
Parent survey		X	X	X
Federal file extraction	X		X	X
Federal interviews	X		X	X
RPP data	Requested in 1999-2000; will be analyzed for Year 2 report			
SASS data	Administered by NCES in 1999-2000; will be analyzed for Year 2 report			

Data Sources

Telephone Survey of State Charter School Coordinators. The charter coordinators (or equivalent) of all 36 states with charter school legislation (plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) were surveyed by phone in the summer and fall of 1999. What is likely to be a larger number of charter school coordinators will be surveyed again in the winter of 2002. As with the original administration, the survey instrument will consist of a combination of open- and closed-ended items on charter school-related operations, requirements, and flexibility, and the state's PCSP grant. Members of the SRI team will administer the survey to all states with charter school legislation as of the end of 2001.

Telephone Survey of Charter School Authorizers. A revised version of the Year 1 survey instrument will be administered to a representative sample of 150 charter school authorizers in the winter and spring of 2001. A version of the same survey will also be administered in winter 2002.

The revised survey is similar to the exploratory survey administered in Year 1, with several adjustments. First, the number of items specifically focused on PCSP have been reduced to reflect the year 1 finding that charter school authorizers are not involved with the program except in minimal ways (e.g., fiscal agents). Second, because this instrument will be administered to a larger sample in years 2 and 3 than the sample surveyed in year 1, SRI International will use a telephone survey subcontractor (using a computer-assisted telephone interview system) for the administration of this survey. The Year 1 telephone survey was administered by SRI researchers. This change compels the SRI team to reduce the number of open-ended items. Third, in many cases, the closed-ended items in the revised survey were shaped by the responses to open-ended questions on the Year 1 survey.

Telephone Survey of Charter Schools. One of the key sources of data for the remainder of this evaluation is the telephone survey of charter schools, which will be conducted in the winter and spring of 2001. Based on SRI's review and update of RPP's list of charter schools (current as of September 30, 1999), a representative sample of 600 charter schools will be drawn for this survey. A telephone survey subcontractor will conduct the data collection. The survey instrument will consist mostly of closed-ended items.

The charter school survey will include items on all the school-level research questions for this evaluation and will document the basic characteristics of charter schools nationwide as of the 2000-2001 school year. The survey will also gather information about the use of PCSP funds at the school level, charter school experiences with flexibility and accountability, charter schools' relationships with their charter authorizers and states, and the ways charter schools assess student performance and other school outcomes.

Site Visits. One round of exploratory site visits will be conducted in fall and winter 2000. Two additional rounds are currently planned for the second and third rounds of data collection (Spring 2001 and the 2001-2002 school year). Data collection will focus on student performance in charter schools and the accountability relationships between charter schools, parents, charter school authorizers, states, and other audiences. Members of the study team are currently responding to requests from ED to add a large-scale analysis of student performance in some or

all of the six states selected for the charter school site visits. These analyses will include comparisons between charter schools and noncharter schools that serve similar populations.

Parent Surveys. Written surveys will be administered to parents in conjunction with the Year 2 and Year 3 site visits.

Extraction of Information from Federal PCSP Files and State Charter Laws. SRI's access to the federal files on PCSP applicants and grantees and its review of state charter laws were very helpful activities for orienting team members to the charter operations, policies, and PCSP details in individual states and charter schools that received PCSP grants directly from ED. It also reduced the data collection burden imposed by this evaluation on telephone survey respondents and federal interviewees. Because the team will not be collecting data directly from PCSP grantees until the winter of 2002, the annual review of federal files and continued review of state laws will keep members of the study team up-to-date with the activities in their assigned states.

In theory, the grantee files could be used to create an ongoing database to which queries could be addressed at any time. The evaluation team has been asked to create this database, which could then be transferred to ED for continued updating and maintenance. However, SRI's review of the files in 1998-99 found considerable inconsistency among them in terms of the material included. In the remaining years of the evaluation, team members will work with the PCSP staff to identify the most important and consistently available data fields for inclusion in a database that is likely to focus on very basic information, such as grantee contact information, annual grant amounts, dates and sources of correspondence, and presence or absence of grant applications and annual performance reports.

Federal Interviews. Interviews with PCSP and Planning and Evaluation Service (PES) staff members at ED, and with congressional staff, will continue as needed.

Charter School Data from RPP International and SASS. The SRI evaluation team has been granted access to data from the RPP study (based on four rounds of telephone surveys with the universe of charter schools). SRI will use these data to address the PCSP evaluation's research questions. ED is also committed to having descriptive data from the universe of charter schools in every year of the evaluation while simultaneously minimizing the data collection burden faced by these schools. Hence, between RPP's data collection in the 1995-1996 through 1998-1999 school years, the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) in 1999-2000, and SRI's survey of charter schools in 2000-2001, the goal of annual school-level data collection will be met by coordinating federal data collection efforts and not unduly burdening charter schools with these requests.

Mapping Research Questions To The Year 1 Report And Future Activities

Exhibit B-2 displays a summary table of where each of the study's research questions is addressed in the Year 1 report and notes that indicate how they will be addressed by future data collection activities.

Exhibit B-2
MAPPING RESEARCH QUESTIONS TO REPORT

Research Questions	Where Addressed
How does the PCSP encourage the development of charter schools?	
How the PCSP awards grants.	Chapter 2
Proportion of charter schools receiving PCSP grants—nationally and by state.	Not addressed in Year 1 Report • SRI School Survey • RPP Data
Reasons for differences in the proportion of funded charter schools among funded states.	Chapter 2
Accessibility, usefulness, and timeliness of federal technical assistance to states, schools, planners.	Chapter 2
Impact of the PCSP on state policies.	Chapter 2
How do state PCSP grantees and charter school authorizers encourage the development of charter schools?	
How states define "start-up" in establishing funding eligibility.	Chapter 2
Number of states that allow planning grants; number of schools opened as a result.	Chapter 2
How states award subgrants.	Chapter 2
State requirements for use of federal funds.	Chapter 2
Accommodations by charter school authorizers for low-income community charter applications.	Not addressed in Year 1 Report • Follow-up charter school authorizer survey
Accommodations of states for low-income community charter applications for federal assistance.	Chapter 2
Extent to which differences in subgrant amount between and within states reflect differences in start-up needs.	Chapter 2
Sustaining charters after federal funding expires.	Not addressed in Year 1 Report • SRI School Survey • Follow-up state coordinator survey
Linkage with policies to intervene in failing schools.	Not addressed in Year 1 Report • SRI School Survey • Follow-up state coordinator survey
Accessibility, usefulness, and timeliness of state technical assistance to schools and school planners.	Chapter 2 • SRI School Survey • RPP Data
How do federally funded charter schools/school planners use their PCSP subgrants?	
Average and range of federal subgrant awards—nationally and by state.	Chapter 2
Proportion of start-up costs accounted for with the federal grant.	Chapter 2
Kinds of planning and implementation activities supported by federal subgrants; extent activities are dictated by state authorizing legislation.	Chapter 2
Start-up barriers overcome by federal funds.	Chapter 2
Importance of access to federal grant money in obtaining or pursuing charter.	Chapter 2
Differences between charter schools that receive PCSP grants and those that do not.	Not addressed in Year 1 Report • SRI School Survey • RPP Data
What are the characteristics of charter schools and the students and families who are involved with them?	
Grade levels and student population served.	Not addressed in Year 1 Report • SRI School Survey • RPP Data
Educational approaches implemented.	Not addressed in Year 1 Report • SRI School Survey • RPP Data

