EXPECT MORE

2018 NACSA LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE



How Can Authorizers Customize Expansion Applications?

Ryan Marks-Colorado Charter School Institute Gregg Stevens-Georgia State Charter School Commission Carol Swann-Swann Educational Solutions (formerly Metro Nashville Public Schools)

Sandi Brown-Colorado Early Colleges



Agenda

- Introductions (5 min)
- Authorizer Profiles (5 min)
- Why this matters: A Colorado Case Study (10 min)
- Defining Expansion (10 min)
- Current expansion processes (10 min)
- Why customize expansion applications (5 min)
- How to customize expansion applications (20 min)
- Questions (10 min)





Panelists

- ➤ Gregg Stevens-Georgia State Charter School Commission
- Carol Swann-Swann Educational Solutions (formerly Metro Nashville Public Schools)
- Ryan Marks-Colorado Charter School Institute
- Sandi Brown-Colorado Early Colleges





Authorizer Profiles





State Charter Schools Commission of Georgia

Authorizer Profile

- The mission of the State Charter Schools Commission of Georgia is to improve public education throughout the state by approving high quality charter schools that provide students with better educational opportunities than they would otherwise receive in traditional schools.
 - Operational in 2013
 - Independent Charter Authorizing Board
 - Portfolio of 29 schools
 - Concerted Focus on Replication and Expansion





Authorizer Profile

Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools – 85,000 students, urban district, 130 different languages spoken

- 29 District-authorized charter schools
- 2 Achievement School District authorized charter schools
- Charters serve approximately 13,000 students, or 15% of the total district
- 94% of our district-authorized charters are consistently high-performing
- 36% of district schools with reward status from the state are charter schools





Colorado Charter School Institute

Authorizer Profile

Our Mission

As a statewide charter school authorizer, the Colorado Charter School Institute (CSI) seeks to foster high-quality public school choices with a focus on schools closing the achievement gap. We believe that every child should have access to high performing public school choices. We are committed to the creation and success of high-quality charter public school options that offer diverse educational models to best meet the needs of every child.





Colorado Charter School Institute

Authorizer Profile

EXPECT

Our Schools

CSI authorizes 39 schools across Colorado and offers 14 educational models including Montessori, early college, and language-immersion.



Our Students

CSI serves over 17,500 students. Our student population is comparable to that of the state and we continue to prioritize service to at-risk students.



Our Outcomes

All CSI schools earned one of the two highest academic performance ratings from the state: Performance and Improvement.





Colorado Case Study





Colorado Case Study

Our vision is to be recognized as the nation's most effective charter school authorizer by building a portfolio of high performing charter public schools that serve all students and utilize innovative educational designs.



Encourage interested highquality charter schools to consider appropriate expansion of services



Customize applications for expanding schools in order to minimizing the requirements for schools while still effectively evaluating the proposed expansions





Colorado Case Study

Policy Environment

Exclusive Chartering Authority (ECA) limits the ability of CSI to authorize charter schools in Colorado.



In Colorado, charter schools can be authorized by school districts or the Charter School Institute (CSI), which is the only statewide authorizer in Colorado.



178 school districts exist in Colorado

170 school districts retain exclusive chartering authority

45 school districts authorize one or more charter schools







COLORADO Early Colleges

EXPECT MORE

Colorado Early Colleges (CEC)

- CEC is a network of tuition-free public, charter schools across the state of Colorado.
- Four high schools and one middle school provide CEC students with the opportunity to take college courses while in high school.
- CEC curriculum is designed to give students the opportunity to concurrently earn a high school diploma and a post-secondary credential within four years.