Research Questions	Where Addressed
Background and demographic characteristics of instructional and administrative staff.	Not addressed in Year 1 Report • SRI School Survey • RPP Data • SASS
Newly created vs. public or private school conversions.	Chapter 1
Selection criteria for admission and the frequency/extent of waiting lists.	Not addressed in Year 1 Report • Student Performance Substudy
Demographic composition of charter schools, compared with the traditional public schools in their surrounding areas.	Not addressed in Year 1 Report • SRI School Survey • RPP Data
Targeting and accommodation of special populations.	Not addressed in Year 1 Report • SRI School Survey • RPP Data
Professional development opportunities available for teachers.	Not addressed in Year 1 Report • SRI School Survey • Site Visits • SASS
What flexibility provisions are charter schools granted?	
Extent to which flexibility provisions granted by state and local laws are realized in practice.	Chapter 3
Factors associated with successful and unsuccessful implementation of flexibility provisions.	Chapter 3
Most critical flexibility provisions.	Not addressed in Year 1 Report
Parent involvement activities and parent requirements.	Not addressed in Year 1 Report • SRI School Survey • SRI Parent Survey
How do charter schools measure student performance, and are charter school students making progress on these and other measures?	
Measures of accountability.	Chapter 4 • Student Performance Substudy • SRI School Survey
Measures of student performance for which charter schools are accountable and how assessed.	Not addressed in Year 1 Report • SRI School Survey • Student Performance Substudy • Site Visits
Extent to which students meet student performance goals.	Not addressed in Year 1 Report • Student Performance Substudy • Site Visits
Range and frequency of corrective action for charter schools that do not meet the student performance terms of their charters.	Chapter 4
Students meeting or exceeding the state performance standards, if applicable.	Not addressed in Year 1 Report • Student Performance Substudy
Comparability of student achievement gains to those of their traditional public school counterparts.	Not addressed in Year 1 Report • Student Performance Substudy • Site Visits
Conditions under which charter schools improve student achievement.	Not addressed in Year 1 Report • Site Visits
Parent beliefs about charter schools and other schools.	Not addressed in Year 1 Report • SRI Parent Survey

Note: Future data collection and analysis activities are marked with bullets.

CHAPTER 2 APPENDICES

Appendix C

PCSP FUNDING AND FUNDING AVAILABLE FOR CHARTER SCHOOLS

- Exhibit C-1 represents a state-by-state breakdown of PCSP funds for FY1995-FY1999. For each year that a state was provided PCSP funds, two figures are displayed in the chart. The first figure represents the annual total per state for the fiscal year, including supplemental funding.

- The second figure (in parentheses) represents the amount of funding per year available for subgrants. For many states, the amount reserved for subgrants was the total funding amount minus the allowable state set-aside of 5%; however, other states reported that they reserved smaller amounts for use at the state level.

- In addition to providing information on the amount of funding available for subgrants and administration on a state-by-state basis, Exhibit C-1 provides evidence of the program's overall growth since 1995 – both in terms of the total funding allocation and the increase in the number of states funded.

Exhibit C-1
TOTAL PCSP FUNDING/TOTAL FUNDING AVAILABLE FOR CHARTER SCHOOLS* BY YEAR AND BY STATE

State	Amount of PCSP State Grant/Amount of PCSP State Grant Available for Charter Schools ($)				
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
AK	No state grant	656,642 (623,810)	1,516,500 (1,440,675)	887,229 (842,868)	526,316 (500,000)
AZ	**750,000** **(712,500)**	1,150,000 (1,092,500)	3,221,226 (3,060,165)	No state grant (direct grants from ED to charter schools)	No state grant (direct grants from ED to charter schools)
AR	No state grant	No state grant	No state grant	No state grant (direct grants from ED to charter schools)	**368,421** **(350,000)**
CA	727,413 (691, 042)	1,250,000 (1,187,500)	3,446,719 (3,274,383)	**8,746,636** **(8,370,531)**	**12,631,579** **(12,000,000)**
CO	728,522 (692,096)	1,025,736 (974,449)	2,000,000 (1,900,000)	3,000,000 (2,850,000)	3,850,000 (3,657,500)
CT	No state law	1,000,000 (950,000)	1,292,770 (1,228,132)	2,045,233 (1,942,971)	1,208,007 (1,147,607)
DE	No state grant	No state grant	**343,057** **(325,904)**	**541,302** **(514,237)**	600,000 (570,000)
DC	No state law	1,000,000 (950,000)	2,500,000 (2,375,000)	4,500,000 (4,288,500)	1,736,842 (1,650,000)
FL	No state law	**2,223,626** **(2,112,445)**	**5,066,026** **(4,812,725)**	5,985,000 (5,685,750)	7,276,500 (6,912,675)
GA	600,000 (570,000)	947,910 (900,515)	1,469,380 (1,395,911)	2,421,053 (2,300,000)	2,421,053 (2,300,000)
HI	No state grant	No state grant	No state grant (direct grants from ED to charter schools)	No state grant (direct grants from ED to charter schools)	2,631,579 (2,500,000)
ID	No state law	No state law	No state law	No state grant	842,105 (800,000)
IL	No state law	794,577 (754,848)	782,850 (743,708)	1,215,000 (1,154,250)	1,147,368 (1,090,000)
KS	No state grant	850,000 (807,500)	914,345 (868,628)	1,263,158 (1,200,000)	No state grant
LA	336,000 (319,200)	**446,250** **(423,938)**	373,711 (355,025)	665,968 (639,329)	1,006,452 (956,129)
MA	589,451 (559,978)	1,599,437 (1,519,465)	4,028,888 (3,827,444)	3,996,192 (3,916, 268)	3,756,432 (3,568,610)
MI	361,047 (342,995)	1,907,986 (1,812,587)	3,843,420 (3,651,249)	5,000,000 (4,900,000)	6,000,000 (5,700,000)
MN	500,000 (475,000)	749,730 (712,244)	450,000 (427,500)	710,500 (674,975)	1,925,000 (1,828,750)

Note: Highest and lowest grants appear in bold.
*Numbers in parentheses represent total funding available for charter schools.