CEC Replication & Expansion Timeline



CEC Enrollment Over Time

■CSEC ■CECFC ■CECP ■CECA



2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017





Defining Expansion





Replication vs. Expansion

	REPLICATION	EXPANSION						
DEFINITION	Replication means <u>opening a new school</u> based on the educational model of an existing high-quality charter school.	Expansion means growing an existing school by significantly increasing student enrollment, adding one or more grades, or adding an additional site/campus to an existing high-quality charter school.						
OVERALL RESULT	 Two (or more) Schools: The existing high-quality charter school continues to operate; AND A new school operates utilizing the model and practices of the existing school. 	One School: An existing high-quality charter school increases its offerings to students by adding grades, increasing student enrollment, adding a campus, or any combination thereof.						
CHARTER CONTRACT	 Two (or more) Charter Contracts: The existing high-quality charter school continues to operate under its current charter contract; AND The new school is authorized under a separate charter contract that holds the new school accountable for its performance. 	One Charter Contract: Because the expansion of a high-quality charter school adds to the offerings of the existing school, no new charter contract is authorized, but the charter contract is amended to reflect the expanded offerings.						

Replication vs. Expansion – Scenario One

Details: Shiny Happy School is a high-quality K-12 school located in Washington County. The governing board of Shiny Happy School identified a need for high quality school choice in neighboring Adams County. The governing board and administration of Shiny Happy School would like to support the creation of a school choice option for Adams County. Representatives of Shiny Happy School:

A) helped to assemble a governing board of community members from Adams County;
B) mapped out a timeline for implementation in partnership with the new board;
C) developed an agreement outlining roles and responsibilities of all parties; and
D) agreed to mentor the Adams County school throughout the petition process and early years of operation.





Replication vs. Expansion – Scenario One

Result: Shiny Happy School will **replicate in partnership with a new governing board.** Because the governing board of Shiny Happy School does not wish to have direct oversight of the new location, the school must replicate in partnership with a new governing board with the intent of forming a new and separate school that will eventually operate independently of Shiny Happy People. The new location, if approved, will receive a charter contract that is separate from the contract for Shiny Happy People and will be governed by the <u>new</u> governing board. The accountability for Shiny Happy School and the new Adams County school will be separate, and each school will be responsible for only the performance of its respective students.





Replication vs. Expansion – Scenario Two

Details: Super Duper Charter is a high-quality middle school located in Freshprinceville. The governing board of Super Duper Charter identified a community in nearby Hammertown that would benefit from its program, and the community has indicated a clear desire to implement the model of Super Duper Charter. Initially, Super Duper Charter considered transporting students from Hammertown, but logistical obstacles related to the current facility are insurmountable. However, a new identified facility in Hammertown will be located relatively close to the current location just became available.





Replication vs. Expansion – Scenario Two

Result: Super Duper Charter will **replicate under the existing governing board.** Because the governing board of Super Duper Charter would like to oversee both school locations, Super Duper Charter will replicate to create a second "sister" school. The governing board of the school will submit a replication application and is eligible for expedited review. While both schools will operate under the authority of a single governing board, they will hold separate charter contracts, and accountability for performance will occur at the school level.





Replication vs. Expansion – Scenario Three

Details: Gotham High is a high-quality high school that wants to open another campus to serve middle school students. The governing board of the existing school desires to maintain oversight of the new campus, and they would like for the new campus to be located relatively close to the existing school. Given the school's successful performance in the high school grade band (arguably the toughest), the governing board believes it could incorporate middle grades into its existing charter contract without jeopardizing the school's overall accountability standing.





Replication vs. Expansion – Scenario Three

Result: Gotham High will **expand.** Because the governing board of Gotham High would like to add additional grade levels (and students), Gotham High can continue to operate as one school. While Gotham High <u>could also choose to replicate</u> and still maintain oversight through a single governing board, replication would result in the middle school campus of Gotham High operating as a second and separate school. As an expansion of Gotham High, the new campus will become part of the existing school with all students contributing to only one accountability determination and allow a more flexible use of funding.