Exhibit C-1
TOTAL PCSP FUNDING/TOTAL FUNDING AVAILABLE FOR CHARTER SCHOOLS* BY YEAR AND BY STATE (continued)

State	Amount of PCSP State Grant/Amount of PCSP State Grant Available for Charter Schools ($)				
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
MO	No state law	No state law	No state law	853,334 (810,667)	1,706,677 (1,621,343)
NJ	No state law	1,415,421 (1,344,650)	1,290,934 (1,226,387)	1,852,632 (1,767,411)	2,763,120 (2,624,964)
NY	No state law	No state law	No state law	No state grant	4,423,053 (4,201,900)
NC	No state law	1,000,000 (950,000)	1,250,000 (1,187,500)	2,250,000 (2,137,500)	4,500,000 (4,275,000)
OH	No state law	No state law	No state grant	1,578,947 (1,500,000)	3,157,895 (3,000,000)
OK	No state law	No state law	No state law	No state law	800,000 (781,579)
OR	286,566 (272,238)	500,000 (475,000)	779,948 (740,951)		2,000,000 (1,900,000)
PA	No state law	No state law	2,300,000 (2,231,000)	3,300,000 (3,234,000)	2,333,333 (2,263,333)
PR	No state grant	1,004,676 (954,442)	1,313,500 (1,247,825)	2,947,368 (2,800,000)	2,625,000 (2,493,750)
RI	No state grant	No state grant	No state grant	789,474 (757,895)	1,009,524 (959,048)
SC	No state law	No state grant	1,447,900 (1,382,745)	1,447,461 (1,389,563)	1,447,297 (1,393,747)
TX	**250,000** **(237,500)**	500,000 (475,000)	2,165,167 (2,056,909)	5,932,500 (5,695,200)	9,473,685 (9,000,001)
UT	No state law	No state law	No state law	No state grant	500,000 (475,000)
VA	No state law	No state law	No state law	No state grant	631,579 (606,316)
WI	No state grant	1,325,000 (1,258,750)	1,956,548 (1,858,721)	3,150,000 (2,992,500)	4,000,000 (3,800,000)
TOTAL	5,128,999	21,346,991	43,752,991	65,078,987.	89,298,817 (3,800,000)

Note: Highest and lowest grants appear in bold.
*Numbers in parentheses represent total funding available for charter schools.

Appendix D

USES OF STATE SET-ASIDE

- The PCSP legislation specifies that state grantees may reserve up to 5% of their total grant for administrative purposes at the state level. Most state coordinators indicated that they retain 5% of their state's total funding, but some states take smaller amounts.

- Respondents from the seventeen states displayed in Exhibit D-1 provided a breakdown of the state portion of their PCSP grant for 1998-99. The budgeting categories listed below matched the budget page in the PCSP application. The largest expenditure category is salaries, with a mean of about $45,000 allocated to this purpose per state.

Exhibit D-1
USES OF 5% STATE SET-ASIDE, BY STATE (1998-1999)
(n = 17)

STATE	Personnel	Fringe	Travel	Equipment	Supplies	Contract	Construct	Other	Tot Direct	Indirect	Stipends	Total	Indirect Rate
AK	22802	7198	2000	500	500	11364	0	**0**	44364	**0**	0	44364	0.00
CA	**161893**	**67983**	5000	2000	18285	**60000**	0	0	**315161**	66184	0	**381345**	0.17
CO	82500	15123	5000	4000	500	22630	0	8192	137945	12,055	0	150000	0.08
DC	97057	11571	2672	**0**	500	700	0	0	112500	97500	0	210000	0.46
GA	**0**	**0**	1000	2500	2000	5000	0	0	**10500**	0	0	**10500**	0.00
KS	24658	0	2500	0	**0**	13000	0	21500	61658	0	0	61658	0.00
LA	0	0	8000	0	0	20000	0	0	28000	0	0	28000	0.00
MI	0	0	**60000**	0	0	**0**	0	**40000**	100000	0	0	100000	0.00
MO	27000	8100	4000	0	0	3567	0	0	42667	0	0	42667	0.00
NJ	49692	11475	**0**	0	1950	0	0	22525	85642	0	0	85642	0.00
NC	78690	18741	3,758	11502	958	0	0	4959	118608	0	0	118608	0.00
OH	7411	0	0	**66458**	5079	0	0	0	78948	0	0	78948	0.00
PA	40000	0	0	0	**26000**	0	0	0	66000	0	0	66000	0.00
RI	31993	0	0	6600	0	0	0	15407	54000	0	0	54000	0.00
SC	0	0	4400	0	1000	49000	0	500	54900	2361	0	57261	0.04
TX	24538	16908	31442	9492	24917	15128	0	0	122425	**114200**	0	236625	0.48
WI	121000	25,700	4000	7000	0	0	0	0	157700	0	0	157700	0.00
MEAN	45249	10753	7869	6474	4805	11788	0	6652	93589	17194	0	110783	0
MEDIAN	27000	7198	3758	500	500	3567	0	0	78948	0	0	78948	

Not applicable: AZ, AR, DE, HI, ID, MS, NV, NH, NM, OK, OR, VA, WY
Missing: CT, FL, IL, MA, MN, NY, PR, UT
Figures in bold indicate the range in that column.

Appendix E

PCSP FUNDS RECEIVED BY CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORIZERS

This appendix summarizes data on what roles charter school authorizers played in the flow of PCSP funds from the state to charter schools (see Exhibit E-1).

- Unless the charter school authorizers were state bodies, they had very little involvement in decisions about PCSP funds and did not receive PCSP funds for their own activities.
- Charter school authorizers often functioned as the flow-through agencies or fiscal agents for disbursing PCSP funds, but this relationship rarely entailed other types of involvement or withholding. In fact, only two school districts reported receiving a share of a subgrant.
- Six of the seven respondents stating that they have received PCSP state grant funds were state educational agencies.

Exhibit E-1
PCSP FUNDS RECEIVED BY CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORIZERS

Charter School Authorizer Relationship To PCSP Funds	Percent of Authorizers (n=32)
This agency has received funds from the state's PCSP grant (n = 7)	22%
This agency has received a share of funds from PCSP subgrants or direct grants from ED that were designated for specific charter schools (n = 2)	6%
No funds received (n = 23)	72%

Appendix F

HOW SUBGRANTS ARE AWARDED

This Appendix displays state-by-state information on the basic processes used to distribute PCSP subgrants (see Exhibit F-1).

- States have primarily taken two approaches to distributing PCSP subgrants: (1) a subgrant competition with winners and losers in which charter schools or charter school planners respond to a request for proposals and are rated and ranked and (2) a calculation that distributes the available PCSP funds for subgrants to all eligible charter schools or planners in the state. These approaches to awarding subgrants are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

Exhibit F-1
HOW SUBGRANTS ARE AWARDED

Process for Distribution of PCSP Funds	Percent of States Using Process	Number of States	States (n=30)
Competitive proposal process	67%	20	AK, AZ, AR, CA, CO, FL, GA, HI, IL, KS, LA, MI, MO, NJ, OH, OR, PR, SC, VA, WI
Awards made to all eligible applicants	43%	13	AZ, CT, DE, DC, KS, LA, MA, MN, NC, PA, RI, TX, VA

Appendix G

FACTORS GIVEN PRIORITY IN THE PCSP SUBGRANTING PROCESS

- Some states establish priority factors for targeting some or all of the funding when awarding PCSP subgrants. For example, some respondents answered that their states gave priority to applicants from schools that do or will serve special student populations; other states target schools located in low-income communities (see Exhibit G-1).

- Respondents were asked to identify all categories that applied in their state. Therefore, percentages do not total 100.

Exhibit G-1
FACTORS GIVEN PRIORITY IN THE PCSP SUBGRANTING PROCESS
(n=28 States)

Priority Factors	Percent of States
Charter school is located in low-income community(ies)	14%
Charter school serves a special student population (e.g., English language learners, special education students)	36%
Charter school uses particular instructional strategies	4%
Charter school implements a specific curriculum	0%
Priority for planning grants	0%
No priority areas	39%

Appendix H

CRITERIA FOR FUNDING DECISIONS

Exhibit H-1 shows the criteria used by states to make PCSP funding decisions. State respondents were given the option of distinguishing between different types of subgrant when considering each criterion. The "nonspecific subgrants" column includes data from states that did not make a distinction between subgrant types when answering this question.

- Whether a state has set priorities or not, most states apply some criteria in making subgrant awards and determining funding levels. The state coordinator survey offered respondents a list of possible factors that might have been used in making funding decisions.
- As in most analyses concerning charter schools, there was clearly no consensus among PCSP grantee states about how to select subgrantees and determine funding levels, especially when broken out by type of award.

Exhibit H-1
CRITERIA FOR FUNDING DECISIONS
(n=30 States)

Criterion	Planning Subgrants	Implementation Subgrants	Dissemination Subgrants	Nonspecific Subgrants
Quality of subgrant proposal	20%	20%	7%	30%
Funding level requested	20%	23%	10%	30%
State ceiling on subgrant award level	17%	20%	0%	37%
Justification for funds requested	20%	23%	10%	30%
Start-up needs greater than in other charter schools	13%	20%	10%	10%
Negotiation of funding level with subgrantee	13%	13%	3%	10%
Student enrollment or projected student enrollment	7%	17%	7%	7%
Number or percentage of educationally disadvantaged students	3%	3%	3%	13%
Funds available for subgrants divided by the number of eligible charter school applications	27%	23%	13%	20%
Recommendations of peer reviewers/field reviewers	13%	17%	3%	27%

Appendix I

RECIPIENTS OF PCSP SUBGRANTS

Exhibit I-1 shows the entities that received PSCP subgrants, as reported by states. State respondents were given the option of distinguishing between different types of subgrant when considering each entity. The "nonspecific subgrants" column includes data from states that did not make a distinction between subgrant types when answering this question.

- State grantees define the entities eligible to receive PCSP subgrants. While the intent of federal legislation is to have PCSP funds devolve from the state to the charter school level, legitimate questions may be asked about the role of intermediaries along the way.

- In general, PCSP subgrants flow from states to founders groups and charter schools. Charter school authorizers that have received PCSP funds are nearly all state entities that both charter schools and are entitled to the 5 percent set-aside for managing and monitoring PCSP activities.

Exhibit I-1
RECIPIENTS OF PCSP SUBGRANTS
(n = 26)

Entity	Nonspecific Subgrants	Planning Subgrants	Implementation Subgrants	Dissemination Subgrants
Founders groups/charter school planners	2 states	8 states	0 states	0 states
Charter schools (i.e., charter schools receive grants directly from the state)	4 states	8 states	15 states	4 states
Charter school authorizers	4 states	4 states	4 states	2 states
Organizations or consortia that provide technical assistance to charter schools and charter school planners	0 states	0 states	0 states	1 state

Appendix J

PCSP-SUPPORTED RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATION, AND EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

Exhibit J-1 summarizes the research, demonstration, and evaluation projects that have been supported with PCSP national funds from 1995 through 1999. All of the following projects are funded through contracts with ED. In addition to the projects listed below, the Office of Special Education Programs funded Project SEARCH (Special Education as Requirements in Charter Schools), awarding a field-initiated grant to the National Association of State Directors of Special Education.