Replication vs. Expansion – Scenario Four

Details: Monty Hall Academy is a high-quality K-12 charter that has an attendance zone of Newton County. The governing board of Monty Hall Academy was approached by a community group wishing to bring the award-winning STEM program implemented by Monty Hall Academy to Keppler County. The community group is well-intentioned, but lacks time and expertise to serve as a quality governing board for a charter school. After many months of planning, the community group and governing board of Monty Hall Academy developed a plan to open a location a new location in Keppler County and adjust the administrative structure of Monty Hall Academy to serve both locations.





Replication vs. Expansion – Scenario Four

Results: Monty Hall Academy will **expand.** The new campus of Monty Hall Academy will be located apart from the current campus, but the administration will operate the two campuses as one school. The performance of both campuses will operate under one charter contract, contribute to one accountability determination, and earn funding as one school.

While Monty Hall <u>could also choose to replicate</u> and still maintain oversight through a single governing board, specific circumstances of the governing board and school administration led to students being better served as one school.





Expansion Processes





State Charter School Commission of Georgia

Expansion Processes

- Established Evaluation Priorities for Replication and Expansion
 - Track Record of Academic Achievement, Standards of Financial Sustainability, Community Engagement, Clear Motives
- Established Standards for Board Governance
- Open Cycle with Frequent Collaboration
- Expedited Review 1-3 Months
- Frequent Use of Charter Amendments for Expansion





Background for Nashville LEA Approved Charters

- Tennessee Law specifies a 10 year contract. When it is time for expansion or renewal, there will be multiple years of data to review academic, operational, and financial.
- Performance frameworks that are a part of the charter contract
- Report cards issued yearly that indicate the status of the charter school that are public documents
- Renewal/Expansion is tiered dependent upon performance simple renewal, renewal with conditions, or non-renewal.





Renewal/Expansion Questions to Consider

- Is the school an academic success?
- Is the school an effective, viable organization?
- Is the school fiscally sound?
- Is the renewal/expansion plan reasonable, feasible, and achievable?





•	Valor Flagship Academy				School Performance Summary (2014-17)									
	Based on the data accumu		ated to date, this school is on track to:				Simple Renewal	Renewal Application Due:		April	2022			
	SchoolName: V Address: 43				1			5-year F	leview:	October	2018			
		lashville, TN					Demographics	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
	Website: w	515) 823-7982	iate.org				African-American:				1596 1696	14% 16%	096 1796	13% 18%
	Profile Profile	010) 823-7982					Hispanic: White:				6396	10%0 61%0	6496	64%
	Principal: Ja	amie Gutter					Asian:				596	690	696	596
	Opened:	2014					FARM:				5396	53%	N/A	N/A
	Current Grades:	5-8					SWD:				796	6%	896	99/0
	Approved Grades:	5-12					EL:				1596	11%	996	896
	Enro Iment:	477					ED:						3096	28%
	Ento Intent.	11//					Organization	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	
	Academic	2011-12	2012-13 2013-14	2014-15	2015-15		Educ. Program							
	Ac h Increase				*		Fin. Management							
	TVAAS (NCE)				;		Governance/Rptng							
	TCAP (PA) Ach. Gap				*		Students/Employees Environment							
	Teacher Survey				*		Obligations							
	ACT (21+)				*		Congarante							•
	_						Overall Organization							
	Overall APF				*									
					*			2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
	3 Year Status						Diversity Racial							
	Academic	2016-17					I/L/D							
	State Accountability						Other Data	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
	Success Rate	78.1					Attendance Rate				9696	99%	9996	96%
	TN %bile	96.7												
	TN Ready						Key to Ratings Excelling							
	ELA % On													
	Track/Mastered	69.10%					Achieving							
	Math % On	72 5004					0.11.6.1							
	Track/Mastered	73.50%					Satisfactory							
	Science % On	91.80%					Review							
	irac k/Mastered				L									
	TVAAS	5					Target No Data Available							
	1		1	I	1		No Data Available							
	Three Year Averge	N/A												
							_							
		2011-12	2012-13 2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	**2016-17								
	Near Term: Current Ratio						-							
	Umrestr. Days Cash						-							
	Enroll. Variation													
	Default						-							
							1							
	Sustainability:													
	Total Margin Debt/Asset Ratio					-	-							
	Debt/Asset Katio Cash Flow													
	Debt Serv. Ratio						1							
							1							
EXPECT	Overall Financial								- 4/					
	*NOTE: State scoutability d at a unavail able for 2015-16 2016-17 TN Read via based on new standards, and thus is considered a baseline year													
	2016-17 I'N Kearly is based on new Standards, and times is considered a basenine year *2016-17 and its intervention of the standards and times is considered a basenine year *2016-17 and its intervention of the standards and times is considered a basenine year													