Exhibit J-1
PCSP-SUPPORTED RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATION, AND EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

Project Title	Contract or Grant Recipient
Research projects	
National Study of Charter Schools	RPP International
Research on Charter School Accountability	University of Washington
Charter Schools and Students with Disabilities	Westat, Inc., and SRI International
Schools and Staffing Survey	American Institutes for Research
Evaluation of the Public Charter Schools Program	SRI International
Study of Growth in Student Achievement	Humphrey Institute
Charter School Finance Study	American Federation of Teachers
Study of Competing Strategies for Education Reform	Michigan State University
Demonstration and other projects	
Cross Fertilization of Ideas and Practices (Project #1)	SRI International and the National Education Association
Cross Fertilization of Ideas and Practices (Project #2)	City on a Hill Charter School (Boston)
Project Connect	North Carolina Public School Forum
Leadership Training (Project #1)	South Eastern Regional Vision for Education, Inc.
Leadership Training (Project #2)	Northwest Regional Education Laboratory
The Employer-Linked Charter School Project	Public Policy Associates
Charter School Teacher Fellowship Program	Council for Basic Education

Appendix K

NEED FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IN PREPARING APPLICATIONS AND REPORTS

- The evaluation team asked state charter school coordinators and leaders of charter schools that received PCSP money directly from ED about the availability and quality of the technical assistance they had received from the federal program offices and other sources. Exhibit K-1 summarizes survey responses on the need for technical assistance in both applying for PCSP grant and preparing an annual performance report. State grantees are referred to as "SEA" in the exhibit, and charter school PCSP recipients are labeled "Non-SEA."

- As the data show, over half of state applicants reported that they need and received technical assistance with proposal preparation; fewer than half of the 14 charter school respondents indicated that they needed and received technical assistance in preparing their proposals.

- At the reporting stage, there was greater similarity in between the responses of the two populations: only about one-third of all responding PCSP recipients reported the need for technical assistance at this juncture, and nearly all recipients who needed help received it. However, one-third of the state grantees either did not know whether assistance with reporting had occurred because respondents were new to the state coordinator position, or had not yet prepared their first annual report.

Exhibit K-1
NEED FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IN PREPARING APPLICATIONS AND REPORTS

	Application		Reporting	
Need for Technical Assistance	SEA (n=38)	Non-SEA (n=14)	SEA (n=36)	Non-SEA (n=14)
Yes, we needed and received this assistance	61%	43%	34%	36%
Yes, we needed this assistance but did not receive it	0%	0%	3%	0%
No, we did not need nor receive this assistance	32%	50%	31%	57%

Note: Percentages do not total 100 because some grantees answered "don't know" or had not yet prepared an annual report.

CHAPTER 3 APPENDICES

Appendix L

COMPLEXITY IN CHARTERING AUTHORITY

Although local school entities and states play an important role in the charter school movement in each state, the specifics of charter granting vary greatly from state to state. For example, in California and Texas, two states in which local boards and the state board of education are assigned roles in chartering, the exact relationships between the state and locality are very different. In California, local boards charter and send on their charter for an official "number" from the state, which is essentially the state's stamp of approval. The state takes on the role of chartering only in the case of an appeal and for the three charter districts in the state. Contrast this approach with Texas, where local boards can charter "campus" (or district conversion) charter schools independent of the state. However, the State Board of Education can also charter—and specifically charters open-enrollment or start-up—schools. The two entities operating independently can sometimes lead to confusion about relationships or overlapping interests, since the state board may charter a school within the boundaries of Houston Independent School District, for example, right alongside a charter that has been authorized by the district itself.

These examples illustrate the challenges in grouping state approaches to chartering into simple categories that do not reflect the true diversity and complexity inherent in the chartering infrastructure. Exhibit L-1 represents an effort to sort states according to relevant ways of viewing the state policy contexts and environments in which charter schools develop. In describing the various state approaches to structuring the authorizing system, there are several categories under which states can fall:

- **Single entity authority (local and state).** There are 15 states where the chartering authority is the purview of one type of agency only: local school boards or districts or a state entity. Ten of these states provide local school boards or districts with the authority to charter in the state. In two of these cases (ID, OR) the state board can also grant charters, but only when the local decision to deny the charter is appealed. In five other states, a state entity is the only authorizing agency. For the most part, this means that the state board of education authorizes the charter, but the SEA is often intimately involved in the review of applications and in many cases makes recommendations to the board. In one case (NJ), the State Commissioner is the sole authorizing agency.

- **Multiple-entity authority (with independence or interdependence)**. In the remaining 23 states, more than one type of entity is permitted to charter. Relationships between the entities permitted to charter come in many forms. The first set of multiple-entity chartering states allow for each of the stated entities to charter <u>independently</u> of each other. In other words, in Arizona, one of three states with an independent entity created for chartering (a fourth is in Pennsylvania, but is meant only for appeals), the State Board of Education charters independently from either the State Board for Charter Schools or the local boards.

The second set of multiple-entity chartering states often have complex, interdependent relationships between the entities that charter. For example, in Minnesota, charter school authorizers include the State Board of Education (which became defunct around the time of the 1999 telephone survey), local boards, intermediate school districts, universities and community colleges, and the chief state school officer. However, in the past, all the Minnesota entities that were *not* the state board submitted their granted charters to the state for ratification. It is not clear who might play this ratification role now that the state board has been dismantled. In another example of this type, New York's charter school authorizers include the state board of education (Board of Regents), the local boards, and the State University of New York's (SUNY's) Board of Trustees. In this state, public school conversions must go through their local boards; moreover, local boards must pass all approved charters on to the state board for final approval. Charter schools approved by SUNY, on the other hand, must submit their charter to the state board, but the comments of the state board are not legally binding, so in some ways SUNY has more authority over the chartering process.

Exhibit L-1
LOCAL, STATE, MULTIPLE INDEPENDENT AND INTERDEPENDENT ENTITIES, BY STATE

State	Entities Permitted to Charter
Single Entity - Locals	
CO	L
KS	L
NM	L
NV	L
OK	L, VTSD
SC	L
VA	L
WY	L
ID	L + SB on appeal
OR	L + SB on appeal
PA	L + IB[1] on appeal
Single Entity - State	
HI	SB
NH	SB
NJ	CSSO
RI	SB
UT	SB
Multiple Entities, Chartering Independent of Each Other	
FL	L, U/C/C[2]
MI	L, ISD, and U/C/C[3]
WI	L, U/C/C[4], M[4]
CT	SB, L
DE	SB, L
LA	SB, L + SB on appeal
OH	SB, L, C, U/C/C, M
TX	SB, L[5]
AZ	SB, IB[6], and L
DC	SB, IB[7]
PR	IB[8]
Multiple Entities, With Interdependence	
AK	L with SB approval
CA	L, C, with SB approval + SB on appeal and SB for charter districts
IL	L with SB approval + SB on appeal
MO	L, U/C/C with SB approval + SB on appeal
NC	SB, L and U/C/C with SB approval
MN	SB, L, U/C/C, CSSO, ISD + SB on appeal
NY	SB, L with SB approval, U/C/C[9]
AR	SB (L approve conversions before sent to SB)
GA	SB (L monitors, renews, and approves charters, and is liable)
MS	SB (L approve before sent to SB)
MA	SB (L and teacher's union approve local charters before sent to SB)

[1] Charter Schools Appeals Board
[2] State universities with laboratory schools
[3] Only public colleges and universities
[4] Only applies to these entities in Milwaukee
[5] Including "home rule" districts
[6] State Board for Charter Schools
[7] DC Public Charter Schools Board
[8] Educational Reform Institute
[9] SUNY Board of Trustees

Key:
L = local boards and/or districts
SB = state board of education
IB = independent board
ISD = intermediate school district
C = counties
M = municipal governments
VTSD = vocational-technical school district
CSSO = chief state school officer
U/C/C = universities/colleges/community colleges

Appendix M

STATE LEGISLATIVE CAPS AND NUMBERS OF CHARTER SCHOOLS

As Exhibit M-1 illustrates, state caps can be grouped into three main categories: no cap at all, statewide caps, and some other form of cap that is not a statewide one.

- **No caps**. These states did not have an annual or overall cap at the state, authorizer or school level.
- **Total Statewide Caps**. The statewide cap category includes caps on (a) total number/percent of charter schools/charter school students in the state and/or on (b) total number/percent of charter schools/charter school students within a given region/district. These are seen as related since, in many cases, a total statewide cap can be calculated on the basis of regional or district caps.
- **Other Caps**. The remaining states have either an annual or overall cap by type of authorizer or type of school. Caps on types of schools were geared primarily toward limiting the number of start-ups, although New Mexico's cap also includes conversions (five per year) as well.

It is significant that 12 states (32%) had no cap whatsoever. Two of the states with no caps had some restrictions on chartering in the state, though they did not fall into particular forms of caps. The Missouri legislation effectively limits charter schools to the geographic areas of Kansas City and St. Louis. Oklahoma legislation stipulates that certain smaller districts are not eligible to charter.

Sixteen states (42% of our sample) currently report a total statewide cap of some kind. Two-thirds of these states have 50 or fewer charter schools in operation. In some cases, state legislation explicitly outlines a cap on the total number of charter schools based on the district or regional caps. For example, in Illinois, the law outlines a cap of 45 statewide, with 15 in Chicago, 15 in the Chicago suburbs, and 15 in the remaining regions in the state. In other cases, states reported a calculated effective cap based on the regional or district caps (e.g., Florida calculated an effective statewide cap to be 950, based on restrictions on the numbers of charters vis-à-vis the size of the district). Total statewide caps ranged anywhere from 6 to 950 charter schools.

Ten states (26%) had other kinds of caps. Four states reported annual caps: Arizona, the District of Columbia, New Hampshire, and North Carolina. Of these, however, at least one is being automatically repealed in 2000 (New Hampshire). Ohio has a cap on the number of charter schools that can be chartered by the State Board of Education (75), though this will be raised to 125 in 2001.

Exhibit M-1
TYPES OF CAPS ACROSS STATES

TYPE OF CAP		STATE
No Cap (n = 12)		CO, CT, DE, GA, MN, MO, OK, PA, PR, SC, WI, WY
Total Statewide Cap (n = 16)	Cap on total number of schools or total number of students in state	CA – 250 + additional 100 per year HI – 25 ID – 60 (12 per year for first 5 years) KS – 15 LA – 42 MA – 50 NJ – 135* RI – 20 (10 directed at at-risk youth); maximum of 6% of school-age population UT – 8
	Regional/District cap (implicitly or explicitly creates an effective statewide cap)	AK – 30 statewide, based on regional caps of 10 in Anchorage, 5 in Fairbanks, 3 in Matanuska-Susitna Borough, 3 in Kenai Peninsula Borough, 2 in City/Borough of Juneau, and 7 in rest of state FL – district caps based on student enrollment (effective statewide cap of approx. 950) IL – 45 cap statewide, based on regional caps of 15 in Chicago, 15 in Chicago suburbs, 15 in rest of state MS – 6 statewide (preference of one in each of 5 congressional districts + one in the delta region) NV – caps by size of county (effective cap of 21 statewide) OR – total number of students in charter schools shall not be more than 10% of the district enrollment VA – 2 per division (as of 7/2000, charter schools shall not exceed 10% of total number of schools or 2, whichever is greater)
Other Caps (n = 10)	Annual cap by type of authorizer or school	AZ – 25 per year for State Board of Ed; 25 per year for State Charter Schools Board (no cap on districts) DC – 20 per year (10 per year for each of the 2 charter school authorizers) NH – 10 per year* NC - 100 per year statewide, 5 per year per district
	Cap on type of school	AR – 12 start-ups total (3 per congressional district) NM – 15 start-ups, 5 conversions per year NY – 100 start-ups (50 by SUNY Board of Trustees, 50 by other charter school authorizers) TX – 120 open-enrollment schools (start-ups) for State Board of Ed (open-enrollment schools with 75% at-risk do not count against cap)
	Other	OH – 75 per State Board of Ed MI – 150 for universities; no single university may exceed 50% of 150.

* Repealed automatically in 2000.

Sources: Year 1 state coordinator survey; legislative analyses (Hirsch, 2000); SRI legislative analyses.

CHAPTER 4 APPENDICES

Appendix N

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE AGE OF STATE LEGISLATION AND CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORIZER VARIABLES

Although the charter movement overall is still quite young, the number of states joining the movement since the first law was passed in Minnesota (1991) has grown steadily in the past decade. As Exhibit N-1 below demonstrates, almost 40% of states (14 states and DC) got involved in the charter school movement in the middle of the last decade (1995 and 1996), with the total number of states involved in charter schools steadily increasing every year. As of September 1999, 36 states plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico had charter school legislation in place.