Customization





Customized Expansion Application

Benefits to Customizing Expansion Applications

- ★ Focus on the evaluation on existing evidence, capacity/readiness of the school leadership, and student and family demand
- Provide clear expectations and transparency around authorization processes
- ★ Minimize the requirements for schools while still effectively evaluating the proposed expansions

FXP

★ Tailor the depth of response based on the scale of the proposed expansion.





Customized Expansion Application

Benefits to Customizing Expansion Applications







Customizing Expansion Applications

Scenario Three

- Gotham High is a high-quality high school that wants to open another campus to serve middle school students.
- New campus to be located relatively close to the existing school.

Scenario Four

- Monty Hall Academy is a high-quality K-12 charter that to open a new location.
- The administrative structure of Monty Hall Academy will be adjusted to serve both locations.

Expansion Review Areas

Organizational Capacity

Facility Capacity & Viability

Financial Viability



Community Need & Support



Organizational Capacity

School has strong and stable school leadership and the school governing board demonstrates the capacity to expand the current program with fidelity, implement the original mission, and replicate and perpetuate success for all students.

What are the key differences between these two applications with regards to the Organizational Capacity review area?

How would these differences inform the expansion evaluation and the application narrative provided by the applicant?





Customizing Expansion Applications

Scenario Three

- Gotham High is a high-quality high school that wants to open another campus to serve middle school students.
- New campus to be located relatively close to the existing school.

Scenario Four

- Monty Hall Academy is a high-quality K-12 charter that to open a new location.
- The administrative structure of Monty Hall Academy will be adjusted to serve both locations.

Expansion Review Areas

Organizational Capacity

Facility Capacity & Viability

Financial Viability



Community Need & Support



Educational Plan

School provides an educational plan that details how the school will meet the needs of all students and sustain the core academic and curricular program through the expansion and will demonstrate high levels of success.

What are the key differences between these two applications with regards to the Educational Plan review area?

How would these differences inform the expansion evaluation and the application narrative provided by the applicant?





Customizing Expansion Applications

Scenario Three

- Gotham High is a high-quality high school that wants to open another campus to serve middle school students.
- New campus to be located relatively close to the existing school.

Scenario Four

- Monty Hall Academy is a high-quality K-12 charter that to open a new location.
- The administrative structure of Monty Hall Academy will be adjusted to serve both locations.

Expansion Review Areas

Organizational Capacity

Facility Capacity & Viability

Financial Viability



Community Need & Support



Facility Capacity & Viability

Current facility occupancy capacity is sufficient to support the expansion or an adequate plan is submitted with the application that will satisfy the facility requirements.

What are the key differences between these two applications with regards to the Facility Capacity and Viability review area?

How would these differences inform the expansion evaluation and the application narrative provided by the applicant?





Next Steps Towards Customization

What Did We Do Well?

What Could We Improve?

Mistakes to Avoid

WDYD?







Contact

Ryan Marks - ryanmarks@csi.state.co.us

Gregg Stevens - gregg.stevens@scsc.georgia.gov

Carol Swann - carolannswann@gmail.com