Exhibit N-1
AGE OF CHARTER LEGISLATION

Early 1991 – 1994 (n=12)	Middle 1995 – 1996 (n=15)	Recent 1997 – 1999 (n=11)
Minnesota (1991)	Alaska (1995)	Mississippi (1997)
California (1992)	Arkansas (1995)	Nevada (1997)
Colorado (1993)	Delaware (1995)	Ohio (1997)
Georgia (1993)	Louisiana (1995)	Pennsylvania (1997)
Massachusetts (1993)	New Hampshire (1995)	Idaho (1998)
Michigan (1993)	Rhode Island (1995)	Missouri (1998)
New Mexico (1993)	Wyoming (1995)	New York (1998)
Puerto Rico (1993)	Connecticut (1996)	Utah (1998)
Wisconsin (1993)	Washington, DC (1996)	Virginia (1998)
Arizona (1994)	Florida (1996)	Oklahoma (1999)
Hawaii (1994)	Illinois (1996)	Oregon (1999)
Kansas (1994)	New Jersey (1996)	
	North Carolina (1996)	
	South Carolina (1996)	
	Texas (1996)	

Legislative Timing

Exhibit N-2 illustrates the relationship between the age of charter legislation and the types of entities permitted to charter schools, their roles and responsibilities, and the types of reporting requirements that are expected of charter school authorizers. Several findings are interesting here. First, although states identify multiple entities for chartering schools regardless of when legislation was passed, the distribution across states differs depending on the year passed. For example, in early states, the proportions allowing local school districts, school boards, and state boards of education to charter were comparable to one another. By contrast, states with recent legislation are much more variable, and local school boards, state boards of education, and universities have become more commonly included in charter legislation. This trend is consistent with both federal legislation and the thinking of charter school proponents, who argue for the value of different types of charter school authorizer.

In the domain of roles and responsibilities, although virtually all states require review of the charter document and student achievement, there appears to be a trend over time that fewer states expect that charter school authorizers will administer budgets or personnel, or provide services to charter schools. Although these are only a small portion of the charter school accountability picture, this finding seems to reflect a trend toward less control being given to charter school authorizers over time and, presumably, more freedom to charter schools in these specific areas of responsibility. Third, with regard to reporting requirements, an interesting—although not linear—pattern emerges over time. For example, fewer states with recent legislation require charter school authorizers and schools to report educational programs or financial record keeping, whereas large majorities of those from the mid-1990s require reporting in virtually all areas from educational programs, to compliance, and student enrollment. In sum, viewing the charter school movement against the backdrop of state legislation yields quite a dynamic picture that is changing the contexts in which charters operate over time.

Exhibit N-2
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AGE OF CHARTER LEGISLATION AND CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORIZER VARIABLES

	1991-94 (n=12)	1995-96 (n=15)	1997-99 (n=11)
Charter school authorizer Type			
Local school boards	50%	67%	82%
Local school districts	42%	20%	27%
State board of education	50%	73%	64%
Universities and colleges	25%	13%	27%
Community colleges	25%	0%	9%
Roles/Responsibilities (% of states reporting that no charter school authorizers have these responsibilities)			
Administer the budget	45%	64%	78%
Administer personnel and benefits	45%	64%	60%
Provide facilities for charter school(s)	27%	57%	60%
Provide services	27%	38%	36%
Reporting Requirements (% of states requiring charter school authorizers to report on these areas)			
Educational program	80%	67%	27%
Financial record keeping	60%	92%	36%
Compliance with federal regulations	40%	91%	44%
Compliance with state regulations	44%	90%	27%
Student enrollment and demographics	80%	92%	36%
Student achievement	90%	86%	64%
Other student performance indicators	67%	82%	40%
Governance/decision-making	44%	64%	10%

Types of Charter School Authorizers Allowed

As described earlier, the legislative decision establishing which entities may charter schools and the roles and responsibilities of such entities can have an important impact on the way the charter school movement develops in an individual state. Exhibit N-3 below shows variation in roles and responsibilities and reporting requirements in light of the four categories of states in terms of charter school authorizer type. In the area of roles and responsibilities beyond review of charter documents and student achievement, states that allow local entities only and those that allow multiple independent entities appear to be less likely than other states to require charter school authorizers to perform functions related to budget, personnel, or services. Similarly, states that allow only local entities to charter appear to be generally less likely to require reporting in most of the reporting categories. Thus, it would seem to be consistent that states that legislate greater local control of chartering also are less likely to require specific responsibilities or reporting burden. This pattern may reflect the belief that this type of decision is best accomplished in the direct relationship between the authorizer and the individual school.

Exhibit N-3
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TYPES OF CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORIZER ALLOWED AND OTHER CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORIZER VARIABLES

	Single Type of Entity – Local (n=9)	Single Type of Entity - State (n=6)	Multiple Entities - Independent (n=11)	Multiple Entities - Interdependent (n=10)
Roles/Responsibilities (% none)				
Administer the budget	43%	80%	46%	78%
Administer personnel and benefits	57%	80%	37%	67%
Provide facilities for charter school(s)	38%	80%	36%	44%
Provide services	33%	75%	27%	11%
Reporting Requirements (% yes)				
Educational program	33%	60%	64%	75%
Financial record keeping	38%	50%	30%	67%
Compliance with federal regulations	43%	75%	67%	57%
Compliance with state regulations	38%	67%	63%	50%
Student enrollment and demographics	38%	80%	83%	75%
Student achievement	67%	100%	83%	78%
Other student performance indicators	25%	75%	90%	63%
Governance/decision-making	13%	33%	42%	71%

Appendix O

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORIZERS, AS REPORTED BY STATES

Exhibit 4-4 in Chapter 4 illustrates the frequency with which states reported the following roles of charter school authorizers:

- **Charter review and negotiation**. However varied charter school authorizers may be in type and other responsibilities, it is a logical and an unequivocal finding that virtually all charter school authorizers in nearly all states have a role in reviewing and monitoring charter documents. This responsibility presumably applies across initial application, charter award, ongoing monitoring and oversight, and renewal.
- **Student achievement**. Concern about and the need for improved academic achievement are driving forces behind the charter school movement. Indeed, the notion of a contract to free schools from regulation in exchange for results in student learning is one of the charter movement's most powerful messages. Not surprisingly, charter school authorizers are required in most states (84%) to monitor student achievement (see Exhibit O-1). The implementation of this monitoring function is probably quite variable, since improvement in achievement can be considered from a multitude of perspectives (e.g., comparisons to state averages or nearby non-charter schools).
- **Budget and personnel**. Most charter school proponents and operators would argue that budget and personnel functions are two of the most crucial areas over which a school should have flexibility. Because of the centralization of state financing systems, however, these may be the functions that are most difficult to disentangle from the existing system. More than half of the states reported that no charter school authorizers were responsible for the administration of budget (60%) and personnel and benefits (56%). In certain states, this might be because different agencies are considered responsible; in others, it might be a point of negotiation.
- **Facilities**. One of the most challenging start-up obstacles for many charter schools is locating appropriate facilities (Berman, et. al., 1998). However, providing facilities at free or reduced rent was not a requirement or high expectation of charter school authorizers in most states. In fact, approximately half of the states with smaller to medium-sized charter populations reported that no charter school authorizer was required to take on this responsibility. In the states with larger charter populations, assigning the responsibility to charter school authorizers was more likely, with over two-thirds of states reporting that some charter school authorizers were responsible for providing these options. Those reporting that responsibility for providing facilities varied indicated that, for the most part, this point was negotiated between the charter school authorizer and the charter school.
- **Provide services**. States were asked whether charter school authorizers were responsible for providing services such as special education. The provision of services, particularly for special education students, has been complicated and sometimes contentious issue for charter

schools (Ahearn, 1999). Lack of clarity about educational and financial responsibilities for students with disabilities has created difficulties for charter school authorizers and schools alike. The primary issue here relates to the higher cost of educating these students and the lack of resources on the part of many charter schools to serve them, despite their obligation under federal law to do so. Similar situations apply to assessment and transportation services. States' reported expectations for the provision of services such as special education were quite variable. None of the states with larger numbers of charter schools reported that all of their charter school authorizers were responsible for providing these services; most of these states reported that some were responsible and others were not, depending on the circumstances. Ten states reported that no charter school authorizers were responsible for providing these services. The basic point that states made was that, in the case of special education services, the picture of who is responsible is perfectly unclear.

In some states, state coordinators responded that "no" charter school authorizers were responsible for functions like special education services or providing facilities because the issue was not addressed directly in the law, so official responsibility was unclear in that state. More often, however, if a state did not assign the responsibility to any of its charter school authorizers, it would mean that another entity was responsible for those activities. More likely than not, the responsible entity would be the charter school itself or, in some cases, the local educational agency (where it is not the charter school authorizer).

Exhibit O-1
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORIZERS, AS REPORTED BY STATES

Role/Responsibility	All Charter School Authorizers	Some Charter School Authorizers	No Charter School Authorizers
Review, negotiate, and monitor the terms of the charter document (n=38)	97%	0%	3%
Review and monitor student performance in the charter school(s) (n=38)	84%	8%	8%
Administer the budget of the charter school(s) (n=34)	15%	24%	62%
Administer personnel and benefits functions for the charter school(s) (n=35)	9%	34%	57%
Provide facilities for charter school(s) at free or reduced rent (n=35)	9%	43%	49%
Provide services (e.g., special education) (n=35)	20%	46%	34%

Appendix P

STATE INFRASTRUCTURE FOR SUPPORTING CHARTER SCHOOLS

The individuals whom the evaluation team interviewed for the charter school state coordinator survey were almost exclusively those identified by the federal Public Charter Schools Program as the key charter school contact in a state. They were, indeed, the most knowledgeable individuals available for the questions that we had. However, there was considerable variability among them in the degree to which they were engaged with information about the charter school movement, the charter schools in their state, the work of charter school authorizers, and the status of charter school legislation. In some cases, the individuals were brand new to their positions or in an "acting" position until a charter school person could be hired. At many state educational agencies, however, the "charter school hat" is a very small one. The human resources that a state can or will devote to charter school affairs will, in the long run, expand or circumscribe the state role in development of the charter school movement.

SEAs allocated anywhere from a very small percentage of one person's time to six full-time staff to charter school work. In some cases, but particularly in states with larger numbers of charter schools, multiple divisions of the SEA had became involved with charter schools at various points and to various degrees. Respondents spoke of cross-discipline teams reviewing applications or dealing with various questions from planners or operators. A few states call on other state governmental agencies far afield from education to provide technical assistance and workshops on a wide array of topics, such as building codes and the state auditing procedures, for charter school planners.

Size of the charter school population in the state seems to have an impact on how many staff are allocated to support charter schools at the state level. States with larger numbers of charter schools tended to have multiple staff, and often a full program, addressing charter school issues. Only one of the states with more than 50 charter schools had fewer than two full-time-equivalent (FTE) staff (1.5). The average number of staff was over 3 FTE among these states (excluding the one state in the group with almost four staff overseeing multiple school choice-related issues, of which charter schools was only one).

The number of charter school staff in states with between 10 and 50 charter schools ranged from a small portion of each of three people's time to a portion of six staff people's time. The average for these states with medium-sized charter school populations, excluding those states with shared responsibilities across multiple programs (and no assigned FTE, per se) was approximately 2 FTE.

Finally, states with very small charter school populations (fewer than 10) tended to have very few staff. Of the 16 states in this category, 5 had between 1 and 2 FTE staff. However, in Virginia (which has no charter schools yet), an Office of Policy and Public Affairs employs seven staff, all of whom are supposed to be knowledgeable about charter school issues as well as a range of other educational issues. In fact, many of the states with small numbers of charters are states where the charter legislation has just recently passed. It was harder for these states to

estimate an FTE because they were still determining how and in what ways they would be supporting charter schools.

States with single-agency chartering authority (either the state agency or local agencies) tended to have smaller staff at the state level working on charter schools. By and large, in states with local entities as the only type of charter school authorizer, 1.5 FTE staff or fewer worked on charter schools; in states with only the state as the charter authorizer, 1 FTE staff or fewer worked on charter schools. In three states (VA, PA, NJ), staff shared the responsibility of charter schools across multiple staff within an office that covered multiple issues besides charters (e.g., an Office of School Choice).

On the other hand, states with multiple entities permitted to charter tended to have much larger numbers of staff working on charter schools. For example, states with multiple entities chartering independent of each other had the largest average of any of the groups of states, with all having more than 1 FTE staff member working on charter schools. In these states, the range of staff assigned to charters ranged from 1.75 to 6 FTE. The number of staff in states with multiple entities chartering with interdependence ranged from fewer than 1 to 5 FTE. Three states in this category (MO, NY, MS), did not estimate a percentage of time, but maintained that multiple persons and divisions were involved at any one point. One implication of the size of a state's charter school staff and the degree to which their jobs are dedicated to charter issues is the role that the SEAs may or may not play in holding charter schools and/or charter school authorizers accountable for maintaining their respective sides of the charter school bargain.